DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 166 163 SP 013 787

AUTHOR Freeman, Donald J.; And Others
TITLE Survey of M.S.U. Graduates of Five Student Teaching Programs: Trends and Long-Range Outcomes of Student Teaching Programs Suggested by a Survey of Michigan State University Graduates and Their Supervisors.
INSTITUTION Michigan State Univ., East Lansing. Coll. of Education.
PUB DATE Jan 79
NOTE 142p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$7.35 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Beginning Teachers; College Graduates; *College Supervisors; *Comparative Analysis; Followup Studies; *Graduate Surveys; Preservice Education; *Program Effectiveness; Questionnaires; Statistical Analysis; Student Teaching; *Teacher Employment; *Teacher Programs

ABSTRACT

This report summarizes responses to an 84-item survey completed by 536 of 994 randomly selected graduates of Michigan State University. The sample includes graduates of five teacher preparation programs (regular, cluster, and overseas student teaching, elementary intern, and competency-based four enrollment periods. The report also reviews responses to a 43-item questionnaire completed by 236 of the 269 supervisors identified by active teachers in the sample. The most significant findings include: (1) There has been a slight decline in the percent of graduates who secure teaching positions; (2) There has been a dramatic increase in the number who enter the profession as substitutes, paraprofessionals, or part-time teachers; (3) There are no significant differences among programs on any of the five subscales embedded within the surveys--self-ratings of performance, supervisor ratings of performance, supervisor ratings of commitment to teaching, graduate ratings of the contribution of student teaching to skill development, and general satisfaction with student teaching; (4) The turnover rate is highest among young, untenured teachers; (5) There are significant program differences on several specific items that focus on employment histories, attitudes, or personal characteristics; and (6) graduates are generally satisfied with the student teaching experience and view the opportunity to teach at more than one grade level or subject area as its most valuable subcomponent. An appendix provides examples of questionnaires, and a bibliography is also included. (Author/DS)

SURVEY OF M.S.U. GRADUATES OF FIVE STUDENT TEACHING PROGRAMS

DONALD J. FREEMAN
BANKS T. BRADLEY
TINA BORNSTEIN

TRENDS AND LONG-RANGE OUTCOMES OF STUDENT TEACHING PROGRAMS SUGGESTED BY A SURVEY OF MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY GRADUATES AND THEIR SUPERVISORS

Donald J. Freeman
Banks T. Bradley
Tina Bornstein

Michigan State University
College of Education
Division of Student Teaching and Professional Development
January, 1979

...al report of research supported by the Division of Student Teaching and Professional Development, College of Education, Michigan State University, East Lansing, Michigan

Abstract

This report summarizes responses to an 84 item survey completed by 536 of 994 (54%) randomly selected graduates of Michigan State University. The sample includes graduates of five teacher preparation programs (regular, cluster, and overseas student teaching; Elementary Intern and competency-based) from four enrollment periods (1969-70, 1971-72, 1974-75, and 1975-76). The report also reviews responses to a 43 item questionnaire completed by 236 of the 269 (88%) supervisors identified by active teachers in the sample.

The results are summarized in a series of 72 tables. The most significant findings include:

(1) There has been a slight decline in the percent of graduates who secure teaching positions.
(2) There has been a dramatic increase in the number who enter the profession as substitutes, paraprofessionals, or part-time teachers.
(3) The turnover rate is highest among young, untenured teachers.
(4) There are no significant differences among programs on any of the five subscales embedded within the surveys: self-ratings of performance, supervisor ratings of performance, supervisor ratings of commitment to teaching, graduate ratings of the contribution of student teaching to skill development, and general satisfaction with student teaching.
(5) There are significant program differences on several specific items which focus on employment histories, attitudes, or personal characteristics.
(6) Graduates are generally satisfied with the student teaching experience and view the opportunity to teach at more than one grade level or subject area as its most valuable sub-component.

These and other significant findings gave rise to four general recommendations.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS (cont.)

LIST OF CHARTS AND TABLES

LIST OF CHARTS AND TABLES (cont.)

- Appendices -

SECTION 1

OVERVIEW OF THE STUDY

- General Goals -

According to published standards of the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE),

> Maintenance of acceptable teacher education programs demands a continuous process of evaluation of the graduates of existing programs, modification of existing programs, and long-range planning. The faculty and administrators in teacher education evaluate the results of their programs not only through assessment of graduates but also by seeking reactions from persons involved with the certification, employment, and supervision of its graduates.[1]

Few, if any, institutions have conformed to this clearly stated NCATE standard for the accreditation of teacher education. Until recently, for example, Michigan State University, like most other institutions, has relied primarily on informal data collection which is of limited value in program development. However, there have been at least a few systematic attempts to evaluate program effectiveness at Michigan State. The design and implementation of the Competency Based Teacher Education program, for example, included systematic assessment of immediate program outcomes, particularly during its initial stages of development.[2] Graduates of the Elementary Intern (EIP) Program[3] and the Overseas Student Teaching Program[4] have been surveyed on more than one occasion. However, each of these efforts has focused on a single preparation program and has therefore been comparatively limited in scope.

This study was designed to address the clear need for a comprehensive and systematic study of graduates from several teacher preparation programs at Michigan State University. Specifically, it includes responses from

graduates who were enrolled in one of the following student teaching programs during the years 1969-76: (1) Regular Student Teaching, (2) Overseas Student Teaching, (3) Cluster Student Teaching, (4) Elementary Intern Program (EIP) and (5) Competency-Based Teacher Education Program (CBTE). This study also includes responses from supervisors of those graduates who are still active teachers.

The basic purposes of the study include the following:

(1) To identify significant trends in the professional development of Michigan State University graduates.

(2) To determine the comparative impact of selected undergraduate teacher preparation programs on professional development.

(3) To determine the degree to which input from supervisors contributes to meaningful program evaluation.*

- The Five Student Teaching Alternatives -

The five student teaching alternatives considered in this study are administered by the Division of Student Teaching and Professional Development at Michigan State University. In order to qualify for student teaching, participants in each of these programs must be of junior/senior status, have a 2.0 overall grade point average, have satisfactorily completed required methods courses and be approved for student teaching by their respective major university department. Although there are variations in the implementation of each program, characteristic features include the following:

Regular: Student teaching consists of a full-time eleven week assignment in a public/private school working with an experienced, certified teacher.

*This goal served as the focus of a Ph.D. dissertation entitled, "A Follow-Study, Comparing Graduates and Supervisors Ratings of the Effectiveness of Michigan State University Teacher Education Programs (1969-1976)." This dissertation was completed by Tina Bornstein in September, 1978, and serves as a companion document to this report.

University coordinators provide assistance to both supervising teachers and student teachers in several different buildings.

Cluster: This program began in 1968 and is characterized by the assignment of groups of 10 to 12 student teachers to a single school. A teacher (cluster consultant) from the school is released a minimum of one-half time to coordinate the student teaching program in that building. Thus student teachers and supervising teachers receive on-site support from cluster consultants as well as college coordinators.

Overseas: Since 1969, students have been able to apply for student teaching placements in English speaking schools located overseas. A university coordinator interviews candidates and accompanies those who are selected to one of the following locations: Madrid, Rome, Guadalajara, The Hague, Brussels, Lakenheath (England), or Belize. The administration of overseas programs typically conforms to the Regular student teaching models.

Elementary Intern Program (EIP): Successful applicants are typically admitted to the EIP program during their sophomore year. During the junior year, they complete methods courses and student teaching in a resident center location. During their senior year, they function as full-time classroom teachers with supervision and instruction provided by intern consultants from the local area schools. University coordinators provide additional supervision and instruction during each stage of the program.

Competency Based Teacher Education (also known as the POINTE Program): The CBTE program has been developed and implemented by a team of university coordinators and classroom teachers. Initially implemented in 1974, the program is a two-term sequence. The first term includes structured experiences in both classroom and instructional laboratory settings. The

second term consists of a full-time student teaching experience which conforms to the cluster model of administration. Almost all of the students in this program have been assigned to the Lansing area schools.

- Development of Questionnaires -

A team of four researchers developed the two questionnaires which were used in this study. (See Appendix E) The team included Donald Freeman, Banks Bradley, and Henry Kennedy from the Division of Student Teaching and Professional Development and Grace Iverson, a research consultant in the Lansing School District. Each questionnaire was reviewed by several other members of the Division and was field tested with a small sample of graduates and supervisors. Minor revisions were made as a result of these analyses.

The 84 items on the graduate questionnaire were designed to provide reliable measures of each of the following:

(a) employment histories

(b) self-ratings of performance of selected teaching skills

(c) general attitudes toward the student teaching experience

(d) ratings of the influence of student teaching on the development of selected teaching skills

The 43 items on the supervisor survey were designed to provide reliable measures of each of the following:

(a) ratings of the graduates' performance of selected teaching skills

(b) ratings of the graduates' commitment to teaching

(c) knowledge of, and attitudes toward, specific teacher preparation programs

- Selection of the Sample* -

Five programs and four years (1969-70, 1971-72, 1974-75, and 1975-76) were examined in this study. The programs have been described in an earlier section of this report. The four years correspond to academic years in which a given individual student taught. The cross between programs and years gives rise to a 4 x 5 sampling matrix, however, two cells in this matrix are empty.

A total of 60 graduates were randomly selected from the total group of program participants within each cell in the matrix. A cover letter and copy of the questionnaire were sent to each graduate in the sample. Whenever a questionnaire was returned as nonforwardable, an alternate from the same group was randomly selected. Despite this adjustment, 86 individuals could not be reached on either the first or second mailings. The final sample therefore consisted of 994 graduates. A second letter and copy of the questionnaire were sent to each individual in the final sample who failed to respond within a reasonable time period. Fifty-four percent of this group ultimately completed the survey.

A majority of the 536 graduates who completed the survey are still active members of the teaching profession. Ninety percent of these individuals voluntarily provided the name and address of their immediate supervisor. Of the 269 individuals identified in this fashion, 236 completed the supervisor survey. Thus 88% of the supervisor surveys were returned.

---

* A complete calendar of events surrounding the selection of the sample and processing of data is presented in Chart A-1 in Appendix A. Appendix A also contains a complete description of the sampling matrix. Copies of the cover letters which were sent to each participant appear in Appendix C.

- Data Analysis -

A variety of statistical tests was used to analyze responses to individual items and scores on five subscales embedded within the surveys. These included analysis of variance tests, Chi-square tests and product-moment correlations. Each analysis was designed to determine if there were significant differences in the response patterms of graduates across the five programs or four years, with alpha arbitrarily fixed at .05. The results of each analysis are described in Section III of this report.

- Assumptions and Limitations of the Study -

(1) Although comprehensive lists of program graduates were developed, it was impossible to obtain accurate addresses for all persons included in the sample. Randomly selected substitutions were used to complete the final sample.

(2) The study was limited to an evaluation of programs which are administered by the Division of Student Teaching and Professional Development. Other preparation programs offered by the College of Education were not included.

(3) Only a mail questionnaire procedure was used. Given strict budgetary limitations, personal contact and direct observation were not feasible.

(4) The supervisor's survey was sent only if specific permission was given by the graduate. Although 90 percent of the graduates voluntarily provided the information, the sample of supervisors is at least slightly biased as a result of this procedure.

(5) Although 55 percent of the graduates and 88 percent of the supervisors

completed the surveys, this group may constitute a biased representation of the total sample. Further, the directional influence of this bias is impossible to determine.

(6) All students who were enrolled in student teaching were included in the groups from which samples were selected. Thus each group may include a few transfer students who completed part of their teacher preparation program at uther universities.

(7) Because the sample was based upon the year in which an individual student taught, it is likely that there is some variation in the date of graduation for the sample representing a given year.

- Footnotes: Section I -

[1]NCATE, Standards for Accreditation of Teacher Education (Washington, D.C.: NCATE, 1977) p. 10.

[2]Michigan Department of Education, Development of a Competency Based Secondary Teacher Education Program Model (Lansing, Mi.: Michigan Department of Education, 1975); and Michigan Department of Education, Development of A Competency Based Teacher Education Program Focusing on the Directed Teaching Experience (Lansing, Mi.: Michigan Department of Education, 1976); and Donald Freeman and Bea Helmke, "Student Perceptions of the Competency-Based Teacher Education Program at Michigan State University: A Formative Report," Michigan State University, East Lansing, Mi., 1975; and Donald Freeman, "Developmental Changes in Attitude Among Participants in a Competency-Based Teacher Education Program," Michigan State University, East Lansing, Mi., 1976.

[3]James Conley, "Personality Characertistics of Female Elementary Intern Program and Conventional Program Students," Michigan State University, East Lansing, Mi., 1968; and Robert Scrivens et al., "Elementary Intern Program Follow-up Study," Michigan State University, East Lansing, Mi., 1973; and William L. Cole et al., "Study of 1974 Elementary Intern Program Graduates," Michigan State University, East Lansing, Mi., 1971.

[4]Banks Bradley, "Overseas Follow-up Study," Michigan State University Department of Student Teaching, East Lansing, Mi., 1971; and Banks Bradley, Overseas Student Teaching: A Follow-up Study Report as an Assessment of Intercultural Experiences in Student Teaching (East Lansing, Mi., Michigan State University, 1975).

SECTION II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

- Introduction -

Although the importance of follow-up studies is clearly recognized, most have been completed for the information of the local sponsoring institutions and not for a wider audience. As a result, there has been little effort to develop theoretical generalizations applicable to teacher education programs or organized procedures for conducting a follow-up study.

However, there are some indications teacher educators are becoming aware of the need to share information from follow-up studies. The American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education included follow-up studies in the 1978 national convention as one of the significant themes for in-depth study for teacher educators. A two-day program of intensive work was offered. These sessions were well attended, indicating an awareness of the need to develop more effective follow-up studies and increase the publication of results and generalizations from such studies.

ERIC has become an important method of providing access to some work that may not otherwise be available. Use of ERIC to publish institutional follow-up reports could greatly facilitate the accessibility to reports for educators who must plan, implement, analyze and report conclusions from follow-up reports. Most certainly, this accessibility and use by researchers should increase reliability, validity, procedures and application of conclusions gleaned from follow-up studies.

Related readings reported in this section will demonstrate the need to increase the publication of follow-up reports. The authors were able to determine only a limited number of reports that provided direct assistance

in developing, implementing and interpreting data. These resources are grouped under two basic categories: Evaluation of Training Programs by Graduates and Miscellaneous Related Readings.

- Graduate Evaluations of Training Programs -

Rosser and Denton[1] conducted a study of 1973-74 graduates of Texas A & M University. They developed a thirty item questionnaire related specifically to the education program. Demographic items and comments with open ended questions were also solicited. The questionnaire was mailed to 196 graduates with 123 returned (62.8%). Every available means was used to increase the rate of return including direct telephone solicitation to non-respondents. The results of the study guided the University staff in revisions of the educational program. In addition, apparently the authors are developing techniques for longitudinal collection of data.

Sandefur has been a leader in developing a model for follow-up studies.[2] The project he directs at Western Kentucky is testing and implementing a number of his ideas. The model requires collection of evaluative data in four categories:

1. Career Line Data
2. Direct Classroom Observation
3. Pupil, Peer, and Supervisory Evaluations
4. Standardized Measures

A stratified random sample of 40 students, who plan to teach in Kentucky, are selected each year. According to the model, data will be collected four times: student teaching, end of first, third and fifth years of teaching experience. Data collection includes on-site class observations and standardized evaluation instruments. Ryan's Classroom Observations Record (a modification

of Flanders' Interaction Analysis sytem) and a model developed by Hough guide the collection of classroom data. Veldman and Peck's "Student Evaluation of Teaching" and "The Teacher Evaluation Peer/Supervisor" rating form developed at Emporia Kansas State College are used for pupil, peer and supervisor evaluations of teaching. Adorno's California F-Scale is the standardized measure which is used.

Sandefur and Adorno have published two articles which provide summaries of some of their preliminary findings.[3] Specific conclusions they have reached concerning teacher performance are compared to the rationale for the theory and implementation of Western Kentucky's teacher education program. In general, the teacher education program was supported by the data analysis. Specific differences between teacher behavior and the University program were also identified. The authors intend to continue the examination of these inconsistencies with additional data from the continuing study of graduates.

The program at Western Kentucky is possibly the most elaborate follow-up study in continuous operation. The staff is apparently generating significant guidelines for conducting follow-up studies as well as evaluating program effectiveness and developing support for generalizations about teachers and teaching.

Drummond[4] summarized a follow-up study of graduates from the University of Maine. A random sample of 1,000 graduates from 1970-76 received a questionnaire with 342 (34.2%) responding. Demographic data and evaluation of the educational program were solicited. Responses were recorded on a ordinal scale of perceived value. Conclusions reached in this study include the following:

1. Student teaching was rated as the most valuable course, with methods second. A nine-point scale was used. Student teaching received an 8, with methods 5-6.

2. Courses with the least value for the teachers were: American School, Growth and Learning Process, Teaching Process, and Laboratory Science courses.

3. Recommended changes in the training program were: longer student teaching period to include varied levels and experiences, early experiences in school settings, and field-based methods courses.

Baer and Foster[5] report the results of a survey of 390 graduates from Northern Illinois University. Conclusions included:

1. Direct experiences with children were most valuable.

2. Student teaching rated as the course of greatest value but should be at varied grade levels.

3. More and better instruction in teaching reading, science, and social studies is needed.

Swami[6] conducted a follow-up of Ohio State University science teacher graduates with one to five years of teaching experience. Baseline data were collected during the pre-service training program. After graduates began teaching, data were collected from the teachers, students and administrators. It was concluded that the type of activities used by the teachers remained stable five years after graduation. In other words, the activities used by teachers did not vary across years of experience.

Goldenberg[7] investigated the relationship between principals' and teachers' perceptions of the quality of preparation and teaching competence. Ninety-four of 136 teachers (69%) and 118 of 134 principals (88%) completed their 15 item questionnaire. Teachers usually rated the teacher training program slightly better than principals. Teachers did view the program as having several separate elements while principals looked at the total program as one entity. Approval of the undergraduate program was given by

both groups. Teachers believed they were weakest in classroom management while principals selected the evaluation process as the teachers' weakest point.

Johnson[8] conducted two follow-up studies of graduates from the University of South Alabama. He found that 60% were generally satisfied with their training with 10% very dissatisfied and 26% somewhat dissatisfied.

Alost[9] reported the efforts of the Health, Physical Education, and Recreation staff to conduct on-site follow-up studies of graduates from Northwestern State University in Louisiana. Apparently, there was no formal collection of data. Observations and interviews were used. Evaluation and interpretation of data were apparently done informally by the University staff. There was a carefully planned visitation program that assured that every graduate was interviewed by a staff person.

A study by Singh and Allen[10] involved 25 graduates of the University of South Florida's early intervention program. An on-site visitation and a questionnaire were used to obtain data. The evaluation identified specific accomplishments of the graduates and needed changes in the program.

Fitch and Klima[11] completed a comparative study of the 1970-71 graduates of the Illinois State University. Elementary teachers from the regular student teaching program were compared with those who received their training at the Joliet Teacher Education Center. There were distinct differences in the training program for teachers, especially in the carefully supervised school experiences for teacher candidates at the Joliet Center. Each of the 75 Joliet graduates was surveyed and compared with 75 randomly selected graduates from the regular program. By using personal contact procedures, a total return of 91% was secured, with 69 from Joliet and 68 for the regular program.

A 110 item questionnaire was used to secure data, including demographic

and program evaluation. Chi-square analyses revealed at least some significant differences between the two programs. No conclusions are stated by the authors relating to quality. However, judging from differences in responses to some of the items and the percent of graduates who were ultimately employed (73% regular and 90% Joliet), the teachers trained at Joliet apparently did have a much higher regard for their training program.

Rusk[12] conducted a follow-up of secondary English teachers who had graduated from Michigan State University between 1962 and 1964. A questionnaire was mailed to all 315 English majors, but only certified secondary teachers were to complete the total questionnaire. Total returns were 169 (54%). Of this number, only 82 (49%) were actually teaching at the time of the survey (1966) but 106 (63%) had taught for at least one year. A questionnaire containing 98 competencies plus demographic data was used. Of the 34 competencies rated "quite significant" by 75% of the respondents, 16 related to teaching, 8 to literature, 6 to written composition, 3 to oral composition, and 1 to language. The implications of the ratings indicated changes were needed in the proportions of the preparation program for teachers. Greater emphasis was needed in the professional preparation of teachers. When respondents evaluated competencies needed by an English teacher in relation to the MSU program, the following tended to be considered inadequate: Understanding Adolescents and Their Learning Process, Knowledge of Materials of Instruction, Ability to Evaluate, and Skills Related to Oral Communication. Although respondents generally felt that student teaching was important, they also felt that varied experiences were needed if student teaching is to have a direct relationship with a teaching job.

- Miscellaneous Related Readings -

Carey[13] conducted a study to determine the validity of teachers'

perceptions of their performance. A total of 175 teachers were paid to complete two paper/pencil questionnaires which had two distinct types of items: (1) perception items (yes or no concerning performance) and (2) behavior items (identification of settings for specific practices). Perception scores for teachers were consistently different from performance scores. The authors therefore conclude that perception of teacher performance could not be used to predict actual performance. A possible flow of the procedure used in the study could be the testing procedure. Perception items were true or false while Behavior testing was multiple choice. No actual observations were used. Because answering questions in a testing situation is subject to other factors, it may not provide a valid measure of level of performance in a classroom setting.

Hardbeck et al.[14] compared self-reports for teachers with direct observation results. The study was composed of 355 teachers in 10 districts located in the proximity of Austin, Texas. Their findings do confirm that self-reports by teachers tend to be higher than observer-recorded scores. These differences did vary in a systematic way, which does permit self-reports' scores to be converted into predictions of observer results.

Crisp[15] investigated the perceived competency of Secondary School English Teachers in Illinois. A "Self-Rating Scale for Experienced Teachers" was sent to 600 randomly selected teachers. A return of 57% was secured. Among the conclusions were: (1) experienced teachers rate themselves higher than beginning teachers, (2) teachers with Master's degrees rate themselves higher than teachers with Bachelor's degrees, and (3) teachers believed themselves to be strong in professional competency.

Copley[16] evaluated the effect of professional courses on beginning teachers by comparing 22 liberal arts graduates without professional education courses, 28 liberal arts graduates with education courses but without student

teaching, and 40 gradoates of a professional education seqoence. Principals were asked to rate each teacher using a 20 item quesrionnaire. There were differences in ratings based on professional preparation bot no difference on other factors.

Vittetoe[17] stodied Central Missouri State University graduates for 1970-73. Of the 1,442 graduates, 747 received teaching contracts. Of this numbe: ratings of teaching performance by principals were obtained for 640. A sorvey rating scale of 1 (superior) to 5 (inadequate) was used. An open-end interview of supervisors for 100 teachers rated superior (1) and 100 rated fair (4) or inadequate (5) was condocted to determine reasons for the performanc ratings given to the teachers. Inadeqoate teachers received comments relating t their inability to discipline, personality clashes, immatority, lack of organization, and lack of confidence. These results are exactly opposite to comments describing superior teachers. Inadequate teachers were judged, in general, to be satisfactory in their knowledge of subject matter. The mean grade point average for the inadequate teachers was 2.68 with a range of 2.16 to 3.85.

Berliner and Tikunoff[18] conducted an ethnographic study of teacher effectiveness as part of the California effort to determine appropriateness of the teacher training program. This study suggested that 21 of the 61 variables which have been identified are generic to teachers at second and fifth grades. However, the authors believe that more complete study of the variables must occur in an effort to determine their validity in differentiating the effectiveness of teachers.

- Sommary -

Although there have been some encouraging signs that the professional literatore describing results of follow-up stodies may be growing, the collectiv results to date have not been very useful in guiding program development.

Some carefully constructed follow-up study models are now in operation. These promise to yield significant data relating to organization procedures, analysis, and interpretation of follow-up study results.

To date, studies have generally relied on self-constructed questionnaires. Some standardization is beginning to appear which may permit cumparison of results.

A few follow-up efforts include direct observation in the classroom. Although this approach is difficult to standardize and interpret, it does promise to provide significant data which may be used to evaluate the impact of teacher training programs and to identify characteristics of effective teachers.

- Footnotes: Section 2 -

[1]R. Stephen Rosser and Jon J. Denton, "Assessing Recent Teacher Education Graduates Using a Two-Scaled Instrument," Education, Fall, 1977, pp. 97-104.

[2]J.T. Sandefur, An Illustrated Model for the Evaluation of Teacher Education Graduates (Washington, D.C.: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1970).

[3]J.T. Sandefur and Ronald D. Adams, "A Case Study of Second-Year Teacher Education Graduates," Journal of Teacher Education, Fall, 1973, pp. 248-249; and "An Evaluation of Teaching: An Interim Research Report," Journal of Teacher Education, Spring, 1976, pp. 71-76.

[4]Robert J. Drummond. 1976 Follow-up of 1970-76 College of Education Graduates, University of Maine, Orono (Bethesda, Md.: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 141 306, 1977).

[5]G. Thomas Baer and Walter S. Foster. Teacher Preparation - What Graduates Tell Us (Bethesda, Md.: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 103 402, 1975).

[6]Piyush Swami. A Follow-up Study for Evaluation of the Preservice Secondary Science Teacher Education Program at the Ohio State University (Bethesda, Md.: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 113 200, 1976).

[7]Ronald Goldenberg. The Relationships Between Principals' and Teachers' Perceptions of the Quality of College Preparation for Teaching Competence (Bethesda, Md.: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 131 075, 1977).

[8]Gronville B. Johnson. Evaluation of the University of South Alabama College of Education Teacher Training Program by Analyses of Its Alumni, 1971 (Bethesda, Md.: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 060 050, 1972; and 1969, ED 062 371, 1972).

[9]Robert A. Alost, "Teacher Education Follow-up," Journal of Health, Physical Education and Recreation 44 (September 1973):67.

[10]P.H. Singh and Elaine S. Allen. University of South Florida, Tampa, College of Education, Follow-up Study: Early Intervention Program (Bethesda, Md.: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 097 795, 1974).

[11]Thomas Fitch and Kenneth Klima, Elementary Teaching Graduates of Illinois State University 1970-71, A Comparative Study: Regular Student Teaching Program Graduates and Joliet Teacher Education Center Graduates (Normal, Ill.: Illinois State University, 1972).

[12]Elizabeth A. Rusk, A Study of Secondary Teachers of English Who Graduated From Michigan State University (East Lansing, Mi.: Michigan State University, 1967).

[13]Lou M. Carey. An Investigation of the Validity of Using Self-Evaluation Instruments to Identify Instructional Needs (Bethesda, Md.: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 142 579, 1977).

[14]Richard J. Hardbeck et al. Individualization of Instruction by Vocational and Nonvocational Teachers: Self Reports Compared With Observations (Bethesda, Md.: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 142 579, N.D.).

[15]Raymond D. Crisp. The Professional Competency of Illinois Secondary School English Teachers: A Report of the Self-Evaluations of Experienced Illinois Secondary School English Teachers, Interim Report (Bethesda, Md.: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 029 889, 1968).

[16]Patrick O. Copley. A Study of the Effect of Professional Courses in Beginning Teachers (Bethesda, Md.: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 098 147, 1975).

[17]Jack O. Vittetoe, "Why First-Year Teachers Fail," Phi Delta Kappan, January 1977, pp. 429-430.

[18]David C. Berliner and William J. Tikunoff, "The California Beginning Teacher Evaluation Study: Overview of the Ethnographic Study," Journal of Teacher Education 27 (Spring 1976): 24-30.

SECTION III

AN ANALYSIS OF RESULTS

I. Employment Histories

One of the most important goals of this study was to plot trends in the employment histories of our graduates and to determine if these trends vary among the five undergraduate training programs. Specifically, the study was designed to provide answers to the following questions:

(1) Has the percent of individuals who secure a teaching position following graduation varied across years and programs?

(2) What type of position is initially secured by those entering the teaching profession?

(3) Has the type of teaching position obtained following graduation varied across years and programs?

(4) What is the fate of those who do not secure a teaching position following graduation?

(5) Does the percent of individuals who are still teaching vary across years and programs?

(6) Do stated reasons for leaving the teaching profession vary across years and programs?

(7) Do supervisor ratings of hiring potential and degree of preparation vary across programs?

(1) Has the percent of individuals who secure a teaching position varied across years and programs?

Data in Table 1 depict the percent of individuals in each cell of the sampling matrix who responded "yes" to the question, "Did you secure a teaching position following graduation?" Table 1 also depicts aggregate

totals for the four years and five programs as well as adjusted means for each year. The latter figures were derived by multiplying the percents in each cell by the total cell population and dividing that figure by the total N. Due to sizable differences in the total number of enrollees in each program, the adjusted means provide a more accurate reflection of the magnitude of change across years.

Table 1: Percent of Graduates Who Secured a Teaching Position Following Graduation

Program \ Year	1969-70 (n=110)	1971-72 (n=110)	1974-75 (n=153)	1975-76 (n=158)	TOTAL
Regular (n=108)*	73.3%	75.0%	69.2%	71.4%	72.2%
EIP (n=108)	92.3%	83.3%	64.7%	62.5%	75.0%
Cluster (n=131)	72.4%	76.7%	86.1%	66.7%	75.6%
Overseas (n=125)	88.0%	78.1%	54.2%	72.7%	73.6%
CBTE (n=59)			60.6%	34.6%	49.2%
TOTAL	80.9%	78.2%	68.0%	63.3%	
ADJUSTED MEANS	75.2%	76.6%	71.7%	65.4%	

	Chi-square	df.	statistical significance
Program Effects	16.43	4	$p < .01$
Year Effects	13.31	3	$p < .01$

* The "n's" reported for each row and column refer to the total number of individuals in each program or each year who responded to the item.

The data in Table 1 support the following general conclusions:

(a) The percent of graduates who secured a teaching position following graduation apparently reached a peak in about 1971-72 and has declined steadily since that time. In terms of the years considered in this study, the percent has varied from an estimated high of 76.6% for the years 1971-72 to an estimated low of 65.4% for the years 1975-76.

(b) This decline has been most dramatic for the EIP program.

(c) The percent of graduates of the CBTE program who secured a teaching position following graduation (approximately 50%) is considerably lower than the percent of graduates who entered teaching from the other four programs (approximately 65% for the corresponding years).

(2) What type of position is initially secured by those entering the profession?

Those individuals who entered the teaching profession following graduation were asked to indicate the type of position they initially secured. Their responses are summarized in Table 2. A cursory examination of this table suggests that the percent of individuals who entered teaching via "substitute teaching" or "part time" teaching roles increased dramatically over the years considered in this study. Whereas less than one in ten graduates began teaching as substitutes in 1969-70, one in four entered teaching as substitutes in 1974-76.

Table 2: Initial Position Secured by Those Entering the Profession

Year	N	Substitute Teaching	Para-professional	Part time Classroom Teaching	Support (e.g. librarian)	Full time Classroom Teaching	Other
1969-70	91	7.1%	0.0%	3.3%	2.2%	81.3%	5.5%
1971-72	89	12.4%	3.4%	3.4%	1.1%	75.3%	4.5%
1974-75	113	25.7%	2.7%	6.2%	2.7%	57.5%	5.3%
1975-76	107	26.2%	1.9%	6.5%	0.9%	57.9%	6.5%
TOTALS	400	18.8%	2.0%	5.0%	1.8%	67.0%	5.5%

(1) Has the type of teaching position obtained following graduation varied across years and programs?

As the data in Table 2 suggest, the percent of individuals who secure a full-time classroom teaching position following graduation appears to be on the decline. In order to determine if this trend is significant and to examine possible differences among programs, a further analysis was conducted. Those individuals who indicated that their initial role was that of a "substitute teacher", a "paraprofessional" or a "part-time classroom teacher" were arbitrarily classified as "underemployed teachers" prior to this analysis.

The data in Table 3 describe the percent of individuals entering teaching who were classified as "underemployed teachers" for each cell in the

Sampling matrix. Aggregate totals for the four years and five programs as well as adjusted means for each year are also presented in Table 3.

Table 3: Percent of Those Entering the Profession Who Were Initially Underemployed (Substitutes, Paraprofessionals or Part-time Classroom Teachers)

Program \ Year	1969-70 (n=91)	1971-72 (n=89)	1974-75 (n=113)	1975-76 (n=107)	TOTAL
Regular (n=73)	13.6%	31.2%	18.8%	36.8%	24.7%
EIP (n=77)	0.0%	25.0%	36.4%	28.6%	22.1%
Cluster (n=97)	23.8%	21.7%	26.7%	21.7%	23.7%
Overseas (n=86)	4.8%	4.2%	33.3%	37.9%	19.8%
CBTE (n=29)			55.0%	44.4%	51.7%
TOTAL	10.6%	19.3%	34.1%	33.0%	
ADJUSTED MEANS	12.7%	25.6%	27.0%	33.6%	

	Chi-square	df.	statistical significance
Program Effects	16.43	4	$p < .01$
Year Effects	13.31	3	$p < .01$

The data in Table 3 support the following general conclusions:

(a) The percent of individuals entering the teaching profession who initially

serve in the role of "substitute teacher," "paraprofessional" or "part-time classroom teacher" has increased dramatically over the years considered in this study.

(b) This trend began as early as 1971-72 when the estimated percent of underemployed teachers (25.6%) was nearly double the estimate of underemployed teachers in 1969-70 (12.7%).

(c) The percent of graduates of the CBTE program who entered the profession as "underemployed teachers" was significantly higher (approximately 50%) than the corresponding percent of graduates from the other four programs (approximately 22%).

The combination of data from Tables 1 and 3 reveals a very clear trend. Whereas the decline in enrollments has very nearly matched the decline in opportunities for employment in the state of Michigan, the percent of student teachers in a given year who may expect to initially secure a full-time teaching position following graduation has declined sharply. These percents are as follows:

Year	% of student teachers who secured a full-time teaching position following graduation
1969-70	65.6%
1971-72	57.0%
1974-75	52.3%
1975-76	43.4%

As these figures suggest, the percent of candidates who secure a full-time teaching position following graduation has declined from approximately 66% to less than 50% during the years considered in this study.

(4) What is the fate of those who do not secure a teaching position following graduation?

Those individuals who did not enter the teaching profession following graduation were asked to respond to three questions regarding their; (a) reasons for not entering the profession, (b) type of position they obtained, and (c) level of education demanded by this position. Responses to these three questions are summarized in Table 4. (See pages 27 and 28).

An examination of the data in Sections B and C of Table 4 suggests that less than 15% of the individuals in this group did not obtain a salaried position following graduation. However, about 40% of those who did obtain jobs were "underemployed" in that their position did not require the level of college education they had received. This figure is only slightly higher than the number of "underemployed teachers" in recent years (approximately 33%). Neither the pattern of jobs obtained, nor the level of underemployment has changed significantly over the years considered in this study. The same is true in regard to stated reasons for not entering the teaching profession. (See Section A of Table 4)

However, stated reasons for not entering the profession did vary among graduates of the five programs. These differences were most pronounced for the EIP and overseas programs. The number of overseas graduates who "decided against teaching as a career," "entered graduate school" or were "offered a job outside of education which promised greater rewards" (total = approximately 54%) was considerably higher than the corresponding fugure for graduates of the EIP program (approximately 8%). If one assumes that these three reasons are indicative of either (a) a decision not to teach or (b) a willingness to consider other alternatives following a comparatively limited attempt to secure a teaching position, it would appear that the overseas group was considerably more mobile than the EIP group. This conclusion is also supported by the fact that over 70% of the EIP graduates indicated that "a teaching position was not avail-

Table 4: Descriptive Characteristics of Individuals Who Did Not Secure a Teaching Position Following Graduation

A. Please check the statement which best describes your reason for not entering the teaching profession.

	Regular (n=31)	EIP (n=29)	Cluster (n=35)	Overseas (n=39)	CBTF (n=30)	TOTAL	Adjusted Means
Decided against teaching as a career	12.9%	3.4%	17.1%	17.9%	10.0%	12.8%	13.1%
Entered graduate school	19.4%	0.0%	5.7%	20.5%	16.7%	12.8%	14.2%
Offered a job outside of education which promised greater rewards	9.7%	3.4%	11.4%	15.4%	13.3%	11.0%	9.9%
A teaching position was not available in the geographical area in which I hoped to reside	38.7%	72.4%	22.9%	20.5%	26.7%	34.8%	36.9%
A teaching position was not available anywhere	12.9%	13.8%	25.7%	17.9%	20.0%	18.3%	16.6%
Other	6.5%	6.9%	17.1%	7.7%	13.3%	10.4%	9.4%

	Chi-square	df	Statistical significance
Program effect	35.19	20	$p < .05$
Year effect	14.64	15	N.S.

(continued)

Table 4 (Cont.): Descriptive Characteristics of Individuals Who Did Not Secure a Teaching Position Following Graduation

B. Which of the following best describes the position you held during the year following college graduation?

N=155

Not employed in a paid position	12.9%
Held a social services position other than teaching	9.7%
Employed in a professional and/or administrative role	23.9%
Employed in a clerical and/or technical role	14.8%
Self-employed	1.9%
Unskilled or semi-skilled labor	13.5%
Other	23.5%

	Chi-square	df	statistical significance
Year Effect	25.00	18	N.S.

C. To what extent was the college education you received essential to success in this position?

N=136

Advancement in this position required even more college education than I had received	18.1%
Advancement did not require any further college education	42.0%
I did not need as much college education as I had already received to secure and advance in this position	39.9%

	Chi-square	df	statistical significance
Program Effect	13.05	8	N.S.
Year Effect	10.39	6	N.S.

able in the geographical area in which I hoped to reside" while only about 20% of the overseas graduates checked this statement.

A final conclusion which is suggested by the data in Section A of Table 4 is reflected in the adjusted means for the three categories listed above. The sum of adjusted means for these three categories suggests that approximately 1/3 of the graduates who did not secure a teaching position following graduation did not attempt to find a teaching post in an "all-out" aggressive fashion.

(5) Does the percent of individuals who are still teaching vary across years and programs?

Those individuals who entered the teaching profession following graduation were asked to indicate if they "still hold a teaching position." Responses to this question are presented in Table 5.

Table 5: Percent of Those Entering the Profession Who Still Hold a Teaching Position

Years	% Still Teaching
1969-70	74.2%
1970-71	69.8%
1974-75	74.3%
1975-76	83.2%

Chi-square = 4.92 (3df) N.S.

Programs	% Still Teaching
Regular	73.1%
EIP	84.0%
Cluster	75.0%
Overseas	69.5%
CBTE	81.5%

Chi-square = 5.79 (4df) N.S.

Results of Chi-square analyses of this data suggest that the percent of individuals who are still teaching does not vary significantly by programs or by years. The latter finding is somewhat surprising. Although

approximately one-fourth of those entering the teaching profession in Michigan leave within the first 8 or 9 years, most of those who leave do so during the first three years of teaching. In other words, those turnovers in teaching which occur are concentrated primarily among the young, untenured teachers.

(6) Do stated reasons for leaving the teaching profession vary across years and programs?

Table 6: Descriptive Characteristics of Those Who Have Left the Teaching Profession

Please check the statement which best describes your reasons for leaving the teaching professinn (N=118)

	1969-70 (n=26)	1971-72 (n=30)	1974-75 (N=32)	1975-76 (n=30)	TOTAL
Did not provide sufficient personal/professional challenge	30.8%	16.7%	31.3%	43.3%	30.5%
Left to raise a family	30.8%	43.3%	0.0%	3.3%	18.6%
Found a more satisfying job outside the profession	11.5%	10.0%	21.9%	13.3%	14.4%
Could not obtain a teaching position in area to which I subsequently moved	11.5%	10.0%	15.6%	26.7%	16.1%
Other	15.4%	20.0%	31.3%	13.3%	20.3%

	Chi-square	df	statistical significance
Program Effect	22.27	16	N.S.
Year Effect	32.95	12	$p < .001$

Table 6 represents a summary of responses to the question, "please check the statement which best describes your reasons for leaving the teaching profession." Although stated reasons for leaving did not vary significantly among graduates of different programs, there are significant differences across years of graduation. Perhaps the clearest trend suggested by the data is a significant reduction in the number of individuals who leave teaching "to raise a family." Approximately 33% of those who entered teaching during the years 1969-72 and who have subsequently left the profession did so in order to raise a family. The corresponding figure for those graduating during the years 1974-76 is less than 5%.

Although the results are somewhat less conclusive, the data in Table 6 also suggest that there may be an upward trend in teachers leaving the profession because (a) it does not provide sufficient personal or professional challenge or (b) because they are unable to find a position in the area to which they subsequently move.

(7) Do supervisor ratings of hiring potential and degree of preparation vary across programs?

Approximately one-third of the supervisors in our sample indicated that they were aware that the teacher they were reviewing had graduated from one of the five training programs. This subsample was asked to indicate if graduates from the program they identified (a) have a greater chance of being hired in their district and (b) are better prepared as classroom teachers than graduates of other programs at Michigan State. Their responses to these two questions are summarized in Table 7.*

* Only two supervisors indicated an awareness that the teacher they were rating had graduated from the CBTE program. Although this finding is perhaps interesting in its own right, it is virtually impossible to generalize from a sample of two individuals. Thus the analysis of data presented in Table 7 is generally limited to the other four programs.

Table 7: Supervisor Ratings of Hiring Potential and Thoroughness of Preparation Received by Graduates of Each Program*

A. Do you feel that graduates from this program have a greater chance of being hired in your district than graduates of other programs at Michigan State University?

	Yes	Not Sure	No
Regular (n=20)	15%	35%	50%
EIP (n=24)	50%	29%	21%
Cluster (n=21)	33%	48%	19%
Overseas (n=16)	-	63%	38%
CBTE (n=2)*	50%	-	50%

Chi-square = 18.84 (6df) $p < .01$

B. Do you feel that graduates from this program are better prepared as classroom teachers than graduates of other programs at Michigan State University?

	Yes	Not Sure	No
Regular (n=20)	5%	60%	35%
EIP (n=24)	54%	33%	13%
Cluster (n=20)	15%	75%	10%
Overseas (n=16)	6%	75%	19%
CBTE (n=2)*	-	-	100%

Chi-square = 35.62 (6df) $p < .001$

* See footnote in text.

In general, supervisor ratings of hiring potential and degree of preparation were most favorable for the EIP program and least favorable for the regular program. Supervisors appeared to be somewhat reluctant to rate the cluster and overseas programs on these two scales. Those who did

check a category other than "not sure." however, seemed somewhat more supportive of the cluster program than the overseas program.

II. Measures of Classroom Performance and General Attitudes Toward Student Teaching

-Introduction-

A second major purpose of this study was to determine if (a) general attitudes toward student teaching and/or (b) the classroom performance of those entering the teaching profession varied across years and programs. Five subscales on the graduate and supervisor surveys were constructed with this goal in mind. These subscales are as follows:

(1) Graduate Ratings of Their General Satisfaction with Student Teaching. (See Table B-3 in Appendix B)

(2) Self-Ratings of Performance Levels on a Specified List of Teaching Skills (See Table B-4 in Appendix B)

(3) Graduate Ratings of the Contribution of Student Teaching to the Development of Specified Teaching Skills (See Table B-5 in Appendix B)

(4) Supervisor Ratings of the Teacher's Commitment to Teaching (See Table B-7 in Appendix B)

-Subscale Reliabilities-

The first step in analyzing responses to the five subscales was to determine the reliability of each. The computer analysis which was conducted provided an index of the contribution of each item in a given subscale to the total reliability of that subscale. Using these indices as a base, three items were omitted from the General Satisfaction With Student

Teaching Subscale, and one item was omitted from each of the following subscales: Self-Ratings and Supervisor Ratings of Performance of Specified Skills and Supervisor Ratings of Performance of Specified Skills and Supervisor Ratings of Commitment to Teaching. These changes were designed to increase the internal consistency of each subscale. The items which were ultimately included in each of the five subscales are listed in Tables B-3 through B-7 in Appendix B.

Table 8: Intercorrelations Among the Five Subscales (Reliability Coefficients (alphas) are Presented in the Diagonal)

		(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
(1)	Graduates' ratings of satisfaction with student teaching (G-SST)	.853	.237	.608	.018	.038
(2)	Graduates' self-ratings of skill performance (G-SP)		.852	.304	-.004	-.043
(3)	Graduates' ratings of contributions of student teaching to skill development (G-CST)			.873	.064	.003
(4)	Supervisors' ratings of graduates' skill performance (S-SP)				.822	.747
(5)	Supervisors' ratings of graduates' commitment to teaching (S-CT)					.942

Reliability coefficients and intercorrelations among the five subscales are presented in Table 8. An examination of the values portrayed in the

diagonal of the intercorrelation matrix suggests that each of the subscales had a high level of reliability. Reliability coefficients ranged from alphas of .82 for supervisor ratings of skill performance to .94 for supervisor ratings of commitment to teaching.

With one or two exceptions, the off-diagonal correlation coefficients were comparatively low. This suggests that, in general, scores on the five subscales were relatively independent. However, there was a comparatively high relationship between the two measures of a graduate's attitude toward student teaching and supervisor ratings of skill performance and commitment to teaching.

Perhaps the most interesting figure portrayed in Table 8 is the correlation between supervisor ratings and self-ratings of performance of selected teaching skills. The correlation between these two measures of classroom performance was -.004. In other words, given the conditions which prevailed in this study (each supervisor rating only one of the teachers in his/her building), there was little or no relationship between how a teacher rated himself/herself in skill performance and how that teacher was rated on the same scale by his/her supervisor.

-Computation of Scores on Each Subscale-

An individual's score on each subscale was determined by adding his ratings across all items in the subscale and dividing that total by the number of items. $\text{Score} = \frac{\text{sum of ratings}}{\#\text{ subscale items}}$ This procedure allowed the investigators to compute meaningful subscale scores for those individuals who inadvertently failed to respond to one of the items in a given subscale. However, those individuals who failed to respond to two or more items in a subscale were omitted from the sample.

Only those individuals for whom there was a complete set of data, including supervisor ratings, were included in the Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) Tests which are reported in the next section. Fifteen of the 228 individuals who should have been included in this sample failed to respond to two or more items on one or more subscales and were therefore also excluded from the analysis.

-Differences in Mean Scores on the Five Subscales by Years and Programs-

The data in Table 9 depict the mean ratings on each subscale for each of the four years and five programs considered in this study. The results of analysis of variance tests of differences in mean scores on each sub-scale are also presented in this table. (See pages 38 through 42.)

These results support the following general conclusions:

(1) Although there was some variance in mean ratings of "General Satisfaction with Student Teaching," the observed differences were not statistically significant for years, programs, or the interaction of years and programs.

(2) Observed means for "Self-Ratings of the Performance of Selected Teaching Skills" were very close to the grand mean of 1.08 for all years and all programs. Those differences which occurred fell far short of statistical significance for years, programs, or the interaction between years and programs.

(3) (a) Although there appeared to be sizable differences in mean ratings of the "Contribution of Student Teaching to Skill Development" across the five programs, these observed differences were not statistically significant. The interaction

between years and programs also fell short of statistical significance.

(b) However, there was a significant inverse relationship between years of experience as a teacher and ratings of the contribution of student teaching to skill development. In other words, experienced teachers rated the contribution of student teaching to skill development at lower levels than did their less experienced colleagues.

(4 (a) "Supervisor Ratings of the Teacher's Performance of Selected Skills" did not appear to vary to any great extent across the five programs. Those differences in mean ratings which were observed fell far short of statistical significance. The same is true for the interaction between years and programs.

(b) "Supervisor Ratings of the Teacher's Performance of Selected Skills" did vary across the four years. In general, supervisors rated teachers with three or more years experience higher than they rated teachers with two or less years of experience.

(5) Although supervisors also appeared to rate experienced teachers higher than less experienced teachers on the "commitment to teaching" subscale, these observed differences were not statistically significant. The same was true for observed differences in mean ratings of commitment to teaching across the five programs as well as the interaction between years and programs.

In summary, there were no statistically significant differences in mean scores among the five programs for any of the subscales used in this study. There were also no statistically significant interactions between years and programs on any of the subscales. However, there were significant differences across the four years in mean scores on two subscales, the "Contribution of

Student Teaching to Skill Development" and "Supervisor Ratings of Skill Performance."

Table 9: Results of Analysis of Variance Tests Subscale Scores

GRADUATE RATINGS

Subscale 1: General Satisfaction With Student Teaching (G-SST)

Please indicate your level of agreement with each of the following statements (eg. Student Teaching was an enjoyable educational experience).

0 = strongly agree
1 = agree
2 = disagree
3 = strongly disagree

Grand Mean = .73 Standard Deviation = .564

Years	Mean Rating	Programs	Mean Rating
1969-70 (n=47)	.59	Regular (n=45)	.82
1971-72 (n=55)	.78	EIP (n=45)	.69
1974-75 (n=54)	.79	Cluster (n=53)	.76
1975-76 (n=57)	.60	Overseas (n=54)	.64
		CBTE (n=16)	.72

ANOVA

Source	df	F-ratio	statistical significance
Main Effects: years	3,195	1.67	N.S.
programs	4,195	.88	N.S.
Interaction: Years x programs	10,195	1.55	N.S.

(continued)

Table 9 (Cont.)

Subscale 2: Performance of Selected Skills: Self-Ratings (G-SP)

How would you rate your ability to apply this knowledge or skill in your classroom (eg. ability to establish rapport with students)?

0 = outstanding (top 10%) 2 = above average
1 = strong (top 25%) 3 = below average

Grand Mean = 1.08 Standard Deviation = .473

Years	Mean Rating	Programs	Mean Rating
1969-70 (n=47)	1.04	Regular (n=45)	1.07
1971-72 (n=55)	1.06	EIP (n=45)	1.03
1974-75 (n=54)	1.11	Cluster (n=53)	1.11
1975-76 (n=57)	1.13	Overseas (n=54)	1.07
		CBTE (n=16)	1.27

ANOVA

	df	F-ratio	statistical significance
Main Effects: years	3,195	.45	N.S.
programs	4,195	.58	N.S.
Interaction: Years x programs	10,195	.46	N.S.

(continued)

Table 9 (Cont.)

Subscale 3: Contributions of Student Teaching to Skill Development (G-CST)

To what extent did your student teaching experience promote the development of this skill? (eg. ability to formulate instructional goals and objectives)

0 = strong influence
1 = moderate influence
2 = limited influence
3 = little or no influence

Grand Mean = 1.24 Standard Deviation = .588

Years	Mean Rating
1969-70 (n=47)	1.46
1971-72 (n=55)	1.31
1974-75 (n=54)	1.15
1975-76 (n=57)	1.10

Programs	Mean Rating
Regular (n=45)	1.39
EIP (n=45)	1.11
Cluster (n=53)	1.21
Overseas (n=54)	1.30
CBTE (n=16)	1.12

ANOVA

Source	df	F-ratio	statistical significance
Main Effects: years	3,195	4.06	$p < .01$
programs	4,195	1.74	N.S.
Interaction: years x programs	10,195	1.06	N.S.

(continued)

Table 9 (Cont.)

SUPERVISOR RATINGS

Subscale 4: Performance of Selected Skills: Supervisor Ratings (S-SP)

How would you rate this teacher's ability to apply this knowledge or skill in the classroom? (eg. ability to establish rapport with students)

0 = outstanding (top 10%) 2 = above average
1 = strong (top 25%) 3 = below average

Grand Mean = 1.07 Standard Deviation = .648

Years	Mean Rating	Programs	Mean Rating
1969-70 (n=47)	.94	Regular (n=45)	1.15
1971-72 (n=55)	1.05	EIP (n=45)	1.01
1974-75 (n=54)	.98	Cluster (n=53)	1.10
1975-76 (n=57)	1.28	Overseas (n=54)	1.06
		CBTE (n=16)	1.00

ANOVA

Source	df	F-ratio	statistical significance
Main Effects: years	3,195	2.97	$p < .05$
programs	4,195	.33	N.S.
Interaction: years x programs	10,195	.49	N.S.

(continued)

Table 9 (Cont.)

Subscale 5: Supervisor Ratings of Commitment to Teaching (S-CT)

Please indicate the extent to which you agree with each of the following statements which refer to professional activities of this teacher (eg. actively participates in various in-service activities such as workshops and teacher committees).

0 = strongly agree
1 = agree
2 = disagree
3 = strongly disagree

Grand Mean = .61 Standard Deviation = .444

Years	Mean Rating
1969-70 (n=47)	.54
1971-72 (n=55)	.57
1974-75 (n=54)	.53
1975-76 (n=57)	.73

Programs	Mean Rating
Regular (n=45)	.66
EIP (n=45)	.60
Cluster (n=53)	.64
Overseas (n=54)	.49
CBTE (n=16)	.71

ANOVA

Source	df	F-ratio	statistical significance
Main Effects: year	3,195	1.78	N.S.
program	4,195	1.07	N.S.
Interaction: years x programs	10,195	1.36	N.S.

In yet another effort to determine if measures of classroom performance vary among years and programs, supervisors were asked to provide global ratings of their teacher's "overall competence as a teacher" and "level of commitment to the teaching profession." Whereas the five subscales considered earlier consisted of seven or more items on one of the surveys, both of the global assessments reflect responses to a single item on the supervisor's survey. Results of analysis of variance tests of observed differences in mean ratings of competence and commitment to teaching are presented in Table 10. As these results suggest, observed differences in global assessments of competence and commitment to teaching were not statistically significant for years, programs, or the interaction between years and programs.

Table 10: Results of an ANOVA Test of Supervisors' Global Ratings of Graduate Competence and Commitment to Teaching*

Program	Supervisors' Global Ratings of Competence		Commitment	
	Mean	n	Mean	n
Regular	1.49	(48)	1.00	(46)
EIP	.94	(49)	.78	(49)
Cluster	1.06	(52)	.91	(53)
Overseas	.81	(57)	.78	(58)
C.B.T.E.	1.28	(18)	.97	(18)
Grand Mean =	1.12		.89	
F-ratios: year	.97 (N.S.)		.88 (N.S.)	
program	.31 (N.S.)		.36 (N.S.)	
inter-action	1.22 (N.S.)		.75 (N.S.)	

* Scale: 0 = outstanding (top 10 percent of all teachers),
1 = strong (top 25 percent of all teachers),
2 = above average
3 = below average

-An Analysis of Individual Items-

In a final effort to determine if general attitudes toward student teaching and measures of classroom performance vary across years and programs, responses to individual items within the five subscales were analyzed in a series of Chi-Square Tests. The results of these analyses are presented in

Tables B-3 through B-7 in Appendix B.

Although the results of these tests reveal significant differences among years and/or programs on a few of the items, these results should be interpreted with caution for two reasons. First, responses to individual items are less reliable than scores derived from responses to sets of related items (subscales). Second, the total number of Chi-square tests which were conducted was so large that it is likely that one or more of the "statistically significant" differences may have resulted from chance alone.

(a) General Attitudes Toward Student Teaching

With these cautions in mind, consider the pattern of responses to four items on the "General Satisfaction with Student Teaching" subscale which are presented in Table 11. Responses to two related items which were not included in the subscale are also presented in this table. Responses to these six items did vary significantly across programs, even though total scores on the subscale did not. In general, the distribution of means on the six items follows a consistent pattern. Mean ratings of participants in the Overseas programs were typically the lowest, suggesting that this group "enjoyed" student teaching more and felt more "comfortable" with their college supervisors than was true for participants in other programs. Mean ratings of participants in the Regular Program, on the other hand, were typically the highest, suggesting that this group "enjoyed" student teaching less and felt less "comfortable" with their college supervisors than was true for participants in other programs. Given the consistency of the pattern of responses and the arbitrary decision not to include the last two items in this subscale, it seems reasonable to conclude that participants in the Regular and Overseas programs differed significantly in

Table 11: Significant Differences on Selected Items of the "General Satisfaction with Student Teaching" Subscale (N=535)

Scale: 0 = strongly agree 2 = disagree dis-
1 = agree 3 = strongly agree

Item	Mean Ratings: regular	EIP	cluster	overseas	CBTE	Chi-square (df. = 12)
Student teaching was an enjoyable educational experience	.69	.58	.78	.38	.65	29.97**
I would recommend my student teaching experience to any undergraduate preparing to enter the teaching profession	.89	.75	.79	.55	.83	27.90**
My student teaching program was responsive recommendations of participating classroom teachers and students	.99	.89	.88	.78	1.00	29.90*
My supervising teacher(s) provided frequent and/or valuable feedback regarding my lesson plans and classroom performance	1.35	.78	.96	.85	.78	20.27[a]
My (clinical consultant/ college supervisor) provided frequent, and/or valuable feedback regarding my lesson plans and classroom performance[b]	1.52	1.23	1.34	1.04	1.33	22.72*
I felt free to discuss my progress and problems with my (clinical consultant/ college supervisor)[b]	1.24	1.15	1.12	.85	1.07	35.12**

a $p < .06$
* $p < .05$
** $p < .01$
b This item was not included in the subscale

their "General Satisfaction with Student Teaching."

The "Contributions of Student Teaching to Skill Development" subscale also provided a measure of general attitudes toward student teaching. Responses to five items on this subscale are presented in Table 12. Responses to each of these items varied significantly across years. In general, the pattern of means across the four years parallels that of total scores on the subtest. As teachers gain years of experience, they are apt to decrease their ratings of the contributions of student teaching to skill development.

The pattern of responses for two of the items in this subscale also varied significantly across programs. The distribution of means on these two items suggests that participants in the CBTE program were more apt to feel that student teaching contributed significantly to their abilities to "formulate instructional goals and objectives" and skills in "evaluating one's own classroom and professional performance" than was true for participants in other programs.

(b) Measures of Classroom Performance

Responses to individual items on the three measures of classroom performance were also analyzed using Chi-square tests. The results for self-ratings of performance of specified skills are presented in Table B-4; those for supervisor ratings of performance are presented in Table B-5; and those for supervisor ratings of commitment to teaching are presented in Table B-6 of Appendix B.

As an examination of these tables suggests, there was not a single instance in which the pattern of responses to an individual item from one of the three subscales varied significantly across programs. This

Table 12: Significant Differences on Selected Items of the "Contribution of Student Teaching to Skill Development" Subscale (N = 388)

To what extent did your student teaching experience promote the development of this skill?	Scale: 0 = strong influence 1 = moderate influence 2 = limited influence 3 = little or no influence

- Year Effects -

Item	Sample Means 1969-70	1971-72	1974-75	1975-76	Chi-square (df. = 9)
Knowledge of educational theory and practice	1.63	1.64	1.32	1.36	18.62*
Ability to formulate instructional goals and objectives	1.48	1.27	1.14	1.20	20.27*
Ability to recognize and deal effectively with problems in student discipline	1.45	1.26	1.15	.85	17.98*
Ability to use effective questioning and interaction techniques in the classroom	1.33	1.44	1.18	1.12	18.41*
Ability to evaluate one's own classroom and general professional performance	1.49	1.31	1.07	.89	25.67**

- Program Effects -

Item	Sample Means Regular	EIP	Cluster	Overseas	CBTE	Chi-square (df = 12)
Ability to formulate instructional goals and objectives	1.35	1.15	1.29	1.41	.74	20.89*
Ability to evaluate one's own classroom and general professional performance	1.40	1.15	1.21	1.08	.81	20.54*

* $p < .05$
** $p < .01$

finding provides still further evidence that there were no significant differences in self-ratings of performance or supervisor ratings of performance and commitment to teaching among participants in the five programs considered in this study.

III. General Analysis of the Impact of Student Teaching on Professional Development

The third general purpose of this study was to determine the impact of various characteristic features of student teaching on professional development. Specifically, the study was designed to provide answers to the following questions:

(1) In the judgment of graduates, how much did student teaching, in general, contribute to one's performance as a classroom teacher?

(2) Is there a relationship between the type of school in which an individual is placed during student teaching and the school in which that individual works during his/her first year of teaching?

(3) How valuable are various instructional characteristics of the student teaching program?

(4) To what extent have various professionals in the student teaching experience influenced one's performance as a classroom teacher?

(5) When do students make a firm decision to seek a teaching position?

(6) Do graduate school enrollments vary by years and programs?

(7) How do graduates and supervisors rank the relative importance of various generic teaching skills?

(8) Is there a relationship between the level of performance suggested by one's student teaching report and various other measures of attitudes and performance?

(i) In the judgment of graduates, how much did student teaching, in general, contribute to one's performance as a classroom teacher?

Graduates who entered the teaching profession and their supervisors were asked to rate the contribution of various instructional experiences on their performance as a classroom teacher. These ratings are depicted in Table 13. Although there were slight differences in mean ratings of supervisors and graduates, the pattern of responses for the four experiences they were both asked to rate was the same. Graduates and supervisors agreed that student teaching and interactions with colleagues have had a moderate to strong influence on their classroom performance. In the judgment of both groups, graduate education courses and in-service programs in the schools have had a limited to moderate influence. Finally, graduate ratings of undergraduate methods courses and other undergraduate education courses also fell in the limited to moderate influence range, but were both viewed as somewhat less influential than the two experiences listed above.

A series of Chi-square analyses were conducted in an effort to determine whether or not the pattern of graduate ratings varied across years and programs. The results of these analyses are also presented in Table 13. Observed differences in mean ratings did not vary among graduates of the five programs for any of the six instructional experiences. With one exception, mean ratings also did not vary among graduates of different years. As the data in Table 13a.1 suggest, there was a direct relationship between years of experience and ratings of the influence of graduate education courses. In other words, the longer one has been teaching, the greater the perceived value of graduate education courses.

Table 13: Ratings of the Relative Influence of Various General Sources on One's Performance as a Classroom Teacher

How much have each of the following contributed to [your / this individual's] performance as a classroom teacher?

Scale: 0 = strong influence; 2 = limited influence
1 = moderate influence; 3 = little or no influence

Source	Mean Ratings: Graduates (n=approx. 400)	Mean Ratings: Supervisors (n=approx. 180)	Chi-squares: Years (df = 9)	Chi-squares: Programs (df = 12)
Student teaching	.68	.67	16.14	11.91
Interactions with colleagues	.85	.80	7.95	12.45
Graduate education courses	1.56	1.07	41.39**	10.38
Inservice programs in the schools	1.57	1.24	7.35	15.30
Undergraduate methods courses	1.86	-	13.36	13.46
Other undergraduate education courses	1.72	-	10.78	8.75

Table 13(a): Mean Ratings of the Influence of Graduate Education Courses on One's Classroom Performance by Years

Year	n	Mean Ratings
1969-70	94	1.33
1971-72	94	1.23
1974-75	103	1.69
1975-76	88	2.01

(2) Is there a relationship between the type of school in which an individual is placed during student teaching and the school in which that individual works during his/her first year of teaching?

In a series of related questions, graduates were asked to describe the the school in which they were placed during student teaching and the school in which they were initially assigned following graduation. As the data presented in sections A and B of Table 14 suggest, there is a clear relationship between the two schools in terms of the number of students in each (small, medium, or large) and the location of the school (urban, suburban, and rural). Individuals who student taught in a small school were very apt to teach in a small or medium sized school following graduation. Those who student taught in a medium sized school were most apt to be initially placed in a medium sized school. The group of individuals who student taught in a large school, on the other hand, appeared to be comparatively flexible in accepting initial teaching assignments in schools of various sizes.

The relationship between the location of the two schools (urban, suburban, rural) was equally strong and followed a consistent pattern. Those who accepted a teaching assignment in an urban school following graduation were most apt to have been placed in an urban school during student teaching; those who accepted an assignment in a suburban school were most apt to have student taught in a suburban school; and those who secured an assignment in a rural school were most apt to have student taught in a rural school.

The data presented in Section C of Table 14, on the other hand, suggest that there was no clear relationship between the type of school (public, private, or parochial) in which one was placed during student teaching and the type of school in which that person was initially employed.

Table 14: Relations Between School in Which One Student Teaches and School in Which One Is Initially Employed

A. Size of School (n=379)

Student Teaching \ 1st teaching position:	Small (n=115)	Medium (n=185)	Large (n=83)	TOTAL
Small (n=61)	52.5%	41.0%	6.6%	15.9%
Medium (n=209)	22.0%	59.8%	18.2%	54.6%
Large (n=109)	33.0%	29.4%	37.6%	28.5%
TOTAL	30.0%	48.3%	21.7%	

Chi-square = 51.41 (6df) $p < .001$

B. Location of School (n=382)

Student Teaching \ 1st teaching position:	Urban (n=116)	Suburban (n=142)	Rural (n=124)	TOTAL
Urban (n=165)	46.1%	23.0%	30.9%	43.2%
Suburban (n=143)	20.3%	53.1%	26.6%	37.4%
Rural (n=74)	14.9%	37.8%	47.3%	19.4%
TOTAL	30.4%	37.2%	32.5%	

Chi-square = 49.40 (4df) $p < .001$

(continued)

Table 14: continued

C. Type of School

Student Teaching \ 1st teaching position	public (n=338)	private (n=31)	parochial (n=14)	TOTAL
Public (n=325)	88.9%	6.8%	4.0%	84.6%
Private (n=51)	82.4%	15.7%	2.0%	13.3%
Parochial (n=8)	87.5%	12.5%	0.0%	2.1%
TOTAL	88.0%	8.1%	3.6%	

Chi-square = 5.74 (6df) N.S.

D. Grade Level and Subject Matter Taught

How similar was your initial teaching position and your student teaching experience in regard to grade level and subject matter taught?

Scale: 0 = very similar
1 = similar
2 = dissimilar
3 = very dissimilar

Years	n	Mean Rating
1969-70	90	.98
1971-72	87	1.25
1974-75	104	1.39
1975-76	103	1.48

Programs	n	Mean Rating
Regular	79	1.38
EIP	81	.98
Cluster	100	1.22
Overseas	96	1.50
CBTE	28	1.43

	Chi-square	df	statistical significance
Program effect	22.28	12	$p < .05$
Year effect	19.09	9	$p < .05$

In a further effort to determine if there is a similarity between one's student teaching experience and his/her initial teaching assignment, graduates were asked to indicate the level of similarity between the two experiences in regard to grade level and subject matter taught. Mean ratings of similarity are presented in Section D of Table 14 for each program and each year considered in the study. As these data suggest, there were sizable and statistically significant differences among the means for both years and programs. The degree to which one's initial teaching assignment is similar to student teaching in grade level or subjects taught declined steadily over the years considered in this study. Further, the degree of similarity was greater for the EIP program than for any of the other four programs.

(3) How valuable are various instructional characteristics of the student teaching program?

Graduates were asked to indicate the relative value of various instructional features of the student teaching program. Their responses are summarized in Table 15, which portrays mean ratings as well as the percent of graduates who indicated that a given option was not provided in their student teaching program. In the judgment of graduates, the opportunity to teach at more than one grade level or in more than one subject matter area had considerable value. However, approximately one-fourth of the graduates did not have an opportunity to participate in this experience during student teaching. According to graduates, observations in other classrooms and written midterm evaluations had moderate value; scheduled seminars had limited to moderate value; and, the student teaching handbook had limited value.

Table 15: Relative Value of Selected Aspects of the Student Teaching Experience

How valuable were each of the following aspects of the student teaching experience? (n=535)

Scale: 0 = great value 2 = limited value
1 = moderate value 4 = little or no value

Source	Mean Rating	% Times Did Not Occur in Student's Program
Opportunity to teach at more than one grade level or subject area	.37	24.6%
Observations in other classrooms	.87	13.9%
Written midterm evaluation of your teaching performance	1.04	25.4%
Scheduled seminars or meetings with other student teachers	1.51	6.6%
Student teaching handbook	2.13	23.2%

(4) To what extent have various professionals in the student teaching experience influenced one's performance as a classroom teacher?

Graduates were asked to indicate the extent to which interactions during student teaching with various individuals influenced their performance as a classroom teacher. A summary of their responses is provided in Table 16. It should come as no surprise that supervising teachers were rated as most influential and principals of the schools in which student teaching occurred were rated as least influential. Mean ratings of the

Table 16: The Influence of Key Individuals in Student Teaching on One's Performance as a Classroom Teacher

To what extent have interactions during student teaching with each of the following individuals influenced your performance as a classroom teacher? (N = 400)

Scale: 0 = strong influence 2 = limited influence
1 = moderate influence 3 = little or no influence

Source	Mean Rating	Chi-square Programs (df = 12)
Supervising teacher	.91	15.63
Cluster consultant/college supervisor	1.71	30.42**
Other teachers in school in which I student taught	1.82	14.49
Other student teachers in the program	1.90	29.82**
Principal of the school in which I student taught	2.28	19.57

** $p < .01$

Mean Ratings:

Source	Regular (n=85)	EIP (n=86)	Cluster (n=102)	Overseas (n=102)	CBTE (n=28)	Chi-square (df=12)
Cluster consultant/ college supervisor	2.12	1.38	1.74	1.61	1.82	30.42**
Other student tchrs. in program	1.76	1.60	2.00	1.76	2.07	29.82**

influence of each of these individuals did not vary among participants in different programs. Further, judgments of the extent to which one's classroom organization and style of teaching are similar to those of the super-

vising teacher were also invariate across programs. (See Table B-8 in Appendix B.)

Mean ratings of the influence of the cluster consultant/college supervisor and other student teachers in the program did vary among the five programs. Participants in the EIP program saw these individuals as having a stronger influence on their classroom performance than was true for participants in the other four programs.

(5) When do students make a firm decision to seek a teaching position?

Data presented in Table 17 suggest that approximately 70% of the graduates made a firm decision to seek a teaching position prior to the student teaching experience. Approximately 11% made this decision during student teaching and 19% did not make a firm commitment until after student teaching. Given the dramatic decrease in available teaching positions and the publicity surrounding this trend, it is somewhat surprising that these figures have not changed significantly during the years considered in this study.

However, there were significant differences in when a firm decision to seek a teaching position was made among participants in different programs. The proportion of individuals who made this decision prior to student teaching was largest for the EIP program and smallest for the Overseas program.

Table 17: Time at Which Students Make a Firm Decision to Seek a Teaching Position

When did you make a firm decision to actively seek a teaching position?

Programs	Prior to student teaching	During student teaching	After student teaching
Regular (n=84)	70.2%	10.7%	19.0%
EIP (n=85)	81.2%	10.6%	8.2%
Cluster (n=104)	70.2%	10.6%	19.2%
Overseas (n=102)	56.9%	13.7%	29.4%
CBTE (n=29)	65.5%	13.8%	20.7%
TOTALS	69%	12%	20%
Adjusted Totals	70.5%	10.9%	18.6%

	Chi-square	df	statistical significance
Program Effects	15.52	8	p < .05
Year Effects	2.41	6	N.S.

(6) Do graduate school enrollments vary by years and programs?

The data in Table 18 summarize responses to two questions regarding graduate enrollments, "How many graduate credits have you earned?" and "What proportion of your graduate credits have you earned at M.S.U.?"

It should come as no surprise that the number of graduate credits earned varied significantly across years. Whereas about 60% of those who graduated in the years 1969-72 have completed 25 or more graduate credits

and have therefore qualified for permanent certification. only about 10% of those who graduated in 1975-76 have reached this level. Because all participants in the CBTE program have graduated within the past three years, it should also come as no surprise that the number of graduate credits earned by participants in this program was lower than the corresponding

Table 18: Graduate School Enrollments by Years and Programs

How many graduate credits have you earned?

A. By Years

	N	0-24	25-48	More than 48
1969-70	110	40.0%	39.0%	20.9%
1971-72	109	40.5%	41.4%	16.2%
1974-75	153	77.1%	14.0%	8.9%
1975-76	158	89.9%	5.1%	2.5%
Totals	530	66.4%	22.5%	11.1%
Adjusted Totals		64.3%	21.4%	14.4%

B. By Programs

	N	0-24	25-48	More than 48
Regular	108	62.0%	20.4%	17.6%
EIP	107	63.6%	26.2%	10.3%
Cluster	130	66.9%	23.1%	10.0%
Overseas	125	65.4%	25.6%	9.6%
CBTE	60	81.7%	11.7%	6.7%

	Chi-square	df	statistical significance
Program Effects	25.97	16	$p < .05$
Year Effects	151.25	9	$p < .001$

(continued)

Table 18: continued

What proportion of your graduate credits have you earned at MSU?

A. By Years

	N	0-25%	26-75%	76% or more
1969-70	110	63.6	4.5	31.8
1971-72	107	61.7	4.6	33.6
1974-75	150	61.3	2.0	36.7
1975-76	150	78.0	3.3	18.7
TOTAL	517	66.7	3.4	29.8

B. By Programs

	N	0-25%	26-75%	76% or more
Regular	106	64.1 (68)	1.9 (2)	34.0 (36)
EIP	103	68.0 (70)	2.9 (3)	29.1 (30)
Cluster	129	65.1 (84)	2.3 (3)	32.6 (42)
Overseas	121	74.4 (90)	5.0 (6)	20.7 (25)
CBTE	58	56.9 (33)	6.9 (4)	36.2 (21)

	Chi-square	df	statistical significance
Program Effects	30.95	12	$p < .01$
Year Effects	20.27	9	$p < .05$

figure for the other four programs. Although graduate enrollments were reasonably consistent among participants in the other four programs, the proportion of graduates from the regular program who have completed more

than 48 graduate credits appears to be somewhat higher than the corresponding proportion of participants in the other programs.

The proportion of graduate credits which have been earned at Michigan State University also varied by years and programs. Approximately one-third of those who graduated during the years 1969-75 have earned 76% or more of their graduate credits at MSU. However, this figure dropped to about 19% for those who graduated during the 1975-76 academic year. Although this evidence is far from conclusive, it may suggest that limited job opportunities in areas serviced by MSU are effectively reducing the proportion of our graduates who return to MSU for their graduate work.

There were also significant differences in the proportion of graduate credits earned at MSU among participants in different programs. Participants in the CBTE program were most apt to complete their graduate work at MSU, participants in the Overseas program were least apt to do their graduate work here. These results provide further evidence of the mobility of the Overseas group and probably also reflect the heavy concentration of CBTE graduates in the Lansing area.

(7) How do graduates and supervisors rank the relative importance of various generic teaching skills?

Graduates and their supervisors were asked to assess the relative importance of most of the generic teaching skills which serve as a focus of the CBTE program. Both groups were also asked to assess the importance of two general knowledge areas; namely, knowledge of educational theory and practice and knowledge of subject matter. In each case, participants were asked to indicate the extent to which the knowledge or skill is "essential to success in teaching." Table 19 summarizes their responses.

Table 19: Graduate and Supervisor Ratings of the Importance of Specified Teaching Skills

To what extent is this skill essential to success in teaching?

Scale: 0 = crucial 2 = limited relevance
1 = important 3 = nonessential

Mean Ratings:

Skills	Graduate (n=approx. 400)	Supervisors (n=approx. 225)	Corresponding t-test
Ability to establish rapport with students	.20	.22	.58
Ability to recognize and deal effectively with problems in student discipline	.43	.46	1.65
Knowledge of subject matter	.73	.87	2.82**
Ability to maintain active student participation in classroom tasks	.45	.50	.42
Ability to communicate with parents and other teachers	.53	.52	.22
Ability to evaluate one's own classroom and general professional performance	.49	.61	1.31
Ability to provide a wide variety of instructional strategies and materials	.51	.53	-
Ability to use effective questioning and interaction techniques in the classroom	.63	.71	.79
Ability to collect and interpret data regarding student needs and achievement	.71	.72	-
Ability to formulate instructional goals and objectives	.59	.66	2.48*
Knowledge of educational theory and practice	1.20	.85	7.54**

* $p < .05$
** $p < .01$

Note: The correlation between mean ratings of graduates and supervisors = .88

Mean ratings of both graduates and their supervisors fell somewhere between "important" and "crucial" to success in teaching for all of the generic teaching skills on the list. Mean ratings of the importance of "knowledge of subject matter" also fell within this range. However, ratings of the importance of knowledge of educational theory and practice fell somewhat below this level, particularly among teachers.

The pattern of mean ratings was remarkably similar among teachers and supervisors. The correlation between the two sets of mean ratings was .88 suggesting that supervisors and graduates generally agreed on their ratings of the relative importance of each skill.

However, there were a few items on which the mean ratings differed in an absolute sense. Supervisor ratings of the importance of "knowledge of educational theory and practice" and an "ability to formulate instructional goals and objectives" were higher than those for teachers. Teacher ratings, on the other hand, were higher than supervisor ratings of the importance of "knowledge of subject matter."

(8) Is there a relationship between the level of performance suggested by one's student teaching report and various other measures of attitude and performance?

In an attempt to determine the predictive validity of student teaching reports, a subsample of 126 individuals (7 from each cell in the sampling matrix) was formed. Supervisor comments on the student teaching reports of each of these individuals were rated on a 5-point global scale of success developed by West (1968) and portrayed in Table 20. A panel of three qualified evaluators rated each report. There was unanimous agreement among the three raters on 54% of the reports which were assessed; two of the three raters agreed on each of the other reports.

Table 20: The Relation Between Student Teaching Reports and Other Measures of Classroom Performance (Supervising Teacher's Comments Only)

A. Mean Student Teaching Report Ratings by Years and Programs

Scale: 1 = Exceptional (top 2%)
2 = Highly Successful (top 15%)
3 = Successful (middle 70%)
4 = Less Successful (lower 15%)
5 = Passed but should not be teaching (lowest 2%)

Year	n	Mean Rating
1969-70	28	2.86
1971-72	28	2.79
1974-75	35	2.65
1975-76	35	2.57

Program	n	Mean Rating
Regular	28	2.82
EIP	28	2.71
Cluster	28	2.71
Overseas	28	2.54
CBTE	14	2.79

ANOVA

Source	df	F-Ratio	Statistical Significance
Main Effects: years	3.96	1.52	N.S.
programs	3.96	.98	N.S.
Interaction: years x programs	9.96	.90	N.S.

B. Correlations With Other Measures

Source	Correlation with Ratings of Student Teaching Reports
- Graduate Ratings -	
Satisfaction with student teaching subscale	.19
Self-rating of skill performance subscale	.04
Contribution of student teaching to skill development scale	.17
- Supervisor Ratings -	
Skill performance subscale	.13
Commitment to teaching subscale	.15
Global rating of competence	.09
Global rating of commitment to teaching	.01

Mean ratings of success suggested by student teaching reports are summarized in Table 20 for each of the four years and five programs. As these figures suggest, student teaching reports seem to have become progressively more favorable over the years considered in this study. There were also slight differences in means for each of the five programs. However, the results of an ANOVA test of these findings suggest that the differences among the observed means were not statistically significant for either years or programs.

As an index of predictive validity, ratings of success based on student teaching reports were compared with various other measures of performance. The correlations between ratings from student teaching reports and scores on other measures are described in Part B of table 20. Each of these correlations was remarkably low. In fact, the correlations between ratings of success based on student teaching reports and measures of an individual's attitudes toward student teaching were as high or higher than corresponding correlations for student teaching reports and the other measures of classroom performance which were obtained in this study.

IV. An Analysis of "General Comments"

Introduction

The final item on both the graduate and supervisor surveys was simply titled, "General Comments." Three hundred four of the 535 (56.8%) individuals who completed the graduate survey responded to this item. Comments ranged in length from one line to two typewritten pages. The proportion of graduates who responded did not vary significantly across the five programs.

Chart 1: Examples of the Classification of Comments Regarding the Undergraduate Teacher Preparation Program

general affective tone	target: Specific Teacher Education Program	Supervising Teacher	University Coordinator	Undergraduate Education Courses
Highly Favorable	"I participated in the overseas program for student teaching. I found this to be an outstanding program."	"I felt my student teaching supervising teacher was excellent."	"My coordinator was excellent, and his evaluations were invaluable, his ratings were both fair and encompassing wide areas of teaching performance."	"Mrs. ____'s methods classes are excellent; her role at MSU - teaching proper teaching methods to prospective teachers is as important as any one term of student teaching."
Favorable	"Overseas teaching program was an excellent experience, but the reality fell short when I returned to the States."	"Also, my student teaching experience was a success for me, due, I feel, to my supervising teacher."	"The coordinator provided ample counseling and on-the-spot training to help develop techniques and a professional attitude."	
Unfavorable	"MSU's secondary ed. program does little to prepare an individual for the real classroom."	"Unfortunately, my supervising teacher and I had an unresolvable conflict."		"Comments on Ed. courses in general. Most are too abstract and very hard to relate to the outside world."
Highly Unfavorable	"I feel that the regular student teaching program should be abolished."	"In terms of student teacher/consultant and supervising teacher/consultant relations we all suffered due to her incompetence."	"My coordinator supervisor in ____ was absolutely no help to me at all."	"Hopefully the collective data from the questionnaires will support the feelings of most graduates, and that is, that the educational courses were generally a waste of time."

In an attempt to summarize this important source of information, it was necessary to adopt a somewhat arbitrary classification system. An effort was made to classify both the type and affective tone of each statement. Statements were initially sorted into two groups, those which made some reference to a characteristic feature of an undergraduate program and those which did not. These general categories included references to specific undergraduate programs, supervising teachers, college coordinators, or undergraduate education courses other than student teaching. The second general category included references to the job market in education, the survey itself, or specific suggestions on how the undergraduate program might be improved. The affective tone of each statement was classified on a four point scale ranging from "highly favorable" to "highly unfavorable." Chart 1 illustrates the classification system which was used for those comments which referred to one's undergraduate program.

The data in Table 21 provide a summary of the frequency and affective tone of comments which referred to characteristic features of the undergraduate program. Nearly one-half of those who wrote comments directed at least some of their statements toward the program in which they had participated. Although the affective tone of comments in this category covered the full range, the number of positive statements was nearly double that of negative statements. Approximately 20% of the respondents commented on undergraduate methods courses or other required courses in education. The vast majority of these statements were unfavorable or highly unfavorable.

Approximately 15% of the graduates commented on their supervising teacher and about 9% referred to their college coordinator in their comments. Comments in both of these categories tended to be bimodally distributed in that they were either highly favorable or highly unfavorable.

Table 21: The Affective Tone and Relative Frequency of Comments Regarding Characteristic Aspects of One's Undergraduate Program*

Affective Tone	Referent: Specific Program	Supervising Teacher	University Coordinator	Undergrad Ed. Courses
Highly Favorable	47	21	13	1
Favorable	57	1	1	4
Unfavorable	26	5	5	14
Highly Unfavorable	20	18	8	44
Mean	2.13	2.44	2.30	3.60
Relative Frequency	(49.3%)	(14.8%)	(8.9%)	(20.7%)

* Reported figures represent the number of individuals who made a statement of this type.

-Program Differences-

An effort was also made to determine if the frequency and affective tone of comments regarding one's undergraduate program varied across the five programs considered in this study. Sections A and B of Table 22 summarize this analysis for both graduates and their supervisors. The numbers reported in Section A of this table represent the mean level of the affective tone of those statements which were classified in a given cell. The percents which are reported represent the proportion of individuals in a given group who directed at least some of their statements toward this characteristic feature of the undergraduate program.

Table 22: Relative Frequency and Affective Tone of Comments by Programs

Affective Scale:	1 = Highly Favorable	3 = Unfavorable
	2 = Favorable	4 = Highly Unfavorable

A. Comments Provided by Graduates:

Program	Mean Level of Affective Tone of Comments Directed Toward - Specific Programs	Supervising Teachers	University Coordinators	Undergrad Ed. Courses
Regular (n=58)	2.53 (51.7%)*	1.90 (17.2%)	2.50 (3.4%)	3.47 (25.8%)
EIP (n=66)	1.72 (54.5%)	3.44 (13.6%)	1.50 (9.1%)	3.86 (10.6%)
Cluster (n=57)	2.38 (42.1%)	2.30 (17.5%)	3.25 (7.0%)	3.60 (26.3%)
Overseas (n=57)	1.82 (66.7%)	2.37 (14.0%)	2.20 (17.5%)	3.50 (21.1%)
CBTE (n=28)	1.82 (39.3%)	1.60 (17.9%)	2.00 (7.1%)	3.71 (25.0%)
TOTAL** (N=304)	2.13 (49.3%)	2.44 (14.8%)	2.30 (8.9%)	3.60 (20.7%)

*Represents percent of individuals in the group who made some statement directed toward this characteristic feature of one's undergraduate program.

**Includes the responses of 38 individuals whose program could not be identified.

B. Comments Provided by Supervisors: (Most comments were directed toward the performance of the teacher: a few were directed toward the undergraduate program in which the teacher had participated)

Program in Which Teacher Participated	Total Frequency	# Favorable Comments	# Unfavorable Comments
Regular	13	11	2
EIP	9	9	0
Cluster	9	5	4
Overseas	17	17	0
CBTE	1	0	1
TOTAL	49	42	7

Approximately one-half of the total sample focused at least some of their statements on the student teaching program in which they had participated. The proportion of individuals who made statements of this type ranged from nearly 66% for the Overseas program to about 40% for the Cluster and EIP programs. The mean level of the affective tone of comments regarding one's student teaching program varied. Comments from participants in the EIP program were most favorable, comments from participants in the Regular program were least favorable.

There was also some variation across programs in the frequency of comments about undergraduate courses other than student teaching. Whereas only about 10% of the participants in the EIP program made comments of this type, approximately 25% of the participants in the other four programs made at least some statements regarding the quality of undergraduate education courses. The affective tone of comments of this type was consistently unfavorable across all five programs.

The frequency of comments directed toward supervising teachers and college coordinators was fairly constant across all five programs. In general, participants in the CBTE were more apt to make favorable comments about both of these individuals than was true for participants in the other four programs. The general affective tone of statements made by participants in the EIP program varied dramatically. Individuals in this group made generally favorable comments about college coordinators and critical comments about their supervising teachers. However, because of the comparatively low frequency of comments in these two categories and the bimodal distribution of those comments which did occur, these conclusions should be viewed as tentative at best.

Only 49 of the 228 (21.5%) supervisors completed the General Comments item. For the most part, these comments focused upon a general appraisal of the per-

formance of the teacher being considered. A few comments were directed toward the undergraduate program in which the teacher participated. A representative sample of supervisor comments is presented in Chart 2 in Appendix C.

In view of the low frequency of supervisor comments, no effort was made to classify statements by type. Further, the affective tone was classified simply as "favorable" or "unfavorable." The data in Section B of Table 22 provide an analysis of supervisor comments by programs. The frequency of comments regarding graduates from the Overseas program is comparatively high; the frequency of comments regarding CBTE graduates is lower than might be expected. In general, supervisors were most apt to make favorable statements about the teachers they were considering or about teacher education programs at Michigan State.

-Suggestions for Improving the Teacher Education Curriculum-

Approximately 20% of the graduates made suggestions of how the teacher education curriculum could be improved. These suggestions were occasionally spelled out in considerable detail. Examples of comments with this focus are presented in Chart 3 in Appendix C. The most frequent suggestion was to provide more classroom exposure, particularly during the initial stages of the program. The need for better placements during student teaching was also mentioned by several graduates. Most of these suggestions called for some form of screening of supervising teachers. Other suggestions which were made by four or more graduates include: provide more emphasis on skills in relating to administrators, aides, and/or parents; provide varied classroom experiences during student teaching; do a better job of counseling teacher certification candidates; and, provide some form of support during one's first year of teaching. Examples of comments in each of these categories are presented in

Chart 3. Comments which did not fit one of the categories listed above, but which deserve mention due to their length and/or degree of expressed concern are also presented in this chart.

-The Job Market-

Thirty-four graduates (11.3%) commented on the present job market in education. Virtually all of these comments were highly critical of the College of Education for preparing too many teachers or for not doing everything possible to assist graduates in finding jobs. Examples of comments regarding the job market in education are presented in Chart 4 in Appendix C.

-The Study Itself-

Fifteen graduates (5%) commented on the study itself. The affective tone of nine of these statements was generally positive and reflected the individual's willingness to participate in future surveys. The other six comments of this type questioned the quality of one or more items on the survey. The comment of one individual deserves special mention. It provides a powerful summary of the purpose of the study. "I only hope you can and will use this information to improve the teacher education program."

SECTION IV

SUMMARY AND GENERAL RECOMMENDATIONS

- Introduction -

Several efforts have been made to evaluate the quality of undergraduate teacher preparation programs at Michigan State University.* Without exception, however, these efforts have been comparatively limited in scope. Most have examined short-range outcomes through surveys of students who are actively enrolled in a given program. A few have looked at long-range effects through surveys of graduates, but these have always focused on only one of the programs offered at Michigan State. This study was therefore designed to provide a more comprehensive information base in that it sought to examine the long-range outcomes of five different teacher preparation programs (Regular Student Teaching, Cluster Student Teaching, Overseas Student Teaching, Elementary Intern Program, and the Competency-Based Teacher Education Program also known as POINTE) for four different years (1969-70, 1971-72, 1974-75, and 1975-76). The study also includes responses from supervisors of those individuals who are still active members of the teaching profession.

Two questionnaires were developed and field tested for use in this study. Both surveys - graduate and supervisor - were designed to address two general goals:

(1) To provide longitudinal data which might be used to plot trends in the professional development of those individuals who have received their provisional teaching certificates from Michigan State University.

---

* Examples are cited in the introductory section of this report.

- determine the comparative impact of selected undergraduate teacher preparation programs offered by Michigan State University on the subsequent professional development of program graduates.

A 4 x 5 sampling matrix suggested by the cross between the five teacher preparation programs and four years in which individuals student taught was used to identify graduates who were included in the sample. However, because there are no graduates of the CBTE program for the years 1969-70 and 1971-72, two of the twenty cells in this matrix are empty. A total of 1,080 surveys (18 x 60) were therefore mailed to a random sample of 60 individuals from each of the other 18 cells. Unfortunately, many of these surveys were returned with no forwarding address. Whenever this happened replacements were randomly selected from the relevant group. Despite this adjustment, 86 individuals could not be reached on either the first or second mailing. Thus the final sample consisted of 994 graduates. Fifty-four percent of this group completed the questionnaire.

The majority of the 536 graduates who completed the survey are still active members of the teaching profession. Ninety percent of these individuals voluntarily provided the name and address of their immediate supervisor. Of the 269 individuals identified in this fashion, 236 completed the supervisor survey, a return rate of 88 percent.

A variety of statistical tests were used to analyze responses to the graduate and supervisor surveys. These include analysis of variance, Chi-square, and product-moment correlating. The wealth of information provided by these analyses may be arbitrarily subsumed under one of three general categories - employment histories, significant differences in program outcomes, and attitudes toward characteristic features of the student teaching experience. The major findings in each of these areas may be briefly summarized as follows:

- Employment Histories -

A significant proportion of the items on the Graduate Study was devoted to information regarding employment histories. These included indices of the number of individuals who found teaching positions following graduation, the number who are still teaching, and reasons for not entering or for leaving the teaching profession. An analysis of the responses to these items suggests that there is reason to be both cautiously optimistic and pessimistic about employ- opportunities for our graduates.

(1) Percent secure teaching positions:

Perhaps most encouraging is the finding that the decline in enrollments has very nearly matched the decline in opportunities for employment. Nearly 2/3 of our graduates in 1975-76 were able to find teaching positions, a decline of only about om 1971-72, which was the most favorable year for employment.

(2) Fate of those who do not enter the profession:

It is also somewhat encouraging to find that the fate of individuals who do not find teaching positions has not changed significantly over the years considered in this stud

(i) Approximately 1/3 of the individuals in this group decided against teaching as a career or were willing to consider other alternatives such as graduate school or more promising jobs outside of the profession.

(ii) The most frequent problem facing individuals who are persistent in their efforts to locate a teaching position appears to be that of being tied to a particular geographical region. Approximately 1/3 of those who did not enter the profession indicated that a teaching position was

not available in the geographical area [illegible] they hoped to reside; less than 4% indicated that a teaching position was not available anywhere.

(iii) Approximately 85% of those who do not enter teaching find a salaried position outside the profession. Sixty percent of this group found jobs which were at least consistent with their level of education.

Despite sizable changes in employment opportunities within the teaching profession, these and other descriptive characteristics of individuals who do not locate teaching positions have not varied significantly across the years considered in this study.

(3) Type of teaching position initially secured:

The most discouraging, and perhaps most significant, finding is that the percent of individuals who enter the profession through "substitute teaching", "paraprofessional" or "part-time teaching" roles has increased dramatically during the years considered in this study. In 1969-70, only about 12% entered the profession in one of these roles; by 1975-76, this figure increased to 34%. The significance of this finding is suggested by the fact that [illegible] 1969-70 approximately two-thirds of those enrolled in student teaching could anticipate finding a full time classroom position following graduation; by 1975-76 this number had dropped to less than 50%. Thus it is not surprising that virtually all of the graduates who voluntarily commented on the current job market in education were highly critical of the College of Education for preparing too many teachers or for not doing everything possible to assist graduates in finding jobs.

(4) Graduate enrollments:

The job market also seems to have had an indirect negative impact on graduate enrollments at Michigan State. Not only are there fewer potential

students entering the profession, but the proportion of graduate credits earned at Michigan State University has also declined during the years considered in this study. It is likely that this decline can be at least partially traced to the lack of job opportunities in those geographical areas which are serviced by Michigan State.

(5) Individuals who leave the teaching profession:

Approximately 25% of those who enter the teaching profession in Michigan leave within the first 8 or 9 years. Most of those who leave do so during their first three years of teaching. The percent of individuals in our sample who have left the teaching profession varies from a high of only about 30% for graduates in 1970-71, to a low of about 17% for graduates in 1975-76. Thus the turnover rate among young, untenured teachers in Michigan is far higher than that for more experienced teachers.

Our data also suggests that fewer teachers are leaving the profession to raise a family. Conversely, the number who leave because teaching does not provide sufficient personal/professional challenge or because they can not obtain a teaching position in the area to which they subsequently move appears to be increasing.

Significant Differences in Program Outcomes

This study attempted to determine if there are significant differences in long-range outcomes of the five preparation programs. Outcome measures include employment histories, measures of classroom performance and perceptions of various characteristic features of the undergraduate program. Significant findings in this regard include the following:

(1) Employment Histories

(a) The decline in percent of graduates entering the profession has been most dramatic for the EIP program. In 1969-70 approximately 90% of the EIP graduates secured a teaching position following graduation; by 1975-76 this percent had declined to the level of employment for graduates of the Regular, Elective, and Overseas programs (approximately 65%). This decline seems to parallel the significant reduction in number of EIP students who were able to spend their final year in the program as intern teachers.

(b) The percent of CBTE graduates who are able to secure teaching positions following graduation is lower than that for graduates of the other four programs (approximately 50% versus 65% for the years 1974-76). Further, a higher proportion of those who do find teaching positions initially assume the role of substitute or part-time teachers. Thus only about 1/4 of the 29 CBTE graduates in our sample were able to secure a full-time teaching position following graduation. This finding may provide still further evidence of the problems encountered by those who are tied to a particular geographical area in that many of the CBTE graduates are committed to seeking jobs in the housing area.

(c) Despite the rather dramatic decline in the percent of EIP graduates who secure teaching positions following graduation, supervisors feel that graduates of this program are better prepared and have a greater likelihood of being hired in their district than graduates of the other four programs.

(2) Classroom Performance

(a) The Graduate and Supervisor Surveys included three general measures of classroom performance: self-ratings of performance on selected teaching

skills, [illegible] ratings provided by supervisors, and supervisor ratings of [illegible] to teaching. The reliabilities of these three measures were .85, .82, and .94. However, there were no statistically significant differences among graduates of the five programs on any of the three measures. [illegible], there were no significant differences among program [illegible] individuals [illegible]. Thus [illegible] program did not appear to yield different long-range effects [illegible] classroom performance.

(b) However, two findings regarding general measures of classroom performance are of interest:

(i) Given the conditions which prevailed in this study (each supervisor rating only [illegible] of the teachers in his/her building), there is little or no relationship between how a teacher rates himself/herself in [illegible] performance and how that [illegible] is rated on the same scale by his/her [illegible]. The correlation between these two measures was .08 in this study.

(ii) Supervisors appear to rate teachers with three or more years' experience higher than they rate teachers with two [illegible] of experience.

[illegible] An indirect measure of [illegible] performance [illegible] interest. The number of supervisors who [illegible] described the [illegible] of teachers in the "General Comments" section of the survey was higher for graduates of the [illegible] program than for graduates [illegible] the other programs. Without exception, these comments were favorable. EIP graduates were the only other group who received unanimously favorable reviews in this section of the survey.

Unfortunately, there may be several plausible explanations for the failure of this study to demonstrate significant differences among graduates of the five programs on general measures of classroom performance. It is possible, for example, that different outcomes were realized in each gram, but these differences dissipated over time such that they had essentially disappeared by the time this survey was conducted. It is also possible that the measures used in this study were simply not sensitive enough to detect long-range differences which do in fact occur. Further research is obviously needed to resolve conflicting explanations of this sort.

(3) Perceptions of various characteristic features of the undergraduate program:

(a) The graduate survey included two general measures of attitudes toward the student teaching experience - level of agreement with a series of statements reflecting "satisfaction with student teaching" and ratings of the "contribution of student teaching to the development of a selected list of teaching skills." The two subscales had reliability coefficients of .8[illegible] and [illegible]. However, there were no statistically significant differences among graduates of the five programs on [illegible] scale. Regardless of [illegible], individuals were typically satisfied with their student teaching experience and felt that this experience had a moderate to limited influence on the development of specific teaching skills.

(b) There is some evidence, however, that participants in the EIP, Overseas, and CBTE programs were more satisfied with their student teaching experience than participants in the Regular program. This evidence includes the following:

(i) Although the differences are not statistically significant, the mean level of response to items on the "general satisfaction with student teaching" subscale is lowest (most favorable) for the Overseas and EIP programs and highest for the Regular program.

(ii) There were statistically significant differences in response patterns to six items which reflect satisfaction with student teaching (e.g., "Student teaching was an enjoyable educational experience."). Participants in the Overseas program responded most favorably to five of these six items; participants in the Regular Program responded least favorably to four of the items.

(iii) Graduates of the EIP, Overseas, and CBTE programs were most apt to make favorable statements regarding their undergraduate programs in the "General Comments" section of the survey; graduates of the Regular program were most apt to make unfavorable comments of this type.

(iv) Although the differences were not statistically significant, mean ratings of the influence of student teaching on professional development were highest for graduates of the EIP and Overseas programs and lowest for graduates of the Regular program.

(v) There were significant differences in response patterns to two items on this subscale. Participants in the EIP program felt the student teaching experience had a moderately strong influence on the development of their abilities to formulate instructional goals and objectives and to evaluate their own performance. Participants in the other four programs rated the influence of student teaching at a lower level on these two items.

(vi) Graduates of the EIP program felt that their college supervisors and other [illegible] in the program had a greater influence on their performance as classroom teachers than is true for graduates of the other four programs. Individuals in this group were also the most apt to make favorable statements about their university coordinators in the "General Comments" section of the survey.

(4) Personal characteristics:

(a) Students are more or less arbitrarily assigned to three of the programs considered in this study. The two exceptions are the EIP and Overseas Programs. This study provides evidence that these two programs attract different types of students. In general, participants in the Overseas program appear to be more [illegible] and more willing to consider alternatives to teaching than is true for participants in the EIP program. Consider the following:

(i) Over 50% of the Overseas graduates who did not enter the teaching profession decided against teaching as a career or were willing to consider other alternatives such as graduate school or more promising jobs outside of education. Less than [illegible]% of the EIP graduates checked one of these three statements as their reason for not entering the profession; [illegible]% of the EIP graduates indicated that a teaching position was not available in the geographical area in which they hoped to reside.

(ii) 81% of the EIP graduates made a firm decision to seek a teaching position prior to the time they student taught; only 57% of the Overseas graduates had made this decision by this time.

(iii) Although the difference is not statistically significant, 84% of the EIP graduates who entered the teaching profession are still teaching; only 70% of the Overseas graduates who entered the profession are still teaching.

(b) Graduate enrollment patterns also reveal some interesting differences among programs. These include:

(i) Graduates of the Regular program are most apt to have completed more than 48 graduate credits.

(ii) Graduates of the CBTE program are most apt to have completed a sizable proportion of their graduate credits at Michigan State; graduates of the Overseas program are least apt to have done most of their graduate work here.

In brief, although this study failed to provide evidence that the five preparation programs have a differential long-range impact on classroom performance, it did provide evidence of significant differences in employment histories, specific attitudes toward characteristic features of the student teaching experience, graduate enrollment patterns, and personal characteristics of those who elected to enter one of the two optional programs.

- Attitudes Toward Characteristic Features of the Student Teaching Experience -

Several of the items on the graduate survey were designed to provide general information for those who are responsible for implementation of the student teaching experience. Significant findings in this general area include:

(1) In the judgement of both graduates and their supervisors, student teaching and interactions with colleagues represent the two most important general influences on one's performance as a classroom teacher. Both are seen as more influential than graduate education courses, in-service programs in the schools, undergraduate methods courses, and other undergraduate education courses. This rank order does not differ across programs or years. However, there is a significant direct relationship between the perceived influence of graduate education courses on one's classroom performance and years of experience as a classroom teacher.

(2) There is a significant relationship between the size (small, medium, large student population) and location (urban, suburban, rural) of the school in which one student teaches and the size and location of the school in which one is initially employed.

(3) In the judgement of our graduates, the opportunity to teach at more than one grade level or subject area is more valuable than any other characteristic feature of the student teaching experience. Other features, in descending order of perceived value, include observations in other classrooms, written midterm evaluations, scheduled seminars, and the student teaching handbook. Further, approximately 1/4 of our student teaching programs do not provide the opportunity to teach at more than one level, written midterm evaluations, or use of the student teaching handbook.

(4) In the judgement of our graduates, supervising teachers have a moderate influence on one's performance as a classroom teacher; cluster consultants or college supervisors, other teachers in the school in which one student teaches, and other student teachers have a limited influence; and the principal of the school in which one student teaches has the least influence of individuals associated with student teaching.

(5) Although 80% of our graduates are willing to work with student teachers from M.S.U., only about 1/4 would be willing to work with more than one student teacher per academic year.

(6) Approximately 70% of our students make a "firm decision to seek a teaching position" prior to student teaching. Approximately 10% make this decision during student teaching and about 20% make this commitment after student teaching. Although these percentages do vary across programs, they have remained constant across the years considered in this study.

(7) Only about 1/3 of the individuals included in this sample have completed 25 or more graduate credits. This figure ranges from a high of approximately 60% for graduates in 1969-70 and 1971-72 to a low of approximately 8% for the 1975-76 graduates. Further, approximately 2/3 of our graduates have completed less than 25% of their graduate credits at Michigan State.

(8) Teachers and their supervisors perceive each of the CBTE generic teaching skills which were cited in this survey as "important" to "crucial" to success in teaching.

(9) Overall levels of performance suggested by supervising teacher comments on Student Teaching Reports have not differed significantly across the years of programs considered in this study. However, the correlations between these ratings and other measures of classroom performance are very low. Thus self-ratings, supervising teacher ratings, and supervisor ratings do not appear to provide highly correlated measures of classroom performance.

(10) Several graduates provided suggestions for improving the teacher education curriculum in the "General Comments" section of the survey. The

most frequent suggestions include: provide more classroom exposure, particularly during the early stages of the program; improve placement procedures during student teaching by more carefully screening either supervising teachers or student teachers; offer more varied experiences during student teaching; equip teachers with skills in relating to administrators, aides, or parents; do a better job of counseling teacher certification candidates; and, provide some support during the first year of teaching.

- General Recommendations -

The data reviewed in this report support a host of specific and general conclusions. They provide substantial support for each of the following general recommendations:

(1) The wealth of information provided by this study exceeded even the most optimistic expectations of the authors. It is therefore readily apparent that Michigan State should conduct comprehensive and systematic follow-up studies of graduates and their supervisors. Such studies should feature:

(i) the early identification of members of the sample in order to avoid the horrendous problem of locating current addresses, increase the range of available information, and establish meaningful dialogue with graduates on something other than a hit or miss basis.

(ii) interviews and observations as well as surveys. (Suggestions for items which should be included in the next survey are presented in Chart F-1 of Appendix F.)

(iii) The formal assignment of one or more members of the faculty to this project. Those energies required to complete this survey far exceeded the expectations of the authors and others associated with the project.]

(2) We should be more vigorous in our efforts to locate and maintain intern positions and in the development and implementation of meaningful programs for substitute teachers. The significant decline in employment opportunities for EIP graduates which parallels the decline in intern positions and the dramatic increase in the number of individuals who enter teaching as substitutes provides ample evidence of the link between "intern" experiences and employment opportunities. To the extent that we can develop and implement comprehensive 5-year programs, we will not only provide more complete and meaningful training, we will also enhance the employment opportunities of our graduates.

(3) If student attitudes are considered a barometer of success, it is clear that any effort to improve the quality of existing programs or to develop new programs should concentrate first and foremost on the field-based component. It is obvious from this and numerous other studies that graduates perceive the "student teaching" experience as far more influential than any of the course work required for certification. Thus improvements in this phase of the program are more apt to promote favorable attitudes than corresponding improvements in the course-work components. Evidence from this study suggests that

(i) there should be greater classroom exposure, particularly during the early phases of the program.

(ii) Field-based experiences should be more varied and should always include the opportunity to observe and teach at more than one grade level or subject matter area.

(iii) Greater attention should be given to the placement of students in schools, including the size and location of schools as well as training and level of commitment of supervising teachers.

(iv) Each program should be sensitive to the fact that only about 1/4 of all teachers would be willing to work with more than one student teacher per academic year.

(4) The clear difference in personal characteristics of those who elected to enroll in the EIP and overseas programs has a number of intriguing implications, particularly at Michigan State which is committed to the concept of offering alternative teacher preparation programs. Minimally, the preliminary findings of this study suggest that this area should serve as the focus of further research. If such an analysis did reveal that different programs do, in fact, attract different types of students, it might be possible to provide meaningful matches between programs and students. The type of student a given program attracts might also be used as a measure of program effectiveness. These and other possibilities suggest that this area should receive further attention in future efforts to evaluate teacher preparation programs.

There are several other specific and general conclusions suggested by the data from this study. It is the deliberate intent of the authors that each reader will reach his/her own conclusions when reviewing the results presented in earlier sections. We offer only the caution that sampling and other limitations inherent in the study severely restrict the generalizability of each analysis. Thus the findings should not be viewed as precise or definitive descriptions. Rather each should be treated in probabilistic terms and should serve as a stimulus to discussion among all who have a stake in teacher preparation programs.

SECTION V

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Alost, Robert. "Teacher Education Follow-Up." Journal of Health, Physical Education and Recreation 44 (September 1973): 67.

Baer, G. Thomas, and Foster, Walter S. Teacher Preparation--What Graduates Tell Us. Bethesda, Md.: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 1[illegible] 1975.

Berliner, David C., and Tidunoff, William J. "The California Beginning Teacher Evaluation Studies: Overview of the Ethnographic Study." Journal of Teacher Education 27 (Spring 1976): 24-30.

Bornstein, Tina. "A Follow-Up Study Comparing Graduates' and Supervisors' Ratings of the Effectiveness of Michigan State University Teacher Education Programs (1969-76)." Ph.D. Dissertation, Michigan State University, 1978.

Bradley, Banks. "Overseas Follow-Up Study." East Lansing: Michigan State University Department of Student Teaching, 1971.

Bradley, Banks, "Overseas Student Teaching: A Follow-Up Report as an Assessment of Intercultural Experiences in Student Teaching." East Lansing: Michigan State University Department of Student Teaching, 1975.

Carey, Lou M. An Investigation of the Validity of Using Self-Evaluation Needs. Bethesda, Md.: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 142579, 1977.

Carpenter, James A. Report of a Survey of Placement of Teacher Education Graduates of Western Kentucky University for Academic Years, 1969-70, 1970-71, 1971-72, and 1972-73. Survey No. 2. Bethesda, Md.: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 090177, 1974.

Conley, James. "Personality Characteristics of Female Elementary Intern Program and Conventional Program Students." Michigan State University, East Lansing, Mi., 1968.

Comeaux, Pamela Harris. A Follow-Up Study of 1967-70 Cooperative Urban Teacher Education Graduates. Bethesda, Md.: ERIC Documentation Reproduction Service, ED 100925, 1975.

Copley, Patrick O. A Study of the Affect of Professional Education Courses in Beginning Teachers. Bethesda, Md.: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 098147, 1975.

Crisp, Raymond D. The Professional Competency of Illinois Secondary School English Teachers: A Report of the Self-Evaluations of Experienced Illinois Secondary School English Teachers. Interim Report. Bethesda, Md.: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 029889, 1968.

Drummond, Robert J. 1976 Follow-Up of 1970-76 College of Education Graduates. University of Maine, Orono. Bethesda, Md.: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 141306, 1977.

Edgar, Eugene, and Niel, Richard S. "Results of a Competency Based Teacher Training Program." Exceptional Children, September 1976, pp. 33-35.

"Elementary Intern Program Follow-up Study." By Robert Scrivens, Chairman, Michigan State University, East Lansing, Mi., 1973.

Fitch, Thomas, and Klima, Kenneth. Elementary Teaching Graduates of Illinois State University 1970-71, A Comparative Study: Regular Student Teaching Program Graduates and Joliet Teacher Education Center Graduates. Normal, Illinois: State University, 1972.

Freeman, Donald. "Developmental Changes in Attitude Among Participants in a Competency-based Teacher Education Program." Michigan State University, East Lansing, Mi., 1976.

Freeman, Donald, and Helmke, Bea. "Student Perceptions of the Competency-based Teacher Education Program at Michigan State University: A Formative Report. Michigan State University, East Lansing, Mi., 1975.

Goldenberg, Ronald. The Relationships Between Principals' and Teachers' Perceptions of the Quality of College Preparation for Teaching Competence. Bethesda, Md.: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 131075, 1977.

Gosnell, John W. "The Relationship Between Work Experience and Occupational Aspiration and Attrition from Teaching." Clearing House, December 1977. pp. 176-179.

Grommon, Alfred H., editor. The Education of Teachers of English for American Schools and Colleges, 1963. Bethesda, Md.: ERIC Document Reproduction Services, ED 024687, n.d.

Hanna, Lyle, and Others. Reports on 'Teach' Teacher Education for Advancing the Culturally Handicapped, Elementary Teacher Preparation. Bethesda, Md.: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 014459, 1967.

Hanna, Lyle, and Others. Reports on 'Teach' Teacher Education for Advancing the Culturally Handicapped, Secondary Teacher Preparation. Bethesda, Md.: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 014460, 1967.

Hardbeck, Richard J., and Others. Individualization of Instruction by Vocational and Nonvocational Teachers: Self Reports Compared with Observations. Bethesda, Md.: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 131202, n.d.

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

Johnson, Granville B. Evaluation of the University of South Alabama College of Education Teacher Training Program by Analysis of its Alumni, 1971. Bethesda, Md.: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 060050, 1972.

Johnson, Granville B. Evaluation of the University of South Alabama College of Education Teacher Training Program by Analysis of its Alumni, 1969. Bethesda, Md.: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 060050, 1972.

Kauffman, Dan, and Others. Assessment of Teacher Preparation Programs. Bethesda, Md.: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 095176, 1974.

Michigan Department of Education. Development of a Competency Based Secondary Teacher Education Program Model. Lansing, Mi.: Michigan Department of Education, 1975.

Michigan Department of Education. Development of a Competency Based Teacher Education Program Focusing on the Directed Teaching Experience. Lansing, Mi.: Michigan Department of Education, 1976.

NCATE. Standards for Accreditation of Teacher Education. Washington, D.C.: NCATE, 1977.

Rosser, R. Stephen, and Denton, Jon J. "Assessing Recent Teacher Education Graduates Using a Two Scaled Instrument." Education, Fall 1977. pp. 97-104.

Rusk, Elizabeth H. A Study of Secondary Teachers of English Who Graduated from Michigan State University. East Lansing, Michigan: Michigan State University, 1967.

Sandefur, J. T. An Illustrated Model for the Evaluation of Teacher Education Graduates. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1970.

Sandefur, J. T., and Adams, Ronald A. "An Evaluation of Teaching: An Interim Research Report." Journal of Teacher Education 27 (Spring 1976): 71-76.

Sandefur, J. T., and Adams, Ronald A. "Case Study of Second Year Teacher Education Graduates." Journal of Teacher Education 24 (Fall 1973): 248-249.

Singh, P. H., and Allen, Elaine S. University of South Florida, Tampa, College of Education, Follow-up Study: Early Intervention Program. Bethesda, Md.: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 097795, 1974.

"Study of 1974 Elementary Intern Program Graduates." By William L. Cole, Chairman. Michigan State University, East Lansing, Mi., 1974.

Swami, Pivush. A Follow-Up Study for Evaluation of the Preservice Secondary Science Teacher Education Program at the Ohio State University. Bethesda, Md.: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 113200, 1976.

Tittetoe, Jack O. "Why First-Year Teachers Fail." Phi Delta Kappan. January 1977, pp. 429-430.

Vest, Bradley. "A Study of Computer-Scored Group Holtzman Inkblot Variables as Related to Student Teaching Success, Major Teaching Fields, and Sex." Ph.D. Dissertation, Michigan State University, 1968.

APPENDIX A

DESCRIPTIONS OF THE SAMPLING PROCEDURE

Chart A-1 Calendar for the Collection of Data

Fall, 1976 through Summer, 1977 -
Development of questionnaires and selection of graduate sample.

Fall, 1977 -
Identification of most promising addresses using M.S.U. Alumni Association files, Student Teaching files, and M.S.U. student telephone directories, in that order.

December, 1977 -
Graduate questionnaires and self-addressed return envelopes were mailed on December 10th.

January, 1978 -
(a) Replacements were randomly selected for those questionnaires which were returned with no forwarding addresses. These individuals were sent the original packet of materials.
(b) Graduates in the initial sample who had not completed the questionnaires were sent a second packet which contained a reminder letter signed by an individual in the College who might be recognized by the graduate and a second copy of the questionnaire.
(c) The initial group of supervisor surveys and self-addressed return envelopes were mailed on January 16. Supervisors who were identified after that date received the packets in mid-February.

March, 1978 -
A second packet of materials was sent to those supervisors who had not returned the initial questionnaire.

April, 1978 -
Collection of data was terminated as of April 30th. Returns received after that date were not included in the analysis.

May-June, 1978 -
Data analysis was completed using computer programs included in the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences.

Table A-1: Number of Graduate and Supervisor Questionnaires Which Were Returned for Each Cell in the Sampling Matrix

Note: The ratios reported in each cell represent the number of questionnaires returned divided by the number of surveys which were successfully mailed.

YEARS / PROGRAMS	Regular	EIP	Cluster	Overseas	CBTE	YEAR TOTALS
1969-70						
Population N	2,367	230	121	72	-	2,790
graduates	30/57	26/56	29/55	25/46	-	110/214
supervisors	8/15	16/16	12/14	17/17	-	53/62
1971-72						
Population N	1,174	265	1,216	72	-	2,727
graduates	24/58	24/53	30/57	33/52	-	111/220
supervisors	12/16	11/13	18/21	18/19	-	59/69
1974-75						
Population N	808	150	438	71	176	1,643
graduates	26/55	34/59	36/56	24/52	33/55	153/277
supervisors	13/13	10/15	14/18	8/8	11/13	56/67
1975-76						
Population N	863	180	383	61	183	1,670
graduates	28/57	25/56	36/58	46/57	27/55	162/283
supervisors	13/16	12/12	13/15	15/19	7/9	60/71
PROGRAM TOTALS	5,212	825	2,158	276	359	8,830
	108/227	109/224	131/226	128/207	60/110	535/994 = 53.8%
	46/60	49/56	57/68	58/63	18/22	228/269 = 84.8%

Table A-2: Level of Student Teaching by Programs

	N	Special Educ.	Lower Elem.	Upper Elem.	Middle/ Jr. High	Senior High
Regular	107	7.5%	17.8%	14.0%	17.8%	43.0%
EIP	109	7.3%	56.0%	27.5%	9.2%	-
Cluster	131	3.1%	21.4%	9.2%	22.9%	43.5%
Overseas	127	12.6%	33.1%	11.0%	13.4%	29.9%
CBTE	59	1.7%	25.4%	23.7%	33.9%	15.3%
TOTAL	533	6.9%	31.0%	15.9%	18.0%	8.1%

APPENDIX B

SUPPLEMENTARY ANALYSES

Table B-1: Percent of Graduates Securing a Full-Time Teaching Position by Level of Student Teaching

Level of Student Teaching	N	% Who Initially Secured a Full-Time Teaching Position
Special Education	33	63.6%
Lower Elementary	130	63.8%
Upper Elementary	66	71.2%
Middle School	65	78.5%
High School	104	62.5%

Chi-square = 2.96 (4 df) N.S.

Table B-2: Internal Mobility of Teachers

(For those who still hold a teaching position) In how many schools have you worked?

Years	Number of Schools: One	Two	Three or more
1969-70 (n=66)	30%	44%	26%
1971-72 (n=64)	38%	22%	41%
1974-75 (n=78)	59%	22%	19%
1975-76 (n=89)	65%	23%	12%

	Chi-square	df	statistical significance
Program Effect	13.45	12	N.S.
Year Effect	37.50	9	$p < .001$

Table B-3: Item Analysis - General Satisfaction With Student Teaching Subscale (N=515).

Scale:	0 = strongly agree	2 = disagree
	1 = agree	3 = strongly disagree

A. The Seven Item Scale

	Mean	Standard Deviation	Chi-squares Programs (df = 12)
Student teaching was an enjoyable educational experience	.60	.718	29.97**
My student teaching experience provided a practical and useful preparation for teaching.	.72	.743	13.20
I would recommend my student teaching experience to any undergraduate preparing to enter the teaching profession.	.74	.818	27.90**
My student teaching program was responsive to recommendations of participating classroom teachers and students.	.89	.679	29.90*
I was encouraged throughout student teaching to develop my own unique style of teaching.	.96	.847	19.67
My supervising teacher(s) provided frequent and/or valuable feedback regarding my lesson plans and classroom performance	.87	.882	20.27
I felt free to discuss my progress and problems with my supervising teacher(s).	.76	.806	14.70

* p < .05
** p < .01

B. Related Items Not Included in the Scale:

	Mean	Standard Deviation	Chi-squares Programs (df = 12)
I believe my presence as a student teacher contributed to the development of a better educational experience for the students enrolled in my supervising teacher's classroom.	.81	.655	12.63
My (clinical consultant/college coordinator) provided frequent, and/or valuable feedback regarding my lesson plans and classroom performance.	1.28	.934	22.72*
I felt free to discuss my progress and problems with my (clinical consultant/college coordinator).	1.07	.906	35.12**

Table B-4: Item Analysis - Graduate Self-Ratings of Skill Performance Subscale (N=192)

Scale: How would you rate your ability to apply this knowledge or skill in your classroom?

0 = outstanding (top 10% of all teachers)
1 = strong (top 25% of all teachers)
2 = above average
3 = below average

	Means	Standard Deviations	Chi-Squares Year (df=9)	Chi-Squares Program (df=12)
Knowledge of educational theory and practice	1.52	.715	12.89	10.25
Knowledge of subject matter*	.85	.650	12.28	10.86
Ability to establish rapport with students	.68	.717	5.98	14.93
Ability to communicate with parents and other teachers	1.01	.745	6.97	7.54
Ability to formulate instructional goals and objectives	1.27	.723	7.08	8.48
Ability to provide a wide variety of instructional strategies and materials	1.19	.793	4.62	11.56
Ability to collect and interpret data regarding student needs and achievement	1.38	.754	7.60	5.58
Ability to maintain active student participation in classroom tasks	1.08	.761	5.29	5.94
Ability to recognize and deal effectively with problems in student discipline	1.15	.862	8.72	13.88
Ability to use effective questioning and interaction techniques in the classroom	1.21	.749	7.88	13.57
Ability to evaluate one's own classroom and general professional performance	1.09	.746	4.64	17.63

*deleted from subscale

Table B-5: Item Analysis: Contributions of Student Teaching to Skill Development Subscale (N=388)

Scale: To what extent did your student teaching experience promote the development of this skill?

0 = strong influence
1 = moderate influence
2 = limited influence
3 = little or no influence

	Means	Standard Deviations	Chi-Squares Years (df=9)	Chi-Squares Programs (df=12)
Knowledge of educational theory and practice	1.54	.921	18.62*	15.58
Knowledge of subject matter	1.20	.918	10.96	6.94
Ability to establish rapport with students	.83	.826	12.31	16.40
Ability to communicate with parents and other teachers	1.41	.948	11.41	8.14
Ability to formulate instructional goals and objectives	1.26	.925	20.27*	20.89*
Ability to provide a wide variety of instructional strategies and materials	1.26	.927	12.16	19.67
Ability to collect and interpret data regarding student needs and achievement	1.73	.884	10.27	13.19
Ability to maintain active student participation in classroom tasks	1.09	.876	15.16	10.05
Ability to recognize and deal effectively with problems in student discipline	1.18	1.005	17.98*	10.37
Ability to use effective questioning and interaction techniques in the classroom	1.26	.911	18.41*	18.34
Ability to evaluate one's own classroom and general professional performance	1.18	.926	25.67**	20.54*

* $p \leq .05$
** $p < .01$

Table B-6: Item Analysis: Supervisor Ratings of Skill Performance Subscale (N=219)

Scale: How would you rate this teacher's ability to apply this knowledge or skill in the classroom?

0 = outstanding (top 10% of all teachers)
1 = strong (top 25% of all teachers)
2 = above average
3 = below average

	Means	Standard Deviations	Chi-Squares: programs (df=12)
Knowledge of educational theory and practice	1.15	.770	10.74
Knowledge of subject matter*	.84	.768	4.60
Ability to establish rapport with students	.73	.785	5.58
Ability to communicate with parents and other teachers	.99	.829	10.41
Ability to formulate instructional goals and objectives	1.10	.811	15.47
Ability to provide a wide variety of instructional strategies and materials	1.03	.783	14.20
Ability to collect and interpret data regarding student needs and achievement	1.21	.851	5.80
Ability to maintain active student participation in classroom tasks	.93	.765	11.91
Ability to recognize and deal effectively with problems in student discipline	1.03	.861	8.88
Ability to use effective questioning and interaction techniques in the classroom	1.11	.804	11.04
Ability to evaluate one's own classroom and general professional performance	1.15	.821	6.53

* Deleted from subscale

Table B-7: Item Analysis: Supervisor Ratings of Commitment to Teaching Subscale (n=211)

Scale: The Teacher whose name appears above...

0 - strongly agree
1 - agree
2 - disagree
3 - strongly disagree

	Means	Standard Deviations	Chi-Squares Programs (df=12)
Establishes cooperative relations with colleagues and various support personnel in the building	.51	.597	14.45
Is receptive to "promising" new ideas or approaches to teaching	.55	.595	7.64
Maintains appropriate professional conduct and appearance	.53	.596	4.53
Actively participates in various in-service activities such as workshops and teacher committees	.66	.667	12.92
Assumes a leadership role within the informal social structure of the school	.94	.718	12.00
Is resourceful in creating and using available instructional materials	.57	.623	8.79
Completes professional assignments and responsibilities in a competent and dependable manner	.46	.571	5.68

Table B-8: The Influence of Supervising Teachers on One's Classroom Organization and Style of Teaching

To what extent is your classroom organization and style of teaching similar to that of the teacher(s) who supervised your student teaching experience?

Scale: 0 = very similar
1 = similar
2 = somewhat dissimilar
3 = little or no similarity

Year \ Program	Regular (n=85)	EIP (n=86)	Cluster (n=104)	Overseas (n=100	CBTE (n=28)	TOTAL
	Mean Ratings					
1969-70 (n=100)	1.68	1.12	1.64	2.35		1.68
1971-72 (n=97)	1.86	1.95	1.60	1.13		1.61
1974-75 (n=110)	1.37	1.28	1.66	1.87	1.74	1.59
1975-76 (n=101)	1.42	1.13	1.44	1.55	1.67	1.45
TOTAL	1.64	1.38	1.59	1.66	1.71	

	Chi-square	df.	statistical significance
Program Effect	8.40	12	N.S.
Year Effect	8.81	9	N.S.

Table B-9: Willingness to Supervise Student Teachers from MSU

Imagine that MSU has an active student teaching program in your district. How many student teachers would you be willing to supervise each year? (N=395)

	Total # Responses
none	18.2%
one	57.2%
two	18.7%
three or more	5.8%

	Chi-square	df	Statistical Significance
Year Effects	7.11	9	N.S.

APPENDIX C

EXAMPLES OF "GENERAL COMMENTS"
PROVIDED BY GRADUATES AND THEIR SUPERVISORS

Chart C-1: A Representative Sample of Comments Made By Supervisors

A. Positive Comments Regarding the Teacher's Performance:

"This has been the most difficult form I have ever completed. _____ is a very good teacher, I feel MSU may have contributed to this but I think he would be a good teacher coming from any teacher education school."

"_____ was one of the most outstanding teachers I have ever worked with. She is a credit to her profession and to MSU."

"_____ is an outstanding young teacher. She is well grounded in theory as well as in practice. Her classroom performance is much better than any teacher of her limited experience should be expected to perform."

"Thanks for the opportunity of 'rating' _____. I honestly considered her to be one of my best teachers ever. (I have sixteen years experience as a principal.) _____ probably had more innate talent than most of us put together in our building. Her art room was the best example of a work center that I have experienced. Thus, I have rated her quite high. However, besides being very talented she could get kids involved. Perhaps, she learned the latter at Michigan State."

"_____ is a totally dedicated, excellent teacher. She has applied for an elementary administrator position in our district and I am highly recommending her for the position."

"_____ is what he is primarily because of the person _____ is. If he reflects MSU then MSU is #1; if he simply reflects himself, then he is #1."

B. Critical Comments Regarding the Teacher's Performance:

"This teacher was prepared in a subject area and does not have a very good knowledge of dealing with students or developing sequential skills within her content area."

"_____ would be a superior college professor. He has some difficulty in high school."

"_____ has had a bad year. Techniques used in the classroom were poor. He has been receptive to constructive criticism and is improving."

C. Comments Which Refer to Teacher Education Programs at MSU:

"I find MSU does well in Teacher Education -- period."

"EIP is one of the better teacher training approaches in the country. I feel that the methods classes still have a long way to go."

Chart C-1 (continued):

"I am very much in favor of the CBTE approach or intern program approach for the training of future teachers."

"I have nothing but the highest, most enthusiastic regard for the EIP program. My experience has convinced me that, given a choice, I would be highly biased to choose a teacher for my building that had been trained in this program. Their grasp of the realities of the profession is practical, their background of experience is broad and their acceptance of guidance and cooperative sharing is very high. Friday night, or I'd say more."

"General education courses generally are of little consequence in helping out new teachers; theory has very limited application without a practical base as a control."

Chart C-4: Examples of Suggestions for Improving the Teacher Education Curriculum

1. Provide more classroom exposure, particularly during the early stages of the program (n=18)
Examples include:

"The only problem as I saw it was that 'would be' teachers should have to do more work in real classrooms."

"I strongly feel that experience based classes are the most valuable. The more methods classes can be connected to classroom practice the better."

"I feel clinical or student teaching type of experiences should be entered earlier in the program."

"I feel methods classes should deal with actual classroom applied techniques."

"Regarding student teaching: it was much too late in my program, and much too short in length."

"If I were to make just one suggestion on the student teaching program, I would suggest that there be a term of mostly observation in the sophomore year, and 2 terms in the senior year."

2. Improve placement procedures during student teaching by more carefully screening either supervising teachers or student teachers (n=10)
Examples include:

"I think student teaching is a very valuable experience, but better care should be taken to provide good supervising teachers."

"I feel that those teachers directing student teachers should be more carefully screened for abilities in the classroom and attitudes towards students."

"More evaluations of supervising teachers and college coordinators."

"When a supervising teacher is given a student teacher, an interview system where the supervisor has an opportunity to screen candidates would be helpful."

"Save student teaching positions for those who really want them."

3. Offer more varied experiences during student teaching (n=5)
Examples include:

"I feel that when a person student teaches for a term that he/she should be required to teach 5 weeks in a lower elementary classroom and 5 weeks in an upper elementary classroom."

"Perhaps student teaching experiences should be split between 2 different types of schools so that the student teacher can experience different situations.

Chart 6-2 (continued):

4. Equip teachers with skills in relating to administrators, aides, or parents (n=4)
Examples include:

"Student teaching did little to prepare me for the problems of coping with administrators."

"I was in fact angry with MSU for not enlightening me especially in the area of administration and roles within the system. And this was nearly fatal to my career."

"This is my first year of teaching - we have aides. It would be helpful to teach students how to select, use, and handle problems with their aides i.e. tardiness, lack of motivation, personality clashes, etc.)

"Prepare your students more for dealing with parents. Let them observe and participate in conferences."

5. Do a better job of counseling teacher certification candidates (n=4)
An example:

"If you could help the undergrad education majors set up their schedules at the very start so they could have their essentials and gain the confidence to go on you'd be doing the best thing possible."

6. Provide some support during the first year of teaching (n=4)
Examples include:

"I am presently substitute teaching. I wish the local school systems would sponsor workshops and seminars for those of us engaged in subbing. It seems to me that they could be very educational and beneficial for us."

"While the student teaching experience is usually very valuable, it is not a realistic situation. As a union rep I have counseled several first year graduates who were floundering and had no one to give the necessary support and suggestions...It would be very beneficial if there was a teacher supervisor for at least the first semester a graduate has a job and is entirely on their own."

7. Other comments:

"Teach the students in the education classes what goes on, not what some idealistic educator feels should go on."

"My year of substitute teaching provided a far more valuable learning experience than the one term of student teaching. One does not survive as a sub if the ability to manage the classroom is lacking."

Chart C-2 (continued):

"I feel that students should have to sub for one year before getting a full-time teaching position."

"More problem solving in college; more emphasis on psychology (physical and mental problems)."

"There should be more undergraduate instruction in group dynamics. This is left to teachers to learn on their own."

"Education courses have the reputation of being just so much B.S. and wasted time (and money)...with the glut of teachers on the market there is no excuse for turning out anything but the best."

Chart C-3: Examples of Comments Related to the Job Market in Education

"Second, when they recruit, tell people what their real chances are of having a teaching position, their intern year. When I went through, there was a lot of 'false advertising'."

"It doesn't matter how good you are if there is no opening there is no job."

"Despite the lack of available teaching positions, I believe the Department of Education could have made much more of an effort to assist graduates in finding work."

"I have been teaching 5½ years, I still find myself on the bottom of the seniority ranking and I have been pink slipped several times."

"Please send more information on exactly how to go about (names and addresses) my getting a teaching job anywhere (including overseas) for the 1978-1979 school year as soon as possible. THANKS!"

"You've got to be kidding. I can't even get an interview, let alone a teaching job."

"Personally, I tried without any success, for 3 years to obtain a job in my geographical area."

"I was a substitute teacher for 2½ years. This experience totally turned me off to teaching. I now have a job outside of education."

"Who really cares what kind of a classroom teacher will I be? Certainly not MSU."

"We were trained under the impression that 'There's always a job for a good teacher.'! That may sound very impressive to an undergraduate who hasn't started looking for a job, but after seeking meaningful employment for over two years without success, that type of idealism doesn't pay the rent."

APPENDIX D

COVER LETTERS SENT TO PARTICIPANTS

D-1 Initial Letters Which Were Sent to Each Participant

MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION · DIVISION OF
STUDENT TEACHING AND PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT
ERICKSON HALL

EAST LANSING · MICHIGAN · 48824

Dear Participant,

As a part of our continuing effort to improve teacher education programs at Michigan State University, we are conducting a follow-up study of past student teachers. You are a part of a randomly selected sample from this group. From your responses to the enclosed questionnaire, we can identify strengths and weaknesses of our teacher education program. In this way graduates will have a significant input in our efforts to improve the ongoing programs. We therefore urge you to take 15 to 20 minutes of your time to complete the questionnaire.

The final question on the survey asks you to name your principal or supervisor. A shorter questionnaire will be sent to him/her. Although this survey will ask your supervisor to rate certain aspects of your performance, the purpose is clearly to evaluate the success of our student teaching program as seen by administrators. We will therefore never analyze or report data for individual teachers! If for any reason you would rather not cooperate in this phase of the study, please complete the questionnaire, omitting only item #83.

All data from both the teacher and supervisor surveys will be published in group form only. A specific respondent will never be identified by name by the research team. Thus all personal information will be kept strictly confidential. We sincerely appreciate your cooperation in this important study.

Respectfully,

W. Henry Kennedy
Director

INSTRUCTIONS

PLEASE:

1. Carefully record your response to each item in the appropriate space on the IBM answer sheet.
2. Use a soft (#2) lead pencil.
3. Write your name at the top of the IBM answer sheet and questionnaire.
4. Detach page 8 of the questionnaire (which includes additional comments you wish to make) and enclose it and the IBM answer sheet in the return addressed envelope. Discard or keep the first seven pages of the questionnaire!
5. Enclose a self-addressed stamped envelope if you wish a copy of the final report.

D-1 (continued):

MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION · DIVISION OF
STUDENT TEACHING AND PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT
ERICKSON HALL

EAST LANSING · MICHIGAN · 48824

January 16, 1978

Dear Supervisor,

As a part of our continuing effort to improve teacher education programs at Michigan State University, we are conducting a follow-up study of former students. An important phase of this study will be to evaluate the success of our undergraduate programs as seen by those who currently supervise our graduates. The teacher who is identified on the enclosed questionnaire voluntarily provided your name and address as their direct supervisor.

From your responses we can gain some insight into the activities and teaching performance of our former students. In this way, graduates and their supervisors can have a significant input in our efforts to improve ongoing programs. We therefore urge you to take approximately 10 minutes of your time to complete the questionnaire.

Your response to the questionnaire will be analyzed and reported by undergraduate programs only. Thus all personal information will be kept strictly confidential and will never be analyzed or reported for individual teachers, supervisors, or school systems. We sincerely appreciate your cooperation in this important study.

Respectfully,

W. Henry Kennedy
Director of Student Teaching

INSTRUCTIONS

Please:

1. Carefully record your response to each item in the appropriate space on the IBM answer sheet.
2. Use a soft (#2) lead pencil.
3. Write your name at the top of the IBM answer sheet and questionnaire.
4. Insert the questionnaire in the enclosed envelope and return.
5. Enclose a self-addressed stamped envelope if you wish a copy of the final report.

D-2: Follow-Up Letters to Those Who Did Not Initially Respond

MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY EAST LANSING · MICHIGAN 48823

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION · OFFICE OF THE DEAN · ERICKSON HALL

January 16, 1978

Dear Participant,

In December, you should have received a letter requesting your participation in a major study of the undergraduate teacher preparation programs at Michigan State University. Although many individuals have returned the questionnaires, we have not yet received your response.

Because the number of returns from former participants in the regular student teaching program is comparatively small, we fear that you and other graduates of this program may not be adequately represented in our efforts to improve undergraduate programs. We therefore urge you to take 15 to 20 minutes of your time to complete this important survey. *

The earlier letter also described our desire for you to supply the name of your supervisor so that we may evaluate the success of our undergraduate programs as seen by administrators. Data from both the enclosed questionnaire and the supervisor survey will be kept strictly confidential and will be published in group form only. If for any reason you would rather not include your supervisor's name, please complete the questionnaire, omitting only item #83.

If you have already returned the questionnaire, please disregard this letter. We sincerely appreciate your cooperation in this important study.

Sincerely,

Keith Goldhammer
Dean

* On the chance that you may have inadvertantly misplaced the original letter, we have enclosed another copy of the questionnaire as well as a stamped envelope.

INSTRUCTIONS

Please:

1. Carefully record your response to each item in the appropriate space on the IBM answer sheet.
2. Use a soft (#2) lead pencil.
3. Write your name at the top of the IBM answer sheet and questionnaire.
4. Insert the questionnaire in the enclosed envelope and return.
5. Enclose a self-addressed envelope if you wish a copy of the final report.

D-2 (continued):

MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION — EAST LANSING · MICHIGAN · 48824
DEPARTMENT OF ELEMENTARY AND SPECIAL EDUCATION

January 16, 1978

Dear Participant,

In December, you should have received a letter requesting your participation in a major study of the undergraduate teacher preparation programs at Michigan State University. Although many individuals have returned the questionnaires, we have not yet received your response.

Because the number of returns from former participants in the Elementary Intern Program is comparatively small, we fear that you and other graduates of this program may not be adequately represented in our efforts to improve undergraduate programs. We therefore urge you to take 15 to 20 minutes of your time to complete this important survey. *

The earlier letter also described our desire for you to supply the name of your supervisor so that we may evaluate the success of our undergraduate programs as seen by administrators. Data from both the enclosed questionnaire and the supervisor survey will be kept strictly confidential and will be published in group form only. If for any reason you would rather not include your supervisor's name, please complete the questionnaire, omitting only item #83.

If you have already returned the questionnaire, please disregard this letter. We sincerely appreciate your cooperation in this important study.

Respectfully,

James E. Snoddy, Chairman
Elementary and Special Education

* On the chance that you may have inadvertantly misplaced the original letter, we have enclosed another copy of the questionnaire as well as a stamped envelope.

INSTRUCTIONS

Please:

1. Carefully record your response to each item in the appropriate space on the IBM answer sheet.
2. Use a soft (#2) lead pencil.
3. Write your name at the top of the IBM answer sheet and questionnaire.
4. Insert the questionnaire in the enclosed envelope and return.
5. Enclose a self-addressed envelope if you wish a copy of the final report.

D-2 (continued):

MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION · DIVISION OF STUDENT TEACHING AND PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT
ERICKSON HALL
EAST LANSING · MICHIGAN · 48824

January 16, 1978

Dear Participant,

In December, you should have received a letter requesting your participation in a major study of the undergraduate teacher preparation programs at Michigan State University. Although many individuals have returned the questionnaires, we have not yet received your response.

Because the number of returns from former participants in the overseas student teaching program is comparatively small, we fear that you and other graduates of this program may not be adequately represented in our efforts to improve undergraduate programs. We therefore urge you to take 15 to 20 minutes of your time to complete this important survey. *

The earlier letter also described our desire for you to supply the name of your supervisor so that we may evaluate the success of our undergraduate programs as seen by administrators. Data from both the enclosed questionnaire and the supervisor survey will be kept strictly confidential and will be published in group form only. If for any reason you would rather not include your supervisor's name, please complete the questionnaire, omitting only item #83.

If you have already returned the questionnaire, please disregard this letter. We sincerely appreciate your cooperation in this important study.

Respectfully,

Banks Bradley

Banks Bradley
Associate Professor

BB/cg

* On the chance that you may have inadvertantly misplaced the original letter, we have enclosed another copy of the questionnaire as well as a stamped envelope.

INSTRUCTIONS

Please:

1. Carefully record your response to each item in the appropriate space on the IBM answer sheet.
2. Use a soft (#2) lead pencil.
3. Write your name at the top of the IBM answer sheet and questionnaire.
4. Insert the questionnaire in the enclosed envelope and return.
5. Enclose a self-addressed envelope if you wish a copy of the final report.

D-2 (continued):

MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION · DIVISION OF
STUDENT TEACHING AND PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT
ERICKSON HALL

EAST LANSING · MICHIGAN · 48824

January 16, 1978

Dear Participant,

In December, you should have received a letter requesting your participation in a major study of the undergraduate teacher preparation programs at Michigan State University. Although many individuals have returned the questionnaires, we have not yet received your response.

Because the number of returns from former participants in the CBTE student teaching program is comparatively small, we fear that you and other graduates of this program may not be adequately represented in our efforts to improve undergraduate programs. We therefore urge you to take 15 to 20 minutes of your time to complete this important survey. *

The earlier letter also described our desire for you to supply the name of your supervisor so that we may evaluate the success of our undergraduate programs as seen by administrators. Data from both the enclosed questionnaire and the supervisor survey will be kept strictly confidential and will be published in group form only. If for any reason you would rather not include your supervisor's name, please complete the questionnaire, omitting only item #83.

If you have already returned the questionnaire, please disregard this letter. We sincerely appreciate your cooperation in this important study.

Respectfully,

Robert Hatfield

Robert Hatfield
Professor

* On the chance that you may have inadvertantly misplaced the original letter, we have enclosed another copy of the questionnaire as well as a stamped envelope.

INSTRUCTIONS

Please:

1. Carefully record your response to each item in the appropriate space on the IBM answer sheet.
2. Use a soft (#2) lead pencil.
3. Write your name at the top of the IBM answer sheet and questionnaire.
4. Insert the questionnaire in the enclosed envelope and return.
5. Enclose a self-addressed envelope if you wish a copy of the final report.

D-2 (continued):

MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION · DIVISION OF
STUDENT TEACHING AND PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT
ERICKSON HALL

EAST LANSING · MICHIGAN · 48824

March 8, 1978

Dear Supervisor,

Recently, you should have received a letter requesting your participation in a major study of the undergraduate teacher preparation programs at Michigan State University. Your name was provided by one of the graduates in our study. Although most have returned the questionnaire, we have not yet received your response.

Because the total number of supervisors in our study is comparatively small, we are anxious to maximize the number of returned questionnaires. This will insure that supervisor evaluations of the success of our undergraduate programs is based upon a representative sample. Such a sample will provide critical information regarding the activities and teaching performance of our former students.

If you have already returned the questionnaire, please disregard this letter. We sincerely appreciate your cooperation in this important study. On the chance that you may have inadvertantly misplaced the original letter, we will send you another copy of the questionnaire in approximately two weeks.

Sincerely,

Dr. Henry Kennedy
Director

HK:dme

APPENDIX E

THE GRADUATE AND SUPERVISOR QUESTIONNAIRES

SURVEY OF M.S.U. COLLEGE OF EDUCATION GRADUATES

Name _____ Student Number _____

Term(s) in which you student taught _____ Year Graduated _____

INSTRUCTIONS: PLEASE RECORD YOUR RESPONSE TO EACH ITEM IN THE APPROPRIATE SPACE ON THE ANSWER SHEET WHICH HAS BEEN PROVIDED.

1-4 How would you characterize your STUDENT TEACHING EXPERIENCE?

1. Level:
   1. Special Education
   2. Lower Elementary
   3. Upper Elementary
   4. Middle or Jr. High
   5. Senior High
2. Type of School:
   1. Public
   2. Private
   3. Parochial
3. School Setting:
   1. Urban
   2. Suburban
   3. Rural
4. Number of Students in the School:
   1. Small
   2. Medium
   3. Large

---

5. In which of the following student teaching programs did you participate?
   1. Regular
   2. Overseas
   3. Cluster
   4. EIP
   5. CBTE
   6. Other (please specify) _____
6. Did you secure a teaching position following graduation?
   1. Yes (please answer items 7-14 below)
   2. No (please skip to items 15 and 16 below)

DO NOT ANSWER ITEMS 7 THROUGH 14 IF YOU DID NOT SECURE A TEACHING POSITION FOLLOWING GRADUATION (SKIP TO ITEM 15 BELOW).

7. What type of position did you initially secure?

1. Substitute teaching
2. Paraprofessional Role
3. Support Position (e.g. librarian, consultant, etc.)
4. Part-Time Classroom Teaching
5. Full-Time Classroom Teaching
6. Administration
7. Other (please specify) _____

8-10 How would you characterize your INITIAL TEACHING EXPERIENCE? (Check all which apply)

8. Type of School:
1. Public
2. Private
3. Parochial

9. School Setting:
1. Urban
2. Suburban
3. Rural

10. Number of Students in the School:
1. Small
2. Moderate
3. Large

11. How similar was your initial teaching position and your student teaching experience in regard to grade level and subject matter taught?

1. Very Similar
2. Similar
3. Dissimilar
4. Very Dissimilar

12. Do you still hold a teaching position?

1. YES (Please answer item 13 below)
2. NO (Please skip to item 14 below)

13. (For those who still hold a teaching position) In how many schools have you worked?

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

SKIP TO ITEM 18

14. (For those who do not still hold a teaching position) Please check the statement which best describes your reasons for leaving the teaching profession.

1. Did not provide sufficient personal/professional challenge or satisfaction.
2. Left to raise a family.
3. Found a more rewarding job outside the profession.
4. Could not obtain a teaching position in area to which I subsequently moved.
5. Other (Please specify) _____

SKIP TO ITEM 18

DO NOT ANSWER ITEMS 15, 16, AND 17 IF YOU SECURED A TEACHING POSITION FOLLOWING GRADUATION (SKIP TO ITEM 18 BELOW).

15. Please check the statement which best describes your reason for not entering the teaching position.....

1. Decided against teaching as a career.
2. Entered graduate school.
3. A teaching position was not available in geographical area in which I hoped to reside.
4. A teaching position was not available anywhere.
5. Offered a job outside of education which promised greater rewards.
6. Other (Please specify) _____

16. Which of the following best describes the position you held during the year following college graduation?

1. Not employed in a paid position - SKIP TO ITEM 18
2. Held a social services position other than teaching.
3. Employed in professional and/or administrative role.
4. Employed in clerical and/or technical role.
5. Self-employed.
6. Unskilled or semi-skilled labor.
7. Other (Please specify) _____

17. To what extent was the college education you received essential to success in this position?

1. Advancement in this position required even more college education than I had received.
2. Advancement did not require any further college education.
3. I did not need as much college education as I had already received to secure and advance in this position.

---

18. How many graduate credits have you earned?

1. 0 - 12 credit hours
2. 13 - 24
3. 25 - 36
4. 37 - 48
5. More than 48 credit hours.

19. What proportion of your graduate credits have you earned at MSU?

1. 0 - 25%
2. 26 - 50%
3. 51 - 75%
4. 76 - 100%

THE STUDENT TEACHING EXPERIENCE

20 - 30 Please indicate your level of agreement with each of the following statements by marking the corresponding response on your answer sheet.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
20. Student teaching was an enjoyable education experience.	1	2	3	4
21. My student teaching experience provided a practical and useful preparation for teaching.	1	2	3	4
22. I would recommend my student teaching experience to any undergraduate preparing to enter the teaching profession.	1	2	3	4
23. My student teaching program was responsive to recommendations of participating classroom teachers and students.	1	2	3	4
24. I was encouraged throughout student teaching to develop my own unique style of teaching.	1	2	3	4
25. I believe my presence as a student teacher contributed to the development of a better educational experience for the students enrolled in my supervising teacher's classroom.	1	2	3	4
26. My supervising teacher(s) provided frequent and/or valuable feedback regarding my lesson plans and classroom performance.	1	2	3	4
27. I felt free to discuss my progress and problems with my supervising teacher(s).	1	2	3	4
28. My (clinical consultant/college coordinator) provided frequent and/or valuable feedback regarding my lesson plans and classroom performance.	1	2	3	4
29. I felt free to discuss my progress and problems with my (clinical consultant/college coordinator).	1	2	3	4

30. How would you characterize your rapport with students during student teaching?

1. Excellent
2. Good
3. Fair
4. Poor

How valuable were each of the following aspects of the student teaching experience?

	Great Value	Moderate Value	Limited Value	Little or No Value	Did not occur in my program
1. Scheduled seminars or meetings with other student teachers.	1	2	3	4	5
2. Observations in other classrooms.	1	2	3	4	5
3. Opportunity to teach at more than one grade level or subject area	1	2	3	4	5
4. Student teaching handbook.	1	2	3	4	5
5. Written midterm evaluation of your teaching performance.	1	2	3	4	5

EXPERIENCE AS A PRACTICING CLASSROOM TEACHER

PLEASE DO NOT RESPOND TO ANY MORE ITEMS ON THIS QUESTIONNAIRE IF YOU HAVE NEVER HELD A CLASSROOM TEACHING POSITION. IF YOU WISH TO ADD ANY COMMENTS, PLEASE DO SO IN ITEM 84 ON THE FINAL PAGE.

36. When did you make a firm decision to actively seek a teaching position?

1. Prior to student teaching.
2. During student teaching.
3. Following student teaching.

37. To what extent is your classroom organization and style of teaching similar to that of the teacher(s) who supervised your student teaching experience?

1. Very similar
2. Somewhat similar
3. Somewhat dissimilar
4. Little or no similarity

38. Imagine that MSU has an active student teaching program in your district. How many student teachers would you be willing to supervise each year?

1. None
2. One
3. Two
4. Three or more

To what extent have interactions during student teaching with each of the following individuals influenced your performance as a practicing classroom teacher?

	Stong Influence	Moderate Influence	Limited Influence	Little or No Influence
39. Supervising teacher	1	2	3	4
40. Cluster consultant/college supervisor	1	2	3	4
41. Other teachers in the school in which I student taught	1	2	3	4
42. Other student teachers in the program	1	2	3	4
43. Principal of the school in which I student taught	1	2	3	-4

44-49 How much have each of the following contributed to your performance as a classroom teacher?

	Strong Influence	Moderate Influence	Limited Influence	Little or No Influenc
44. Undergraduate methods courses	1	2	3	4
45. Student teaching	1	2	3	4
46. Other undergraduate education courses	1	2	3	4
47. In-service programs in the schools	1	2	3	4
48. Interactions with colleagues	1	2	3	4
49. Graduate education courses	1	2	3	4

50-82 Instructions: Please answer the three questions which follow each knowledge or skill area listed below. (Mark the response which best expresses your view on the answer sheet.

	A. To what extent is this skill essential to success in teaching?					B. How would you rate your ability to apply this knowledge or skill in your classroom?					C. To what extent did your student teaching experience promote the development of this skill?				
		Crucial	Important	Limited Relevance	Nonessential		Outstanding*	Strong*	Above Average	Below Average		Strong Influence	Moderate Influence	Limited Influence	Little or No Influence
Knowledge of educational theory and practice	50	1	2	3	4	51	1	2	3	4	52	1	2	3	4
Knowledge of subject matter	53	1	2	3	4	54	1	2	3	4	55	1	2	3	4
Ability to establish rapport with students	56	1	2	3	4	57	1	2	3	4	58	1	2	3	4
Ability to communicate with parents and other teachers	59	1	2	3	4	60	1	2	3	4	61	1	2	3	4
Ability to formulate instructional goals and objectives	62	1	2	3	4	63	1	2	3	4	64	1	2	3	4
Ability to provide a wide variety of instructional strategies and materials	65	1	2	3	4	66	1	2	3	4	67	1	2	3	4
Ability to collect and interpret data regarding student needs and achievement	68	1	2	3	4	69	1	2	3	4	70	1	2	3	4
Ability to maintain active student participation in classroom tasks	71	1	2	3	4	72	1	2	3	4	73	1	2	3	4
Ability to recognize and deal effectively with problems in student discipline	74	1	2	3	4	75	1	2	3	4	76	1	2	3	4
Ability to use effective questioning and interaction techniques in the classroom	77	1	2	3	4	78	1	2	3	4	79	1	2	3	4
Ability to evaluate one's own classroom and general professional performance	80	1	2	3	4	81	1	2	3	4	82	1	2	3	4

* Outstanding = top 10% of all teachers
Strong = top 25% of all teachers

83. Please provide the name and address of the principal or supervisor in the school in which you are currently working.

Name: _____

Address _____

_____

_____

84. GENERAL COMMENTS:

FOLLOW-UP STUDY OF M.S.U. GRADUATES - SUPERVISOR SURVEY

Name _____ Date _____

Address _____

As a part of a follow-up s dy of graduates o! College of Education at Michigan State, we would appreciate yo cooperation in evaluating the performance of _____
Your responses to this survey will be confidential. Results will be reported collectively rather than by schools or individuals.

1-8 Please indicate the extent to which you agree with each of the following statements which refer to professional activities of this teacher. (Please mark the corresponding spaces on the answer sheet which has been provided.)

THE TEACHER WHOSE NAME APPEARS ABOVE...	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1. Seeks active involvement with students outside the classroom setting	1	2	3	4
2. Establishes cooperative relations with colleagues and various support personnel in the building	1	2	3	4
3. Is receptive to "promising" new ideas or approaches to teaching	1	2	3	4
4. Maintains appropriate professional conduct and appearance	1	2	3	4
5. Actively participates in various in-service activities such as workshops and teacher committees	1	2	3	4
6. Assumes a leadership role within the informal social structure of the school	1	2	3	4
7. Is resourceful in creating and using available instructional materials	1	2	3	4
8. Completes professional assignments and responsibilities in a competent and dependable manner	1	2	3	4

Items 9 and 10 ask you to compare this teacher with other teachers in his/her field

9. Where would this teacher rank in overall competence as a teacher?

   1. Outstanding (top 10% of all teachers)
   2. Strong (top 25% of all teachers)
   3. Above average
   4. Below average

10. Where would this teacher rank in level of commitment to the teaching profession?

   1. Outstanding (top 10% of all teachers)
   2. Strong (top 25% of all teachers)
   3. Above average
   4. Below average

Instructions: Please answer the two questions which follow each knowledge or skill area listed below. (Mark the number on your answer sheet which best expresses your view.)

Knowledge/Skill	A. To what extent is this skill essential to success in teaching?				B. How would you rate this teacher's ability to apply this knowledge or skill in the classroom?				
	Critical	Important	Limited Relevance	Nonessential		Outstanding (top 10% of all teachers)	Strong (top 25% of all teachers)	Above Average	Below average
Knowledge of educational theory and practice — 11.	1	2	3	4	12.	1	2	3	4
Knowledge of subject matter — 13.	1	2	3	4	14.	1	2	3	4
Ability to establish rapport with students — 15.	1	2	3	4	16.	1	2	3	4
Ability to communicate with parents and other teachers — 17.	1	2	3	4	18.	1	2	3	4
Ability to formulate instructional goals and objectives — 19.	1	2	3	4	20.	1	2	3	4
Ability to provide a wide variety of instructional strategies and materials — 21.	1	2	3	4	22.	1	2	3	4
Ability to collect and interpret data regarding student needs and achievement. — 23.	1	2	3	4	24.	1	2	3	4
Ability to maintain active student participation in classroom tasks — 25.	1	2	3	4	26.	1	2	3	4
Ability to recognize and deal effectively with problems in student discipline — 27.	1	2	3	4	28.	1	2	3	4
Ability to use effective questioning and interaction techniques in the classroom. — 29.	1	2	3	4	30.	1	2	3	4
Ability to evaluate one's own classroom and general professional performance — 31.	1	2	3	4	32.	1	2	3	4

Items 33-37: In your judgment, how much have each of the following contributed to this individual's performance as a classroom teacher?

	Strong Influence	Moderate Influence	Limited Influence	Little or None	No basis for ev
33. Student teaching	1	2	3	4	5
34. Undergraduate education courses	1	2	3	4	5
35. In-service programs in the schools	1	2	3	4	5
36. Interactions with colleagues	1	2	3	4	5
37. Graduate education courses	1	2	3	4	5

38. Did this teacher begin his/her professional career under your supervision?
    1. yes
    2. no

39. Prior to this survey, were you aware that this teacher graduated from Michigan State University?
    1. yes
    2. no

40. This teacher graduated from one of the following teacher preparation programs at Michigan State University. If you are aware of which program, please check the appropriate box. If you have no knowledge of the program she/he graduated from, please check the "don't know" category.
    1. Elementary Intern Program (E.I.P.)
    2. Competency-Based Teacher Education Program (C.B.T.E.)
    3. Overseas Student Teaching Program
    4. Cluster Student Teaching Program
    5. Regular (Conventional) Program
    6. Don't Know (Skip to item 43)

DO NOT ANSWER QUESTIONS 41 and 42 if you checked "Don't Know" in Item 35 (skip to Item 43)

41. Do you feel that graduates from this program have a greater chance of being hired in your district than graduates of other programs at M.S.U.?
    1. yes
    2. not sure
    3. no

42. Do you feel that graduates from this program are better prepared as classroom teachers than graduates of other programs at M.S.U.?
    1. yes
    2. not sure
    3. no

43. GENERAL COMMENTS:

APPENDIX F

ITEMS WHICH SHOULD BE INCLUDED IN THE NEXT SURVEY

Chart F-1 Items Which Should be Added to the Next Survey

In the judgement of the authors, the following items should be added to the next survey:

- sex of the respondent
- Was the individual married or single at the time he/she graduated?
- Was the individual tied to a particular geographical area at the time he/she initially looked for a job? If so, type of area (metropolitan, rural, etc.)
- How much job satisfaction does teaching provide?
- How much job satisfaction is experienced by those who did not find teaching positions?
- How valuable are each of the specific undergraduate courses which were required?
- Conduct interviews and add to the list of reasons for: (a) not entering the teaching profession and (b) leaving the profession.
- Who was most helpful in securing a job?
- What proportion of those who enter the profession as "underemployed teachers" ultimately secure a full-time classroom position?
- At what time did those who have left the profession make their exit? (eg. after one year, after two years, etc.)