

INFORMATION TO USERS

This was produced from a copy of a document sent to us for microfilming. While the most advanced technological means to photograph and reproduce this document have been used, the quality is heavily dependent upon the quality of the material submitted.

The following explanation of techniques is provided to help you understand markings or notations which may appear on this reproduction.

- 1. The sign or "target" for pages apparently lacking from the document photographed is "Missing Page(s)". If it was possible to obtain the missing page(s) or section, they are spliced into the film along with adjacent pages. This may have necessitated cutting through an image and duplicating adjacent pages to assure you of complete continuity.**
- 2. When an image on the film is obliterated with a round black mark it is an indication that the film inspector noticed either blurred copy because of movement during exposure, or duplicate copy. Unless we meant to delete copyrighted materials that should not have been filmed, you will find a good image of the page in the adjacent frame.**
- 3. When a map, drawing or chart, etc., is part of the material being photographed the photographer has followed a definite method in "sectioning" the material. It is customary to begin filming at the upper left hand corner of a large sheet and to continue from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. If necessary, sectioning is continued again—beginning below the first row and continuing on until complete.**
- 4. For any illustrations that cannot be reproduced satisfactorily by xerography, photographic prints can be purchased at additional cost and tipped into your xerographic copy. Requests can be made to our Dissertations Customer Services Department.**
- 5. Some pages in any document may have indistinct print. In all cases we have filmed the best available copy.**

**University
Microfilms
International**

**300 N. ZEEB ROAD, ANN ARBOR, MI 48106
18 BEDFORD ROW, LONDON WC1R 4EJ, ENGLAND**

7907381

PATANICZEK, DENNIS AL
A DESCRIPTIVE STUDY OF THE CONCERNS OF
FIRST-YEAR TEACHERS WHO ARE GRADUATES OF THE
SECONDARY EDUCATION PILOT PROGRAM AT MICHIGAN
STATE UNIVERSITY.

MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY, PH.D., 1978

University
Microfilms
International 300 N ZEEB ROAD, ANN ARBOR, MI 48106

© 1978

DENNIS AL PATANICZEK

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

A DESCRIPTIVE STUDY OF THE CONCERNS OF FIRST-YEAR TEACHERS
WHO ARE GRADUATES OF THE SECONDARY EDUCATION PILOT
PROGRAM AT MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY

By

Dennis Pataniczek

A DISSERTATION

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

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Department of Secondary Education
and Curriculum

1978

ABSTRACT

A DESCRIPTIVE STUDY OF THE CONCERNS OF FIRST-YEAR TEACHERS WHO ARE GRADUATES OF THE SECONDARY EDUCATION PILOT PROGRAM AT MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY

By

Dennis Pataniczek

This was a descriptive study of the concerns of first-year teachers who were graduates of the Secondary Education Pilot Program (SEPP) at Michigan State University. SEPP is a four-year alternative undergraduate secondary teacher education program. The study had four purposes: 1) to identify and describe the concerns of the subjects, 2) to relate those concerns to the subjects' undergraduate teacher preparation program, 3) to relate the findings to the developmental conceptualization of teacher concerns as posited by Frances Fuller, et al., and 4) to gather feedback and evaluative data about SEPP.

Literature was reviewed in the areas of current and historical trends in teacher education, conceptualizations of follow-up studies, and the concerns of beginning teachers. A separate chapter provided information about SEPP, including a program description, an historical framework, prior research, studies of the program and a description of program features which led the researcher to hypothesize the differences in the first-year teaching concerns of its graduates.

Data were gathered through survey questionnaires to all subjects and interviews were conducted with a randomly selected sample of the subjects. Data gathered included demographic

information, the degree of concerns held by subjects in fifty-five areas (early and late in the school year) perceived sources of help in resolving concerns, evaluative data about SEPP, and reactions to the Fuller developmental conceptualization.

Major findings included:

1. The subjects beginning of the year concerns were largely self concerns about adequacy, adjustment, and acceptance, but subjects also held a high degree of concern for having an impact on students, for meeting the needs of individual needs of students, for organizing instruction, and for improving their own teaching.
2. The subjects maintained their relative degree of concern for having impact on students and for dealing with troublesome students throughout the year, but were also concerned with individualizing instruction, with meeting the special needs of students and with student learning by the end of the year. Concerns about being liked, respected, and accepted, and concerns about discipline lessened by the end of the year.
3. When the concerns were examined by level of concern, there was less absolute concern for all levels, but the relative concern for teacher-student relationships dropped, and concern for meeting the needs of individual students rose. Concern about the improvement of instruction maintained its relatively high ranking.
4. Individuals' concerns varied greatly, and movement from the beginning to the end of the year also varied.

5. No statistically significant variances were found between groups of subjects when categorized on the basis of several variables.
6. The subjects' undergraduate education program and fellow teachers were most helpful in resolving the subjects' first-year concerns.
7. SEPP provided strengths to the subjects in relating to students, in self-evaluation skills, in problem solving, and through personal growth.
8. Field experiences were cited as the single most useful portion of SEPP.
9. The subjects believed their concerns to be of a cyclical nature, that many levels of concern occurred simultaneously, and that they returned to early concerns even when those concerns were felt to be largely resolved.
10. The vast majority of the subjects were extremely satisfied with their undergraduate teacher preparation.

Reflections and recommendations were made in the areas of preservice teacher education, inservice teacher education, follow-up studies, and the study of teacher concerns.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This dissertation is a product, not only of my own, but of the significant others who share in parts of my life. Without their encouragement, assistance, and support, the project would have been impossible.

Dr. Richard Gardner, as dissertation director and guidance committee chairman, provided support, insight, challenge, and standard of excellence. Dick was there when needed, and he often provided perspective which kept this study within manageable limits. Dick is a caring, supportive, and humane educator whose balance between idealism and realism are a model for others to emulate.

Dr. Sam Corl was also chairman of my guidance committee, and was also my employer, and friend. Sam Corl made the meaning of the word 'community' real to me. All of us who have had contact with Sam have become aware of our own uniquenesses as well as those commonalities which bind us together in community. He is a creative, caring, and brilliant teacher-scholar, whose standards of excellence in teacher education have inspired confidence and a drive toward personal and professional growth.

Dr. Howard Hickey, Dr. Lou Romano, and Dr. Tim Little, as members of my guidance committee, have been supportive and have contributed insights and offered suggestions that have made this dissertation more than it would have been otherwise.

Dr. Dale Alam also served on this guidance committee before departing MSU for George Peabody College. His support and the life space he provided and encouraged for reflection were important in my own growth. His influence will be with me for many years.

Gini Brown gave me more than she will ever know, from the first day I stepped into her classroom as a student intern more than ten years ago. Our relationship has flourished, and she has given me love, support, encouragement, and challenge. She is one of the finest person and teachers I have known.

Paula Stein has been my friend, my colleague, and in many ways my mentor. She has challenged me and has supported my endeavors and growth. Her concepts of "purpose" and "focus" will remain permanent parts of my life. I will always treasure her companionship in our adventure in the sharing, caring, learning and belonging that is SEPP.

There are a group of people, each of whom has given me something unique, whom I acknowledge with the greatest sincerity. Their contributions have been varied and many, and I treasure the special relationship I share with them all. Thom Negri, Cass Book, Monte Blair, Carol Norris, Nancy Corl, Sue Rekittke, Dan Jarrad, Jan Runyan, and Gail McCarthy are all a part of this dissertation. Special thanks go to Gary Clark as an individual as well as a representative of a special group who have contributed immeasurably to my life.

Two special people deserve separate mention:

Barbara Bowman has given me encouragement to be myself and to do the best I can do. With her love, support, and friendship, I

have grown and will continue to do so. She has been instrumental in the course of my life.

Bruce Grant Williams gave me faith and confidence in myself as a person, and rescued me in many times of crisis. Through him, I have learned to relax, to try new things, and to begin to accept what is while still striving for what can be. I cherish his friendship and I cherish him.

My parents have always given me love, support, and the encouragement that made all of this possible. I hope they know what they have given me.

Finally, this dissertation is dedicated with gratitude to the students of the Secondary Education Pilot Program, past and present, who have shared with me an adventure in personal and professional growth. I wish them all success and happiness in the years ahead.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter		Page
	LIST OF TABLES	viii
	LIST OF FIGURES	ix
I	THE NATURE OF THE STUDY	1
	Introduction	1
	Statement of the Problem	2
	Overview of the Study	2
	Purpose of the Study	4
	Assumptions on Which Study Is Based	5
	Need for the Study	5
	Limitations of the Study	8
	Definition of Terms	9
	Overview of Succeeding Chapters	10
II	REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	11
	Part I: Historical and Current Trends in Teacher Education	11
	Part II: Conceptualizations of Follow-up Studies	22
	Part III: Concerns of Beginning Teachers	27
	Summary	37
III	THE SECONDARY EDUCATION PILOT PROGRAM	39
	Part I: Program Description	39
	Part II: Historical Framework	42
	Part III: Prior Research and Studies of the Program	44
	Part IV: Program Features	51
	Summary	55
IV	DESIGN AND PROCEDURES	57
	Selection of Subjects	57
	Instrumentation	59
	The Survey Questionnaire	59
	The Interviews	62

Chapter		Page
	Collection of Data	63
	Compilation of Data	64
V	PRESENTATION OF THE FINDINGS	67
	Introduction	67
	Part I: the Survey Questionnaire	67
	Demographic Information	68
	Teaching Level and Satisfaction with First-Year Teaching Level	68
	Extent of Teaching Assignment in Major Field	69
	Average Class Size	69
	Attendance at In-Service Meetings	69
	Enrollment in College Graduate Courses, 1977-78	70
	Average Age of Building Faculty	70
	Satisfaction with Undergraduate Teacher Education Program	71
	Amount of Experience with School-Age Youngsters During Undergraduate Years	71
	Commitment to Teaching	72
	Desire to Return to Teaching Next Year	72
	Expressed Concerns of First-Year Teachers	73
	Levels of Concern	80
	Differences among Groups of Subjects	82
	Examination of Individual Concerns	87
	Sources of Help in Resolving Concerns	88
	Responses to Open-Ended Question	88
	Part II: the Interviews	98
	Beginning of the Year Concerns	98
	End of the Year Concerns	100
	"Crucial" Concerns	101
	Unresolved or Recurring Concerns	102
	Change in Concerns	102
	Concerns about the Coming School Year	103
	Rating the First Year of Teaching	105
	Self-Evaluation Process Used by Subjects	106
	Strengths Provided by Undergraduate Teacher Preparation Program	107
	Program Components Cited as Useful	109
	Weaknesses in Undergraduate Teacher Preparation Program	110
	Reactions to Fuller's Conceptualization of Teacher Concerns	111
	Summary of Findings	114
VI	SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, REFLECTIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS .	119
	Summary of Findings	119
	Conclusions	127

Chapter	Page
Reflections	129
Recommendations for Further Research	135
APPENDIX A	137
APPENDIX B	147
APPENDIX C	148
APPENDIX D	156
APPENDIX E	158
BIBLIOGRAPHY	162

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1 Students entering and exiting SEPP by reason	41
2 First-year teaching levels of respondents	68
3 Satisfaction with first-year teaching level	68
4 Average class sizes reported by respondents	69
5 Attendance at inservice meetings by subjects	70
6 Enrollment in college graduate courses	70
7 Average age of building faculty	70
8 General satisfaction with undergraduate teacher education program	71
9 Experience with youngsters while an undergraduate student	72
10 Commitment to teaching	72
11 Desire to return to teaching next year	73
12 Professional concerns expressed by first-year teachers . .	74
13 Mean scores for levels of concern	81
14 Summary of multivariate analyses of variance for the independent variables	83
15 Levels of concern expressed by individual subjects	89
16 Sources of help in resolving concerns of first-year teachers	91
17 Level of concern expressed on open-ended concerns question	93

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure	Page
1 Components of Secondary Education Pilot Program	41

CHAPTER ONE

THE NATURE OF THE STUDY

Introduction

Much research has been conducted in the last fifteen years in the area of teacher concerns. Frances Fuller and her associates at the University of Texas have been instrumental in much of this activity and have posited a developmental conceptualization of teacher concerns. Furthermore, Fuller and others, notably Hall and Jones, believe that the concerns of teachers can change through preparation. (Fuller, 1969; Fuller and Bown, 1975; Hall and Jones, 1976.)

According to Fuller, most beginning teachers, either student teachers or first and second year in-service teachers, have as their main concern issues of self adequacy and survival in the school setting. Moreover, only when these concerns have been largely resolved can teachers move on to concerns about the tasks of teaching, and only after these task concerns have been for the most part resolved can teachers have as their major concern the impact they may have on student learning (Fuller, 1969).

Most pre-service secondary teacher education students follow a professional studies curriculum which encompasses four major areas: educational psychology, teaching methods, student teaching, and social/philosophical foundations of education (Conant, 1963; AACTE, 1976). This is also the case for most secondary education majors at Michigan State University.

There does exist at Michigan State University, however, an alternative to the "regular" secondary teacher education program. This is the Secondary Education Pilot Program, which has completed its fifth year of existence. The first graduates of this program were currently in their first year of teaching in public and private school classrooms in Michigan as well as several other states at the time of this study.

This alternative program differs from other teacher education programs in several respects, and at this writing no attempt has been made to survey the graduates of this program who are currently teaching as to their perceptions about their professional preparation in light of their experiences.

Statement of the Problem

The intent of this study was to identify and describe the perceived concerns of a group of beginning teachers whose pre-service preparation occurred in Michigan State University's Secondary Education Pilot Program. Additionally, selected beginning teachers of this group were interviewed to determine if possible relationships existed between their major foci of concern and the role of pre-service professional preparation.

Overview of the Study

This study surveyed graduates of the Secondary Education Pilot Program who were engaged in their first year of teaching in a public or private school. Graduates who were enrolled in graduate programs as full-time students, those graduates who were substitute teaching, and those graduates in field other than teaching were not included in the study. Additionally, selected first year teachers were interviewed to

obtain additional information about their pre-service preparation, their major concerns, and their perceptions about changes in concerns during their first year of teaching.

The study included subjects' perceptions of the degree of concern they held regarding fifty-five areas at the time of the study, as well as the degree of concern they had at the beginning of their teaching year. Additional information was gathered about various sources of help in resolving concerns and about their pre-service preparation. Subjects interviewed were surveyed as to the role of their pre-service preparation as it related to resolving concerns, and were also surveyed as to their reactions to the Fuller developmental conceptualization as it related to individual teaching situations.

The study concentrated on a description of the concerns held by subjects who graduated from Michigan State University in 1976 and whose pre-service professional preparation occurred in the Secondary Education Pilot Program. These subjects are described by utilizing data drawn from a four-part survey questionnaire. Additionally, subjects are described utilizing data from interviews.

The intent of the study was to describe the concerns of these beginning teachers to the extent that the information could be utilized to determine if their concerns are congruent with concerns that might be expected from beginning teachers according to the developmental conceptualization formulated by Fuller, and additionally to determine if possible relationships existed between the nature of their pre-service preparation and the major concerns as beginning teachers.

The study design builds on a prior study (Norris, 1976) in which an evaluation model based on that described by Stake (1967) was

proposed. Data relevant to the descriptive portion of the Stake model was collected, especially to identify and describe certain outcomes of the program. The Fuller conceptualization of teacher concerns and research conducted by Briscoe (1972) were also utilized to build an organizing conceptual framework for this study.

Purpose of the Study

One purpose of the study was to describe the perceived concerns of graduates of the Secondary Education Pilot Program who were currently engaged in the first year of full time teaching. Descriptions of the perceived concerns could serve to answer such questions as:

1. What were the perceived concerns of SEPP graduates who were completing their first year of teaching?
2. What were the changes in perceived concerns that took place since the beginning of the teaching year?
3. What resources were perceived to have been most helpful in identifying and resolving such concerns?
4. What were the relationships between the perceived degree of concern and selected variables, namely:
 - a. Satisfaction with present teaching level
 - b. Extent of teaching assignment in major field of study
 - c. Average class size
 - d. Attendance at in-service meetings (1977-78)
 - e. Enrollment in college graduate courses (1977-78)
 - f. Average age of building faculty
 - g. General satisfaction with undergraduate teaching preparation
 - h. Amount of pre-service experience with school age students
 - i. Commitment to teaching.

Interviews with selected beginning teachers were conducted to serve the following purposes:

1. To identify the role of pre-service professional preparation in resolving concerns
2. To identify the role of specific components of pre-service professional preparation which were most helpful in (1) above
3. To gain additional information about perceived changes in concerns
4. To provide evaluative data about the effectiveness of the Secondary Education Pilot Program
5. To gather perceptions about and reactions to Fuller's conceptualization
6. To provide data which suggests further research on Fuller's theory of teacher concern

Assumptions on Which Study Is Based

The basic assumptions underlying this study were (1) graduates of the Secondary Education Pilot Program who were currently employed as full time classroom teachers would be able and willing to offer their perceptions of their major concerns, (2) such perceptions may offer insight about the role of teacher preparation and the development of concerns, (3) such perceptions may offer data which may be utilized in evaluating the program, (4) information from the study may suggest further areas of inquiry about the effectiveness of the program as well as about the developmental conceptualization posited by Fuller.

Need for the Study

Norris (1976) provided baseline data about the students currently enrolled in the Secondary Education Pilot Program. In her recommendations, she stated:

As in any new enterprise, one must walk before running. Thus, through a carefully constructed evaluation plan, the step by step process can be followed, validated, modified, and expanded. It is recommended that such a process be implemented, that evaluation components be identified, and that data collection efforts begin in an orderly, sequential manner. Information gathered from evaluation and monitoring reports may be of use to the program administrators and staff, the university Curriculum Committee, and the participating students as well. One such model reviewed in the literature, the Stake model, appears to be appropriate to the process. It is recommended that remaining components within the model be identified and that evaluative research begin.

Especially important among Norris' recommendations was:

Given certain predetermined program components, how do students perceive the contribution of those components to the development of themselves as professionals? Additional research needs to be completed to determine the degree to which the program functions to enhance professional development as well as personal development (Norris, 1976).

The study proposed here clearly fits the need outlined by Norris.

Pegues (Peer and Pegues, 1978) surveyed teacher training institutions to determine current practices in teacher education follow-up evaluation in the United States. Over eighty percent of respondents to a national survey attributed value to the follow-up process, but only slightly over fifty percent actually were involved in follow-up practices. It is noted that this is despite the NCATE accrediting process standards, in particular, standard 5.1 which requires systematic follow-up evaluation of program graduated in education.

Fuller listed several implications for further research. Among those "unanswered questions" were several which this study addressed. These are:

1. First are questions about the sequence itself. Is it correct and complete? Are there phases even "lower" and "higher" than those suggested here?
2. Second is concern phase a function of person, of the situation or of both? If concerns are related to

characteristics of the person and/or the situation, what are these characteristics? Must situations, for example, be interpersonal, stressful and novel?

3. Third, do individuals as well as groups go through these phases? So far the findings come only from data about groups. Can some individuals skip a phase, be in more than one phase at a time, regress to an earlier phase? (Fuller, 1969.)

Data from this study were utilized to begin to provide some answers to these questions, as the study surveyed situational aspects relative to concerns and examined individual as well as group concerns.

Thus, it can be seen that this study could serve to meet the needs outlined by Norris, Fuller, and NCATE.

Learning about the concerns that beginning teachers have holds important implications for both pre-service and in-service teacher education. If, as Fuller states, teacher education courses often answer questions that are incongruent with the major concerns of teacher education students, then it may be possible to develop curricula which aim at either the current concern of teacher candidates (at the pre-service level) or of beginning teachers (at the in-service level). Another possible implication is to develop strategies to move teachers or teacher candidates to higher or different concern levels, thus making course objectives and curricula or in-service training programs more congruent with concerns.

The study was an attempt to add to the general body of knowledge about teacher concerns and, in particular, to Fuller's developmental conceptualization. Fuller's specific "unanswered questions" were partly answered, or at least the questions themselves were made more clear or more refined.

The study also served to:

1. Point directions for professional growth of present teachers and teacher candidates,
2. Add to the body of knowledge about how teachers change, learn, and grow at critical points in their teaching careers, and in particular during the first year of teaching,
3. Suggest strengths and weaknesses in the Secondary Education Pilot Program,
4. Suggest areas for further research, and
5. Serve to provide baseline data for future studies of teacher concerns with this population.

Such longitudinal studies have been recommended by Fuller and implied by Briscoe (Fuller, 1969; Briscoe, 1972).

The role of teacher preparation in the development and perception of teacher concerns was a fundamental focus of this study. Through a survey questionnaire and interview methodology, it was believed that the role of a particular teacher education program could be clarified in terms of its impact on the development of concerns.

Limitations of the Study

The reader should be aware of possible limitations to this study.

These include:

1. Findings from this study are not generalizable to other beginning teachers whose preparation program differed from that of the subjects of this study.
2. Because of the nature of the pre-service program itself, generalizations about the effect of the program to include all members of the population may not be warranted.
3. Cause and effect relationships will not be explored and reported, but rather only correlational relationships between variables.
4. The nature of the personalized relationship between the researcher and the subjects may affect this research.

5. Subjects may be unable to relate either program components for the role of the entire program to development and change in concern because of lack of complete understanding of the program goals and objectives or time lapse.
6. Only graduates who were currently employed full time in their first year of teaching were involved with the study. It was recognized that graduates who were employed as substitute teachers might make valuable contributions to the study, but the focus of the study was on the concerns of those who were employed as full time classroom teachers.

Definition of Terms

Secondary Education Pilot Program (SEPP) is an alternative pre-service secondary teacher education program sponsored by the Department of Secondary Education and Curriculum within the College of Education at Michigan State University.

Concerns are matters perceived and expressed by the subjects as problems, potential problems, or matters causing worry or anxiety related to their employment as teachers. Concerns have been grouped accordingly:

Level one concerns focus on the question "Where do I stand?" and are concerns about "the new situation in schools and the expectations of principals and teachers." These may also be referred to as acceptance and adjustment concerns.

Level two concerns focus on the question "Am I adequate?" and are concerns about "self-adequacy as a teacher, about discipline, about what to do when a pupil asks a question to which (he/she) doesn't know the answer..." These are referred to as self-adequacy concerns.

Level three concerns focus on the question "How do my pupils feel about me?" and deal more specifically with "social and emotional relationships with pupils...and with pupils as individuals and their unique feelings." These are also referred to as concerns about students and teacher-student relationships.

Level four concerns focus on the question "Are pupils learning what I'm teaching?" and deal with concerns about "pupil gain in knowledge and to some extent gain in pupils'

understanding, application, synthesis, and evaluation of what is being taught them."

Level five concerns focus on the question "Are pupils learning what they need?" and deal with concerns about the needs of pupils as persons.

Level six concerns focus on the question "How can I improve myself as a teacher?" and are concerns about "anything and everything that may contribute to the development not only of the pupils in (his/her) own class but of children generally." (Hall and Jones, 1976)

Pre-service professional preparation refers to course work and field/clinical experiences undertaken prior to receiving a provisional teacher certificate.

Overview of Succeeding Chapters

A review of the literature pertinent to the study and related research are presented in Chapter II. Chapter III focuses on the Secondary Education Pilot Program and includes descriptive information as well as prior evaluative data. Data collection and analysis procedures are presented in Chapter IV. Findings are presented in Chapter V. A summary of the study, reflections, and recommendation for further research are included in Chapter VI.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

This chapter contains a review of the literature and related research. The review is organized into three areas: (1) teacher education: historical and current trends, (2) conceptualizations of follow-up studies, and (3) concerns of beginning teachers. Research and studies of the Secondary Education Pilot Program are found in Chapter III.

Part I: Historical and Current Trends in Teacher Education

Teacher training in this country had its beginnings with the first private normal school founded in Concord, Vermont, in 1823. After that time, there were many who began to argue for some teacher training on a wider scale.

In 1831 the first moves toward public support of teacher education came when the Massachusetts legislature passed a bill which provided for the establishment of three normal schools. The curriculum consisted of most of the usual subjects taught in schools and "almost from the first day, a model school was organized to provide real experience for the normal school students."

Other states in the eastern United States followed the Massachusetts example with normal schools being established. The basic proposition was that the normal schools were "to take the students as they were and attempt to make teachers of them" (Haberman and Stinnet, 1973).

The establishment of Michigan State Normal in 1853 marked the movement of state supported teacher training out of the eastern seaboard region. The proliferation after that time was rapid. "In 1839, there were three students enrolled in normal schools. By 1875, this number exceeded 23,000..." The normal schools were, by this time, the main source of teachers for the common schools (Harper, 1939).

Normal schools were gradually replaced by state teachers' colleges, beginning about 1900. These conversions were not necessarily because of failures of the normal schools, but because of new developments in education, especially the rapid proliferation of public high schools after 1860.

The Massachusetts Board of Education in 1838 asserted,

No one can entertain a doubt that there is a mastery in teaching as in every other art. Nor is it less obvious that within reasonable limits this skill and this mastery may themselves be made the subject of instruction and be communicated to others (Conant, 1963).

Another change in education affecting the transition of normal schools to the status of teachers' colleges was the rising standards of teacher certification. With the growing number of high schools, there developed a trend requiring teachers in these schools to be college graduates. The content of traditional early programs was based on a trilogy: the teacher needs to know his subject, he needs to know the nature of youth, he needs to know the process of learning.

Another shift of teacher education to general purpose colleges and universities came in the 1950's and 1960's and was caused by at least two things: the public furor about education caused by Sputnik, and the virtual innundation of colleges by veterans. Single purpose teacher education institutions are all but gone (Haberman and Stinnett, 1973).

With the launching of the Soviet satellite Sputnik in 1957, Americans became worried that the Soviets were "ahead" of Americans in scientific development, and that teacher education institutions were to blame at least in some degree. The rift between the "academics" of the liberal arts fields and teacher educators became most intense after that time. (Hodenfield and Stinnett, 1961). The launching of Sputnik also launched a barrage of criticism at those whose task it was to train teachers.

This rift between academics and teacher educators was discussed and debated at a conference in Bowling Green in 1958. The most vital agreement "was the virtually unanimous acknowledgement that teacher education is the responsibility of the entire college or university."

The Bowling Green conference gave rise to the Kansas conference a year later. There was general agreement that the content of teacher education should include certain essentials and certain amounts of preparation in terms of semester hours should be required. These were:

	Elementary	Secondary
Orientation to the profession	1 sem. hr.	1 sem. hr.
Psychological foundations	6	6
Sociological foundations	3	3
Methods, material, and curriculum	10	3
Observation and student teaching	<u>8</u>	<u>8</u>
	28	21

There was also agreement on the value of student teaching and agreement that four years for preparation was not enough and that a fifth year was necessary (Hodenfield and Stinnett, 1961).

The appearance of James Bryant Conant's The Education of American Teachers in 1963 added fuel to the controversy over both the form and content of teacher education. Conant's major findings revealed that there is little commonality among teacher education programs across the

country, and he attributed this to both the form and content of teacher education. Conant's major findings revealed that there is little commonality among teacher education programs across the country, and he attributed this to both state certification requirements and beliefs of professional educators.

While Conant found the conclusion unsettling, he did not necessarily regard the lack of agreement as a negative judgment. To him, the conclusion "points clearly to the need for giving institutions freedom to experiment with different ways of training teachers" (Conant, 1963).

Conant believed that there are four elements necessary for teacher preparation. These were:

1. A democratic social component,
2. An interest in the way behavior develops in children and some experience of this development,
3. A sympathetic knowledge of the growth of teaching, and
4. Principles of teaching.

Conant held many components and courses in contemporary programs in disdain, including "foundation courses" and general methods courses for secondary teachers. He saw student teaching as the "one indisputably essential element in professional education (Conant, 1963).

The unresponsiveness gave rise to the issue of accountability. From the time of Sputnik forward, the attention to both the form and content of teacher education programs increased dramatically. The federal government responded to the presumed deficiencies in the schools (outlined by such critics as Richtenbacher) based on the assumption that the heart of the problem was the teachers' subject matter deficiency. Resources were poured into curriculum development and academic

in-service mainly in the sciences and mathematics. There is no doubt that subject matter upgrading (especially in certain academic areas) was significant, "but pedagogy, the professional act of teaching, received little attention" (AACTE, 1976).

There developed from several quarters, most notably the federal projects, the beginnings of the competency-based teacher education (CBTE) movement, which has proven to be one of the most controversial as well as most popular developments in teacher education in the last quarter century.

Out of the research and development projects in teacher education and out of the rising criticism of teachers and schools as products of teacher preparation programs, "there has come commitment to quality teacher education and an emphasis on new programs and implementation strategies" (AACTE, 1976). Progress in both the development of simulations, protocols, laboratory approaches and microteaching has occurred, as well as the development of teacher centers and complexes to meet the needs of the already at least provisionally certified practicing professional.

Despite the new developments and the plethora of programs, new courses and modules, criticism of teacher education still abounds, and it may well be that such criticism is the major impetus for change in this field. The criticism can also form some of the yardsticks for evaluating current programs.

The current content of secondary teacher education, while varying slightly from state to state, includes courses in the social foundations of education, psychological foundations, methods of teaching a subject, principles and practices of secondary education, and student teaching

(Burnell, 1975). Such a series of courses has come under criticism from many quarters for various reasons, for as Burnell states (1975), "unfortunately, the content and purposes of these courses have changed little over the last twenty years."

The current state of the art in teacher education may perhaps be best examined by looking at two seemingly diverse aspects -- current and continuing criticism and proposals for reform, and at a variety of alternative programs which have emerged, partly as a reaction to criticism leveled at traditional programs.

The American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (AACTE), in a 1976 report, stated:

All of us have known for decades that teacher education has never been adequate. Equally, we have known that changing conditions have made teaching progressively more difficult. The gap between what we have needed to do and what we have been able to do is no secret. For too long, teachers and teacher educators have proclaimed their professional status, knowing that it was more aspiration than reality (AACTE, 1976).

The report defines areas of concern in the preparation and makes recommendations concerning desirable content and/or experiences. A brief look at these areas may serve to define some of the prevailing issues in teacher education today.

The AACTE report places special importance on the self-image of the teacher:

Esteem from significant others and a strong sense of personal and professional worth on the part of teachers undoubtedly is related to teaching competence. It would appear that a first step is to elevate the level of respect and appreciation for the teaching profession in the minds of teachers themselves and the public (AACTE, 1976).

The report also stresses the importance of a "safe" level for beginning teachers. The AACTE states that

...the profession must establish consensus on the professional culture required to begin the practice of teaching, and the means to assure career-long professional development (AACTE, 1976).

Surveying major components of teacher preparation, the report comments extensively on at least a dozen areas, and provides guidelines for attempting to meet needs in each area. These included recommendations for providing:

1. General or liberal studies which include "alternative ways of knowing."
2. A study of the theoretical bases of education, including the undergirding disciplines of psychology, sociology, anthropology, and philosophy.
3. Academic specialization which has breadth as well as depth, with such specialization being "human-service functional."
4. A continuous "interplay of theory and practice."
5. Development of a broad repertoire of teaching performance skills, for without such skills, teachers "will remain preoccupied with survival matters rather than broader educational concerns."
6. Fostering of "humanistic educational values and attitudes" which include an awareness of the interplay of personal philosophy and specific environmental philosophies.
7. Development of "professional literacy" among teacher candidates.
8. A continuum of field experiences which are linked with knowledge components.
9. Special emphasis on the learning disabled students and their needs.
10. Study of a significant subculture.
11. Provision of "adequate life space" while preparing to teach.
12. Development of more continuity between pre-service and in-service learning activities.

13. Attempts to expand "the application of professional education beyond the school."

There would seem to be ample evidence that many teacher education programs are providing alternatives to the traditional content and sequence of courses. The alternatives differ from the "traditional" preparation programs in at least one of several respects, and those differences will serve to be organizers for the review of alternative models. These differences may be categorized as increased personalization, increased field centeredness, competency based, expanded conceptually based reduced focus to serve a particular clientele, or some combination.

The Fulton project at the State University of New York, Oswego, features a two semester approach to field experience which has four goals:

1. Gradual familiarity with the school and teaching
2. Provision of several different experiences
3. Encouraging peer interaction and mutual support
4. Improving student teachers' understanding of the role of the school in the community (Gilroy and Moody, 1976)

The University of Wyoming middle school teacher education program offers exposure to transescents in a sequence of field experiences which are tightly structured to allow teacher education students a rounded and realistic view of teaching (Arth, 1977).

The Personalized Teacher Education Program (PTEP) at the University of Texas, Austin, features at least three unique components:

1. Repeated feedback and counseling for engendering effective teaching,

2. A more differential assignment of instructional tasks and activities contingent on the unique characteristics of the prospective teacher, and
3. Self-observation and feedback on the prospective teacher's behavior through video taping (Copeland, 1976).

The tutorial and clinical programs of teacher education at Northwestern University contain two basic components, on-campus tutorials and off-campus clinical experiences, which are arranged in a four-year sequence with each year having a major thematic emphasis (Hazard, 1967).

Some new programs seek an expanded concept of the role of teacher and teaching.

Individually Guided Education (IGE) serves as the focus for reorganizing pre-service and in-service teacher education in one Ohio program. The University of Toledo program holds that:

...the primary task of colleges of education goes beyond simply producing teachers who will move smoothly into existing school structures. Rather the task is to produce teachers who are dedicated to experimentation, who exhibit intellectual curiosity, and who have the maturity of judgement to nurture and develop that which is educationally viable as well as to alter that which is educationally weak. The college is concerned with developing educational policy makers (Dickson, 1976).

The Teacher Year Alternative (TYA) is an option to the traditional teacher education sequence at The University of Northern Colorado. It rests on the assumption that two major processes of becoming a teacher are in the areas of self-understanding and making use of that self-understanding; that teacher education, not a content area in the traditional sense, is a process of becoming; that those things necessary to become an effective teacher can be taught; and that the learning experience crucial for becoming a teacher can be grouped into six areas (Welch, Usher, and Warner, 1976).

The University of Vermont supports another expanded concept of teacher education which sees the teacher as a "human service educator." This expanded definition of the teaching role stems from analysis of complex interrelationships present in human society (Ducharme/Nash, 1975).

Somewhat unique approaches to teacher education are not new, and descriptions of several early approaches can be found. An inter-university program involving four universities in New York was described as an "experimental program for the preparation of secondary school teachers" (Irvine, 1964). The programs at the four schools offered such features as various entry points, more extensive field experiences, flexible curriculum offered through independent study, and an earlier entrance into teacher education.

The Florida "experiment" in undergraduate teacher education was initiated in the late 1950's for both elementary and secondary majors. The major assumption underlying the "new" Florida approach was that:

...a psychological approach, based on experience, problems and need of students, and oriented to conceptual development, might prove superior to the organized subject-matter approach to the standard teacher education program.

Students could enroll in the experimental program as sophomores.

The Florida program was one of the few "early" programs reviewed that reported on efforts at serious evaluation. Control groups were established initially, and data gathering efforts were continuous, but at the end it was determined that there lacked "sufficient information to demonstrate the effectiveness of this particular program." Major difficulties in conducting research efforts on this program included a lack of adequate instruments to measure the numerous outcomes, complex interrelationships of many factors making it difficult to isolate

particular variables, problems of inadequate resources and staffing, and difficulties in locating program graduates due to their mobility (Gordon, et al., 1964).

Dean (1971) conducted research on Michigan State University's Mott Institute for Community Improvement Level IV Program and the regular program at Michigan State University. Level IV was a program which included features of increased field-centeredness during preparation, and also was a program aimed at serving a particular clientele, namely those who would teach in the inner city. Through a survey designed to gather participants' perceptions of the effectiveness of their preparation, and another survey designed to gather principals' perceptions of participant performance, Dean concluded that the graduates of the Level IV program perceived that they (1) encountered significantly less "cultural shock upon entrance to inner city teaching," (2) were significantly better prepared to meet such shock, (3) sought inner city teaching assignments to a greater degree than regular program participants, (4) perceived that they they were "significantly more effective with the disadvantaged and understood community needs to a greater degree" than did regular program graduates, and (5) felt strongly that the Level IV program had "more effectively prepared them for teaching than the regular program would have." Principals surveyed did not perceive significant differences in their teaching performance (Dean, 1971).

Competency-based teacher education programs represent another type of program which is rapidly proliferating in this country today. Such programs may or may not be offered as "alternate programs," but most contain many of a number of common elements. Such elements or commonalities have been described by Hall and Jones (1976) and by Dickson,

Saxe, et al. (1973). The common elements of competency-based teacher education include:

1. A focus on the student's acquisition of specific competencies.
2. A set of learning objectives that are stated in such a way that their accomplishment can be observed in certain learner behaviors or knowledge.
3. Established success criteria levels, known to the learner in advance.
4. Learning activities which are geared to assist each student in acquiring at least the minimum levels of competence.
5. Emphasis on mastering the competencies rather than on meeting time commitments.

Such programs often follow a "systems approach" to teaching and learning, and there may be within individual programs other elements of personalization and individualization, field-centeredness, faculty teams, and programmed instruction.

Part II: Conceptualizations of Follow-up Studies

Pegues has recently completed a study of teacher education follow-up evaluations in the United States. She found that forty-two percent of NCATE accredited institutions are not doing follow-up evaluation, but that more than eighth percent of all respondents attribute value to the follow-up process. She found negligible sophistication in methods and procedures used: "no method of data gathering other than the questionnaire was among the top ten" (Peer, 1978).

Most studies which have been reported have been of this type. Recently, however, studies have been completed which utilize other methodologies to serve varying purposes.

Ryan and his associates at the Ohio State University sought to study the life space of the first year teacher, specifically concentrating upon "the new teachers' perceptions of what was happening to them as they began their careers." One strand of their inquiry dealt with teachers' reflections and reactions to their preparation. Ryan states,

Two themes emerged from the first year teachers' responses to questions about their teacher preparation programs: a realization of the limits of such programs, and a valuing of firsthand experiences.

Ryan comments on this finding:

If the teachers in our study are representative of a majority of teacher education graduates, the people we are preparing seem to understand our limitations much more clearly than we (as teacher educators) do (Ryan, et al., 1978).

Sandefur presented a model for the evaluation of teacher education graduates which emerged from generalizations developed about characteristics of good teaching. Evaluative data was to be derived from four categories: career line data (which included "perception of the quality of their teacher preparation program" and "perceived problems in teaching"), direct classroom observation, pupil, peer, and supervisor evaluations, and standardized measures. The model further proposes that the:

...data are to be collected for a minimum of five years after the student has graduated from the undergraduate teacher education program.

Feedback mechanisms are to be established to ensure that teacher educators have information for use in programmatic decision making (Sandefur, 1978).

An interim report on the above model was published in the spring of 1976 after the fourth year of the cycle. The purpose of the interim report was to "report a limited number of the more exciting trends or directions our data imply." Although data had been collected on a

number of secondary teachers, only data on elementary teachers were presented. A number of relationships were discovered between measures of indirect teaching and "other desirable teaching behaviors." The amount of indirect teaching increased significantly between the end of the first year and the end of the third year. An unexpected finding was:

...teachers with more authoritarian attitudes were rated higher by trained observers, students, supervisors, and peers; and such teachers also used more indirect teaching activity.

This finding was in conflict with previous studies and research on authoritarianism. Possible explanations for this finding are currently under investigation (Sandefur and Adams, 1976).

Western Kentucky University conducted a study of "first year teachers' perception of problems." Its purposes were to:

...determine which problems were perceived as most serious, and to identify teaching behavior and characteristics related to these perceptions.

Data were obtained from both elementary and secondary teachers, as a part of the research described above. Major findings included:

1. Secondary and elementary teachers perceive problems similarly, with classroom discipline, motivation of students, relevance of materials to students, and self-evaluation of teaching as most serious.
2. Generally the association between the variables supported the notion that first year teachers who perceive problems as more serious demonstrate less desirable classroom behaviors than first year teachers who perceive problems as less serious.

Data were collected by obtaining career line data through two instruments and by direct classroom observation through two systems of observations (Sandefur, 1976).

The Ohio State University has developed a plan for studying its teacher education graduates which relies on questionnaire responses by

all graduates, by all OSU faculty, and by a sample of supervisors and peers. Samplings of student ratings will also be collected. The questionnaires for graduates requested certain demographic information and responses to a checklist of a series of items on two scales, attitudinal and actual behavioral. Questionnaires concerning the core areas of teacher education at both the secondary and elementary level as well as questionnaires specific to subject matter areas have been developed. The materials will be utilized for the first time this year, but plans exist to collect such data at four times in the teachers' careers: after student teaching, and one, three, and five years after program completion (O'Donnell, 1978).

Cruickshank has designed an evaluative follow-up study of teacher education graduates which involves studying teachers' perceived problems after one year of teaching. Cruickshank sees such a study as serving four functions, namely: (1) acquainting teacher educators with a current view of teacher life in a classroom, (2) providing data to be utilized in teacher preparation program revision, (3) providing data to be utilized for curriculum and instructional material development, and (4) serving as evidence of continuing program evaluation. Very briefly, the procedures which are to be utilized are (1) the collection of personal accounts of problems, (2) conversion of such accounts to goal statements, (3) transfer of goal statements to a Teacher Problems Checklist, and (4) response to the checklist by a representative sample of graduates in order to find which problems are perceived as frequent and bothersome. Cruickshank then suggests several procedures to be followed in the study. No report has yet been made on actual implementation of the procedures (Cruickshank, 1978).

Borich has reported on three concepts of evaluation which comprise models for conducting follow-up studies of teacher education and training. Pay-off evaluation, also known as product evaluation, seems to center on evaluation of pupils' performance on a gauge of teacher behavior and training. Scriven is given credit for the major impetus to such pay-off evaluation studies which have been largely conducted since 1967. Process evaluation is discussed by Borich as "the manner and extent of program implementation." Borich credits the popularization to Stufflebeam, et al., but made note of the importance of systems of low-inference classroom observation and their subsequent influence on the concept of process evaluation in teacher education. The third concept of evaluation is goal assessment, which links "the widespread practice of developing teacher competencies and the often neglected need to validate them." Borich comments that proponents of this concept, such as Stake, believe that goals themselves are measurable and, therefore, amenable to evaluation. Scriven carried Stake's concept further, arguing that an independent evaluator should be assigned to every project "in order to undertake an unbiased assessment of the values and goals implicit in the program and its materials." Borich sees goal assessment as serving as an intermediate step between competency development and competency validation.

Borich reviewed five follow-up studies which shared certain characteristics: (1) a focus on early and mid elementary grades, primarily in reading and math, (2) focus on student outcomes measured by standardized tests, (3) an emphasis on "teacher behaviors measurable on low-inference classroom observation systems," (4) production of quantified findings, and (5) use of experienced teachers. Based on major findings

of the five studies and their implications for competency development and validation, Borich suggests three models for evaluation. These three are termed "needs assessment," "relative gain," and "process-product." The needs assessment model:

...serves the evaluator by identifying discrepancies between the competencies the teacher should possess and those the teacher believes he or she possesses.

The relative gain model focuses on pupil performance and, while one step removed from the teacher training process, it attempts to meet demands for teacher and/or institution accountability. The process-product evaluation model is more complex, and includes both the process behavior of the teacher and pupil performance measures (Borich, 1978).

Part III: Concerns of Beginning Teachers

The late Frances Fuller has posited a three-phase developmental conceptualization of teachers' concerns. The three phases are, briefly stated:

1. Pre-teaching phase: non-concern
2. Early teaching phase: concern with self
3. Late concerns: concern with pupils

Each of Fuller's phases deserve elaboration, as well as the methodology employed in developing this conceptualization.

The pre-teaching phase, that is, the time that education majors spend "before having actual contact as teachers with pupils," has seemingly not been reported, at least in published studies. Fuller reported that in counseling sessions, such students in their pre-teaching phase "rarely had specific concerns related to teaching itself." She concluded that the:

...pre-teaching period seemed to be a period of non-concern with the specifics of teaching, or at least a period of low involvement in teaching.

The early teaching phase, as described by Fuller, was that initial teaching period. Studies of both student teaching and the first full year of teaching were reported. This phase involved covert and overt concerns. The covert concerns basically dealt with the question "Where do I stand?" and subsumed issues of acceptance as a staff member, support, building working relationships, and authority questions. Fuller reported a reluctance on the part of beginning teachers to report such concerns. Overt concerns centered on the question "How adequate am I?" and involved, besides class control, issues of subject matter competency, the freedom to fail, to learn from mistakes, and coping with evaluation. Fuller reported that even these concerns are not freely reported to supervisors.

The third phase, termed as "late concerns," dealt with concern for pupils. Research on this phase was termed tentative, due to a lack of data about concerns of experienced teachers. However, Fuller stated that when concerns of "experienced superior teachers" are reported, they tend to "focus on pupil gain and self-evaluation as opposed to personal gain and evaluations by others."

Fuller's methodology was three-fold, and involved examining published studies of teacher concerns, two studies of student teachers (counseling seminars and written concerns statements), and re-grouping data of other investigators. Each phase of the methodology deserves comment.

The review of published studies included:

...six published studies (which) have examined young teachers' perceived problems without severely restricting the alternatives among which the teachers could choose (Fuller, 1969).

Phillips (1932) reported that new teachers in England saw:

...problems of class management, the treatment of difficult individuals, the attitude of head teachers, and of older members of the staff, to young teachers, (and) the apparent difference in outlook between one generation and another, especially as regards (a) disciplinary methods, (and) (b) educational aims and values...

as "possibly the more serious" concerns. Phillips' reports came from "extensive correspondence" with teachers during a ten year period (1922-1932).

Gabriel reported that young teachers (with one to two years of experience):

...record relatively greater degree of strain as regards discipline, criticisms from heads and inspectors, and for extraneous duties, including preparation.

Collecting his data from a six-part questionnaire (n = 736), Gabriel also reported the teachers with ten or more years of experience:

...record relatively high for "the continuous noise of children," for problems connected with classwork and for interruptions and clerical work. (Gabriel, 1957).

The other published data concern American teachers. Travers, et al. (1952) concluded:

A sentence completion test revealed that the anxieties of this group of student-teachers tended to be focused on the problem of discipline and on the desire to be liked by the pupils...

both before and after student teaching. Travers' sample consisted of 120 elementary education majors who had had no clinical experience and few opportunities for visits and observations. Of the twenty-one sentence completions, three were singled out for study regarding anxiety. Those sentence stems were: "I hope my class never...; I shall expect

students in my class...; when I become a teacher, I suppose my greatest problem will be..." It is to be noted that these data concern only elementary student teachers, a difference from the Phillips and Gabriel data, and Travers' purpose was to determine the aspects of student teaching which were anxiety-producing.

Thompson (1963) administered a checklist of thirty-five questions, each defining a particular type of anxiety, to 125 student teachers who were nearing the end of their internships. The most frequently reported anxieties concerned the expectations of critic teachers, mastery of subject area, evaluation of lesson plans, reactions from students, desired standards of teacher conduct, in ability to answer student questions and problems of discipline. This researcher would caution that these responses came during the internship and the matter of social desirability in responses may be in question. It is also noted that of the thirty-five items on the questionnaire, nearly all dealt with issues of self-adequacy. Respondents were given an opportunity to list other concerns; the frequency of such "other concerns" was not reported, only that "the following are of special interest." Two of those reported were task-type concerns not included on the original questionnaire.

Robinson and Berry used Thompson's questionnaire to survey an additional 193 elementary and secondary student teachers. The researcher was unable to locate the original source document, but according to Fuller as well as Erickson and Ruud,

...they expressed most concern about the frequency of visits and observation of the college supervisor and about being graded themselves and giving grades to their pupils (Fuller, 1969; Erickson and Ruud, 1964).

Erickson and Ruud surveyed ninety home economics student teachers in North Dakota before their student teaching experiences to "ascertain the type and degree of anxieties they were experiencing." Major items causing anxiety were concern about adequate subject matter preparation, evaluation by supervising teachers and college supervisors, and discipline. A control group of teachers with one to two years experience was utilized. "The experienced teachers indicated the same anxieties as did the student teachers, but to a lesser degree" (Erickson and Ruud, 1964).

Fuller's summarization is that:

...what we know is that beginning teachers are concerned about class control, about their own content adequacy, about the situations in which they teach, and about evaluations by their supervisors, by their pupils, and of their pupils by themselves (Fuller, 1969).

It is to be noted that, in fact, the concerns reported were for student teachers before student teaching, during student teaching, immediately after student teaching, and, in the case of the British studies, for first and second year teachers as well.

Fuller conceded that there were several possible explanations for the reported data, and, in order to take those possibilities into account, small groups of student teachers were observed during their student teaching in two separate studies, one relying on counseling seminars which substituted for the usual weekly student teaching seminar, and another which relied on written concerns statements. The results of the first study indicate that student teachers were "self concerned during most of the semester, shifting to more concern with pupils during the end of their student teaching." Data from the second study were collected into three categories:

1. Where do I stand? How adequate am I? How do others think I'm doing?
2. Problem behavior of pupils; class control. Why do they do that?
3. Are pupils learning? What do I do to affect their gain?

The concerns statements revealed that twenty-two of twenty-nine students expressed concerns mainly in the first category; six expressed concerns in categories one and two. No respondents expressed concerns in the third category. These results seem to support Fuller's dichotomy between self-concerns and concern with pupils.

It is noted that Fuller defined "early concerns" as "the perceived problems of student teachers or beginning in-service teacher." All six previously published studies which were reviewed above deal with that definition. When the results of those studies are dichotomized into concern with self and concern with pupils, all six report early concerns to be with self and none report concern with pupils. It is to be remembered, however, that choices in at least two of the studies (Thompson; Robinson and Berry) were limited primarily to "self-concerns."

Data from other investigations were also regrouped into the concern with self and concern with pupils dichotomy. Studies of first year in-service teachers in Indiana and Texas (York, 1967, 1968) revealed that at least twice as many concerns were with self as with pupils (in Indiana, at least seventy-eight percent of the reported concerns dealt with self).

Several salient points are made by Fuller regarding the six published studies, two unpublished surveys, and the Fuller studies of student teachers. The first is their agreement on the pervasiveness of self concerns as distinguished from pupil concerns. The second is that

no study reports concerns with:

...instructional design, methods of presenting subject matter, assessment of pupil learning, or with tailoring course content to individual pupils, the areas often presented before student teaching in education courses.

The third point is that there do not appear to be any significant differences between pre-service teachers (before, during, and after student teaching) and beginning in-service teachers (teachers in their first and second years of teaching).

Two studies of experienced teachers were reported which indicated that with teaching experience, the concerns shift away from self to more concern with pupils (Gabriel, 1957; Jackson, 1968). Only one study reported any shift to pupil concerns at the pre-service level (the counseling seminar study). This difference is explained by differences in data gathering, the increased number of time samples, and the open-ended nature of the discussion.

Fuller believed that "concerns can change over preparation." She has posited a developmental conceptualization involving three phases. This conceptualization is reported above..

This theory of teacher concerns was refined in later writings by Fuller and Bown (1975). In their discussion of the pre-service experiences of becoming a teacher, Fuller and Bown posit three "stages," or clusters of concerns termed survival, mastery, and impact. Each "stage" deserves further elaboration.

Survival concerns focus on:

...one's adequacy and survival as a teacher, about class control, about being liked by pupils, about supervisors' opinions, about being observed, evaluated, praised and failed. These are concerns about feelings, and seem to be evoked by one's status as a student. Pre-service teachers have more concerns of this type than in-service teachers.

Mastery concerns center about the teaching situation, and are:

...concerns about having to work with too many students or having too many non-instructional duties, about time pressures, about inflexible situations, lack of instructional materials, and so on. These frustrations seem to be evoked by the teaching situation. In-service teachers have more concerns of this type than pre-service teachers.

Impact or pupil concerns are:

...about recognizing the social and emotional needs of pupils, about the inappropriateness of some curriculum material for certain students, about being fair to pupils, about tailoring content for individual students, and so on. Although such concerns cluster together, they are expressed by both pre-service and in-service teachers. This may be because such are associated with characteristics which cut across experience or because in-service teachers feel such concerns more while pre-service teachers express more concern about everything than do in-service teachers.

The sequence of concerns usually involves a period of pre-teaching concerns involving concern with students; i.e., themselves. Such concerns are usually unrelated to teaching. Experiencing actual teaching, however, "radically" changes the concerns of pre-service teachers (Fuller, 1969; Fuller and Bown, 1975), and they are then concerned about survival issues. Teaching situation concerns are added to the self-survival concerns, and Fuller and Bown note that "these are still concerns about their own performance, their teaching performance, not concerns about pupils and their learning." Concern about pupils or impact concerns may be present in pre-service teachers, but Fuller and Bown note that:

...they may be unable to act on these concerns. Flooded by feelings of inadequacy, by situational demands and conflicts, they may have to lay aside these concerns until they have learned to cope with more urgent tasks, such as being heard above the din.

This last stage is not inevitable:

In the third stage, the teacher may either settle into stable routines and become resistant to change or else may become consequences-oriented: concerned about her impact on pupils and perhaps responsive to feedback about herself.

Several unanswered questions are raised by Fuller (1969) and Fuller and Bown (1975).

Do the groupings represent actual stages or only clusters? Are they distinct or overlapping? Do teachers teach differently or are they differentially effective in different stages? Fuller and Bown note that the groupings "have been described mainly in terms of what the teacher is concerned about rather than what she is actually accomplishing." Whether or not these are discrete stages, it is maintained that the labels do represent clusters of concerns. Other questions posed by Fuller include:

Is the sequence complete and correct? Are there higher or lower phases? Is the concern a function of the individual, the situation, or both? Do individuals as well as groups go through these phases? Can some people skip a stage or be in more than one stage at the same time? Can a person regress to an earlier phase? If an experienced teacher does regress to an earlier phase, does s/he go through the earlier phase more quickly than does an inexperienced teacher? Are generalizations to groups other than classroom teachers warranted? Are concerns really related to teaching behavior, teaching competency, or pupil learning? Are the concerns manipulable ...can concerns be directed toward concern with pupils? (Fuller, 1969)

Hall and Jones (1976), relying on Fuller's research, believe that "the concerns are often predictable." The sequence in which they normally progress is as follows:

- Phase I -- Concerns about Self
 - Level 0 -- Concerns unrelated to teaching
 - Level 1 -- Concerns about self as a teacher
- Phase II -- Concerns about Task
 - Level 2 -- How adequate am I?
 - Level 3 -- How do my pupils feel about me?

Phase III -- Concerns about Impact

Level 4 -- Are they learning what I'm teaching?

Level 5 -- Are they learning what they need?

Level 6 -- How can I improve as a teacher?

(Hall and Jones, 1976)

Briscoe (1972) studied the professional concerns of first-year secondary teachers in selected Michigan public schools. Professional concerns were identified and related to eleven variables. Briscoe found no significant differences in expressed professional concerns among first-year secondary teachers with respect to eight of the variables, but did find significant differences with respect to three: with varying ages, with varying average faculty ages, and with varying frequencies of enrollment in college graduate courses.

Briscoe's subjects were asked to examine fifty-one possible concerns and note the degree to which each had been a concern at the beginning of the year and the degree to which each was a concern late in the school year. The areas of greatest concern for the population at the beginning of the year were (in order of frequency):

1. Keeping order in my classes
2. Providing instruction for slow learners
3. Having adequate instructional materials available
4. Dealing with "troublesome" students
5. Finding appropriate instructional materials

Items of greatest concern at the end of the year were:

1. Providing instruction for slow learners
2. Organizing instruction for the year
3. Having adequate instructional materials available
4. Determining students' academic needs
5. Finding appropriate instructional materials

Briscoe noted that "four of the five concerns reflected problems of classroom management/discipline, or knowing students."

Briscoe also found that the two greatest sources of help in resolving concerns of first-year teachers were their undergraduate teacher education programs and fellow teachers. These two sources of help far outweighed the other possible sources of help.

Summary

Literature has been reviewed in the areas of current and historical trends in teacher education, conceptualizations of follow-up studies, and the concerns of beginning teachers. This review provides a further conceptual framework in which to consider the findings of this study.

Teacher education in the United States has been characterized by emergent growth, although in the past seventy years, certain features have remained relatively static. Alternative programs have attempted departures from the past, and have been characterized here according to features of increased personalization, increased field-centeredness, an expanded conceptual base of the role of the teacher, or a narrowed focus which is designed to serve a particular clientele. Problems of evaluation in such programs have been described and delineated.

Follow-up studies of teacher education programs have, until recently, been confined to questionnaires to graduates. While almost all institutions place value on the follow-up process, fewer than half of the institutions in a national study engaged in the process. Recently, efforts have been made to expand the conceptual bases of such studies to include descriptions of the life-space of first-year teachers, and

methodologies involving direct observations have been utilized. Three concepts of evaluation were described as models for conducting follow-up studies of teacher education, with particular attention paid to the goal assessment model described by Robert Stake.

Studies of the concerns of beginning teachers were reviewed, with the emphasis directed at the work of Frances Fuller and her associates. Fuller has posited a developmental conceptualization of teacher concerns, in which beginning teachers pass through levels of concern moving from concerns with self and toward concerns about students and their needs. A review of the Briscoe research, which was a major influence on this study, was also included.

CHAPTER III

THE SECONDARY EDUCATION PILOT PROGRAM

This chapter focuses on the Secondary Education Pilot Program. The chapter will be organized around four topics: a program description, an historical framework, prior research and studies, and a discussion of the program characteristics which lead the researcher to believe that there may be differences between the concerns of SEPP graduates and other beginning teachers. It is to be noted that changes in the structure and content of the program have been implemented in the time since the subjects were enrolled in program components. This study describes, however, program features and components in existence at the time the subjects were enrolled.

Part I: Program Description

The Secondary Education Pilot Program at Michigan State University is a four-year alternative program for students preparing to teach in high schools or junior high or middle schools. The program is composed of twelve sequential courses in which students participate in professional development activities every term they are in residence at the university.

Field experiences are tied to on-campus instructional activities which compose the "courses" of the program. A description of these courses is found in the student handbook which follows as Appendix A. In addition to these courses and accompanying field experiences, the

program features small advisement groups meeting at least six hours every term and which provide opportunities for sharing and reflection, a week-long leadership training laboratory focusing on problem solving in classroom and interpersonal settings, and a "mindbender" program in which students are required to read and discuss one book or its equivalent concerning a current educational topic each term outside the regular program requirements. These experiences beyond formal classroom instruction are designed to serve integrative functions, tying together the on-campus instruction, field experiences, subject area preparation, and personal and professional concerns. A chart outlining the scope and sequence of activities is shown below in Figure.1.

SEPP offers features which are designed to form a holistic program. The current SEPP student handbook lists the following advantages to students:

1. A continuous blending of professional development, subject area study, and viable field experience.
2. Extensive field experience (at least twice that of most other programs), and wider variety of contacts with young people.
3. Deliberate experience with adolescents in informal and non-school settings.
4. A regular staff of professional educators working with students in all phases of the program, including the clinical experience modules. The same staff who work with students early in the program continue with them throughout, and supervise these students in field components.
5. Systematic professional and personal advisement, supplementing that offered by the student's academic major department and residence hall staff.
6. A coherent program, spanning four years (twelve terms) of growth and development aimed at excellence in career preparation (Corl, 1975)

PLEASE NOTE:

Dissertation contains small
and indistinct print.
Filmed as received.

UNIVERSITY MICROFILMS.

FIGURE 1: COMPONENTS OF SECONDARY EDUCATION PILOT PROGRAM

YEAR	TERM	COURSE NUMBER	TITLE	NATURE OF COURSE	ADVISEMENT GROUP	MIND-BENDER	FIELD EXPERIENCE (NATURE)	
Freshman	Fall	102A	Intro to Secondary Ed	Seminar	Advise ment Groups Meet Continuously Six Hours Per Term	In seminar	No	
	Winter	102B	Personal Dimensions of Secondary Teaching	Microlab focusing on interpersonal communication values clarification microteaching		Yes	No Microteaching to peers included in lab	
	Spring	102C	Secondary School youth culture	Camping Weekend with early adolescents		Yes	Yes Camping Weekend with middle school youth (40)	
Sophomore	Fall	202A	Educational Psych: Adolescence	Course focused on Growth and Development and Learning Theories		Yes	-- Optional Interning Yes Action research in school setting	
		202B	Workshops in Secondary Education	Students chose from variety of workshops on sociological and psychological aspects of teaching		Yes	--Optional Interning Optional Interning	
		202C	Alternative Secondary School Structures	On site visits to variety of school settings		Yes	Yes five days of school visits (30 hrs.)	
Minimum of 120 clock hours with students required by this time. Requirement to be met by several options.						--	Optional Interning	
	Pre-fall	Leadership Training Laboratory						
Junior	Fall	302A	Teaching Skills Lab	Instruction and Field Experience in Generic Teaching Skills		Yes	Yes	40 hrs. Interning
	Winter	302B	Lab in Ethnic Values of Adolescents	Lab setting with Public School students (racial & ethnic mix.)		Yes	Yes	Workshop w/ minority students (16)
	Spring	302C	Clinical Field Experience Secondary Education	Full time supervised Internship weekly seminar groups		No	Yes	Full time clinical Internship (400 Hrs.)
Senior	Fall	402A	Advanced Workshops in Secondary Education	Agenda determined by staff & student perception of needs		Yes	--	Interning optional
	Winter	402B	Seminar in Teaching Secondary Discipline	Specific discipline curriculum problems and methodology		Yes	--	Interning optional
	Spring	402C	Senior Secondary Education Proseminar	Seminar in Educational Philosophy; personal educational philosophical statement required		No	--	Interning optional

Part II: Historical Framework

The Secondary Education Pilot Program had its beginnings in a proposal written by Dr. Sam Corl in summer, 1971. In his rationale for beginning such a venture Corl cited several problems in the current secondary teacher education program at Michigan State University.

According to Corl, these problems were, briefly stated:

...lack of continuity in the present program, lack of focus expressly for the secondary teachers, lack of substantial and meaningful field experience alternatives, and lack of conscious direction, control and advisement on the part of the Department of Secondary Education and Curriculum (Corl, 1971).

Corl then proposed an experimental program for secondary pre-service teacher education whose goal was "diversity," and which was

...designed to help each student discover the best teaching and interaction style for him, and to produce an optimum set of different teachers each skilled in his or her own style and the behaviors appropriate to that style (Corl, 1971).

Corl's other goals for the proposed program included "vigorous inquiry, meaningful real experiences, and intellectual excellence and honesty" (Corl, 1971).

Corl then proceeded to describe general goals and more specific objectives for the program. The basic philosophical orientation outlined in the proposal became essentially the list of "Underlying Professional Assumptions" found in the student handbook, Appendix A of this study. Corl's 1971 proposal also included a description of program experiences and sections on the selection of students and evaluation.

The evaluation model proposed by Corl for the experimental program was that first described by Robert Stake (1967). The model called for

no comparisons to the existing program, but rather comparison of actual antecedents, transactions and outcomes to those which were intended. According to Corl, the model was more congruent with the underlying philosophy of the program as an alternative program and with the absence of any intent "to imply that the finished product of this teacher education program can be defined in behavioral terms" (Corl, 1971).

Corl's proposal was approved through the University's usual sequence of committees and hearings in the spring of 1973, and authorization was given for a first class to be admitted in the fall of 1973.

Eighty-three students were admitted to the Secondary Education Pilot Program in the fall of 1973. Forty of that group had completed the program at this writing. Since that time, others have been admitted, eighty-two in 1974, forty-six in 1975, and forty-five in 1976. Table 1 below provides further data.

Table 1
Students Entering and Exiting SEPP by Reason

	1973	1974	1975	1976	TOTALS
Admitted	83	82	46	45(1)	256
Career Change(2)	25	32	16	7	80
Left University	11	11	11	8	41
Program Conflict(3)	4	11	4	5	24
Completed Program	42	27	0	0	69
Remaining in Program	1	1	15	25(1)	42

¹This figure includes fifteen students who were admitted in 1976 who were sophomores. These students "doubled up" the freshman and sophomore years of SEPP and nine are scheduled to graduate in 1979.

²This figure includes those who changed their majors to elementary or special education.

³The most common program conflicts are with women's intercollegiate athletics and theater. Students in these programs often find conflicts in emphases which remove them from SEPP.

Part III: Prior Research and Studies of the Program

Research on the Secondary Education Pilot Program was conducted by Norris in 1975 and published in 1976. Norris' purpose was

...to identify and generally describe the freshman and sophomore students who were actively enrolled in an alternative secondary teacher education program at Michigan State University (Norris, 1976).

Her intent was to "provide descriptive data from which baseline information could be developed for further research." Norris' research centered on the two classes currently enrolled in the program.

According to Norris:

This study, descriptive and exploratory in nature, has not purported to be hypothesis testing; neither has it been designed to produce unquestionable conclusions for the most part. The intent was to provide descriptive data from which baseline information could be developed and further researched. The potential of hypothesis generating was not limited, rather it was perceived to be optimal and applicable to both processes and products of the teacher education program.

This is not to suggest that firm findings cannot be drawn from the data. Such findings should be considered as generalizations from which hypotheses for further study may be generated.

In summary, the data suggest that the following findings may be drawn:

1. SEPP students are not significantly different from non-SEPP students with respect to their attitudes, beliefs, perceptions, basic personality characteristics, and socio-economic backgrounds.
2. Both SEPP and non-SEPP students are not significantly different from other college-age students nationwide with respect to their attitudes, beliefs, and basic personality characteristics.
3. Both SEPP and non-SEPP students are similar to other practicing teachers described in the literature in terms of their socio-economic backgrounds.

4. SEPP students do not appear to have the degree of commitment to becoming and staying teachers to the same degree as do the non-SEPP students.
5. SEPP and non-SEPP students generally perceive the university community to be helpful to them. Students studied chose to stay at Michigan State University partially for this reason (Norris, 1976).

An external review and evaluation committee was formed by the College of Education in the spring of 1976. Its charge was to evaluate the Secondary Education Pilot Program "...stating both strengths and weaknesses...(and) a recommendation for continuance of the program." The committee issued its report in June of 1976, and based its summary on an intensive interview with the program director, an assessment of material utilized in the program, and responses to a questionnaire sent to those students currently enrolled in SEPP. The report of the committee was delivered to the Chairman of the Department of Secondary Education and Curriculum on June 15, 1976.

Among the strengths of the program reported by the committee were:

1. The program is an alternative and thus seems to fill a need for such alternatives in teacher education.
2. There is a well-defined philosophy to the program which fits well with its action model. Theory and task seem to be well-mated.
3. The hard and devoted work of a small staff is an asset.
4. The counseling function with respect to professional and career goals is outstanding.
5. The program seems to be on the "cutting edge" of placing a priority on the organic triad of "academic-student teaching-clinical experience."
6. Currently enrolled students expressed "overwhelming satisfaction" with the program.

Among the weaknesses reported were:

1. A lack of communication within the university community about the "existence, goals and intents of SEPP."
2. Some weakness in intra-program communication.
3. A need for more extensive contact with "University faculty serving as subject matter specialists."
4. "Shakiness" on the part of the entire operation, "no doubt due to the 'year-by-year' operation of the enterprise."

The committee recommended continuation of the pilot program in order for the first class to complete the full program cycle, and that another freshman class be recruited to begin the fall quarter of 1976.

The committee also recommended that:

...resources be allocated for personnel to conduct a rigorous and systematic evaluation of the SEPP with results of such an evaluation utilized to make a final 'go/no-go' decision on continuation of the program (Little, Wagner, and Schweitzer, 1976).

It is to be noted that a fourth class was admitted to the program in the fall of 1976, in light of this committee's findings.

A second evaluative effort took place in the fall of 1976. Interviews were conducted of students enrolled in SEPP:

...in an effort to ascertain the expectations, attitudes, learned abilities, contacts with school-age young people, and commitments to teaching of these students acquired through their association with SEPP.

As a result of twenty-two interviews, two documents were produced concerning reported results of the interviews and the interviewer's "informal evaluation and interpretation of interview" (MSU, 1976).

The interviewing instrument consisted of twenty-three open-ended questions drawn up primarily by the staff of the program, to which several areas were added by the Institute for Research on Teaching. The interviews were conducted by an outside interviewer, a member of

the staff of the Institute for Research on Teaching, and all of the interviews were recorded. The open-ended nature of the questions made it difficult to summarize findings neatly, but some of the pertinent clusters of responses follow.

The decision to become a part of the Secondary Education Pilot Program seemed to be related to the opportunity for early exposure to students and to the opportunity for more field work than would normally be available through the regular teacher education program. Most respondents indicated that they were either somewhat or seriously interested in becoming teachers at the time they became program members; and for nearly all, their commitment to teaching greatly increased during the time that they were members of the program.

Initial expectations centered about the opportunity for early field work and contact with school-age students. Another cluster of expectations dealt with the opportunity for career decision-making. For the majority of respondents, their initial expectations were satisfied by their involvement with the program.

Particularly positive experiences in the program centered once again on contact with school-age students. Other positive experiences included the personalized nature of the program, and contact with the staff.

When queried about doubts about themselves, the profession and their preparation, respondents primarily discussed the realities of the job market and questions about finding a teaching position. Other doubts mentioned frequently enough to be categorized as clusters included doubts about their major areas, their abilities to transmit

their knowledge, and doubts about fitting into an existing structure of a school or school system. The beginning sessions of the program, particularly the first term, were remembered with more negative feelings.

Positive feelings about the self, the profession, and preparation heavily focused on commitment to people and to students. Other positive feelings were expressed about perceiving themselves to be competent and feelings of being well-prepared through their involvement with the program. Respondents attributed the helpful advisory relationship of the SEPP staff to be supportive and particularly helpful.

Asked to describe the program to someone who might be unfamiliar with it, respondents chose to describe it primarily in terms of the amount of early and continued field experiences, its experimental nature, and the opportunity for early career decision-making. Mentioned most frequently as a specific new knowledge or skill acquired while members of the program were skills in interpersonal communication, adolescent and developmental psychology, teaching methods, and learning theories (MSU, 1976).

The comments by the interviewer about the instrument and the responses generally dealt with the fact that the instrument was devised by the SEPP staff, and the possible resulting bias in responses. However, the interviewer felt that most of the responses were sincere and honest. The interviewer noted that many of the respondents compared their past and current experiences with the program to the experiences that students in the regular program have, and pointed to this comparison as an area for further study. The interviewer noted that the students "interviewed seem to have a realistic picture of the job market today for teachers." The interviewer concluded:

I think that SEPP is a teacher education program of significant value. It seems to engage in a great deal of self-examination and has the structures to prevent decay. Greater demands are placed on students directly pertaining to teacher education in SEPP, but virtually every student interviewed felt that in the final analysis, and given the opportunity, they have the desire to be good, effective teachers (MSU, 1976).

A third external evaluative effort commenced in the fall of 1976. The charge of that evaluative committee was the evaluation of SEPP and a focus on the questions:

1. Should SEPP be continued?
2. If continued, what are the basic needs?
3. If continued, what are the needs to make an outstanding effort?

The committee utilized interviews with SEPP students and staff, interviews with field supervising teachers, interviews with MSU senior faculty, an examination of instructional materials utilized in SEPP, and an examination of the Norris research. The committee issued its report in December, 1976.

Strengths of the program cited by the committee included its inherent philosophy, its emphasis on field experience and human relations, and the enthusiasm of the staff and students. Weaknesses cited included: . . .

...lack of a systematic exposure to the literature and methods of specific teaching disciplines, isolation from and a lack of communication within the College of Education, a small staff, a feeling that substantive materials in education...may be downplayed, the P-N grading system, "grandiose" objectives, and the need for better articulation of the philosophy.

The committee's recommendation was that "the SEPP should be continued as an alternative program for secondary school teacher education." The committee also noted the difficulty in examining the

program structure apart from its present staff, and recommended the formation of an advisory committee and greater utilization of existing courses in the college at least to supplement SEPP (Juloa, Lancaster, Little, Manson, and Wagner, 1976.)

The director of the program responded to the report of this evaluation team in a letter to the department chairman. Among his major points were:

1. SEPP should be viewed holistically as a program. The staff felt that three components of the program served integrative functions to this end, those being the small advisement groups, the leadership training laboratory and the "mindbender" program.
2. The staff of SEPP has varied and has included eleven individuals. The director pointed out that "SEPP reflects at least as well our differences as our homogeneity.
3. The objectives described by the evaluation team as "grandiose" should always be viewed as in process, not as statements of final conditions or terminal results.
4. The demands on SEPP students exceed those in the regular program, but SEPP students generally agree that the extra work is "worth it." The director states, "We consider the academic quality of our program to be well above the norm, but our mode of operation as a predominantly inductive process may make that more difficult to observe.
5. The SEPP staff is frustrated by its inability to establish effective working relationships with other departments, but are seeking solutions to this matter.

The staff recommended that "SEPP be maintained as a regular alternative program" and proposed several steps to alleviate problem areas (Corl, 1977.)

The department chairman recommended continuation of SEPP. He endorsed the strengths of the program and stated that the weaknesses "merited consideration," and offered various remedies to these problems.

The chairman urged that the Director's letter (above) be given serious consideration in any deliberations (Gross, 1977).

It is to be noted that the College of Education did not act on the findings of the committee, the program director, or the department chairman. No new classes have been admitted to the program since the fall of 1976.

Part IV: Program Features

There are several features of the Secondary Education Pilot Program which lead the investigator to hypothesize differences in the concerns of first-year teachers who are graduates of the program. Such features of the program include its emphasis on self-study and self-evaluation, early and continued field experiences, the personalized nature of the program (including staff advisement, supervisory and counseling functions), emphasis on individualization, and the inductive nature of the program. While the features will be discussed separately, the features are intertwined and integrated throughout the program.

A decided emphasis on self-analysis and self-evaluation begins early in the program. Students examine their own beliefs and values toward teaching as a career in the first term seminar and such self-study is an integral thread continuing throughout the program. In self-report evaluations at the end of each term and through journals which are maintained throughout the program, students are asked to evaluate their own growth and skill development in light of the program goals as well as their own personal goals. Special emphasis is given to the self-as-teacher component in the first two years of the program, and then once again in the final year. Such an emphasis on the self in the pre-service program may serve to resolve some of the concern with self

that normally preoccupy the first-year teacher, as evidenced by the Fuller research.

Early and continued field experience may also aid in resolving concerns about the self in the teaching role. SEPP students have deliberate contact with school-age youngsters as early as the freshman year, and by the beginning of the junior year, have accumulated nearly four hundred hours of contact with students in formal or informal educational settings. Contacts with youngsters (built into the program) include a camping weekend with secondary school students, workshops, employment in camp or recreational settings, part- or full-time school internships, tutoring, interviewing for action research, and leadership of extracurricular school activities or out-of-school service or social groups. The average number of contact hours with students was approximately fifteen hundred for the first graduating class, with some students accumulating as many as four thousand hours. Such contacts were designed to alleviate fears of first-year teachers, especially when compared to first-year teachers whose only field experience was through a single term of student teaching.

Personalization in the program takes several forms and each form may have impact on the first-year teachers' concerns. Personalization in the program occurs in the personal relationship between staff and students and among the students themselves.

The staff of the program has remained relatively stable, with three staff members working with the first graduating class for the entire four years, and two staff members working with them for three years. Staff members serve as advisors to the students, are responsible for major portions of instruction, supervise clinical and field experience,

and function in a personal counseling capacity when necessary. Small advisement groups which meet for six hours per term allow for additional contact and communication.

The small advisement groups served the added function of increased personal contact and communication between students in the program. Students met on a regular basis, six hours per term, with their peers to discuss educational issues, experiences, and personal and professional concerns. Such sharing enables students to be exposed to more than their own concerns and experiences, and to be able to deal with such matters. Concerns which might normally have arisen in the first year of teaching may be at least anticipated and partially resolved in this way. Such extended personal contact between staff and students not only may have presented a model of teaching which emphasized concern for student growth, but may have represented a means, at least partially, to resolving students' concerns as they arose as well.

The program is individualized where that is necessary and appropriate. While most students share common experiences, individual circumstances in many cases necessitated the development of individualized study programs. Certain students, for example, substituted courses in the College of Education to meet SEPP requirements, or developed independent study courses to better suit their needs. Students, with staff advisement, often largely set their own agendas for growth following intern or clinical experiences. This was especially notable following the full time clinical internship in the junior year, after which students both individually and as a group set their own agendas for the course Advanced Workshops in Secondary Education. It is believed that such an individualized approach may have served to meet, and at least

partially resolve, certain concerns which otherwise would have carried over into the first year of teaching.

The Secondary Education Pilot Program may be described as an experience-based program, as distinguished from a performance-based program or model. The instructional staff did not, as a rule, set performance objectives for students. Rather, students were encouraged and asked to "set their own performance standards as an outgrowth of their own experiences," and constantly "to revise those goals in light of further reconstruction of experience" (Corl, 1976). It is to be noted that in the few cases where students were not successful in their own goal setting, further staff guidance and/or intervention was necessary. This inductive model of learning is certainly an important feature of the program. Because students are encouraged to identify and begin to resolve concerns on an on-going basis, such an emphasis may produce differences in the type of concerns expressed by first-year teachers who are graduates of this program and first-year teachers who are graduates of programs where this does not occur.

These several features of the program have possible consequences for the concerns of first-year teachers. Such features may have served as a modeling of concern about students and their growth, as well as having served to resolve or partially resolve concerns that, without these features, might not have developed until sometime during the first year of teaching.

This study represented a part of continuing evaluation of the Secondary Education Pilot Program, and concentrated on exit behaviors of its graduates in terms of their concerns as first-year teachers as well as on their perceptions of the program's strengths and weaknesses in

preparing them for their first year of teaching. The study is consistent with the Stake evaluation model proposed when the program was initiated, although interim steps in the evaluation process were not diligently pursued due to a lack of resources allocated for these processes.

Summary

This chapter included a description of the Secondary Education Pilot Program, an historical framework, prior research and studies of the program, and a description of program features which may have been instrumental in arousing and/or partially resolving concerns about teaching. This chapter added to the conceptual framework presented in Chapters I and II of this study.

The Secondary Education Pilot Program (SEPP) is a four-year alternative teacher education program at Michigan State University designed for undergraduates preparing to teach in junior or senior high schools. Twelve sequential courses, small advisement groups, a "mindbender" reading program, an off-campus leadership training laboratory, and modules of continuing field experiences comprise the program, and students participate in professional development activities each term they are in residence at the University.

The program was initiated with the enrollment of the first class in the fall of 1973, having its conception with a lack of satisfaction with the existing program. The attrition rate has exceeded fifty percent, with most of those exiting the program having made a change in career plans or leaving the University.

Prior research on the program was conducted by Norris in 1976 when the program had been in existence for two years. Her study was designed

to provide baseline (antecedent) data about the program in accordance with the evaluation model described by Stake and endorsed by Corl as appropriate to this program. Norris found that the students in SEPP were not significantly different from non-SEPP students on a number of measures, including attitudes, personality characteristics, socioeconomic backgrounds, beliefs, and perceptions. The only major difference was in the lesser degree of commitment that SEPP students held to becoming and staying a teacher.

Evaluative studies of the program conducted by external committees were also reviewed. All of the committee evaluation reports cited indicated general participant satisfaction with the program, especially regarding field experiences. The committee reports cited weaknesses in the program operation, but made recommendations that the program be continued as an alternative path to certification. It is noted that this recommendations for continuation was not acted upon by the university, and no new classes have been admitted since 1976.

Several features of the program were described which led the researcher to hypothesize differences in the concerns of first-year teachers who were program graduates from the concerns of beginning teachers studied by others reviewed in this study. Those features were an emphasis on self analysis and self evaluation; early and continued field experience; the personalized nature of the program, which included staff instructional, supervisory and counseling functions; emphasis on individualization; and the inductive nature of the program. Such features will be related to the findings, where appropriate, in Chapter VI.

CHAPTER IV

DESIGN AND PROCEDURES

The purpose of this study was to describe the concerns of first-year teachers who were graduates of the Secondary Education Pilot Program at Michigan State University and to discuss those concerns in relationship to their undergraduate teacher education program. The intent of this chapter is to describe the research design used in this study, and to detail the procedures utilized in the selection of instruments, and in the collection, compilation, and treatment of the data. Included in this chapter is a description of the subjects studied, a discussion of the instruments utilized, and a delineation of the procedures followed in the collection, compilation, and the treatment of data, and a statement of the hypotheses which were tested.

Selection of Subjects

The subjects for this study were those graduates of the Secondary Education Pilot Program at Michigan State University who were employed as full-time teachers during the 1977-1978 school year, and who responded to a questionnaire survey dealing with teacher concerns. All subjects had completed the requirements for Michigan provisional teacher certification through the auspices of the Secondary Education Pilot Program. Excluded from the study were those graduates of the program who were not employed on a contractual basis with a public, parochial or private school. Therefore, substitute teachers and persons engaged in activities other than teaching were excluded from this study.

In keeping with the program evaluative model proposed by Corl, no direct comparisons were made between graduates of SEPP and any other teacher education program.

All SEPP graduates who were in their first year of teaching were identified from records maintained by the Secondary Education Pilot Program. Twenty-one first year teachers were mailed a survey questionnaire on May 18, 1978. Nineteen responses were received by June 1, 1978, exceeding the seventy-five percent response rate criteria which was established at the onset of the study. Further efforts to gain responses from the other two teachers were not successful.

All subjects received their Michigan provisional secondary teacher certification in 1977, and all had completed all phases of the Secondary Education Pilot Program at Michigan State University. The subjects were composed of four male and fifteen female first-year teachers, all between twenty-two and twenty-four years of age. The nineteen subjects were employed in nineteen different school districts, fifteen in Michigan and four out-of-state. Three subjects taught in private or parochial schools, the remainder in public school settings. Eight respondents were chosen at random to be interviewed. The interviewed subjects included one male and seven female first-year teachers. Six of those interviewed taught in Michigan schools and two in Illinois. All but one of those interviewed were returning to the same school district next year. The one who was not returning had secured employment in a nearby district after financial pressures had caused her previous position to be eliminated.

Instrumentation

This study was conducted in two phases, the survey questionnaires and the interviews. Each will be discussed below in terms of its objectivity, development, and design.

The Survey Questionnaire

The objectives for the survey were to:

1. Gather descriptive and demographic information.
2. Determine the degree of concern the subjects felt about fifty-five potential problem areas at the beginning of the school year and late in the school year.
3. Determine what sources/resources were perceived as most helpful in resolving concerns in several areas.
4. Gather:
 - a. Perceptions about concerns which were not included in the survey.
 - b. Perceptions about components of their undergraduate teacher preparation that the subjects deemed useful in either identifying or resolving concerns.
 - c. Perceptions about the effectiveness of their entire undergraduate teacher preparation program.
 - d. Suggestions for improving teacher education programs.

Identification of Variables. Decisions about variables to be used were made after reviewing the literature and related studies and conversations with public school teachers, students, and university staff.

The variables used were:

1. Demographic and descriptive information about the subjects:
 - a. Grade(s) taught
 - b. Grade(s) subject would choose to teach
 - c. Number of classes taught in major field of study

- d. Number of classes taught in minor field of study
 - e. Average class size
 - f. Number of in-service programs attended in 1977-78
 - g. Number of college courses taken in 1977-78
 - h. Average age of faculty in building
 - i. Type of community
 - j. General satisfaction with undergraduate teacher education program.
 - k. Amount of experience with school-age youngsters while an undergraduate
 - l. Location of experience with youngster (school, camp, etc.)
 - m. Commitment to teaching
 - n. Desire to return to teaching next year
2. The degree of concern held by subjects at the beginning of the year and at the end of the year in fifty-five areas representing Fuller's six levels of concern:
- a. Self-adjustment and acceptance in the school setting
 - b. Self-adequacy
 - 1) Classroom management
 - 2) Subject area
 - c. Motivation for student behavior and teacher-student relationships
 - d. Evaluation of students' learning of what is taught
 - e. Evaluation of students' learning what they need
 - f. Self-evaluation and improvement of instruction
3. Identification of sources which were helpful in the areas of:
- a. Classroom management
 - b. Evaluation of student learning

- c. Planning for instruction
 - d. Grading students
 - e. Adjusting to the job
 - f. Evaluating one's own teaching
 - g. Dealing with parents
 - h. Teaching subject area
 - i. Finding instructional material
 - j. Improving one's own teaching
4. Feedback that subjects could give to university staff by:
- a. Identifying concerns not mentioned on other parts of the questionnaire
 - b. Specifying components of their undergraduate teacher preparation program that were especially helpful in resolving concerns
 - c. Evaluating the effectiveness of their entire undergraduate teacher preparation program in preparing them for teaching
 - d. Making suggestions for improving teacher education programs

The instrument developed by Briscoe (1972) was felt to meet these objectives, with some adaptations necessary after interviewing Secondary Education Pilot Program staff, teachers, and administrators and the review of literature pertinent to this study. The procedure utilized to develop the final instrument for this study included:

- 1. Reviewing other studies dealing with the concerns of beginning teachers
- 2. Presenting open-ended questions to experienced teachers enrolled in a graduate course at Michigan State University
- 3. Presenting open-ended questions to two groups of pre-service secondary teacher education students:
 - a. A group about to begin student teaching

- b. A group who had completed student teaching
4. Reviewing Briscoe's instrument
5. Adapting the descriptive and demographic information portion (Part I of Briscoe's instrument) to meet the objectives of this study
6. Adding items to the list of potential problem statements (Part II) and to the areas where help was received (Part III) to ensure that all levels of concern (according to the Fuller scheme) were represented
7. The statements and situations in Parts II and III were scored for the level of concern independently by three experienced teachers in accordance with the Manual for Scoring the Teacher Concerns Statement (Fuller and Case, 1972). The three scorers then met and reached consensus on the level of concern for each situational statement. All levels of concern were represented. Procedures for determining the level for each area on the checklist are detailed in Appendix E.
8. Developing open-ended questions to meet the objectives of this study
9. Reviewing the final instrument with experienced teachers and university staff.

The final survey instrument was an eight-page, four-part questionnaire found in Appendix C.

The Interviews

The objectives for the interview portion of the study were to:

1. Obtain a measure for congruence with the concerns reported on the questionnaire,
2. Gain information about the nature of the change concerns,
3. Gain information about recurring or unresolved concerns,
4. Gather self-perceptions of their success as first-year teachers and needed improvements,
5. Gather data about the processes that subjects utilized for self-evaluation,
6. Obtain reactions to the Fuller theory of teacher concerns, and

7. Gather evaluative data about the Secondary Education Pilot Program.

The procedures utilized in developing an interview guide were:

1. Developing a rough interview guide in accordance with the objectives of this study,
2. Field testing the interview guide on two first-year teachers and two experienced teachers,
3. Revising the draft of interview guide, and
4. Developing the final interview guide.

An interview guide was developed consisting of fifteen major questions. Most were open-ended questions to provide maximum freedom of response. The final interview guide which was utilized is found in Appendix D.

Collection of Data

The twenty-one graduates of the Secondary Education Pilot Program who were first-year teachers were mailed a packet of materials on May 18, 1978. The packet contained a cover letter explaining the request for their assistance (Appendix B), and eight-page, four-part survey questionnaire (Appendix C), and a stamped, addressed envelope to return the survey. The teachers were asked to complete the survey and return it by May 31.

By June 1, 1978, nineteen first-year teachers' completed surveys had been returned. Attempts at securing the other responses were unsuccessful. The total response rate was ninety (90) percent.

Eight subjects whose responses to the survey were received were selected at random for interviews conducted by the investigator. The interviews were all conducted between June 10 and June 26, 1978. Four of the interviews were conducted by telephone, and the remaining four

in person. Each of the interviews was tape-recorded, and varied in length from twenty to thirty minutes. The interviews were conducted utilizing the interview guide found in Appendix D.

Compilation of Data

Data from the nineteen subjects were tabulated in its original form, coded, quality checked, and transferred to data processing cards for use with existing programs at the Michigan State University Computer Laboratory. After determining frequencies, certain responses within categories were collapsed together to allow statistical analysis. A one-way multivariate analysis of variance was computed with each of the nine independent variables for the level of concern of first-year teachers and for the degree of change over time. The independent variables selected were:

1. Satisfaction with present teaching level
 - a. Desire no change in teaching level
 - b. Desire to add or drop a teaching level
2. Extent of teaching assignment in major field of study
 - a. Teaching primarily in major area
 - b. Teaching primarily outside major
3. Average class size
 - a. Fewer than twenty pupils per class
 - b. Twenty-one to twenty-five pupils per class
 - c. Twenty-six or more pupils per class
4. Attendance at in-service meetings
 - a. Attended no in-service meetings
 - b. Attended one or two in-service meetings

- c. Attended three or more in-service meetings
- 5. Enrollment in college graduate courses, 1977-78
 - a. Enrolled in no college graduate courses
 - b. Enrolled in one or more college graduate courses
- 6. Average age of building faculty
 - a. Under thirty years of age
 - b. Thirty to forty-nine years of age
- 7. General satisfaction with undergraduate teacher preparation
 - a. Extremely satisfied
 - b. Less than extremely satisfied
- 8. Amount of pre-service clinical experience with school-age youngsters
 - a. Over one thousand hours
 - b. 750-999 hours
 - c. Under 749 hours
- 9. Commitment to teaching
 - a. Extremely committed
 - b. Mildly committed

A major research question of this study was to determine whether beginning teachers who are graduates of SEPP, given the unique nature of their preparation, had the same concerns as other beginning teachers according to the developmental conceptualization as posited by Fuller. In addition the following null hypotheses were tested at the .05 level of significance:

- Hypothesis 1: There are no significant differences in expressed levels of concern among the subjects with varying degrees of satisfaction with their first-year teaching level.

- Hypothesis 2: There are no significant differences in expressed levels of concern among the subjects with varying extent of teaching assignments in their major fields.
- Hypothesis 3: There are no significant differences in expressed levels of concern among the subjects with varying average class sizes.
- Hypothesis 4: There are no significant differences in expressed levels of concern among the subjects with varying frequencies of attendance at in-service meetings.
- Hypothesis 5: There are no significant differences in expressed levels of concern among the subjects with varying frequencies of enrollment in graduate college courses.
- Hypothesis 6: There are no significant differences in expressed levels of concern among the subjects in buildings with varying average faculty ages.
- Hypothesis 7: There are no significant differences in expressed levels of concern among the subjects with varying degrees of general satisfaction with their undergraduate teacher preparation.
- Hypothesis 8: There are no significant differences in expressed levels of concern among the subjects with varying amounts of pre-service experience with school-age youngsters.
- Hypothesis 9: There are no significant differences in expressed levels of concern among the subjects with varying degrees of commitment to teaching.

It is noted that a tenth hypothesis (There are no significant differences in expressed levels of concern among the subjects with varying desires to return to teaching next year) was not tested due to the similarity of responses by the subjects. All subjects indicated that they wished to return to teaching next year.

CHAPTER V

PRESENTATION OF THE FINDINGS

Introduction

The purposes of this study were to identify and describe the concerns of first-year teachers who were graduates of the Secondary Education Pilot Program, to relate those concerns to pre-service preparation, to relate the concerns to the developmental conceptualization of teacher concerns as posited by Fuller, et al., and to gather evaluative data about the Secondary Education Pilot Program. It is the intent of this chapter to present the findings of this study.

Findings from the four-part survey questionnaire will be presented first, followed by findings from the interviews.

Part I: the Survey Questionnaire

The survey questionnaire consisted of four parts (see Appendix C). Part one asked for certain demographic information which was used to further analyze data from remaining parts of the survey. Part two consisted of a checklist of fifty-five items of potential concern. Subjects were asked to indicate the degree of concern they held in each area at the beginning of the year and at the end of the year. Part three asked subjects to indicate persons or resources which were helpful during their first year of teaching in resolving concerns in twelve areas of teaching. Part four asked subjects to respond to four open-ended questions. Findings are reported for each part of the survey.

Demographic Information

The first part of the survey questionnaire asked respondents to answer questions which provided demographic information which was used in the analysis of the data. Responses to these questions follow.

Teaching Level and Satisfaction with First Year Teaching Level

Of the nineteen respondents, the majority were teaching in senior high school situations, with others reporting teaching assignments in junior high schools, combination junior and senior high schools, elementary, or some combination.

Table 2
First-Year Teaching Levels of Respondents

<u>Teaching Level</u>	<u>Number Teaching</u>
Senior High School (grades 9-12)	13
Junior High/Middle School (grades 6-8)	1
Junior and Senior High School	3
Elementary (grades 1-5)	1
Elementary and Senior High School	1

Many of the respondents indicated satisfaction with their present teaching level, with some desiring either to drop or add a teaching level.

Table 3
Satisfaction with First-Year Teaching Level

Desire no change in teaching level	10
Desire to change teaching level	9

Extent of Teaching Assignment in Major Field

All but one of the subjects reported that they were teaching primarily in their major field of preparation. Several reported that they were teaching one or two class periods in their minor field, but in only one instance was the minor field taught more than the major field.

Average Class Size

Most respondents indicated that the average size of their classes was under thirty students, with only two reporting average class sizes above that level. Several respondents indicated average class sizes of less than twenty.

Table 4
Average Class Sizes Reported by Respondents

Fewer than 20 pupils per class	5
20-24 pupils per class	6
25-29 pupils per class	6
30 or more pupils per class	2

Attendance at In-Service Meetings

Most respondents attended at least one or more in-service meetings during their first year of teaching, with four attending three or more such meetings. Several respondents who indicated that they had not attended such meetings penciled in the margin of the survey that in-service meetings were not held in their school districts during the 1977-78 year due to budget restrictions.

Table 5
Attendance at Inservice Meetings by Subjects

Attended no inservice meetings	5
Attended one or two inservice meetings	7
Attended three or more inservice meetings	4

Enrollment in College Graduate Courses, 1977-78

Most of the respondents did not enroll in college graduate courses during their first year of teaching. A few enrolled in one course, and one respondent reported that she had enrolled in two college graduate courses.

Table 6
Enrollment in College Graduate Courses

Enrolled in no college graduate courses	14
Enrolled in one college graduate course	4
Enrolled in two or more college graduate courses	1

Average Age of Building Faculty

All of the subjects were in the same general age grouping (22-24 years of age), but their first-year teaching assignments were in buildings whose average faculty age ranged from under thirty to 40-49 years. It is noted that the average age of the building faculty is that perceived and reported by the respondent, and that the real average faculty age may have been higher or lower than the respondent's perception.

Table 7
Average Age of Building Faculty

Under 30 years of age	4
31-39 years of age	14
40-49 years of age	1

Satisfaction with Undergraduate Teacher Education Program

Most respondents were "extremely satisfied" with their undergraduate teacher education program, and only one respondent indicated anything less than "mild satisfaction." That one respondent was one of the subjects who was later interviewed, and her comments indicate that she was not referring to the Secondary Education Pilot Program when she indicated "extremely dissatisfied," but rather another program in the College of Education in which she was dually enrolled. Her response is listed here, however, as stated on the survey.

Table 8
General Satisfaction with
Undergraduate Teacher Education Program

Extremely satisfied with program	14
Mildly satisfied with program	4
Mildly dissatisfied with program	0
Extremely dissatisfied with program	1

Amount of Experience with School-Age Youngsters
During Undergraduate Years

The amount of experience with school-age youngsters gained by the respondents during their undergraduate years ranged from slightly less than 750 hours to nearly four thousand hours. The table below reflects the respondents' perception or memory of the amount of contact with school-age youngsters while an undergraduate student.

Table 9
Experience with Youngsters While an Undergraduate Student

Over 1500 hours	3
1000-1499 hours	5
750-999 hours	5
Under 750 hours	6

For most of the respondents, this experience with youngsters prior to graduation from Michigan State University occurred in schools or in camp or recreational settings. For those students who reported over 1500 hours, at least some portion of that time was spent in camp or recreational settings.

Commitment to Teaching

Three-fourths of the respondents indicated that they held a "strong" commitment to remaining a teacher. No respondents indicated a weak commitment, or that they would leave the profession within the next year.

Table 10
Commitment to Teaching

Strongly committed to teaching	13
Mildly committed to teaching	6
Weak commitment to teaching	0

Desire to Return to Teaching Next Year

All of the respondents indicated that they wanted to return to teaching in the coming year, with three indicating that their return would depend upon the availability of a teaching job. It is known from data obtained elsewhere that several of the respondents were "pink-slipped" or their positions were eliminated due to budgetary cuts.

Table 11
Desire to Return to Teaching Next Year

Definitely desire to return	16
Desire to return, pending availability of a teaching position	3
Do not desire to return	0
Undecided	0

Expressed Concerns of First-Year Teachers

Subjects in this study responded to a checklist of fifty-five potential concerns. Subjects were asked to indicate whether the item was "of much concern," "of some concern," or "of no concern" at "the beginning of the year" as well as to what degree each was still a concern at the end of the year, "now." The closer the average degree of concern was to 3.0, the greater the degree of concern; the closer the average degree of concern was to 1.0, the lesser the degree of concern.

Table 12 reflects the mean degrees of concern for each item as reported for the beginning of the year and for the end of the year. The scores are listed in order of their average degree of concern at the end of the year, with the order of the average degree of concern at the beginning of the year listed also.

The five greatest concerns expressed by the subjects as a group at the end of the year were:

1. Dealing with troublesome students
2. Having impact on my students
3. Meeting the needs of individual students
4. Providing instruction for slow learners
5. Knowing my students are learning what I'm teaching

Table 12
Professional Concerns Expressed by First-Year Teachers

Concern	N	Beginning Concerns			Now Concerns			Mean Change from Beginning to Now
		Rank	Mean	SD	Rank	Mean	SD	
Dealing with troublesome students	19	2	2.79	.419	1	2.63	.496	Down .14
Having impact on my students	19	1	2.84	.375	2	2.53	.697	Down .31
Meeting the needs of individual students	19	9	2.58	.697	3	2.53	.612	Down .05
Providing instruction for slow learners	19	12	2.58	.697	4	2.53	.612	Down .05
Knowing my students are learning what I'm teaching	19	11	2.58	.507	5	2.47	.612	Down .11
Evaluating students with special needs	18	24	2.28	.575	6	2.44	.511	Up .16
Individualizing instruction	19	22	2.32	.749	7	2.42	.607	Up .10
Having adequate instructional materials available	19	5	2.63	.496	8	2.42	.607	Down .21
Finding appropriate instructional materials	18	13	2.50	.618	9	2.39	.698	Down .11
Determining students' academic needs	19	19	2.37	.597	10	2.37	.496	Same
Keeping order in my class	18	4	2.72	.461	11	2.33	.594	Down .39
Organizing instruction for the year	18	14	2.50	.618	12	2.33	.767	Down .17

Table 12, cont.

Concern	N	Beginning Concerns			Now Concerns			Mean Change from Beginning to Now
		Rank	Mean	SD	Rank	Mean	SD	
Getting to know students as individuals	19	6	2.63	.597	13	2.32	.749	Down .31
Having students respect me as a teacher	19	7	2.63	.496	14	2.32	.749	Down .31
Providing instructional variety within individual lessons	18	18	2.39	.608	15	2.28	.575	Down .11
Asking for feedback to improve instruction	19	20	2.37	.684	16	2.16	.688	Down .21
Handling single discipline problems without interrupting instruction	18	8	2.61	.502	17	2.11	.583	Down .50
Determining grades	18	21	2.33	.686	18	2.11	.583	Down .22
Establishing classroom operating procedures	19	16	2.47	.612	19	2.11	.737	Down .36
Dealing with groups of students	19	29	2.16	.602	20	2.11	.809	Down .15
Maintaining student respect	19	3	2.74	.452	21	2.05	.621	Down .69
Providing instruction for gifted students	18	33	2.06	.802	22	2.00	.767	Down .06
Using evaluation other than tests	19	37	2.00	.577	23	1.95	.705	Down .05
Handling administrators' observations of my teaching	19	15	2.47	.697	24	1.95	.705	Down .52
Having students like me	19	10	2.58	.607	25	1.95	.621	Down .63

Table 12, cont.

Concern	N	Beginning Concerns			Now Concerns			Mean Change from Beginning to Now
		Rank	Mean	SD	Rank	Mean	SD	
Avoiding showing favoritism	19	32	2.11	.737	26	1.90	.737	Down .21
Getting to know other teachers	19	25	2.26	.653	27	1.90	.809	Down .36
Understanding the school's unwritten rules	19	27	2.21	.713	28	1.90	.737	Down .31
Dealing with parent criticisms	18	28	2.17	.786	29	1.89	.758	Down .28
Understanding and following administrative directives	19	28	1.95	.621	30	1.84	.765	Down .11
Finding supportive colleagues	19	26	2.21	.787	31	1.84	.834	Down .37
Handling criticisms from other teachers	19	34	2.05	.621	32	1.79	.631	Down .26
Knowing the principal's expectations for me as a classroom teacher	19	17	2.42	.607	33	1.79	.855	Down .63
Dealing with problems of drug use	19	42	1.79	.713	34	1.79	.787	Same
Arranging furniture to facilitate learning	18	48	1.56	.784	35	1.78	.808	Up .22
Using bulletin boards	19	41	1.84	.765	36	1.74	.806	Down .10
Keeping records (attendance, etc.)	19	40	1.90	.809	37	1.74	.653	Down .16
Getting along with the principal	19	30	2.11	.737	38	1.68	.749	Down .43
Conducting individual parent conferences	19	35	2.00	.507	39	1.63	.597	Down .37

Table 12, cont.

Concern	N	Beginning Concerns			Now Concerns			Mean Change from Beginning to Now
		Rank	Mean	SD	Rank	Mean	SD	
Constructing tests	18	36	2.00	.767	40	1.61	.608	Down .39
Achieving tenure	19	47	1.58	.769	41	1.58	.838	Same
Asking other teachers for help	19	31	2.11	.737	42	1.58	.769	Down .53
Interpreting the results of teacher-made tests	18	46	1.61	.698	43	1.56	.616	Down .05
Designing evaluation instruments to measure individual instruction	17	49	1.53	.624	44	1.53	.624	Same
Asking questions at faculty meetings	19	51	1.53	.697	45	1.53	.612	Same
Dealing with non-instructional personnel (custodians, secretaries)	18	52	1.50	.514	46	1.47	.513	Down .03
Being accepted as a full-fledged staff member	19	23	2.32	.671	47	1.47	.697	Down .85
Operating audio-visual equipment	19	44	1.68	.820	48	1.47	.612	Down .21
Knowing the school's expectations for me outside the classroom	19	39	1.90	.737	49	1.47	.612	Down .43
Writing behaviorally stated objectives	18	43	1.78	.647	50	1.44	.511	Down .34
Interpreting the results of commercially prepared tests	19	53	1.47	.772	51	1.37	.597	Down .10
Knowing what tenure evaluation criteria are	19	55	1.32	.582	52	1.37	.496	Up .05

Table 12, cont.

Concern	N	Beginning Concerns			Now Concerns			Mean Change from Beginning to Now
		Rank	Mean	SD	Rank	Mean	SD	
Implementing the school's grading system	19	50	1.53	.772	53	1.32	.478	Down .21
Doing lesson plans for the administration	18	45	1.61	.502	54	1.28	.461	Down .33
Handling racially mixed classes	17	42	1.79	.606	55	1.19	.485	Down .60

Only two of these concerns were in the top five at the beginning of the year; the remaining three moved up from rankings of nine, ten, and eleven, respectively, to three, four, and five.

The degree of expressed concern was least in the following areas at the end of the year, in descending order:

1. Interpreting the results of commercially prepared tests
2. Knowing what tenure evaluation criteria are
3. Implementing the school's grading system
4. Doing lesson plans for the administration
5. Handling racially mixed classes

Generally speaking, there was a downward degree of concern from fall to spring. Forty-six items received a lesser degree of concern in the spring; four items were of greater concern; and five items held the same mean degree of concern.

Upward movement in the mean degree of concern was limited to four of the fifty-five items, and the movement ranged from .05 to .22. The four items showing upward movement in the degree of concern were, in order of greatest change:

1. Arranging furniture to facilitate learning
2. Evaluating students with special needs
3. Individualizing instruction
4. Knowing what tenure evaluation criteria are

Downward movement for the forty-six items whose mean scores decreased from fall to spring ranged from .03 to .85. The five areas showing the most downward movement in the mean degree of concern were, in order of greatest change:

1. Being accepted as a full-fledged staff member

2. Maintaining student respect
3. Having students like me
4. Knowing the principal's expectations for me as a classroom teacher
5. Handling racially mixed classes

Changes in the group ranking of concerns are also evident from Table 12. Those concerns which moved up most in ranking were:

1. Evaluating students with special needs (24th to 6th)
2. Individualizing instruction (22nd to 7th)
3. Using evaluation other than tests (37th to 23rd)
4. Arranging furniture to facilitate learning (33rd to 22nd)
5. Providing instruction for gifted students (33rd to 22nd)

Those concerns which moved downward most in the ranking were:

1. Being accepted as a full-fledged staff member (23rd to 47th)
2. Maintaining student respect (3rd to 21st)
3. Knowing the principal's expectations for me as a classroom teacher (17th to 33rd)
4. Having students like me (10th to 25th)
5. Handling racially mixed classes (41st to 55th)

Levels of Concern

The fifty-five items on the list of potential concerns were scored as to level of concern according to the Manual for Scoring the Teacher Concern Statement (Fuller and Case, 1972). Mean scores were computed for each level, as shown in Table 13.

The ranking by level of concern changed from the beginning of the year to the end of the year. The ranking by level of concern at the beginning of the year was:

Table 13
Mean Scores for Levels of Concern

LEVEL OF CONCERN	MEAN DEGREE OF CONCERN		
	In the Begin- ning of the Year	Now	Change
Level 1: Concern about self adjustment	1.96	1.65	Down .31
Level 2: Concern about self adequacy (classroom manage- ment and subject area)	2.22	2.00	Down .22
Level 3: Concern about pupil-teacher relationship	2.54	2.11	Down .43
Level 4: Concern about students' learning what is taught	1.91	1.76	Down .15
Level 5: Concern about meeting real needs of students	2.31	2.30	Down .01
Level 6: Concern about the improvement of instruction	2.50	2.29	Down .21

<u>Rank</u>	<u>Level</u>
1	Level 3: Concern about pupil-teacher relations
2	Level 6: Concern about improvement of instruction
3	Level 5: Concern about meeting the real needs of students
4	Level 2: Concern about self adequacy
5	Level 1: Concern about self adjustment
6	Level 4: Concern about students learning what is taught

The ranking at the end of the year was:

<u>Rank</u>	<u>Level</u>
1	Level 5: Concern about meeting the real needs of students
2	Level 6: Concern about the improvement of instruction
3	Level 3: Concern about pupil-teacher relations
4	Level 2: Concern about self adequacy
5	Level 4: Concern about students learning what is taught
6	Level 1: Concern about self adjustment

Differences among Groups of Subjects

The purpose of this section is to report findings which indicate differences among groups of subjects within the population of first year teachers who were graduates of the Secondary Education Pilot Program. The groups considered were formed on the basis of responses to questions found in part one of the survey, and the groups were tested for differences in overall level of concern. The differences occurring between these concerns and ten independent variables chosen were examined by means of a one-way multivariate analysis of variance. A .05

alpha level of significance was selected as the critical value in the interpretation of the findings.

These differences are summarized in Table 14. A brief review of the differences follows. It is noted that the purpose of this section is to report findings which indicate differences in the level of concern when the subjects are divided into groups based on their responses to demographic questions.

Table 14
Summary of Multivariate Analyses of Variance
for the Independent Variables

Variable	F-Ratio	Degrees of F	P less than
Satisfaction with first-year teaching level	.6529	1 and 17	.4302
Extent of teaching assignment in major field	.9492	1 and 17	.3436
Average class sizes	.4710	2 and 16	.6327
Attendance at inservice meetings	.6635	2 and 13	.5317
Enrollment in college graduate courses, 1977-78	1.7534	1 and 17	.2030
Average age of building faculty	.2563	1 and 17	.6192
Satisfaction with undergraduate teacher preparation	.0695	1 and 17	.7953
Preservice experience with school-age youngsters	.4748	2 and 16	.5305
Commitment to teaching	.1025	1 and 17	.7527
Desire to return to teaching	DROPPED		

Satisfaction with First Year Teaching Level.

Hypothesis 1: There are no significant differences in expressed level of concerns among the subjects with varying degrees of satisfaction with their first year teaching level.

Results: There were no significant differences. ($P=0.4302$)
Therefore, this hypothesis could not be rejected.

The subjects were divided by their responses into two groups: those who wished no change in their present teaching level, and those who desired either to drop or add a teaching level. No significant differences were found between these two groups.

Extent of Teaching Assignment in Major Field.

Hypothesis 2: There are no significant differences in expressed level of concerns among the subjects with varying extent of teaching assignments in their major field.

Results: There were no significant differences. ($P=0.3436$)
Therefore, this hypothesis could not be rejected.

The respondents were grouped according to the extent of their teaching assignments in their major fields. No significant differences were found between those who were teaching primarily in their major fields and those who were teaching primarily outside their major fields.

Average Class Size.

Hypothesis 3: There are no significant differences in expressed level of concerns among the subjects with varying average class sizes.

Results: There were no significant differences. ($P=0.6327$)
Therefore, this hypothesis could not be rejected.

The respondents were grouped according to their average class sizes. There were no significant differences found between groups based on different class sizes.

Attendance at Inservice Meetings.

Hypothesis 4: There are no significant differences in expressed level of concerns among the subjects with varying frequencies of attendance at inservice meetings.

Results: There were no significant differences. ($P=0.5317$)
Therefore, this hypothesis could not be rejected.

The respondents were divided into groups based on varying attendance at inservice meetings. No significant differences were found between groups who attended no inservice meetings, who attended one^{or} two inservice meetings, and those who attended three or more inservice meetings.

Enrollment in College Graduate Courses, 1977-1978.

Hypothesis 5: There are no significant differences in expressed level of concerns among the subjects with varying frequencies of enrollment in college graduate courses during 1977-1978.

Results: There were no significant differences. ($P=0.2030$)
Therefore, this hypothesis could not be rejected.

The respondents were grouped according to the frequencies in enrollment in college graduate courses during 1977-1978. There were no significant differences found between those who had enrolled in no college graduate courses and those who attended one or more college graduate courses during 1977-1978.

Average Age of Building Faculty.

Hypothesis 6: There are no significant differences in expressed level of concerns among the subjects with varying average building faculty age.

Results: There were no significant differences. ($P=0.6192$)
Therefore, this hypothesis could not be rejected.

The respondents were divided into groups based on the average age of the faculty in their buildings. No significant differences were

found between those who taught in buildings where the average faculty age was under thirty, and those who taught in buildings where the average faculty age was thirty or above.

Satisfaction with Undergraduate Teacher Preparation.

Hypothesis 7: There are no significant differences in expressed level of concerns among the subjects with varying degrees of general satisfaction with their undergraduate teacher education.

Results: There were no significant differences. ($P=0.7953$) Therefore, this hypothesis could not be rejected.

The respondents were grouped according to their degrees of general satisfaction with their undergraduate teacher preparation. No significances were found between those who were extremely satisfied and those who were less than extremely satisfied with their undergraduate teacher preparation.

Amount of Preservice Experience with School-Age Youngsters.

Hypothesis 8: There are no significant differences in expressed level of concerns among the subjects with varying amounts of preservice experience with school-age youngsters.

Results: There were no significant differences. ($P=0.5305$) Therefore, this hypothesis could not be rejected.

The respondents were divided into groups based on the number of hours of preservice experience with school-age youngsters (over 1000 hours, 750-999 hours, under 750 hours). There were no significant differences found between these groups.

Commitment to Teaching.

Hypothesis 9: There are no significant differences in expressed level of concerns among the subjects with varying degrees of commitment to teaching.

Results: There were no significant differences. ($P=0.7527$)
Therefore, this hypothesis could not be rejected.

The respondents were divided into groups based on their expressed degree of commitment to teaching. No significant differences were found between those who indicated that they were strongly committed to teaching (would probably remain a teacher for five years) and those who indicated that they were mildly committed to teaching (would remain a teacher for one-two years).

Desire to Return to Teaching Next Year.

Hypothesis 10: There are no significant differences in expressed level of concerns among the subjects with different decisions to return to teaching next year.

Results: The hypothesis was not tested because there were no respondents who did not want to return to teaching next year.

Examination of Individual Concerns

Beginning of the year concerns and end of the year concerns were examined for individual subjects. A number of differences appeared.

Eleven individuals showed movement toward lesser concern or remained the same in all levels of concern from the beginning to the end of the year. This downward movement occurred in as many as all six levels. One individual showed no movement toward lesser concern at any level. Upward movement toward greater concern occurred in as many as four levels for some individuals to no movement toward greater concern for others.

Examination of movement within each of the levels revealed only one trend. The number of individuals who showed movement toward lesser concerns decreased gradually from level one (fifteen individuals moved

toward lesser concerns from the beginning to the end of the year) to level six (nine individuals showed such movement).

Table 15 reflects individual mean concern scores by level for the beginning and end of the year as well as the amount of movement for each individual by levels of concern.

Sources of Help in Resolving Concerns

The third part of the survey questionnaire dealt with persons or sources which were helpful to first year teachers in resolving concerns categorized into ten areas. First year teachers were asked to note the "most helpful," "next most helpful," etc., by placing a "1" and "2" respectively in the appropriate column. Table 16, "Sources of Help in Resolving Concerns of First-Year Teachers," reflects the number of subjects who rated each source as "most helpful" and "next most helpful." When the sources "other" was rated most helpful or next most helpful, subjects were to indicate who or what that source was in the space provided.

From the data it is evident that the undergraduate education program and fellow teachers were by far the most significant sources of help in resolving the concerns of first-year teachers.

Responses to Open-Ended Questions

Responses to the open-ended questions of the survey questionnaire provide data which are relevant to the questions that form the purposes of this study. Discussion of the findings as they apply to those questions will be deferred to Chapter VI, and the findings themselves will be presented here with only brief comments by the investigator.

Table 15
Levels of Concern Expressed by Individual Subjects

Subject Number	LEVEL ONE			LEVEL TWO			LEVEL THREE			LEVEL FOUR			LEVEL FIVE			LEVEL SIX		
	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3
1	1.90	1.15	-.75	2.10	1.60	-.50	2.40	1.00	-1.40	1.63	88	-.75	2.30	1.70	-.60	2.50	2.50	same
2	1.75	1.45	-.30	2.30	2.20	-.10	2.40	2.00	-.40	1.63	1.63	same	1.80	2.50	+.70	3.00	2.50	-.50
3	1.95	2.25	+.30	1.90	2.50	+.60	2.60	2.40	-.20	2.00	2.00	same	1.80	2.20	+.40	2.50	2.50	same
4	1.90	1.60	-.30	2.00	1.60	-.40	2.80	2.40	-.40	2.13	1.75	-.38	2.30	2.20	-.10	2.50	2.50	same
5	1.65	1.25	-.40	2.00	2.00	same	2.00	2.00	same	1.88	2.00	+.12	2.00	2.10	+.10	2.00	1.50	-.50
6	1.35	1.10	-.25	1.90	2.00	+.10	2.00	1.40	-.60	1.75	2.00	+.25	1.70	1.90	+.20	1.50	1.50	same
7	2.00	1.90	-.10	2.20	2.00	-.20	2.60	2.00	-.60	2.13	1.88	-.25	2.30	2.50	+.20	2.50	2.00	-.50
8	1.75	1.20	-.55	2.20	2.00	-.20	2.60	2.00	-.60	2.25	1.88	-.37	2.60	2.50	-.10	3.00	2.50	-.50
9	2.15	1.50	-.65	2.40	1.30	-1.10	3.00	3.00	same	1.88	1.57	-.13	1.90	1.90	same	2.00	1.50	-.50
10	1.80	1.85	+.05	1.30	1.20	-.10	2.00	2.00	same	1.13	1.13	same	1.70	1.90	+.20	2.00	2.00	same
11	1.75	1.40	-.35	2.00	1.80	-.20	2.40	2.00	-.40	1.38	1.38	same	2.60	2.40	-.20	2.50	2.50	same
12	2.65	1.70	-.95	2.70	1.90	-.80	3.00	2.40	-.60	2.13	1.50	-.63	2.60	2.10	-.50	2.50	2.50	same
13	2.15	1.35	-.80	2.30	1.70	-.60	2.40	1.20	-1.20	2.63	1.63	-.50	2.10	2.00	-.10	2.50	2.50	same
14	2.35	2.10	-.25	2.50	2.10	-.40	3.00	2.80	-.20	2.13	2.13	same	2.80	2.90	+.10	3.00	2.50	-.50
15	1.40	1.40	same	1.70	1.70	same	2.00	1.40	-.60	1.50	1.38	-.12	2.30	2.30	same	2.50	2.50	same

Table 15, cont.

Subject Number	LEVEL ONE			LEVEL TWO			LEVEL THREE			LEVEL FOUR			LEVEL FIVE			LEVEL SIX		
	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3
16	2.10	1.35	-.75	2.50	1.60	-.90	2.60	2.60	same	1.50	1.50	same	2.70	2.20	-.50	3.00	2.00	-1.0
17	1.90	2.50	+.60	2.30	2.80	+.50	2.80	2.80	same	1.88	1.88	same	2.60	2.80	+.20	2.50	3.00	-.50
18	1.85	1.65	-.20	2.30	1.90	-.40	2.80	2.20	-.60	1.75	1.63	-.12	2.50	2.20	-.30	2.50	2.00	-.50
19	2.55	2.50	-.05	2.40	2.40	same	2.80	2.60	-.20	2.25	2.25	same	2.50	2.50	same	3.00	3.00	same

1 = Beginning of the year mean score

2 = End of the year mean score

3 = Change

Table 16
Sources of Help in Resolving Concerns of First Year Teachers

Area of Concern	School Admin.		Fellow Teacher		Secondary Student		Inservice Program		Undergrad Education		Courses Taken 77-78		Other	
	MOST HELP -FUL	NEXT MOST HELP -FUL	MOST HELP -FUL	NEXT MOST HELP -FUL	MOST HELP -FUL	NEXT MOST HELP -FUL	MOST HELP -FUL	NEXT MOST HELP -FUL	MOST HELP -FUL	NEXT MOST HELP -FUL	MOST HELP -FUL	NEXT MOST HELP -FUL	MOST HELP -FUL	NEXT MOST HELP -FUL
Classroom management	5	6	6	7	0	0	0	0	7	2	0	0	1	1
Evaluating what my students are learning	2	0	5	3	1	1	0	0	7	3	1	0	1	1
Planning for instruction	1	2	5	2	0	1	0	0	12	1	0	0	1	1
Grading students	0	1	8	3	0	2	0	0	8	1	0	0	2	2
Adjusting to the job	3	7	10	4	1	1	0	0	2	1	0	0	3	1
Evaluating my own teaching	5	4	1	4	2	4	0	0	10	0	0	0	1	0
Dealing with parents	7	2	9	4	0	0	0	0	2	2	0	0	0	0
Teaching my subject	0	0	3	6	0	1	0	0	12	3	1	1	2	0
Finding instructional materials	1	0	7	7	0	0	0	0	9	2	1	0	0	1
Improving my own teaching	5	4	4	6	2	3	0	0	5	2	1	0	2	1
	29	26	58	46	7	13	0	0	74	17	4	1	13	8
	55		114		20		0		91		5		21	

Question one of the open-ended section asked subjects to list "concerns I have had this year that have not been mentioned in this questionnaire." Twenty different concerns were mentioned by the respondents. Of those concerns listed below, most were mentioned once. Items which were mentioned more than once were in the area of concerns about students (five mentions) and discipline (three mentions). While it is noted that there may have been items on the checklist that reflected these same concerns, they apparently were important enough to the teachers involved to mention them again here. It is also noted that the time during the year at which these items were concerns was not specified. Among those mentioned were:

Dealing with budgeting in departments

Concerns about other teachers being "inhuman" or "incompetent"

Not fitting into an older faculty social group

Being "pink-slipped"

Concerns about students: "ungratefulness," "immature behavior," "rotten home life," "disrespectful," "apathetic"

Teaching a course I was not prepared for

Mainstreaming and how to deal with it

Overconcern with subject area to the loss of affective goals

School philosophy and practices are incongruent

Dealing with parents who are "always right"

Making lessons relevant, interesting

Being able to help kids with personal problems

Coping with paperwork and administrative details as well as teaching

Concern about the issue of merit pay

Concern that "I didn't realize the situation I was getting into in the fall: programmed materials in a military situation"

When the concerns above are grouped according to level of concern using the Fuller and Case scheme, the range of levels is represented. A more precise breakdown of the concerns by level is found in Table 17.

Table 17
Level of Concern Expressed on Open-Ended Concerns Question

<u>Level</u>	<u>Number of Concerns at This Level</u>
1 -- Concern about self adjustment	5
2 -- Concern about self adequacy (classroom management and subject area)	5
3 -- Concern about pupil-teacher relationship	3
4 -- Concern about students' learning what is taught	0
5 -- Concern about meeting real needs of students	2
6 -- Concern about the improvement of instruction	5

The second open-ended question stated: "Please specify any components (parts) of your undergraduate teacher preparation program that have been especially useful to you as a teacher in either identifying or resolving concerns or problems in teaching." All respondents answered this question in some way, and a summary of responses follows, along with the number of mentions the item received.

From the listing, one notes that there were many components of the program which were useful to different subjects. The single most useful part of the program was the variety of experiences with students, both in formal classroom settings and out of the classroom as well.

Experience with kids in and outside of classrooms (10 mentions)

Self analysis and self evaluation (5)

Force field analysis and problem solving techniques (3)

Work with minorities and those in different income brackets (2)

Ideas of being myself, accepting others, being honest with students (2)

Evaluation techniques (2)

Planning (2)

Leadership laboratory (2)

Diagnosing reading levels and working with special students (2)

Understanding the adolescent (2)

Knowing about student groupings (2)

Knowing and understanding myself and my goals and ideas about teaching

Student teaching in my junior year -- "I knew what I wanted to work on"

School visitations

Sharing experiences with other-perspective teachers every term

Individual help from everyone in the program

Observation techniques -- "I liked the emphasis on observation of students and their behavior"

Developing classroom climate

Discipline

Knowing that there were several ways to teach

Other comments by respondents included:

"The association with competent staff members who had much to teach about teaching"

"The program helped to make me a strong person"

"I rely little on my teacher education program, but rather on fellow teachers and students"

The third open-ended question asked respondents to "comment on the effectiveness of (their) entire undergraduate teacher preparation

program in preparing (them) for teaching." A listing of responses follows, with quotes from subjects included as indicated.

Several areas of the program were cited as being helpful in preparing the subjects for their first year of teaching. Among those items mentioned were:

Exposure to a lot of "real" situations (5 mentions)

Concern of SEPP for the individual (3)

Developed my confidence in my own abilities (2)

Knowing legal aspects of teaching

Self-analysis and evaluation

Use of student records, test data, sociograms

Interpersonal communication and relations with others

"SEPP gave us as much experience as seemed to be possible"

Getting me into schools early enough as to make a decision about teaching

Leadership roles were an important part

"I learned to accept responsibility and criticism for my mistakes"

Change in attitude toward myself -- "I grew up a lot, thanks to SEPP"

"My first year of teaching has been very successful, so my teaching program must have prepared me well"

"It gave me a pretty good idea of what to expect when I got a classroom of my own"

"On the whole I am quite satisfied with my teacher preparation program; there is only so much you can learn in the college classroom. There is no substitute for classroom experience"

SEPP was "very time consuming, but it paid off"

"Quite effective. I feel so much better prepared than other first year teachers at _____. I gained some very important insights into myself as a teacher. I also developed in the program an ability to objectively evaluate classroom situations and examine all of the alternative actions I could take"

Philosophy is the key -- "Experience plays a part of it, but a teacher's philosophy rules it all; and I feel that my undergraduate courses gave me a strong sense of exactly what my philosophy is. In other words, the philosophy brings out the methods of instruction, and the undergrad program brought out the philosophy."

"I have forgotten many of the things I learned and have gone back to use 'old methods' for discipline and classroom regulations -- because they are easier to use."

"The SEPP curriculum helps one look at himself as well as the schools in a realistic and knowledgeable way. It teaches you to look at the people in the schools and focus on the students. The SEPP program helped me to understand myself, situations, the school, and others more clearly."

"Very effective. Many areas that I'm involved in were covered. The skills I needed were well-taught, and I refer to the materials I kept from my classes a lot."

Comments in this section were generally positive, and again, respondents indicated that much of the effectiveness was due to exposure to "real" situations.

The fourth open-ended question asked respondents for suggestions for improving teacher education programs. Twenty-eight different comments were made, with over a third of the suggestions dealing with the need for more actual experiences with students. Among responses were:

More actual experience with students (5 reponses)

More courses on discipline (2)

Continue giving actual experiences

Broaden horizon of experiences to include both junior and senior high

"My administrator were amazed at the list of experiences I had, and hired me over 110 other applicants."

"What is real needs to be stressed more."

Another cluster of suggestions dealt with student behavior and discipline. Sample comments were:

Include a course on kids' behavior and methods to combat these problems.

"Make sure that teachers realize their rights and responsibilities in the classroom -- they do have the power to prevent or stop disruption."

Other suggestions were not easily clustered, but covered a broad range of topics. Sample suggestions included:

Teach different methods of grading and evaluation

More training on slow learners or students "who quietly struggle by themselves"

More concern for impaired kids (mainstreaming)

More interaction with students' subject area and department

Ordering materials for next school year

How to create materials if the district is poor

"Teacher ed is far too positive -- place more emphasis on the 'not so attractive' areas of teaching."

Alert students to problems in parochial as well as public education, especially ACE (Accelerated Christian Education).

Keep student, subject and administration in priority order

"Incorporate contact with professional people trained to work with problem young people (i.e., social workers, psychologists, drug treatment counselors, etc.)."

Keep offering job-hunting skills

Philosophy course was valuable.

Include some sort of general career ed information, so it can be passed on to students

Give student teachers more "complete control" of their classrooms

"SEPP should be available to all entering education students"

It is not known from the context of these comments whether they are intended as criticisms of the program or are offered as suggestions for any teacher education program.

Part Two: the Interviews

Interviews were conducted with eight subjects, selected at random.

Beginning of the Year Concerns

One question, "What were your major concerns when you started teaching?" yielded responses that were congruent with items rated "of much concern" on the checklist. In fact, all of the responses to this interview question were rated "of much concern" in the beginning of the year category of the survey.

The number of major concerns at the beginning of the year reported to the interviewer ranged from two for one subject to eight concerns for two others. A total of eighteen concerns were reported, and all can be categorized into several major headings.

The major concern at the beginning of the year centered on respondents' establishing themselves in their new teaching situation. Five of the eight subjects interviewed expressed this concern directly, and the three others indicated that this was a major concern also by their listing of specific concerns which seem to fit this heading.

Two other major concerns were reported by a majority of those interviewed. Both dealt with concerns about one's adequacy, specifically with concern about discipline and about subject area adequacy. Each was mentioned by five respondents directly. Sample responses which indicated a concern for discipline were:

(Concern about "whether I'd have a strong enough personality to avoid being taken advantage of.")

Establishing discipline

"What they (the administration) would expect from me in terms of discipline."

Responses indicating concerns about subject matter adequacy were stated directly.

Other beginning of the year concerns for establishing oneself in the school setting were dealing with racial problems, following rules and administrative procedures and details, finding appropriate materials, getting along with faculty, being observed and evaluated, dealing with parents, and concern about status as a first-year teacher.

Three subjects indicated concern with students and developing relationships with students. The specific concerns mentioned were:

Concern about teaching ninth graders ("I had always wanted to teach high school, which meant grades ten, eleven, and twelve.")

"Building trust with new students" (subject had done her full-time clinical internship in that same school)

Having kids respect me

Only one subject reported a concern for student learning. Her response was interesting: "I was concerned about making sure they learned everything about my subject, and I completely forgot about my own personal reasons for being a teacher." When questioned about those reasons, she stated that being a model for students and helping them to understand themselves were areas she neglected at the beginning of the year. It is noted that of the items on the fifty-five item checklist, "Having impact on my students" was ranked first in terms of mean level of concern for the entire group at the beginning of the year. Yet no subject interviewed mentioned this as one of his/her major concerns.

Thus, nearly all of the major concerns expressed by those subjects interviewed fell into the first three categories of Fuller's conceptualization; namely, concern about adjustment, self-adequacy, and relationships with students.

End of the Year Concerns

The second interview question dealt with concerns at the end of the school year. In general, the responses were more in the area of trying to meet the real needs of kids, concerns about teaching effectiveness, and improving one's own teaching. Most of the concerns which had mentioned for the beginning of the year were no longer concerns.

Seven of the eight subjects interviewed expressed concerns which dealt with the areas noted above. Sample responses were:

(My main concern is) "My program -- constantly analyzing it and seeking feedback"

Wondering about meeting kids' needs: "I wonder how I can be up there teaching what a noun and verb are to a girl who comes into school and tells me about how her father beats up on her and how her mother tells her that she doesn't care about her kids. You know, I wonder how I can justify what I'm doing up here when what the kid needs is to learn how to survive in her own home."

"I guess I worry about my effectiveness with the kids -- my effectiveness as a teacher, and how much they are learning."

How relevant my subject is and how I can make it more interesting.

Classroom organization -- "I want to do better next year."

Concerned about "how much they were actually learning -- whether I was really coming through or not."

The eighth subject responded slightly differently, in that she was searching for a new job, as her old position was eliminated by budget cuts. She mentioned that at the end of the year, her major concern was finding a new job, but that she also was concerned about tying things together before she left her former position.

Other concerns mentioned which were important at the end of the school year included concerns about students' "preoccupation" with grades; lack of parental involvement and support for the educational

needs of students, "making them see that it's important to know how to read and write well," what was going to happen to the "open" concept at a school, and some concern with discipline "because of the way kids acted during the last few weeks of school."

"Crucial" Concerns

Subjects were asked to identify the "most crucial" concern of all those mentioned, including both beginning and end of year concerns. The responses generally indicated that while the concerns expressed at the end of the year were more crucial overall, the resolving of early concerns was a necessary ingredient in that process. Three respondents indicated that the "discipline" concern had to be resolved before they could really begin to work on meeting students' needs. Three respondents indicated that "how much they're actually learning" was the most crucial concern. One of those stated that her greatest concern, and the most crucial one, was "the way my program comes across to the kids, the interest they have in it, and the amount they learn from it."

One subject, indicating that she behaved very differently at the beginning of the year than at the end, stated:

For a first year teacher, just getting along with the administration and faculty (was most important)...you've got to make yourself comfortable with a group before you can do anything on your own. Otherwise they're all going to be looking at you, waiting for you to make a wrong move.

Identifying at what point crucial concerns arose was difficult for the subjects interviewed. One mentioned that her concern about her subject area and the curriculum was one which had bothered her all year: "I'm always thinking about what I can do to make it a little more interesting, another way to approach a problem that a student may be

having." Another subject, however, responded that she was "fairly oblivious (to things) up until about Christmas." Before that, she indicated that she was just trying to "make it through."

Unresolved or Recurring Concerns

Concerns that were recurring or unresolved at the end of the first year of teaching were fewer in number for all subjects interviewed. There were minor concerns about discipline with half of those interviewed, but in all cases this was stated to be only a minor concern. One subject discussed the recurring concern of an overemphasis on her subject area, on form rather than content in a writing class. She added that she was concerned that she was not putting the proper emphasis on "what they've done right."

Subject area preparation was a minor recurring concern for one subject, who stated, "I muddled through this year learning things on my own." She added that she wanted to improve the situation for next year.

Another recurring concern dealt with dissatisfaction with the administration. She said that dealing with the administration had become more of a concern only because she would have a new administrator next year, and she was not very optimistic about working harmoniously with him. She added, however, that it might not be that important: "I have a tendency to make a big deal out of things that really aren't."

Change in Concerns

The interviewer asked subjects to try to describe the change in concerns that they had experienced. This, too, seemed to be difficult for the subjects. Three stated that the change was a slow process, a sort of "gradual unfolding." One stated that the process was "slow...

it dawned on me one day that I've changed." The change was a process that involved "falling down and standing up again."

One subject indicated that for her, the awareness of new concerns came at least partially as a result of "spending time in the teachers' lounge, and listening to the concerns of other teachers." She said, "Then I would start seeing some of the things they were talking about... and would start seeing them happen to me." The same subject also commented that at the beginning of the year she was concerned about her own self-adequacy, and at the end about concerns for pupils and their needs. But, she added, "I don't think I could have anticipated those things (needs of kids) until I actually got into the school to see the kids I was working with."

Another subject described what happened to her: "When I started to get feedback and reinforcement (for what I was doing), I became more confident, and then I began to be concerned about other things (than myself)."

Concerns about the Coming School Year

Subjects were asked to describe their major concerns about the coming school year. Half of the subjects indicated that they were concerned about curriculum. One subject indicated that her major concern was trying "to maintain a level of quality instruction when other teachers aren't doing that." She also indicated that she was "trying to increase (students') positive feelings about that (quality instruction)." Another indicated that he was concerned about better organization in his classroom, but felt confident that he would be doing a better job. Another indicated that her concern was "remotivating

(herself) for the year...I'll be doing something for the second time, and I don't want to be stale."

Other concerns mentioned by those returning to the same school included an impending administrative change, concern about working largely with "underachievers," content "to some extent" (as her exact assignment was still in doubt), and the future of the open philosophy of the school.

One of the subjects was changing jobs -- to a new district, and another was changing to a different building within the same district. The subject who was moving to a new district indicated that she had many of the same "adjustment" concerns that she had the previous fall, including "meeting people, dealing with new community expectations, and relating to high school students (she had taught in a junior high school last year)." The one moving to a new building indicated concerns about "getting along with the faculty there," but indicated: "You know, as a first-year teacher, you have so many things to be concerned with, other than just teaching, like getting along with others, getting established, etc. Next year, I won't be as concerned about that."

Subjects were also asked to speculate about what their probable concerns would be next year if they changed jobs. All but one indicated that they would probably have many of the same concerns they had last fall in their first year of teaching. Some of their sample comments included:

"If I changed jobs, I'd be starting out all over again. I'd be feeling out the school again...I now feel a part of things, but I would have to prove myself all over again...I'd have to start right from the beginning.

"Establishing myself at first; getting to know people."

"I think I would have the same concerns just because I'd know what to look for now...there are a lot of things that you have to do, or overcome, before you can really get down to teaching."

Sure that she would start by establishing herself, but
"I don't know whether it would take so long to get over that."

"Probably the same thing over again, fitting into the school."

Rating the First Year of Teaching

Subjects were asked to evaluate their first year of teaching by rating themselves on a five-point scale, with five being high. The responses ranged from three to five, with the mean for the group being 4.03 for the eight subjects. Subjects were asked to comment on their self-ratings, giving any reasons for their rating.

One subject rated herself on two dimensions -- getting across subject matter, and rapport with students. She rated the first area a three, the second a five. She indicated that the area she wanted to work on was finding better ways to get her subject across.

Another subject rated herself three to four, citing her "super self critical nature" as part of the explanation. "I'm not satisfied with methodology, classroom organization, and routine, but I'll probably always be changing."

Rating herself a three, this subject stated that "I don't feel that I did as good a job as I heard the kids telling me I did." She cited instances where she "should have been" more patient and understanding, and "should have" made more efforts to get to know certain kids, and thought that she should have "stopped and listened to what

they were saying, and dealt with that." She also believed that no first-year teacher should rate a five.

A fourth subject rated herself 4.5 because she had "done everything I knew how to do." When asked why she didn't rate herself a five, she commented that there "probably was something I don't know yet."

Rating himself a four, another subject indicated that "organization was probably (his) my biggest drawback," adding that next year he wanted to be "more inventive." Also rating herself a four, another subject said that she had received much positive feedback from parents, adding, "I can always improve." Another subject who rated herself four said that she, too, could always improve, commenting, "I wasn't perfect."

The last subject gave herself a five rating.

Self-Evaluation Process Used by Subjects

Subjects were asked about their own personal self-evaluation process, including the kinds of data they used to evaluate themselves. Seven of the eight subjects indicated that they used either formal or informal feedback from students as a major indicator of how they were doing. The eighth said that she relied heavily on comments from parents and administrators. Other data sources mentioned included other teachers' comments, supervisory ratings (although two subjects spoke disparagingly of the usefulness of such supervisory ratings), and comparison to one's own capabilities and expectations.

One subject spoke at length about this topic. Concerning self-evaluation, she said:

I'm glad you asked me that. It's something I always felt that SEPP did that the other program didn't. The other program...would give you all these methods...but they never really made you think critically about yourself. SEPP has always impressed on me that the human being is so fragile, especially the teenager or junior high kid -- you have to be so critical of yourself. In that respect, I think it has been very helpful as far as making me very self-critical. I'm constantly evaluating myself.

Strengths Provided by Undergraduate Teacher Preparation Program

Another major portion of the interviews dealt with the subjects' undergraduate teacher preparation program. Respondents were asked to cite special strengths they had as a result of SEPP and to identify portions of the program which were especially valuable to them. They were also asked to identify areas where they wished that the program had done more or had done something differently, as well as to make any general comments about the program.

Special strengths attributed to being a part of the Secondary Education Pilot Program seemed to cluster into three major areas: strengths associated to relating well to students, strengths associated with personal growth while in the program, and strengths associated with being able to "handle situations."

Being able to relate well to students was mentioned as a special strength by six of those subjects interviewed. One subject said that SEPP made her "more able to sense moods in people, to see how students are feeling from day to day." One subject felt that the relationship she was able to have with kids was due to SEPP, at least in part. Another cited individual relationships with students, and yet another cited both individual and small group interactions as special strengths attributable to SEPP.

Four subjects indicated that the personal growth they experienced as a part of SEPP was a valuable strength in the classroom. One cited her self-concept as a strength; another the confidence she now had in herself. Two subjects said that SEPP helped them to overcome their shyness. The comments of one subject were particularly revealing on this topic: "I never really sat down and thought about myself until then (in SEPP)...I think I learned more personal-type things that I did actual information. I grew a lot as a person; I think you have to before you can help other people who are still growing."

Five subjects indicated that they were better able to handle situations that they encountered as a result of their participation in SEPP. One described this as "being quick on my feet...nothing seems to rattle me." Another said that she was really comfortable with teaching because of the amount of practical experience she had with students. Two subjects indicated that they had a clear idea of what to expect in teaching, and the year proved that this was the case. Yet another said: "I knew how to react to a lot of the situations that came up." Another said that because of her experience in SEPP, she realized that the problems and situations she encountered were not unique to her, and that many teachers face these same situations.

Other strengths which were cited by the subjects as attributable to SEPP included self evaluation and analysis, knowing a variety of problem-solving techniques, having a good knowledge of how small groups work, and goal-setting and planning for instruction.

Program Components Cited as Useful

A variety of program components were cited as having been particularly useful. The most often mentioned, and seemingly most important, were the field experiences which were undertaken under the auspices of the program. Five subjects cited this as valuable. One commented that the part of the program that was most valuable was "just being in the field so long -- having so many different field experiences ... it's hard to pinpoint any special one." Another commented that "they hired me because of SEPP. People couldn't believe that I had all this experience for someone my age...they said it was incredible. I was hired because of my experience."

Other program components that were cited as especially useful were the spring camping weekend ("It was good for me, both as a participant and as a leader; it was good getting to know the good qualities of many people."), the leadership training laboratory, microteaching, the "microlab" (Ed 102B), the teaching skills laboratory, and the "philosophy course" (Ed 402C). One subject spoke about the philosophy course as especially important, but realized that the course in itself was not enough: "Without the four years of experiences, the philosophies and ideas (we had been exposed to) would have been lost...the idea of 'celebration of self,' especially that one."

There was some indication that subjects could not "compartmentalize" the program and identify the source of many strengths. One student commented, "I don't know whether a lot of the things I do are a result of SEPP, or if I do them because I'm me." Another stated that she couldn't recall a lot of the content of the program, but, "I'm sure

I must have drawn on that without realizing I do...I must use it (the program) but I can't say exactly how."

Weaknesses in Undergraduate Teacher Preparation Program

When asked what SEPP might have done that it didn't, four of the subjects said that they were basically satisfied. Two of those four said that SEPP did all that it possibly could, and indicated that there were limits to how much a teacher education program could be expected to do. Their comments are revealing: "Nothing can fully prepare you for that first day of class...if anyone in SEPP was prepared, I was; but I was not prepared...it blew my mind...I walked into class and here was this sea of kids, just all staring at me." Another commented, "The main thing is just getting out there and doing it -- it's the best way to learn things. And SEPP can't do that for you. Nothing outside of yourself can."

The other four respondents, however, made several suggestions for improvement of the program. These included:

- more realism -- what it's really like. Have first-year teachers come in and share their experiences.
- spend less time on theories.
- I had so much information, it was hard to apply in the classroom.
- I think one of the biggest faults was that no one every told us our faults, and what we need to build up, to improve on."
- more subject area methods.
- I wish they would have forced me into a high school experience.

Final, general comments about SEPP included:

It (SEPP) is four years of talking and being a part of education before you get out there, discussing problems that you're going to encounter in an atmosphere that's very personal. I don't think that you get that in the regular program...there's no one (in the regular program) to talk to about your problems.

(Citing the personalized nature of the program) I think that education should be personal...(the kids) need people who can understand them...they need someone they can identify with, that will understand them and (who) wants to be there.

I really enjoyed the program. I got a lot out of it. I was really glad that I got into it.

The most important thing is that I grew a lot from it. Personally, I think it helped me a lot.

People who can't have SEPP are really losing out. It was a really good program. People helped us in SEPP all the way through.

Reactions to Fuller's Conceptualization of Teacher Concerns

In the last portion of the interviews, the Fuller developmental conceptualization of teacher concerns was described to the subjects, and their general reactions were solicited. A series of other questions was also asked.

All of the subjects interviewed agreed that Fuller's conceptualization was applicable to their first year of teaching. General comments ranged from "it makes perfect sense to me" to "pretty precise" and "perfect." Many thought that all of the stages appeared "at some time during the year." All but one of the subjects saw concern for "survival" as being present during the beginning of their first year of teaching. One subject commented that at the beginning, "I was worrying about myself, my survival," but that at the end of the year, "I'm worrying more about my subject's relevance to my students." Another stated, "A lot of it is gaining a sense of security...then you can look at your

program, at the kids and their learning." Yet another stated, "Knowing that I can survive, now I'm more concerned with the actual teaching part of it...what kind of difference can I make?"

Some subjects saw variations to the sequence as presented by Fuller. None of the subjects thought that they necessarily resolved the concerns of one stage before moving on to another. One subject said,

But I don't think I ever went through one and resolved one, and went on to another one. I think I may have started out with one. I've kept all of them, like I have gone through all of them...maybe two of them hit me at once. I'm still concerned probably about all of those things together.

Another subject said that she saw herself as having gone through the stages, "...and I still go back to pieces of that, because I'm teaching new classes all the time. I go through all of those stages every time I have a new class." Another subject felt that the first stage was being resolved all during the year, but that it wasn't "a big concern." Another perception was that "After the year started, the first five stages came quickly together and overlapped. The sixth came more toward the end of the year as I looked back and ahead."

Most subjects saw themselves in more than one stage at once. There were several different perceptions of which stages overlapped. The most frequent mention of overlapping stages seemed to be of the last three stages. Others felt that the third stage seemed to be present and overlapping with the others. One subject said that even while she was in the "adjustment" phase, she was at the same time concerned about student learning and the impact of her program. To another subject, stages three and four always seemed to be present.

Most of the subjects felt that the stages were "a cycle," and that most of them would be repeated if they went to a new teaching job.

The only major differences in perceptions about this aspect was which of the stages might not be present, or the degree to which certain stage concerns would be of importance. Several pertinent comments about this aspect were noted: one subject said that if she changed jobs, she would not be as concerned with acceptance by the students and the knowledge of her subject matter due to increased confidence. One other subject thought that he would not go through all of the stages, or that he might go through stages one and two very briefly, depending on the new teaching assignment. Another subject believed that she would probably go through all the stages, but that the emphasis might be on the later stages. Another subject said, "I'm sure I would probably go through most of them again. I think the middle stages won't stand out as much. They're kind of always there, I think."

There was disagreement as to whether the rate of resolving the concerns would be different in a new teaching situation. While two of the subjects thought that passing through the stages would take the same amount of time in a new situation, others felt that they would move through the first two or three stages more rapidly because "they knew what to look for" and because of increased confidence in self. Others felt that they might be in the first two stages only briefly, and then move on.

Several specific comments are worthy of reporting. Several of those interviewed indicated that the questions posed by each stage should be reconsidered from time to time.

One subject distinguished between two kinds of survival. She said, "In the first year, it's survival -- am I going to make it? Later, it's the 'am I right for the job?' kind of survival." The same subject also

commented that the concern for self is actually a part of all of the stages, in that your perceptions are present in all of the stages.

Summary of Findings

The subjects, all graduates of the Secondary Education Pilot Program, in their first year of teaching in high schools and junior high schools, were generally well satisfied with their teacher preparation and had an average of about one thousand hours of experience with school age youngsters before their first year of teaching. Most had attended one or two inservice meetings, and only one-fourth had enrolled in college graduate course. Two-thirds were strongly committed to teaching; the remainder were mildly committed. All of the subjects desired to return to teaching next year.

As a group, their initial concerns were higher in the areas of gaining student respect, handling discipline problems, and maintaining order. A major finding of significant interest was that the group's highest concern (as measured by mean score) at the beginning of the year was "having impact on my students." Other concerns ranked high by the group included concerns in the areas of knowing students as individuals and meeting individual needs, organizing their classrooms, and concern for student learning.

The degree of concern at the end of the year was lower overall in most categories, although there were major shifts in the ranking of concerns by the group. Generally speaking, the ranking shifts generally encompassed higher relative concern for meeting students' needs, providing individualized instruction and evaluation, finding and utilizing appropriate instructional materials, and concerns about student

learning. It is noted that "dealing with troublesome students" ranked second at the beginning of the year, moved into the first place ranking at the end of the year. This shift could be described as moving away from concerns about self adequacy to concerns about student learning and meeting students' needs.

When the concerns were analyzed in terms of the level of concern, according to the Fuller-Case scheme, several conclusions are warranted. While all levels of concern made downward movement in terms of other scores; levels one, two, and three showed the most downward movement (from greater to lesser concern); and level five made the least downward movement, leaving it as the highest ranked level at the end of the year (replacing level three). Two interesting facts emerged: level six remained in second place ranking from beginning to end; levels one and four occupied the last two rankings at both the beginning and end of the year, although they reversed rankings.

When the data were analyzed for differences in expressed level of concern among the subjects on the basis of ten variables, no significant differences emerged. This may indicate that the similarities among the subjects at the beginning of the year outweighed any differences their teaching situations may have produced.

There appeared to be differences in the manner in which individuals' concerns changed from the beginning of the year to the end. When individual mean scores were examined by level of concern, a number of differences emerged. Movement toward lesser concerns from the beginning of the year to the end occurred for most subjects, with a notable exception: one subject showed no movement toward lesser concerns.

Individuals moved toward greater concern from the beginning to the end of the year in as many as four levels.

The most helpful resources in resolving concerns during the subjects' first year of teaching were their undergraduate teacher preparation and fellow teachers. It is interesting to note that inservice meetings were not ranked as especially helpful by the subjects.

The open-ended questions on the survey questionnaire yielded additional data. Concerns about students, student-teacher relationships, and about discipline were most frequently mentioned as concerns that were not mentioned elsewhere. When analyzed by level of concern, there appeared five concerns each at levels one, two and six; fewer concerns were added to the other levels.

Experiences with youngsters was the most valuable component of SEPP, as measured by the number of times it was mentioned. Other components of the program deemed useful by the subjects were self analysis and self evaluation, and problem solving techniques. Many could not isolate specific program components, but indicated that the program as a whole was useful.

Exposure to "real" situations, concern for the individual, and personal growth experiences were among the many positive aspects of the entire program cited by subjects.

Suggestions for improving teacher education programs cited the need for as much preservice experience with youngsters as possible, and "more" courses on discipline and the behavior of students, as well as many specific suggestions.

The interviews confirmed that early concerns (at the beginning of the year) centered around the areas of self adequacy and adjustment to

the job. Late concerns dealt with students and their learning and teacher effectiveness. Gaining a sense of security and confidence was important before subjects became involved with concerns for students.

Subjects indicated that they believed that concerns are cyclical; i.e., they would once again be concerned about adjustment if they changed jobs.

The subjects interviewed felt generally positive about their first year of teaching, rating themselves with a mean 4.0 out of a high of 5.0. Areas cited as "needing improvement" dealt with classroom organization, making the subject area relevant, and meeting the real needs of students. Subjects generally utilized feedback from students and self-evaluative skills obtained in their teacher education program for evaluating themselves.

SEPP was cited as providing a variety of strengths to the subjects. Most important were strengths associated with relating to students, being able to "handle" a variety of real classroom situations, and personal growth which occurred in the program. Field experiences were by far the most useful portion of the program for the first-year teachers interviewed.

Half of the respondents saw no major weaknesses in the program, stating that SEPP "did all it could." The other half made a variety of suggestions for improvement, including providing direct feedback, experience with different grade levels of instruction, and providing more realism and emphasizing negative as well as positive aspects of teaching.

All of the subjects interviewed agreed that Fuller's conceptualization was generally applicable to their first year of teaching. Some

subjects saw variations to the sequence as presented by Fuller. Most subjects saw themselves in more than one stage at once. Most of the subjects felt that the stages represented a "cycle," and that most of the stages would be repeated in a new teaching situation. There were disagreements about the rate at which subjects saw themselves moving through the stages in a new teaching situation.

CHAPTER VI

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, REFLECTIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The purposes of this study were to identify and describe the concerns of first-year teachers who were graduates of Michigan State University's Secondary Education Pilot Program, to relate those concerns to the pre-service teacher preparation, to relate those concerns to their developmental conceptualization of teacher concerns as posited by the late Frances Fuller, and to gather evaluative data and feedback about the Secondary Education Pilot Program. This chapter will present a summary of findings as they apply to those purposes, will present conclusions based on the data, reflections of the investigator about the area of teacher concerns and pre-service teacher preparation, and recommendations for further research.

Summary of Findings

Data about concerns of first-year teachers who were graduates of the Secondary Education Pilot Program at Michigan State University were gathered through a four-part, eight-page survey questionnaire as well as through interviews conducted with a random sample of eight subjects. The data revealed that the initial major concerns of the subjects were concerns about gaining and maintaining student respect, handling discipline problems, maintaining order, and having impact on students. Other concerns ranked high by the group included concerns in the areas of knowing students as individuals, meeting the needs of individual

students, organizing classroom instruction, and concern about student learning. It is noted that the concern about having impact on students was ranked high by the group as a whole, but when subjects were interviewed, that particular concern appeared to be either a concern that was important before the school year began or one that appeared concurrently with the other above-mentioned concerns.

By the end of the year, subjects had maintained their relatively higher degree of concern for having impact on students, for dealing with "troublesome students," for meeting the needs of individual students, and for having adequate instructional materials available. There were several concerns, however, that were ranked relatively high at the beginning of the year that became less important at the end of the year. Those concerns that lost at least seven places in the ranking by the group included concerns in the area of gaining and maintaining student respect, getting to know students as individuals, discipline problems, and having students like them. These were replaced in relative importance by concerns in the areas of individualizing instruction and evaluation, concern for students with special needs, concern for student learning, and determining the academic needs of students. There was less relative concern at the end of the year for issues involving acceptance and adjustment to the school, and there was higher relative concern at the end of the year for issues of meeting students' individual needs, and knowing that students are learning.

The degree of concern was lower in nearly all areas at the end of the year, as measured by mean scores, despite the shifts in relative concern as reflected in the ranking of concerns. Only four items showed a gain in their mean scores from the beginning to the end of the

year (arranging furniture to facilitate instruction, evaluating students with special needs, individualizing instruction, and knowing what tenure evaluation criteria are). Items which showed a substantial drop in degree of concern from the beginning to the end of the year, again measured by mean scores, included being accepted as a full-fledged staff member, maintaining student respect, having students like me, knowing the principal's expectations for me as a classroom teacher, and handling racially mixed classes.

Concerns of individual subjects were examined by level of concern, according to the Fuller and Case Manual for Scoring the Teacher Concerns Statement (Fuller and Case, 1972). This revealed that there were great variances in changes for the different levels from the beginning to the end of the year. Some subjects had lower mean scores for all levels of concerns at the end of the year than at the beginning of the year; only one subject showed a gain in mean scores for all levels of concern. In addition, it was found that there were differences in the number of individuals whose mean scores were higher and lower for beginning of the year concerns and for end of the year concerns at the various levels. The mean scores of fourteen individuals dropped in level one concerns (concerns about self-adjustment) from the beginning of the end of the year, for example, while only nine individuals showed a drop in mean score for level six (concerns about improving instruction) at the end of the year.

The data were analyzed for differences in expressed level of concern among the subjects on the basis of nine variables. The one-way multivariate analyses of variance of the nine stated hypotheses

indicated that no significant differences in expressed level of concern were found among the subjects:

1. With varying degrees of satisfaction with their first-year teaching level,
2. Teaching to varying extents in their major fields of study,
3. With varying average class sizes,
4. With varying frequencies of attendance at in-service meetings,
5. With varying enrollments in college graduate courses,
6. Teaching in buildings with varying average faculty ages,
7. With varying degrees of satisfaction with their undergraduate teacher preparation program,
8. With varying amounts of pre-service experience with school-age youngsters, and
9. With varying degrees of commitment to teaching.

A tenth hypothesis dealing with differences based on varying decisions to return to teaching next year was not tested, as all of the subjects indicated a desire to return to teaching next year.

Relating the concerns of these first-year teachers to their undergraduate teacher preparation program (SEPP) involved examining several sources of data. It has already been noted that no significant differences among the subjects was found with varying degrees of satisfaction with their undergraduate teacher preparation program or with varying amounts of experience with school-age youngsters while an undergraduate student. It was found, however, that pre-service teacher preparation has an important role in resolving the concerns of first-year teachers in several areas. Beginning teachers also bring to their first teaching positions several strengths which they consider important and useful in

their first year of teaching. Both of these areas were examined in this study.

The subjects rated sources of help to them in resolving their first year teaching concerns. When examining frequencies of responses, it was found that the subjects rated their undergraduate education program higher than any other source of help as being "most helpful" in the following areas:

1. Teaching my subject,
2. Planning for instruction
3. Evaluating my own teaching,
4. Finding instructional materials,
5. Grading students,
6. Classroom management,
7. Evaluating what my students are learning, and
8. Improving my own teaching.

The subjects' undergraduate teacher education program was not rated as being particularly helpful in the areas of:

1. Adjusting the job and
2. Dealing with parents.

It is noted that fellow teachers were rated as "most helpful" or "next most helpful" in a number of areas, and must be considered as an equally valuable source of help in resolving the concerns of first-year teachers.

Subjects identified several components of their undergraduate teacher preparation program as especially useful in their first year of teaching. Experience with youngsters in a variety of settings was identified as especially useful by most of the subjects. Other components

identified as especially useful were self-evaluation skills and problem-solving techniques.

The subjects believed that they were especially strong in several areas due to their undergraduate teacher preparation program. Exposure to "real" situations (and thus developing a larger repertoire of responses to such situations) was cited as a major strength, as were skills in relating to students on both an individual and small group basis. The subjects also indicated that the personal growth which had occurred in or as a result of the program was another major strength.

The subjects of this study were most concerned with level three concerns (concerns about students and student-teacher relationships) at the beginning of the year, as measured by mean scores. By the end of the year, however, there was less absolute and relative concern for this area. Yet the subjects also indicated that one of the major strengths they had acquired as a result of SEPP was precisely in the area of being able to relate well with students. Reflections on this finding will be discussed in a later section of this chapter.

An important finding which relates teacher concerns to pre-service teacher preparation deals with the perception of many of the subjects that any pre-service teacher preparation program is limited in what it can do to prepare students of education to resolve concerns. One subject who felt especially well-prepared as a result of SEPP commented that she did not feel prepared at all when she encountered the "sea of faces" that first day of teaching. Another subject, commenting that there were limits to what teacher education could do said,

The main thing is just getting out there and doing it -- it's the best way to learn things. And SEPP can't do that for you. Nothing outside of yourself can.

Relating the concerns of these first-year teachers to the developmental conceptualization of teacher concerns posited by Fuller required that the concerns be analyzed by level of concern. When the levels of concern were examined at the beginning of the year, level three (concern about students and teacher-student relationships) was highest in ranking as well as mean score. By the end of the year, this level of concern fell to third in the rankings, being replaced by level five (concern about whether students are learning what they need).

Mean scores for all levels of concern showed downward movement from the beginning to the end of the year. Levels one, two, and three made the most downward movement toward less concern, and level five made the least downward movement.

The differences in the amount of downward movement caused shifts in relative concern as measured by the ranking of the levels of concern. In the beginning of the year, level three (concern about students and teacher-student relationships) was of most relative concern, followed by, in order, level six (improving my own teaching), level five (concern about whether students are learning what they need), level two (concern about self-adequacy), level one (concern about self-adjustment in the school), and level four (concern about whether students are learning what is taught). By the end of the year, however, level five was of most relative concern, followed, in order, by levels six, three, two, four, and one. It is interesting to note that level six, supposedly the highest level in terms of teacher growth, remained in second place ranking from the beginning to the end of the year.

Individuals showed both higher and lower mean scores for all of the levels of concern. It is apparent that individuals move at

different rates in terms of their concerns. Some individuals showed greater concern at most or all of the levels from the beginning to the end of the year; most subjects, however, showed less concern at most or all of the levels.

Those subjects who were interviewed were asked their reaction to the Fuller conceptualization of teacher concerns, after hearing a brief description of the levels. All agreed that each of the six levels had been a concern at some time during the year, and that the first two levels were of primary concern at the beginning of the year. The other levels quickly followed, and all of the subjects agreed that there was overlap among at least two or more of the levels at some point during the year. Most of the subjects believed that if they were to move to a new school district next year, levels one and two would probably reappear as major concerns, indicating a cyclical nature of concerns. There was disagreement as to the rate that they would resolve the concerns in a new teaching situation.

Feedback and evaluative data about the Secondary Education Pilot Program were solicited and received in the course of this study. It can be said that subjects were generally well-satisfied with the preparation they received for their first year of teaching. Many subjects stated that there was little, if anything, that SEPP could have offered that it did not.

Field experiences with youngsters in a variety of settings was cited as the single most valuable part of the subjects' experience within the Secondary Education Pilot Program. Subjects in this study cited several ways in which this field experience was valuable -- in relating to students, in developing a repertoire of responses to a variety of

situations, in becoming a stronger person, in making a career decision, in being hired for a job.

Other particularly positive aspects of the program for the subjects were personal growth experiences, the acquisition of interpersonal communication skills, problem-solving techniques, self-evaluation techniques, and developing a coherent personal philosophy of education. Concern for individuals was also rated as a positive outcome of the program by many of the subjects.

First-year teachers who were graduates of SEPP generally felt positive about their first year of teaching, and gave themselves an average of 4.00 on a 5.00 rating scale. The subjects cited several areas for self-improvement, including better classroom organization, making their subject more interesting and/or relevant, and trying to meet the real needs of students.

When asked for suggestions to improve the program, half of the subjects stated that the program had done "all that any program could do." Others cited the need for even more experience with youngsters. Other suggestions mentioned by one or two subjects included providing more direct feedback and suggestions for improvement, more courses dealing with discipline, emphasizing the negative as well as positive aspects of teaching, and some work on mainstreaming.

Conclusions

From the analysis of the perceptions expressed by the graduates of the Secondary Education Pilot Program who were in their first year of teaching, it seems reasonable to conclude that:

1. While the subjects were primarily concerned with issues of self-adequacy and adjustment to their new school

settings at the beginning of the year, they were also concerned about having an impact on students as well as improving their own instruction.

2. It appears that participation in the Secondary Education Pilot Program aroused a higher degree of concern for individual students and their needs, and also that participation in SEPP provided the necessary skills and attitudes to deal with such courses.
3. Concerns at the end of the first year of teaching moved away from concerns with self-adequacy and adjustment and toward an even higher degree of concern for meeting the needs of individual students.
4. Pre-service teacher preparation is an important and valued resource for resolving the concerns of first-year teachers.
5. No single situational or individual factor has been identified to account for statistically significant differences in either the level or degree of concern held by first-year teachers.
6. Overall satisfaction with pre-service teacher preparation and the amount of experience that first-year teachers had with school-age youngsters appear to be of great value and importance to the first-year teachers who were subjects of this study.
7. The Secondary Education Pilot Program provided pre-service teacher preparation experiences which prepared the subjects very well for their first year of teaching.
8. Field experiences were cited as the most important contribution to resolving concerns during the first year of teaching.
9. First-year teachers have difficulty isolating specific components of their pre-service teacher preparation as having impact on their first-year teaching performance.
10. Graduates of teacher preparation programs who have had teaching experience may have a more clear perception of the limits of pre-service teacher preparation programs than do teacher educators.
11. The Secondary Education Pilot Program may be strengthened by encouraging students to embark on as many field experiences as possible at differing levels, by providing its students with more direct feedback, and by encouraging dialogue between its students and those who are currently engaged in their first year of teaching.

12. Any conceptualization of teacher concerns may be more cyclical than developmental in nature.
13. The degree of concern for relating to students as individuals, for meeting the needs of individual students, and for improving one's own instruction may be raised through pre-service teacher preparation.
14. Self concerns about adjusting to a school setting and self-adequacy in both subject area and discipline areas may be generic to the first teaching assignment and to changes in teaching assignments thereafter.
15. Concerns do not occur in an invariant sequence, but rather differ for groups as well as for individuals.
16. There is an overlapping of several levels of concern, but no perceptible pattern appears at this time.
17. No single situational factor can be attributed to differences in level of concern.

Reflections

The first-year teachers who were the subjects of this study were graduates of the Secondary Education Pilot Program at Michigan State University. Their pre-service teacher preparation experiences were composed of a set of features that have been described elsewhere in this study. Those experiences were unique in many respects, and may have contributed to the concerns that these subjects had as first-year teachers.

In the literature and studies of teacher concerns, only one study appears which indicates that beginning teachers have any major concerns about students and their learning. Most of this research was either conducted by Frances Fuller and her associates, or compiled by them. The data compiled here would seem to indicate differences between the subjects of this study and the subjects of other studies in several areas.

Subjects of this study, while being concerned with self-adjustment, self-adequacy and acceptance, were also concerned with students, their needs, and their learning at the beginning of their first year of teaching. These concerns for students and their growth increased during the year for the subjects of this study. The subjects also showed concern for the improvement of their own instruction at the beginning of the year, and this concern was maintained throughout their first year of teaching. These results would not be expected from studying the concerns of other first-year teachers in other studies.

The subjects of this study also differed from the subjects studied by Briscoe (1972) in several respects. Subjects who were SEPP graduates had much less relative concern at the end of the year for gaining and maintaining student respect, having students like them, for handling discipline problems, and similar concerns than did the subjects of Briscoe's research. On the other hand, first-year teachers who were graduates of SEPP had greater relative concern for "dealing with troublesome students" than did Briscoe's subjects, as well as more relative concern for having impact on students and meeting their individual needs.

It is not possible from this study to definitely conclude that the pre-service teacher preparation program of the subjects was the cause of these differences. However, there would seem to be indications that the program of pre-service teacher preparation, or at least portions of it, were instrumental in arousing and resolving the concerns of the subjects of this study. The number of individuals who commented on their concern for relating to students, for example, can be coupled with nearly unanimous agreement among those interviewed that one of

their greatest strength arising from SEPP was the ability "to relate to kids as individuals and in small groups." It is the belief of this investigator that there were experiences within SEPP that aroused this area as an initial concern and further, that SEPP also provided skills and attitudes that were instrumental in the first-year teachers' attempts to resolve such concerns.

Field experiences were cited as particularly important by the subjects who were surveyed, and those who were interviewed confirmed the importance of such experiences. It is not possible from this study to cite particular experiences or events which happened during field experiences as causing a particular concern, or a means for resolving a particular concern. The subjects themselves commented that it was difficult to isolate components of SEPP that were valuable. Another subject commented at length that no one experience was, in isolation, invaluable. It was, rather, the combination and integration of all of the portions of the program which must be viewed as a whole in looking at effects.

In this study, the developmental conceptualization of teacher concerns was examined, and a group of first-year teachers was studied to ascertain if such a developmental conceptualization applied in this case. From the data it must be concluded that teacher concerns would appear to be more cyclical in nature, rather than developmental. Several features of what are considered criteria for developmental processes were absent from the concerns expressed by the subjects of this study. Two of these criteria were that the phases or levels were not irreversible for the subjects of this study, and that the phases did not occur in an invariant sequence. Concern for levels five and six,

for example, often seemed to occur concurrently with or even before levels three and four. Several subjects commented that they repeatedly went back to prior stages and dealt with recurring concerns. The subjects indicated that they believed the levels of concern to be cyclical, in that "they were sure" they would return to the first two stages if they left their present teaching assignments for different ones.

In the mind of the investigator, this study raised the question of appropriate methodology for the study of teacher concerns. It would seem important to know reasons why subjects indicated that an item was of "great concern" or one of the other categories. This would be especially important for assigning the items to levels of concern. For this reason, the interviews seemed to yield much more valuable insight, if not more valuable information, into understanding the concerns of first-year teachers. This was in spite of the fact that the reliability between raters for assigning items to levels of concern exceeded eighty percent. Such assignment of items to levels may have been more of "consistent speculation" than of understanding the concern of individuals. An example may clarify this point.

"Dealing with troublesome students" was a major concern for the subjects of this study at the beginning and at the end of the year. If one followed the criteria for assigning concerns to levels as outlined by Fuller and Case, that particular item would be placed into level two, concern about one's adequacy in the area of student discipline. However, comments in response to the open-ended questions on the survey, and also comments by subjects interviewed, indicated that the real concern in this instance, at least for those subjects, was more with the frustration of feeling helpless to aid an individual student who was

being a discipline problem, when they as teachers knew that the student's home life was much less than desirable. The concern for "dealing with troublesome students" then may have taken on a different meaning than as a concern for discipline.

The experience of teaching may also cause one to define concerns differently. For example, one subject commented that before she began teaching last fall, her major concerns were in the areas of "being accepted" by the staff at her new school and with "making a difference with kids." It is likely, in the opinion of this investigator, that the meaning of "making a difference" changed as a result of the teaching experience. From examining and analyzing responses to a checklist, such differences in interpretation and meaning are not clear. Another example of differing meanings was offered by a different subject, who said that "survival," for example, meant different things at different times. It would seem that further research efforts in the area of teacher concerns must center around defining concerns more precisely, and attempting to get at the reasons for such concerns, rather than at applying concern "labels" to events or phenomena which may have differing meanings and interpretations.

Many of the subjects commented on their own processes of self-evaluation and self-analysis as being a strength they had gained as a result of SEPP. In the opinion of this investigator, those skills appeared to be very highly developed, as many were able to point out their own strengths, weaknesses, and proposed remedies "on the spot." The subjects of this study showed, by the manner in which they thought aloud and then answered the questions of the interviewer, that this

process of self-evaluation is one which is on-going, important, and highly valued.

Comments by the subjects about their pre-service teacher preparation speak for themselves, for the most part. However, it is the reflection of this researcher that many of the comments made by those interviewed seemed to reflect very much the features that were described as unique elsewhere in this study. Comments about the personal nature of education and the learning process, about meeting the real needs of students, about individualizing instruction, about the importance of interpersonal relationships -- all of these seem to reflect much of what the Secondary Education Pilot Program seems to value and tries to model for its students.

The purpose of this study has not been to study concerns in an attempt to eliminate them. Concerns from a valuable piece of the growth process for teachers as well as for others. One of the subjects of this study commented that one should be continually concerned about issues, and that one should continually reexamine him/herself "for all of that is part of growing."

Studying teacher concerns has implications for both in-service and pre-service teacher education. Many of these implications were detailed by Briscoe in his 1972 study, and need not be repeated here. One implication, however, having its roots in this particular study, is that pre-service teacher preparation experiences such as the Secondary Education Pilot Program provided for the subjects of this study, seem to have special value, and are regarded highly by its graduates after a year of teaching experience.

Based on the perceptions of the subjects of this study, pre-service preparation programs are effective and valued when:

1. They not only raise, but also help to resolve, issues of personal growth.
2. Field experiences with youngsters in a variety of settings are provided and supervised.
3. They provide a forum for the discussion of both personal and professional concerns with both University and public school staff and fellow students on a continuing basis.
4. They contain a degree of personalization and individualization which is often absent in other quarters of a large university setting.
5. They provide for the development of individual teaching styles and accompanying behaviors appropriate to those styles.
6. They provide for the development of self-analysis, self-evaluation, and problem solving skills.
7. They provide experiences with youngsters early enough that students can make appropriate career decisions.
8. The focus of the program is on the personal and professional growth and development of individuals within the program.

The Secondary Education Pilot Program at Michigan State University appears to satisfy its students well in these areas, based on subjects' perceptions after a year of teaching.

Recommendations for Further Research

1. Study the concerns of teachers who move from one school district to another, in an attempt to verify the recurring nature of concerns about adequacy, acceptance, and adjustment, and to determine if teachers will resolve these concerns at a faster rate in a new situation.
2. Continue to follow the subjects of this study to determine what changes, if any, occur in their concerns over time. The data presented in this study can be utilized as baseline data for such a longitudinal study.

3. Replicate this study with a non-SEPP sample or population to examine possible differences.
4. Examine various research methodological approaches to determine if there may be different and better ways to assess concerns and the meanings and importance that teachers attach to them.
5. Continue to seek feedback and evaluative data from these subjects about the continuing value of their pre-service teacher preparation program, and to seek whatever new perceptions the subjects may offer in light of their continuing teaching experience.
6. Develop methodological approaches to try to pinpoint the value of specific program components in the growth of teachers.
7. Study samples from both SEPP and non-SEPP populations at Michigan State University to provide comparative data about the strengths and weaknesses of the two programs. Such data can be used for program development purposes, as well as for decision making-purposes.
8. Continue to study teacher concerns in attempts to relate teaching practices and performance to teacher concern.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A
STUDENT HANDBOOK
SECONDARY EDUCATION PILOT PROGRAM

*Secondary
Education
Pilot
Program*



A Foreword

When one person's life touches, and thus enriches, the life of another, both achieve the most complete human excellence. Our schools should bring people together in ways which allow us to touch and enrich each other. But any such product of our society -- our institutions, our laws, our pronouncements of principle and purpose -- depend on the people who use them for their own benefit, and for the benefit of those who come after them. Our schools must depend on the excellence of the human beings who enter them for whatever purposes, not on the structure of the institution, the curriculum, or the principles which govern them and give them promise. We recognize this fundamental truth in asserting that good teachers are effective persons; before anything else, both effectively human and interhuman.

This is a program which focuses on the person. It celebrates the uniquenesses and the excellences of the human spirit. The spirit of humanity is formed of qualities of life which give meaning to our being: the darkness of frustration, loneliness, sadness and despair on the one hand; the light of joy, goodness, satisfaction and worthiness on the other. We seek neither side of life by itself. We accept both as having the potential to enrich us when accompanied by four necessary qualities of the interhuman: caring, sharing, learning and belonging.

We welcome anyone who chooses to be a part of this program. At the same time, we encourage honest exploration of the self and of the teaching profession. If such an exploration is honest, it will lead some to a decision not to stay with us. We accept such a decision as a positive affirmation of personal qualities leading to other areas of human endeavor with equal validity, vitality and worth.

It is not necessary or desirable that all those who come together in this program be alike -- either in the beginning or at the end of our time together. What is necessary and desirable is that sharing, caring, learning and belonging of unique persons be the source of enrichment and fulfillment for all of us. We commit ourselves to those processes.

We invite you to look through this description of our program. Then if you would like to be a part of such an adventure, or would like to know more about SEPP, please get in touch, and let us get to know each other.

S. S. C.
September, 1973

The Secondary Education Pilot Program

The Secondary Education Pilot Program (SEPP) is one of a number of efforts of the College of Education at Michigan State University to provide quality teacher preparation for its students. Designed for students preparing to teach in high schools and junior high or middle schools, the program features a sequence of experiences for students beginning in the fall of the freshman year for many, and ending with the receipt of certification and degree. The program is intended to provide a way of testing career decisions early, with the resultant elimination of teaching as a career for some very early in their college careers; others, who confirm a career choice in education, can gain real field experience immediately, and begin to coordinate their professional preparation with their academic programs. Unlike the usual four-course sequence followed in virtually all of the secondary teacher preparation programs in this country (Educational Psychology, Teaching Methods, Social Foundations and Student Teaching), students in SEPP participate in professional development activities during every term in which they are in residence at the University.

The program offers the following advantages to the student:

1. A continuous blending of professional development, subject area study, and viable field experience.
2. Extensive field experience (at least twice that of most other programs), and wider variety of contacts with young people.
3. Deliberate experience with adolescents in informal and non-school settings.
4. A regular staff of professional educators working with students in all phases of the program, including the clinical experience modules. The same staff who work with students early in the program continue with them throughout, and supervise these students in field components.
5. Systematic professional and personal advisement, supplementing that offered by the student's academic major department and residence hall staff.
6. A coherent program, spanning four years (12 terms) of growth and development aimed at excellence in career preparation.

SEPP distinguishes between *experience based* learning and *performance based* learning. In describing this program as *experience based* we are also describing an inductive model of teacher preparation. We do not, as a rule, set performance objectives FOR our students. We ask students to establish their own performance standards as an outgrowth of their own experiences, and constantly encourage students to revise those goals in light of further reconstruction of experience.

Of course not all experiences are equally significant or equally educative. To believe otherwise is to abdicate responsibility for guiding learning. Dewey defines experience in a way that emphasizes both the person and the environment -- as experience

results in internal personal change, it also results in changes in the objective conditions in which the experience occurs. We believe that educative experience is that which leads students to affect their world in important real ways. We want them to act on their own initiative such that their world responds. It is through an examination of those actions and responses that students, with guidance from SEPP staff members, engage in a continual process of reconstruction of experience. If both the experience and the processing of it are determined by student perceptions, student needs, and student developed goals and objectives (as these are played out in the real arena of public education), the resultant "products" should be as diverse as the number of students involved. SEPP cherishes those differences, and builds on them toward the development of professional excellence in its graduates.

We understand the process just described to be very different from what is usually described in the literature on *performance based* instruction. We do not claim that the way we have chosen is best for all students -- it is an alternative, open to those who choose to pursue their professional growth in this way. In the pursuit of professional growth, we ask that students reflect, through their participation in the various parts of the program:

INITIATIVE -- they should seek out opportunities for professional growth through field experience, through enrichment experiences on campus, and through leadership and service within the structure of the program itself.

RESPONSIBILITY -- they should assume responsibility for as much of their own learning and growth as they can. It is assumed that the resources of the program will contribute significantly to individual excellence, but only within the context of individual responsibility and effort. A general commitment to excellence, implied by membership in the program, carries with it the responsibility for meeting obligations of effort, attendance, and rigorous inquiry.

COMMITMENT -- they should expect that involvement in SEPP represents a commitment to participation well beyond the level expected of students in some other teacher education programs. In exchange for that commitment, students should expect greater flexibility within the program, a higher level of excellence in preparation for a professional career, and a background of experience and learning which is unique and exemplary within the field.

Underlying Professional Assumptions

Specific common objectives for all students are antithetical to the nature of a program which focuses on uniquenesses in individual style and individual goals and objectives. But complete neutrality as to purpose is also synonymous with intellectual sterility. The following assumptions about teachers and education make up an umbrella under which individual strengths may be developed and nurtured. These statements reflect characteristics of healthy personal growth, and should always be viewed as "in process", not as statements of final conditions or terminal results. Each can be converted to

one or more specific objectives applicable to an individual student, as such application becomes appropriate. We encourage students to make such application directly to themselves, rather than externally specifying such applications for them.

1. We need teachers who are effective persons. We define "effective" as embracing the following conditions --
 - a. a well developed system of personal beliefs and values; a philosophy of life.
 - b. personal behavior consistent with those beliefs and values.
2. We need teachers who understand how young people learn, how they grow and develop as persons, and who are aware of young people's needs and social concerns.
3. We need teachers who can respond effectively to young people's needs, who respect and value individuality and diversity, and who are receptive to young people's concerns, social interactions and problems.
4. We need teachers who understand the fundamental structure of their subject matter, and who are able to select and implement appropriate ways of helping young people understand and use that structure in their lives.
5. We need teachers who understand the organization and process of education, the role of schooling in modern society, and can critically evaluate that role, as well as working effectively with it.
6. We need teachers who can identify their own strengths and weaknesses, and using as criteria their own beliefs, values and goals, the needs and expectations of their students, and the expectations of the social system, act to capitalize on their strengths and correct their weaknesses.
7. We need teachers who can diagnose and act to remediate students' deficiencies in basic skills, interpersonal social skills, and self-concepts, as well as helping young people to build on their strengths and personal skills.
8. We need teachers who can provide relevant and appropriate feedback to students and parents.
9. We need teachers who are sensitive to the inherent conflicts between helping, on one hand, and intrusion on the other; between acting as an objective agent of change on one hand, and a public servant on the other; and between the examination of personal values as a part of the educational process on one hand, and the intrusion upon family and privacy on the other. Sensitivity to these conflicts should be reflected in effective professional behavior.
10. We need teachers who function as active, effective members of a professional staff. That effectiveness includes the utilization of professional and human resources, the sharing of scholarship and ideas, and the application of skill and understanding to the solving of institutional problems.

11. We need teachers who are knowledgeable about research in educational areas and can utilize that research, as well as other appropriate skills, to contribute significantly to program development and implementation.
12. We need teachers who deal with conflict creatively and effectively in their own lives, in their classrooms, and in the school and community in which they work.
13. We need teachers who are thoroughly professional; who recognize their responsibilities within the institution in which they work, and in their professional organizations, and who behave in such a way as to be exemplars for their students, bringing credit to their profession and to themselves.

The Program

The Secondary Education Pilot Program substitutes totally for the regular professional certification sequence at Michigan State University. It does not affect at all the academic programs required by departments of major outside of the thirty credits of professional course work required for certification in Michigan. In building this program within the framework of an experiential model, we have also found it necessary to conform to many institutional requirements such as "courses" and "credits." While the following outline of our curriculum appears to be very similar to descriptions often found in university catalogues, it should be understood that seldom in the sequence of "courses" are students involved in what could traditionally be called "school work". Learning environments are carefully and uniquely developed to directly reflect the philosophical model which underlies this program, always providing time for reflection and feedback among students and staff.

The following "courses" make up the program of experiences for members of SEPP. They meet the requirements for provisional certification in Michigan. Questions about specific requirements in other states should be directed to the Undergraduate Advisement Center, 134 Erickson Hall, Michigan State University, East Lansing, Michigan 48824.

ED 102A	<u>Introduction to Secondary Education</u> Series of seminars on secondary school problems and issues.	Fall	1 cr.
ED 102B	<u>Personal Dimensions of Secondary Teaching</u> Laboratory setting emphasizing personal values, beliefs and behaviors related to teaching in secondary schools. Includes micro-teaching, small group processes and individual assessment activities.	Winter	2 cr.
ED 102C	<u>Secondary School Youth Culture</u> Laboratory setting emphasizing characteristics of adolescent social systems in and out of school. Participants will include students from local schools, SEPP members, and upperclassmen in secondary education.	Spring	2 cr.

- ED 202A Educational Psychology: Adolescence Fall 2 cr.
Emphasizes cognitive, affective and physical growth of adolescents; theories of learning as applied to secondary education; problems of early adolescence.
- ED 202B Workshops in Secondary Education Winter 2 cr.
Students select from a variety of single session workshops focusing on psychological and sociological aspects of teaching in secondary schools.
- ED 202C Alternative Secondary School Structures Spring 1 cr.
On-site examination of a variety of secondary school organizational patterns, together with on-campus analysis of underlying theories of social organization and curriculum construction.
- ED 302A Teaching Skills Laboratory Fall 2 cr.
Instruction and field experience in selected generic teaching skills, including classroom management, secondary reading, data analysis, grouping and sociometric techniques, instructional planning, assessment and evaluation.
- ED 302B Laboratory in Ethnic Values of Adolescents Winter 1 cr.
Laboratory setting focusing on ethnic values, beliefs and attitudes, and their impact on public secondary schools. Participants will include SEPP students, high school and middle school representatives of racial and ethnic minorities.
- ED 302C Clinical Field Experience in Secondary Teaching Spring 12 cr.
Clinical experience in secondary teaching. Supervised by subject specialists, SEPP program staff, and selected public school personnel. Coupled with 302A and 302B into a one year integrated sequence of experiences under common supervision.
- ED 402A Advanced Workshops in Secondary Education Fall 2 cr.
Workshops on a variety of educational issues and problems, such as finance, curriculum construction, advanced evaluation and assessment techniques, advanced teaching methodology, etc. Agenda is determined by staff and students jointly, growing out of the 300 sequence and students' perceived needs and concerns.
- * Most students, by the time they begin 302C, will have completed at least 400 hours of clinical experience in the field. Students should guard against the assumption that the extended experience in 302C is the equivalent of student teaching. We see this as only one of a number of clinical experiences, some of which may follow this term. We encourage experimentation and refinement of personal teaching style during this term, as well as the development and refinement of instructional skills. We encourage, also, objective evaluation and feedback by students, cooperating staff in the field setting, and SEPP staff. Placement credentials for students in SEPP reflect their performance over the four years of the program, not only the one term of student teaching which is usually reported to prospective employers.

- ED 402B Seminar in Teaching Secondary Disciplines Winter 2 cr.
 Focus on instructional and curriculum problems in specific disciplines of student's major field of study. SEPP staff will work in liason with various University personnel in helping students explore materials, strategies and patterns of curriculum organization in major fields.
- ED 402C Senior Secondary Education Proseminar Spring 1 cr.
 Focus is on student's personal refinement of educational philosophy. Readings on current historical and philosophical perspectives will form the core of program, and serve as an introduction to graduate study in education.

In addition to the above program of study and experience, students are expected to take part in several other activities which, because they recur each term, form the integrating thread of the SEPP program.

MIND-BENDERS

We find that undergraduates are not uniformly excited about reading theoretical treatises by John Dewey, Harry Broudy, etc. But they can (and should) have a familiarity with the "stars of the educational world." Lay people and teachers in the schools, as well as many students, read John Holt, Jonathan Kozol, etc., and expect our students to have informed opinions about them. Thus, each term, students are expected to read and discuss at least one book or its equivalent outside the regular program requirements. The book is chosen from a bibliography which is revised yearly, and which provides for student choice as well as staff direction and guidance.

FIELD EXPERIENCE REQUIREMENT

During the second year of the program (occasionally earlier, for those who are ready) SEPP requires students to complete the equivalent of 120 hours of clinical experience with young people in a field setting over and above that which may be included in the regular program requirements. It is strongly recommended that this requirement be met through summer camp work or recreation and park supervision during the first or second summer in the program. If completed during school time, this requirement could take the form of two, 2-hour blocks of time each week, spent as a teacher's aide in a local school. Such positions are considered voluntary, and are seldom a source of pay for students. Done this way, the requirement can be met in one academic year.

LEADERSHIP TRAINING LABORATORY

Junior students spend one week in September, prior to the beginning of the term, in a concentrated, live-in workshop setting designed to focus on interpersonal skills, group processes, and the dynamics of instructional groups, as well as problem solving and research utilization skills. Minimal costs for this module of the program are borne by students; no academic credit is given. One outcome of this laboratory is the guiding agenda for the 300-level sequence of experiences.

- ED 402B Seminar in Teaching Secondary Disciplines Winter 2 cr.
 Focus on instructional and curriculum problems in specific disciplines of student's major field of study. SEPP staff will work in liason with various University personnel in helping students explore materials, strategies and patterns of curriculum organization in major fields.
- ED 402C Senior Secondary Education Proseminar Spring 1 cr.
 Focus is on student's personal refinement of educational philosophy. Readings on current historical and philosophical perspectives will form the core of program, and serve as an introduction to graduate study in education.

In addition to the above program of study and experience, students are expected to take part in several other activities which, because they recur each term, form the integrating thread of the SEPP program.

MIND-BENDERS

We find that undergraduates are not uniformly excited about reading theoretical treatises by John Dewey, Harry Broudy, etc. But they can (and should) have a familiarity with the "stars of the educational world." Lay people and teachers in the schools, as well as many students, read John Holt, Jonathan Kozol, etc., and expect our students to have informed opinions about them. Thus, each term, students are expected to read and discuss at least one book or its equivalent outside the regular program requirements. The book is chosen from a bibliography which is revised yearly, and which provides for student choice as well as staff direction and guidance.

FIELD EXPERIENCE REQUIREMENT

During the second year of the program (occasionally earlier, for those who are ready) SEPP requires students to complete the equivalent of 120 hours of clinical experience with young people in a field setting over and above that which may be included in the regular program requirements. It is strongly recommended that this requirement be met through summer camp work or recreation and park supervision during the first or second summer in the program. If completed during school time, this requirement could take the form of two, 2-hour blocks of time each week, spent as a teacher's aide in a local school. Such positions are considered voluntary, and are seldom a source of pay for students. Done this way, the requirement can be met in one academic year.

LEADERSHIP TRAINING LABORATORY

Junior students spend one week in September, prior to the beginning of the term, in a concentrated, live-in workshop setting designed to focus on interpersonal skills, group processes, and the dynamics of instructional groups, as well as problem solving and research utilization skills. Minimal costs for this module of the program are borne by students; no academic credit is given. One outcome of this laboratory is the guiding agenda for the 300-level sequence of experiences.

ADVISEMENT GROUPS

The small groups which begin with the seminar group in 102A continue to meet regularly each term throughout the tenure of the program. The purposes of these groups are to provide students time and setting for the discussion of issues and concerns arising out of their participation in SEPP and other University activities; the groups also provide a way of regularly feeding back into the planning process student needs and concerns.

Student Leadership in SEPP

One of the unique opportunities offered to students beyond the first year is that of participating in the leadership (and, occasionally, the instruction) of others in the program. Small group leadership, seminar leadership, and the sponsoring of special events all give students the additional opportunities for experience which both prepare them for classroom work as a professional, and adds to their marketability upon receipt of degree and certification.

Costs of Student Membership in SEPP

SEPP involves thirty credits of instruction, for which students pay regular fees as stipulated by the University's tuition policy. Those thirty hours replace the usual set of courses taken by teaching candidates. Because students need not count on textbook expenses for this program every term, as many of the components of the program are rooted in experiential modes, material costs should be somewhat reduced. For those components of the program which involve travel, housing and meals away from campus, reasonable charges are made to cover those expenses. In every case, finances are an open topic for discussion, and will be carefully explained to any student who wishes to discuss them. In no case will a student who cannot afford expenses above and beyond regular tuition be prevented from participating fully in the program on that account.

Additional Information

Additional information may be obtained by contacting the Secondary Education Pilot Program; 324 Erickson Hall; Michigan State University; East Lansing, Michigan 48824, or by calling (517) 355-1786.

A Comparison of SEPP and Typical Secondary Teacher Education Programs

Typical Programs			
Year	Term	Course or Program Module	Clinical Hours
Freshman	F	None	
	W	None	
	S	None	
	Summer	None	
Sophomore	F	None	
	W	None	
	S	Educ Psych (?)	?
	Summer	None	
Junior	F	Educ Psych (?)	
	W	" "	
	S	Methods (?)	
Senior	F	Methods	?
	W	Student Tch	400
	S	Social Found	
	Total		400 (+)

SEPP			
Year	Term	Course or Program Module	Clinical Hours
Freshman	F	Intro to Sec Ed	
	W	Pers Dim of Sec Tchg	22
	S	Sec Sch Youth Cult	48
	Sum	Field Experience	120+
Sophomore	F	Educ Psych Adolesc	
	W	Mkshp Sec Ed	10
	S	Alt Sec Sch Struc	40
	Sum	Field Experience	120+
Junior	F	Ldr Tr Lab	100
	W	Tch Skills Lab	40
	S	Lab Eth Val Adol	48
	S	Clin Fld Exp Sec Tch	400
Senior	F	Adv Mkshp Sec Ed	var
	W	Sem Tch Sec Disc	var
	S	Senior Sec Prosem	
	Total		828*

* Total represents a minimum figure, counting the field experience in summer only once. In actuality, most of the graduates in 1977 (the first class to complete the program) show well over 2000 hours of field experience in a variety of activities made available through the program.

APPENDIX B
LETTER TO FIRST-YEAR TEACHERS

Secondary Education Pilot Program

324 Erickson Hall
Michigan State University

May 19, 1978

Dear _____,

We need your help! We are attempting an evaluation of SEPP, and need your help in providing certain information and perceptions about your first years of teaching as well as your perceptions of SEPP's contribution to your professional growth. One purpose of this study is to examine the concerns of SEPP first year teachers and look at the possible relationship between those concerns and a number of other variables. Your help can make a valuable addition to this study, which is a part of my doctoral dissertation.

It is especially important that you answer candidly and honestly, as we need to know exactly what you think and feel.

The questions in this study will help you think about concerns that you may have had or may still have as a first year teacher. The questions should take no more than thirty (30) minutes to complete. Background information is requested on the first two pages which will help in the interpretation of the responses.

We realize that it is getting toward the end of the school year, and that you may be feeling many pressures. If at all possible, could you take the time now to respond to this questionnaire, and drop it in the mail today in the enclosed stamped and addressed envelope.

In any case we would appreciate having you return the questionnaire by May 30.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Dennis Pataniczek, Instructor
Secondary Education Pilot Program

cs

APPENDIX C
THE QUESTIONNAIRE USED TO GATHER
DATA FOR THE STUDY

A STUDY TO IDENTIFY
THE
CONCERNS OF FIRST-YEAR TEACHERS

Please respond to the following questions. They are designed to provide information which will help in the interpretation of your responses in Part II. We would appreciate it if you did not discuss this questionnaire with fellow teachers. We seek YOUR opinions. From this information we hope to be able to make suggestions for teacher education programs and in-service programs.

1. What grade(s) do you teach now? (Circle all that apply)
K 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12
2. What grade(s) would you choose to teach? (Circle all the apply)
K 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12
3. How many classes (periods) do you teach in your MAJOR field of study?
0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 (Circle your answer)
4. How many classes (periods) do you teach in your MINOR field of study?
0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 (Circle your answer)
5. What is the average size of your classes? (Circle your answer)
Under 20 20-24 25-29 30-34 35-39 Over 40
6. How many of the in-service programs have you attended? (Circle your answer)
0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 or more
7. How many college courses have you taken this year? (Circle the answer)
0 1 2 3 4 5 or more
8. What is the average age of the faculty in your building? (Circle the answer)
Under 30 30-39 40-49 Over 50
9. In what type of community is your school located? (Circle the answer)
Rural Small town City Suburban Inner City
10. Generally speaking, how satisfied are you with your undergraduate teacher education program:
____ Extremely satisfied
____ Mildly satisfied
____ Mildly dissatisfied
____ Extremely dissatisfied

11. About how much experience did you have with school age youngsters did you have during your undergraduate years?
- ☐ over 1500 hours
 - ☐ 1000-1499 hours
 - ☐ 750-999 hours
 - ☐ under 750 hours
12. Where did this experience take place? Put the approximate number of hours.
- in schools _____ hours
- in camps or recreational settings _____ hours
- other (please specify) _____
- _____ hours
- _____ hours
- _____ hours
13. At the present time, how would you describe your commitment to teaching?
- ☐ Strong. I probably will remain a teacher for 5 years.
 - ☐ Mild. I'll probably teach for another year or two
 - ☐ Weak. I'll probably leave teaching within a year.
14. Do you want to return to teaching next year?
- ☐ Yes, definitely
 - ☐ Yes, depending on the availability of a job.
 - ☐ No
 - ☐ Undecided

PLEASE GO ON TO THE NEXT PAGE

All beginning teachers experience many concerns. These concerns fall into many categories. Listed below are some situations you may have thought about this year. Please indicate (by checking the appropriate box) the extent to which this situation has been a concern to you BOTH (1) at the BEGINNING of the year and (2) NOW.

	(1) AT THE BEGINNING OF THE YEAR			(2) NOW		
	OF MUCH CONCERN	OF SOME CONCERN	OF NO CONCERN	OF MUCH CONCERN	OF SOME CONCERN	OF NO CONCERN
Constructing tests						
Providing instruction for slow learners						
Keeping order in my classes						
Writing behaviorally stated instructional objectives						
Dealing with "troublesome" students						
Determining students' academic needs						
Dealing with non-instructional personnel (custodians, secretaries)						
Knowing that my students are learning what I'm teaching						
Conducting individual parent conferences						
Handling single discipline problems without interrupting instruction						
Designing evaluation instruments to measure individualized instruction						
Handling racially mixed classes						
Evaluating students with special needs						
Achieving tenure						
Determining Grades						
Implementing the school's grading system						
Using evaluation techniques other than tests						

	(1) AT THE BEGINNING OF THE YEAR			(2) NOW		
	OF MUCH CONCERN	OF SOME CONCERN	OF NO CONCERN	OF MUCH CONCERN	OF SOME CONCERN	OF NO CONCERN
Interpreting the results of commercially prepared tests						
Knowing what criteria evaluation criteria are						
Having impact on my students						
Individualizing instruction						
Handling criticism from other teachers						
Handling administrators' observations of my teaching						
Being accepted as a full-fledged staff member						
Doing lesson plans for the administration						
Maintaining student respect						
Getting to know students as individuals						
Asking questions at faculty meetings						
Getting along with the principal						
Finding supportive colleagues						
Knowing the principal's expectations for me as a classroom teacher						
Having adequate instructional materials available						
Asking for feedback to improve instruction						
Establishing classroom operating procedures						
Finding appropriate instructional materials						
Using bulletin boards						
Dealing with groups of students						

	(1) AT THE BEGINNING OF THE YEAR			(2) NOW		
	OF MUCH CONCERN	OF SOME CONCERN	OF NO CONCERN	OF MUCH CONCERN	OF SOME CONCERN	OF NO CONCERN
Understanding the school's unwritten rules						
Having students respect me as a teacher						
Operating audio-visual equipment						
Asking other teachers for help						
Knowing the school's expectations for me outside the classroom						
Dealing with parent criticisms						
Understanding and following administrative directives						
Keeping records (attendance, etc)						
Meeting the needs of individual students						
Having students like me						
Arranging furniture to facilitate learning						
Getting to know other teachers						
Avoiding showing favoritism						
Interpreting the results of teacher- made tests						
Providing instructional variety within individual lessons						
Organizing instruction for the year						
Providing instruction for gifted students						
Dealing with problems of drug use						

As you look back on this year, consider what persons were most helpful as you dealt with concerns in the areas listed below. If more than one person was helpful in a particular area, place a "1" below the MOST helpful, a "2" below the NEXT most helpful, etc. If you check "other", please indicate who that is in the space provided.

	School Administration	Teachers Secondary	Student In-Service	Program UNDERGRADUATE	Education program Course(s) taken this year	Name Other
Classroom Management						
Evaluating what my students are learning						
Planning for instruction						
Grading students						
Adjusting to the job						
Evaluating my own teaching						
Dealing with parents						
Teaching my subject						
Finding instructional materials						
Improving my own teaching						

In the first parts of this questionnaire you were asked to respond to a number of specific items. In this final portion you are asked to respond to questions of a more general nature. You may reinforce positions you have taken earlier, as well as raise issues that may not have been included in the first parts. Because all of us have varied backgrounds and experiences, we will respond differently to these questions. This is quite normal and to be expected. We seek your candid responses.

1. Some concerns I have had this year that have not been mentioned in this questionnaire are:

2. Please specify any components (parts) of your undergraduate teacher preparation program that have been especially useful to you as a teacher in either identifying or resolving concerns or problems in teaching.

3. Please comment on the effectiveness of your entire undergraduate teacher preparation program in preparing you for teaching.

4. What suggestions would you make for improving teacher education programs?

THANK YOU AGAIN FOR YOUR SUPPORT!

Folded in half, this questionnaire will fit in the stamped, addressed envelope for mailing to :

Teacher Concerns Study
College of Education
311 Erickson Hall
Michigan State University
East Lansing, MI 48824

APPENDIX D

INTERVIEW GUIDE

APPENDIX D

INTERVIEW GUIDE

What were your major concerns when you started teaching last fall?

What are your major concerns now (at the end of the school year)?

Which of all of the concerns that you've mentioned seems most crucial to you? Why?

Are there still some unresolved concerns, or concerns that seem to be recurring ones?

At what points in the year did crucial concerns come up?

Can you describe how your concerns have changed since the beginning of the year?

On a 5-point scale, with 5 being high, rate your success as a first-year teacher. (If not 5, why not? What would you want to improve on?)

What special strengths did you have as a result of SEPP? Can you identify from what parts of the program these strengths came?

What might SEPP have done that it didn't? Any suggestions for improving the program?

How do you evaluate yourself? What kinds of data do you utilize?

What are your major concerns about teaching next fall? What if you changed school districts?

Brief explanation of Fuller's levels of concern: 1. Where do I stand? 2. How adequate am I? 3. What do pupils think of me? Why are they like they are? 4. Are my pupils learning what I'm teaching? 5. Are my students learning what they need? 6. How can I improve myself as a teacher?

What is your general reaction to this theory. Where were you last fall? Where are you now?

How do you account for the differences? Were you ever in more than one stage at once? Which levels seemed to overlap, if any? If you changed positions, where do you think you would be in terms of concern level? Would you go through the level(s) at a faster rate?

Any final comments about this study or about SEPP?

APPENDIX E

ASSIGNMENT OF CONCERNS TO LEVEL OF CONCERN

APPENDIX E

ASSIGNMENT OF CONCERNS TO LEVEL OF CONCERN

The assignment of items from the checklist of 55 items contained in the survey questionnaire (See Appendix C) to levels of concern was accomplished in accordance with instructions and criteria found in A Manual for Scoring the Teacher Concerns Statement (Fuller and Case, 1972). Assignment was made independently by three scorers, and then consensus was reached on each item. Inter-rater agreement before the meeting to reach consensus was found to be .80.

Level one concerns serve to answer the question "Where do I stand?" Accordingly, the following items are considered to be level one concerns for the purposes of this study?

Dealing with non-instructional personnel (custodians, secretaries)

Conducting individual parent conferences

Achieving tenure

Implementing the school's grading system

Knowing what tenure evaluation criteria are

Handling criticism from other teachers

Handling administrators' observations of my teaching

Being accepted as a full-fledged staff member

Doing lesson plans for the administration

Asking questions at faculty meetings

Getting along with the principal

Finding supportive colleagues

Knowing the principal's expectations for me as a classroom teacher

Understanding the school's unwritten rules

Asking other teachers for help

Knowing the school's expectations for me outside the classroom

Dealing with parent criticisms

Understanding and following administrative directives

Keeping records (attendance, etc.)

Getting to know other teachers

Level two concerns serve to answer the question "How adequate am I?" Accordingly, the following items are considered to be level two concerns for the purposes of this study?

Keeping order in my classes

Dealing with "troublesome students"

Handling single discipline problems without interrupting instruction

Handling racially mixed classes

Establishing classroom operating procedures

Finding appropriate instructional materials

Using bulletin boards

Operating audio-visual equipment

Organizing instruction for the year

Dealing with problems of drug use

Level three concerns serve to answer the questions "How do pupils feel about me?" and "What are pupils like?" Accordingly, the following items are considered to be level three concerns for the

purposes of this study:

Maintaining student respect

Getting to know students as individuals

Having students respect me as a teacher

Having students like me

Avoiding showing favoritism

Level four concerns serve to answer the question "Are pupils learning what I'm teaching?" Accordingly, the following items are considered to be level four concerns for the purposes of this study:

Constructing tests

Writing behaviorally stated objectives

Knowing that my students are learning what I'm teaching

Designing evaluation instruments to measure individualized instruction

Determining grades

Using evaluation techniques other than tests

Interpreting the results of commercially prepared tests

Interpreting the results of teacher-made tests

Level five concerns serve to answer the question "Are pupils learning what they need?" Accordingly, the following items are considered to be level five concerns for the purposes of this study:

Providing instruction for slow learners

Determining students' academic needs

Evaluating students with special needs

Having impact on my students

Individualizing instruction

Dealing with groups of students

Meeting the needs of individual students

Arranging furniture to facilitate learning

Providing instructional variety within individual lessons

Providing instruction for gifted students

Level six concerns serve to answer the question "How can I improve my own teaching?" Accordingly, the following items are considered to be level six concerns for the purposes of this study:

Having adequate instructional materials available

Asking for feedback to improve instruction

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education. Educating, a profession: report of the Bicentennial Commission on Education for the Profession of Teaching of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education. Washington, D. C.: AACTE, 1976.
- Arth, A. A. University of Wyoming: middle school teacher education. Journal of Teacher Education, 1977, 28, 32-37.
- Borich, G. D. Three school based models for conducting follow-up studies of teacher education and training. Austin, Texas: Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, University of Texas at Austin, 1978.
- Briscoe, F. G. The professional concerns of first year secondary teachers in selected Michigan public schools: a pilot study. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Michigan State University, 1972.
- Burnell, J. B. The preparation of secondary teachers: future prognosis. Teacher Educator, 1975, 11, 10-16.
- Conant, J. B. The education of American teachers. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1963.
- Copeland, E. P. & Febinger, G. A personalized approach to teacher education. Colorado Journal of Educational Research, 1976, 16, 23-27.
- Corl, S. S. The professional education of high school and junior high school teachers at Michigan State University. Unpublished paper, Michigan State University, 1971.
- Corl, S. S. Secondary Education Pilot Program (handbook). East Lansing: Michigan State University, 1975.
- Cruickshand, D. R. Evaluation (follow-up of graduates). Columbus, Ohio: The Ohio State University, 1978.
- Dean, D. H. A comparative study of graduates of the Michigan State University College of Education Mott Institute for Community Improvement level IV program and the regular teacher preparation program. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Michigan State University, 1971.
- Dickson, G. E. IGE as a focus for reorganizing pre-service and in-service teacher education in Ohio. Journal of Teacher Education, 1976, 27, 244-249.

- Dickson, G. E. & Saxe, R. W., et al. Partners for educational reform and renewal. Berkeley, California: McCutchan Publishing, 1973.
- Ducharme, E. R. & Nash, R. J. Humanizing teacher education for the last quarter of the twentieth century. Journal of Teacher Education, 1975, 26, 222-228.
- Erickson, J. K. & Ruud, J. B. Concerns of home economics students preceding their student teaching. Journal of Home Economics, 1967, 59, 732-734.
- Fuller, F. F. Concerns of teachers: a developmental conceptualization. American Educational Research Journal, 1969, 6, 207-226.
- Fuller, F. F. & Bown, O. H. Becoming a teacher in K. Ryan, ed., Teacher education, part II, The 74th Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, 1975.
- Fuller, F. F. & Case, C. A manual for scoring the teacher concerns statement. Austin, Texas: Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, University of Texas at Austin, 1972.
- Gabriel, J. An analysis of the emotional problems of the teacher in the classroom. London: Angus and Robertson, Ltd., 1957.
- Gilroy, J. J. & Moody, F. E. Lessening anxiety associated with student teaching. Teacher Educator, 1976, 12, 11-15.
- Gordon, I. J., et al. The Florida experiment in undergraduate teacher education. Changes in Teacher Education. Washington, D. C.: National Education Association, 1964.
- Haberman, M. & Stinnett, T. M. Teacher education and the new profession of teaching. Berkeley, California: McCutchan Publishing Corporation, 1973.
- Hall, G. E. The study of individual teacher and professor concerns about innovations. Journal of Teacher Education, 1976, 27, 22-23.
- Hall, G. E. & Jones, H. L. Competency-based education. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1976.
- Harper, C. A. A century of public teacher education. Washington, D.C. National Education Association, 1939.
- Hazard, W. R. The tutorial and clinical program of teacher education. Evanston, Illinois: Northwestern University Press, 1967.
- Hodenfield, G. K. & Stinnett, T. M. The education of teachers. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1961.
- Irvine, W. L. Project I: an experimental program for the preparation of secondary school teachers. Changes in teacher education. Washington, D. C.: National Education Association, 1964.

- Jackson, P. W. Life in classrooms. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1968.
- Little, T., Wagner, J. & Schewitzer, J. SEPP evaluation committee report. East Lansing: Michigan State University, 1976.
- Michigan State University. The report on interviews conducted with students in the Secondary Education Pilot Program. East Lansing: Michigan State University, 1976.
- Michigan State University. Interviewers' informal evaluation and interpretation of interviews with students in the Secondary Education Pilot Program. East Lansing: Michigan State University, 1976.
- Norris, C. A. An alternative secondary teacher education program at Michigan State University: preliminary study. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Michigan State University, 1976.
- O'Donnell, R. M. The Ohio state plan for evaluating its graduates. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, Chicago, 1978.
- Peer, G. & Pegues, W. A national survey of teacher education follow-up practices. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, Chicago, 1978.
- Phillips, M. Some problems of adjustment in the early years of a teacher's life. British Journal of Educational Psychology, 1932, 2, 237-56.
- Robinson, E. & Berry, C. A. An investigation of certain variables related to student anxieties before and during student teaching. Grambling, Louisiana: Grambling College, 1965.
- Sandefur, J. T. A model for the evaluation of teacher education graduates. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, Chicago, 1978.
- Sandefur, J. T. & Adams, R. D. Teacher preparation evaluation program (TPEP). Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, Chicago, 1978.
- Stake, R. E. The countenance of educational evaluation. The record (Teachers' College), 1967, 5, 523-540.
- Ryan, K. My teacher education program? well... First year teachers reflect and react. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, Chicago, 1978.
- Thompson, M. L. Identifying anxieties experienced by student teachers. Journal of Teacher Education, 1969, 14, 435-439.

- Travers, R. M. W., et al. The anxieties of a group of student teachers. Educational Administration and Supervision, 1952, 38, 368-375.
- Welch, I. D., et al. The teacher year alternative: an option to traditional teacher education. Colorado Journal of Educational Research, 1976, 16, 6-12.
- York, J. L. Problems of beginning teachers. Austin, Texas: Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, University of Texas at Austin, 1968.