

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 248 206

SP 024 950

AUTHOR Loadman William E.; Holcomb, Zelda J.
 TITLE Follow-up of 1978-1979, 1980-1981, and 1981-1982 Graduates at the Ohio State University's College of Education. Technical Report #8 [and] Executive Summary.
 INSTITUTION Ohio State Univ., Columbus. Coll. of Education.
 PUB DATE Dec 83
 NOTE 197p.
 PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Statistical Data (110)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC08 Plus Postage.
 DESCRIPTORS Academic Aspiration; Career Development; *Education Majors; *Education Work Relationship; Graduate Surveys; Higher Education; *Job Satisfaction; Outcomes of Education; Preservice Teacher Education; *Program Effectiveness; *Student Characteristics; Teacher Attitudes; Teacher Employment
 IDENTIFIERS *Ohio State University

ABSTRACT

A follow-up study was conducted of graduates of the College of Education at Ohio State University (OSU). A questionnaire obtained information regarding: (1) present job status; (2) job satisfaction; (3) student teaching experience; (4) attitudes toward preservice academic training; (5) educational background and aspirations; and (6) demographics. The results of these analyses are presented in this technical report. Demographic information and select questionnaire items for each sample year are presented in tabular form. Based on these tables, a profile of each sample year is presented. The next section contains a discussion of questionnaire items by employment subgroup (teaching, education-related field, noneducation-related field). The subgroups are discussed for each sample year, and differences within those years by program area, sex, and teaching level are presented. A comparison between years of each subgroup is also presented. The next section contains a discussion of a group of items regarding the student teaching experience and a group of items dealing with the educational background of the respondents. Appendices contain the follow-up questionnaire and the two informational letters mailed with it. The statistical analyses that produced significant results are also in the appendix. (JD)

 * Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
 * from the original document. *

ED248206

FOLLOW-UP PROJECT
TECHNICAL REPORT #8 (1983)
DR. WILLIAM E. LOADMAN
DIRECTOR

SP024950

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)
This document has been reproduced as
received from the person or organization
originator.
* Minor changes have been made to improve
reproducibility.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this docu-
ment do not necessarily represent official NIE
position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
William E. Loadman

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."



Technical Report #8: Follow-Up of 1978-1979, 1980-1981 and 1981-1982
Graduates at The Ohio State University's
College of Education .

December, 1983

Prepared by:

William E. Loadman
Zelda J. Holcomb

Produced for the OSU College of Education as part of a total effort
to redesign teacher education. This project is funded entirely from
State of Ohio, Department of Education Project 419 monies.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
LIST OF TABLES.....	iv
<u>INTRODUCTION</u>	
Samples.....	1
Questionnaire Modification	2
Data Processing.....	3
Statistical Analyses.....	3
Organization of the Technical Report.....	4
<u>PROFILE OF SAMPLE YEARS</u>	
1978 - 1979.....	5
1980 - 1981.....	7
1981 - 1982.....	9
Comparisons by Sample Year.....	18
<u>TEACHING</u>	
<u>1978 - 1979</u>	
Method of Obtaining Employment.....	19
Description of Current Teaching Position.....	19
Measures of Performance.....	20
Professional Interaction in the School Setting.....	20
Teaching Perspective.....	21
Comparisons on Program Area, Teaching Level and Sex.....	21

1980 - 1981

Method of Obtaining Employment.....	22
Description of Current Teaching Position.....	22
Measures of Performance.....	22
Professional Interaction in the School Setting.....	23
Teaching Perspective.....	23
Comparisons on Program Area, Teaching Level and Sex.....	23

1981 - 1982

Method of Obtaining Employment.....	24
Description of Current Teaching Position.....	24
Measures of Performance.....	25
Professional Interaction in the School Setting.....	25
Teaching Perspective.....	25
Comparisons on Program Area, Teaching Level and Sex.....	26
Comparisons Among Sample Years.....	27

EDUCATION RELATED EMPLOYMENT

1978 - 1979.....	43
1980 - 1981.....	43
1981 - 1982.....	44
Comparisons Among Sample Years.....	45

NONEDUCATION - RELATED EMPLOYMENT

1978 - 1979.....	49
1980 - 1981.....	50
1981 - 1982.....	50
Comparisons Among Sample Years.....	52

	PAGE
<u>COMPARISONS BY SUBGROUPS</u>	
Total Sample.....	53
1978 - 1979.....	53
1980 - 1981.....	53
1981 - 1982.....	54
<u>STUDENT TEACHING</u>	
1978 - 1979.....	59
1980 - 1981.....	59
1981 - 1982.....	60
Comparisons Among Sample Years.....	60
<u>IDENTIFIED CURRICULUM AREAS FOR INCREASED EMPHASIS.....</u>	63
<u>SUMMARY.....</u>	67
<u>APPENDICES</u>	
Appendix A - Follow Up Questionnaire.....	70
Appendix B - Informational Letters.....	74
Appendix C - Sample Year Profiles.....	76
Appendix D - Teaching Subgroup.....	80
Appendix E - Education Related Subgroup.....	125
Appendix F - Noneducation-Related Subgroup.....	139
Appendix G - Employment Subgroup (All Sample Years).....	156
Appendix H - Student Teaching Items.....	178
Appendix I - Population and Sample Sizes by Program Area.....	180

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE		PAGE
1	1978 - 1979 Chi-Square By Program Area.....	6
2	1978 - 1979 Chi-Square By Sex	6
3	1980 - 1981 Chi-Square By Program Area	8
4	1980 - 1981 Chi-Square By Sex.....	8
5	1981 - 1982 Chi-Square By Program Area	10
6	1981 - 1982 Chi-Square By Sex	10
7	Program Area	11
8	Sex	12
9	Age	12
10	Race	13
11	Currently Employed or Unemployed.....	13
12	Full-Time/ Part-Time.....	14
13	Type of Current Employment.....	14
14	Usefulness of Educational Preparation.....	15
15	Consideration of Further Professional Study.....	15
16	Whether or Not Student Transferred.....	16
17	Satisfaction with Current Employment.....	16
18	Years of Teaching	17
19	Employed in Major or Minor Field	17
20	Full-Time/Part-Time Employment.....	28

TABLE		PAGE
21	Most Helpful Method For Securing Employment.....	28
22	Method For Obtaining First Position.....	29
23	Rating of the Educational Placement Office.....	29
24	Location of Current Position.....	30
25	Level of Teaching	30
26	Size of Present School.....	31
27	Racial Mix of School.....	31
28	Motivation of Present Students.....	32
29	Present Classroom Discipline.....	32
30	Satisfaction with Current Employment.....	33
31	Feelings About Teaching.....	33
32	Usefulness of Educational Preparation.....	34
33	How Well Prepared to Teach.....	34
34	Level of Confidence.....	35
35	Teaching Effectiveness.....	35
36	Ways to Improve Effectiveness.....	36
37	Assistance with Discipline.....	36
38	Expectations for Supervision Extracurricular Activities	37
39	Participation in Extracurricular Activities.....	37
40	Pay for Supervising Extracurricular Activities.....	38
41	Who Evaluates Teaching.....	38
42	How Many Times Evaluated.....	39
43	Most Meaningful Evaluation Method.....	39
44	Person Helpful in Professional Development.....	40

TABLE		PAGE
45	Person Supportive and Encouraging.....	40
46	Perspective on Student Characteristics.....	41
47	Perspective on Instructional Methods.....	41
48	Perspective on Important Learning Outcomes.....	42
49	Full-Time/Part-Time.....	42
50	Usefulness of Educational Preparation.....	46
51	Sought a Teaching Position.....	46
52	Regret They Are Not Teaching.....	47
53	Satisfaction With Current Employment.....	47
54	Reasons for Not Teaching.....	48
55	Rating of the Educational Placement Office.....	48
56	Full-Time/Part-Time Employment.....	55
57	Usefulness of Educational Preparation.....	55
58	Sought A Teaching Position.....	56
59	Regret They Are Not Teaching.....	56
60	Satisfaction With Current Employment.....	57
61	Reasons For Not Teaching.....	57
62	Rating of Educational Placement Office.....	58
63	Location of Student Teaching.....	58
64	Classroom Discipline During Student Teaching.....	61
65	Success of Student Teaching Experience.....	61
66	Relationship With Cooperating Teacher.....	62
67	Ability Level of Students During Student Teaching..	62
68	1978 - 1979 Identified Curriculum Areas for Increased Emphasis,	64
69	1980 - 1981 Identified Curriculum Areas for Increased Emphasis.	65
70	1981 - 1982 Identified Curriculum Areas for Increased Emphasis.	66

INTRODUCTION

The Follow-up Project of the College of Education has completed studies on samples of first-year teachers since 1977. The information gathered was collected by questionnaire, direct observation and telephone interviews. The results were compiled and reported in annual technical reports.

The follow-up data obtained from the graduates are part of the Student Information System (SIS) developed in the College of Education. This system allows for students to be evaluated from the time they apply to a teacher education program through their first three or four years of teaching. The follow-up data is the last data component collected and entered in the system.

The follow-up study is conducted in part to meet the standards of the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) and the Ohio State Department of Education's standards for evaluating teacher education students. The data provides information that enables the College to ascertain the professional status of its graduates. In addition, it assists the College in evaluating and modifying its academic programs.

The following is a detailed report of the process implemented for developing and completing the follow-up studies, during the 1982-83 academic year on graduates of the College of Education.

Samples

This year the Follow-up Project staff made various changes in implementing the study of graduates of the College of Education. First, three sample years were selected for study as opposed to only one. This decision was made to facilitate accurate comparisons between years and assessment, over time, of satisfaction with job placements, teacher turnover and the identification of other such trends.

Samples were selected from the 1978-1979 graduates, 1980-1981 graduates and the 1981-1982 graduates. The 1978-1979 and 1980-1981 samples were 20 percent random samples stratified by program area; the 1981-1982 sample was the total population. These sample sizes were chosen because first year teachers have traditionally been the population of interest hence, the larger size; in addition, the other two years had been previously surveyed and a sample is sufficient to produce representative responses for the entire population therefore, keeping the cost of the study at a minimum. The samples were stratified by program area based on the fact that the literature has indicated significant differences can be found on various measures by program area and the results will be presented by program area as well as in aggregate form. In those program areas that had five or less in the population, the total number was selected for use in the sample.

The population lists for each year were obtained from The Ohio State University Alumni Office. The Follow-up staff coded each name and then randomly selected the number of students that would yield an appropriate size sample by program area. The sample sizes* were as follows:

1978-1979	213
1980-1981	193
1981-1982	961 (entire population)

Each follow-up questionnaire was assigned a code number for record keeping purposes and to maintain confidentiality. They were mailed on March 14, 1983. Each questionnaire was checked off as it was returned. On April 15, 1983, a follow-up letter and questionnaire were mailed to those subjects who had not responded to the first mailing. The total response rate for each year is:

1978-1979	139	63%
1980-1981	114	59%
1981-1982	614	62%

Questionnaire Modification

The Follow-up staff examined the questionnaire that had been used in previous years and identified areas for modification. Changes in the wording of certain items were made, some items were eliminated and new items added. Common items were grouped under definite headings to identify the area being addressed by the items. The headings were (1) demographics, (2) current employment, full or part-time, (3) educational background, (4) student teaching, (5) individuals not teaching, (6) individuals teaching, (7) current teaching situation, (8) professional interactions in the school setting, and (9) teaching perspective.

An important addition to the questionnaire was a request, if the student was teaching, to contact his/her supervisor. This will enable the follow-up project staff to gather additional information on ratings of the graduate's teaching competence. After the questionnaire was modified and printed, a coding structure was developed for data entry and statistical analysis. The open-ended questions were content analyzed to construct categories for coding. This was performed by randomly selecting 100 questionnaires and tallying the responses for the open-ended questions. Those responses that occurred five or more times were designated as a category or alternative. The multiple choice items were assigned values to represent an interval scale.

* The population sizes for each year by program area can be found in Appendix I.

Data Processing

Initially the collected data was being entered on IBM answer sheets to be scanned and then transferred to tape for storage purposes. However, entering the data directly from the forms into the Student Information System was found to be a more efficient method. The data is now stored on the SIS data base. It is transferred to tapes to facilitate statistical analysis and generation of information and reports in a shorter "turn around" period. It can be anticipated to have any requests of follow-up information within a two week period. The transfer of data to tape is done directly to University Systems from the College Information Service, where SIS is maintained, to the Instructional Research Computing Service where the tapes are stored.

Statistical Analysis and Reporting

In previous years the collected data from the follow-up questionnaire were analyzed primarily by computing frequencies and percentages for each item. From that analysis a profile was developed of the sample and some comparisons made with the previous year. The analysis for this year will be more extensive.

First a chi-square to determine the representativeness of the respondents by program area and sex for each sample year was performed. Descriptive statistics including means, standard deviations, frequencies, and percentages were produced for each item.

From these results, a description or profile of the students was developed for each sample year. Comparisons between sample years were made and differences examined using analysis of variance techniques. Comparisons were also made between the following groups within each year:

- (1) Program Areas
- (2) Teaching Level (elementary, secondary)
- (3) Sex
- (4) Current Employment Subgroups (teaching, education related, noneducation related)

The Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) and hand calculations were used to perform the analysis.

Organization of the Technical Report

The results of the aforementioned analyses are presented in the following technical report. The format of the report is as follows. First, demographic information and select questionnaire items for each sample year are presented in table form. Based on these tables a profile of each sample year is presented.

The next section contains a discussion of questionnaire items by employment subgroup. Three categories of employment were developed for analysis purposes. The three subgroups are those individuals currently employed in teaching including full-time classroom teachers and permanent substitutes; those individuals employed in an education related field; and those employed in a noneducation-related field. The subgroups are discussed for each sample year, and differences within those years by program area, sex, and teaching level are presented. Finally, a comparison between years of each subgroup is presented.

The next section deals with comparisons between the subgroups. i.e., is there a difference between individuals teaching and individuals employed in the noneducational field on how they rate the usefulness of their educational preparation?

The final section contains a discussion of a group of items regarding the student teaching experience and a group of items dealing with the educational background of the respondents. This group of items is discussed by each sample year.

Finally, the appendices contain the Follow-up Questionnaire answered by the graduates, and the two informational letters mailed with the questionnaire. The statistical analyses that produced significant results can also be found in the appendices.

PROFILE OF SAMPLE YEARS

1978-1979

The final 1978-1979 sample consisted of 135 completed and useable questionnaires. This sample represents those persons who have graduated from the College of Education four years ago. A chi-square analysis demonstrated that the sample was representative of the sex variable (see Table 2) but not the program area variable (see Table 1). By examining the contribution of each program area to the chi-square (Table 1), it was evident that nonrepresentativeness on program area was due to the over representation of small program areas. As stated in the previous section, total population numbers from the smaller program areas were used in the sample. Therefore, when using the data the reader should consider the fact that the smaller program areas have a proportionally greater contribution to the sample results than they would in the population. The nonrepresentativeness of the sample on the program area variable means that the results can be generalized to the sample with confidence, but to the population with caution. As will be seen later, the impact of this on the conclusions of the findings appear to be minimal.

The data collected from the completed questionnaires from the 1978-1979 sample yield the following profile. The reported percentages are based on those individuals that responded to the item and not the entire sample, i.e. the missing values were not included in the calculation of the percentage values. Therefore, the percentages are based on slightly different sample sizes for each item (see Tables 7 through 18). The majority of the graduates are:

- females (63%)
- presently 26-30 years of age (85%)
- Caucasian (94%)
- currently employed (89%)
- employed in a full-time capacity (91%)
- employed in teaching (48%)
- have taught four or more years (31%)
- somewhat or very satisfied with their current employment (83%)

TABLE 1

1978-1979

Chi-Square By Program Area

Program Area	1	2	3	4	5	7	8	10	12	14	15	16	17	18	21	23	24	26	27	28	Combined*
Contribution Observed	5	2	2	1	4	3	4	34	7	5	3	4	7	7	2	7	13	4	8	8	19
Contribution Expected	5	5	1	1	1	5	1	42	5	4	3	1	7	5	3	9	11	7	3	14	7
Contribution To Chi-Square	0	1.8			.8	1.5	.8	.25	0		0	.8	.33	.44	.36	1.2	8.33	2.57			20.57

* Groups 3, 4, 5, 8, 11, 29, and 30 all had expected frequencies of 1.

 $\chi^2 = 39.85$; $df = 16$; Table Value = 26.30; $p \leq .05$

TABLE 2

Chi-Square By Sex

Sex	MALE	FEMALE
Frequency Observed	49	85
Frequency Expected	47	87
Contribution To Chi-Square	.085	.046

 $\chi^2 = .131$; $df = 1$; Table Value = 3.84; $p \leq .05$

In addition, the majority:

- completed their entire four years at OSU (91%)
- were elementary education majors (25%)
- found their educational preparation to be useful in their current employment (93%)
- intend to engage in further professional study in the education field (53%)

1980-1981

The total respondents for the 1980-1981 sample totaled 114. This sample represents those persons who graduated from the College of Education two years ago. The subsequent chi-square analyses demonstrated that the sample was representative of the population on the sex variable (Table 4), and the program area variable (Table 3).

The resulting profile from the 1980-1981 sample is as follows. The majority of the graduates are:

- female (72%)
- presently 20-25 years of age (72%)
- Caucasian (94%)
- currently employed (91%)
- employed in a full-time capacity (83%)
- employed in teaching (38%) or a noneducation field (38%)
- have not taught a complete year (52%)
- somewhat or very satisfied with their current employment (77%)
- completed their entire four years at OSU (80%)
- were elementary education majors (33%)
- found their educational preparation useful in their current employment (92%)
- intend to engage in further professional study in the education field (54%)

(See Tables 7 through 18.)

TABLE 3

1980-1981

Chi-Square By Program Area

Program Area	1	2	3	5	6	7	8	10	11	12	13	15	16	17	18	21	23	24	27	28	29	30	Combined*
Frequency Observed	3	4	0	2	1	6	1	37	3	4	3	4	5	3	4	3	7	9	2	6	1	4	27
Frequency Expected	5	5	1	2	1	5	1	41	5	6	1	1	1	3	3	2	7	9	1	7	1	1	13
Contribution To Chi-Square	.80	.20	-	-	-	.20		.39	.8	.67	-	-	-	0	.33		0	0	-	14	-	-	15.07
* Groups 3, 5, 6, 8, 13, 15, 16, 21, 27, 29, and 30 were combined because their expected frequencies were less than 2.																							
$\chi^2 = 18.60$; $df = 11$; Table Value = 19.68; $p \leq .05$																							

TABLE 4

Chi-Square By Sex

Sex	MALE	FEMALE
Frequency Observed	32	82
Frequency Expected	32	82
Contribution To Chi-Square	0	0

$\chi^2 = 0$; $df = 1$; Table Value = 3.84; $p \leq .05$

1981-1982

The total respondents for the 1981-1982 sample numbered 614. This sample represents first year graduates of the College of Education. The chi-square analysis for representativeness demonstrated that this sample was representative of the original population on both the sex and program area variables. (See Tables 5 and 6.)

The resulting profile from the 1981-1982 respondents is as follows (see Tables 7 through 18). The majority of the graduates are:

- female (78%)
- presently 20-25 years of age (77%)
- Caucasian (97%)
- currently employed (98%)
- employed in a full-time capacity (68%)
- employed in teaching (34%)
- have not taught a complete year (63%)
- somewhat or very satisfied with their current employment (68%)
- completed their entire four years at OSU (74%)
- elementary education majors (40%)
- found their educational preparation to be useful in their present employment (92%)
- intended to engage in further professional study in the educational field (56%)

On each of the tables a total sample size and percent was listed. This is an unweighted sum of all responses across the three sample years. As will be seen later, because there are negligible differences across the responses from sample years, the unweighted total column presents a reasonably accurate picture of all respondents.

TABLE 5
1981-1982

Chi-Square By Program Area

Program Area	1	2	3	5	7	8	10	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	21	23	24	26	27	28	30
Frequency Observed	23	19	3	16	28	3	246	38	2	27	10	12	22	14	4	35	45	22	6	30	4
Frequency Expected	18	24	1	12	24	6	250	31	2	25	6	6	18	12	6	37	49	31	6	37	6
Contribution To Chi-Square	1.39	1.04	4	1.33	.67	1.5	.06	1.58	0	.16	2.67	6	.89	.33	.67	.11	.33	2.61	0	1.32	.67

$\chi^2 = 27.33$; $df = 20$; Table Value = 31.41; $p \leq .05$

TABLE 6
Chi-Square By Sex

Sex	MALE	FEMALE
Frequency Observed	137	473
Frequency Expected	159	451
Contribution To Chi-Square	3.04	1.07

$\chi^2 = 4.04$; $df = 1$; Table Value = 3.84; $p \leq .05$

TABLE 7
PROGRAM AREA

	1978-1979		1980-1981		1981-1982		TOTAL	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
AGRICULTURE	5	4	3	3	23	4	31	3.6
ART	2	2	4	4	19	3	25	2.9
BIOLOGICAL SCIENCE	2	2	1	1	3	1	6	.7
BROADCAST COMMUNICATION	1	1	0	-	0	-	1	.1
BUSINESS EDUCATION:	4	3	2	2	16	3	22	2.6
DANCE EDUCATION	0	0	1	1	0	-	1	.1
DENTAL HYGIENE	3	2	6	5	28	5	37	4.3
DISTRIBUTIVE EDUCATION	4	3	1	1	3	1	8	.9
ELEMENTARY EDUCATION	34	25	37	33	246	40	317	37.0
ELEMENTARY-SPECIAL ED	3	2	3	3	6	1	12	1.4
ENGLISH EDUCATION	7	5	4	4	38	6	49	5.7
ENGLISH COMMUNICATION	0	0	3	3	2	.3	5	.6
EXCEPTIONAL CHILDREN	2	2	0	-	21	3	23	2.7
FOREIGN LANGUAGE	3	2	4	4	10	2	17	2.0
HEALTH EDUCATION	4	3	5	4	12	2	21	2.5
HOME ECONOMICS	7	5	3	3	22	4	32	3.7
INDUSTRIAL TECHNOLOGY	7	5	4	4	14	2	25	2.9
MATHEMATICS	2	1	3	3	4	1	9	1.1
MUSIC EDUCATION	7	5	7	6	35	6	49	5.7
PHYSICAL EDUCATION	13	10	9	8	45	7	67	7.8
RECREATION EDUCATION	4	3	0	-	22	4	26	3.0
SCIENCE EDUCATION	8	6	2	2	6	1	16	1.9
SOCIAL STUDIES EDUCATION	8	6	6	5	30	5	44	5.1
SPEECH-THEATRE EDUCATION	2	2	1	1	0	-	3	.4
TRADE AND INDUSTRIAL EDUC	2	2	4	4	4	1	10	1.2
TOTAL	134	101 *	113	104	609	99*	856	100.0

*Rounding error

TABLE 8
Sex

Subgroup: All	1978-1979		1980-1981		1981-1982		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
(2) Male	49	37	32	28	137	23	218	25
(1) Female	85	63	82	72	473	78	640	75
Total	134	100	114	100	610	101*	858	100
Mean	1.39		1.28		1.22		1.26	
Standard Deviation	.53		.45		.42		.45	
*Rounding error								

TABLE 9
Age

Subgroup: All	1978-1979		1980-1981		1981-1982		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
(1) 20-25	36	27	82	72	471	77	589	69
(2) 26-30	85	63	20	18	64	11	169	20
(3) 31-35	9	7	7	6	38	6	54	6
(4) 36-40	2	2	2	2	20	3	24	3
(5) over 40	3	2	3	3	18	3	24	3
Total	135	101*	114	101*	611	100	860	101*
*Rounding error								

TABLE 10
Race

Subgroup: All	1978-1979		1980-1981		1981-1982		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
(1) Asian American	1	1	2	2	5	1	8	1
(2) Black Non-Hispanic	5	4	4	4	9	2	18	2
(3) Hispanic	1	1	0	--	2	.3	3	.4
(5) White	127	94	107	94	590	97	824	96
(6) Other	1	1	2	1	2	.3	5	.6
Total	135	101*	115	101*	608	101*	858	99*

*Rounding error

TABLE 11
Currently Employed or Unemployed

Subgroup: All	1978-1979		1980-1981		1981-1982		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
(1) Yes	119	89	103	91	562	92	784	92
(2) No	15	11	10	9	47	8	72	8
Total	134	100	113	100	609	100	856	100
Mean	1.11		1.11		1.09		1.10	
Standard Deviation	.32		.39		.35		.35	

TABLE 12
Full-Time/Part-Time

Subgroup: All	1978-1979		1980-1981		1981-1982		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
(2) Full-time	109	91	85	83	384	68	578	74
(1) Part-time	11	9	18	18	177	32	206	26
Total	120	100	103	101*	561	100	784	100
Mean	1.91		1.83		1.68		1.74	
Standard Deviation	.29		.38		.47		.44	
*Rounding error								

TABLE 13
Type of Current Employment

Subgroup: All	1978-1979		1980-1981		1981-1982		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
(1) Classroom Teacher	54	45	37	36	169	30	260	33
(2) Other School Employment	3	3	5	5	8	1	16	2
(3) Post-Secondary	2	2	1	1	7	1	10	1
(4) Permanent Substitute	3	3	2	2	24	4	29	4
(5) Day to Day Substitute	2	2	11	11	119	21	132	17
(6) Education Related	17	14	8	8	55	10	80	10
(7) Noneducation-related	39	32	39	38	182	32	260	33
Total	120	101*	103	101*	564	99*	787	100
*Rounding error								

TABLE 14
Usefulness of Educational Preparation

Subgroup: All	1978-1979		1980-1981		1981-1982		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
(3) Very Useful	57	48	45	44	244	44	346	44
(2) Somewhat Useful	54	45	49	48	251	45	354	45
(1) Not Useful	9	8	8	8	66	12	83	11
Total	120	101*	102	100	561	101*	783	100
Mean	2.40		2.36		2.32		2.34	
Standard Deviation	.63		.63		.67		.66	
*Rounding error								

TABLE 15
Consideration of Further Professional Study

Subgroup: All	1978-1979		1980-1981		1981-1982		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
(1) Masters, Education	58	45	49	46	283	48	390	47
(2) Doctorate, Education	5	4	2	2	3	1	10	1
(3) Specialist, Education	5	4	6	6	39	7	50	6
(4) Non-educational Field	34	26	24	23	136	23	194	24
(5) No Further Study	28	22	25	24	130	22	183	22
Total	130	101*	106	101*	591	101*	827	100
*Rounding error								

TABLE 16
Whether or Not Student Transferred

Subgroup: All	1978-1979		1980-1981		1981-1982		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
(6) No, Completed entire four years at OSU	102	76	91	80	454	74	647	75
(5) Yes, Entered as a Freshman	7	5	3	3	21	3	31	4
(4) Yes, Entered as a Sophomore	15	11	12	11	61	10	88	10
(3) Yes, Entered as a Junior	10	7	5	4	51	8	66	8
(2) Yes, Entered as a Senior	0	--	1	1	7	1	8	1
(1) Other	1	1	2	2	17	3	20	2
Total	135	100	114	101*	611	99*	860	100
*Rounding error								

TABLE 17
Satisfaction with Current Employment

Subgroup: All	1978-1979		1980-1981		1981-1982		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
(5) Very Satisfied	57	48	37	36	195	35	289	37
(4) Somewhat Satisfied	42	35	40	39	183	33	265	34
(3) Neutral	10	8	6	6	61	11	77	10
(2) Somewhat Dissatisfied	7	6	14	14	83	15	104	13
(1) Very Dissatisfied	4	3	5	5	40	7	49	6
Total	120	100	102	100	562	101*	784	100
Mean	4.18		3.88		3.73		3.82	
Standard Deviation	1.03		1.19		1.27		1.24	
*Rounding error								

TABLE 18
Years of Teaching

Subgroup: All	1978-1979		1980-1981		1981-1982		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
(1) None	34	27	56	52	366	63	456	56
(2) One	13	10	14	13	191	33	218	27
(3) Two	20	16	34	32	15	3	69	8
(4) Three	20	16	2	2	3	1	25	3
(5) Four or More	39	31	2	2	4	1	45	6
Total	126	100	108	101*	579	101*	813	100
Mean	3.13		1.88		1.42		1.75	
Standard Deviation	1.61		1.00		.64		1.10	
*Rounding error								

TABLE 19
Employed In Major or Minor Field

Subgroup: Teaching	1978-1979		1980-1981		1981-1982		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
(1) Employed in Major Field	44	77	34	87	158	82	236	82
(2) Employed in Minor Field	2	4	1	3	10	5	13	4
(3) Employed in Major and Minor Field	2	4	1	3	9	5	12	4
(4) Employed in Other Education Field	9	16	3	8	16	8	28	10
Total	57	101*	39	101*	193	100	289	100
*Rounding error								

COMPARISONS BY SAMPLE YEAR

Examination of the profiles and tables for each sample year demonstrates very little difference between the sample years on these select variables. Statistical analysis supports this observation. Analyses of variance produced only three significant differences on the 13 selected variables which made up the profiles. (See Appendices C.)

The significant differences were found on the sex, full-time/part-time employment, and satisfaction with current employment variables. These significant differences indicate that more males have graduated in the College of Education each year, and there was a significant increase in the male graduates between the 1978-1979 sample and the 1981-1982 sample. The increase in male graduates was a progressive increase from sample year to sample year. (See Appendix 1C.)

The second significant difference indicates that although a large percentage of graduates have found employment each year, the percentage of those that are employed full-time is less each year from the 1978-1979 sample year to the 1981-1982 sample year. A plausible explanation for this difference is that the longer an individual is out of college the more likely he is to find full-time employment. (See Appendix 2C.)

The final significant difference between the 1978-1979 and 1981-1982 samples indicates that the graduates that have been out of college the longest are the most satisfied with their current employment. It would appear that the older graduates have had more time to select employment that would be more satisfying to them. (See Appendix 3C.)

TEACHING

The respondents that identified themselves as classroom teachers and permanent substitutes comprise the employment subgroup teaching. For each sample year they represent 48 percent (N = 57), 38 percent (N = 39), 34 percent (N = 193), respectively. The discussion for each sample year will be divided into five categories (1) method of obtaining employment in teaching; (2) description of current teaching position; (3) measures of performance, i.e. effectiveness, confidence, etc.; (4) professional interaction in the school setting; and (5) teaching perspective.

1978-1979 Sample

Method of Obtaining Employment

The discussion contained in this category revolves around the responses to five questionnaire items that address how graduates went about seeking employment and a brief description of their employment status. The items include (1) whether or not graduates are employed in their major or minor field; (2) whether they are full or part-time employees; (3) what was the most helpful strategy for securing employment; (4) how was their first teaching position obtained; and (5) how they rated the services of the placement office. (See Tables 19 through 23.)

In the 1978-1979 teaching subgroup, 77 percent of the respondents are employed in their major field and an overwhelming majority (97%) are full-time teachers. When seeking employment the respondents felt that personal initiative (81%) was the one most important strategy for securing employment. They identified a personal contact as the primary method for obtaining their first teaching position (33%). In regard to the placement office services, a small percentage (23%) of the respondents did not use the services. The ratings of good and fair were the most frequent ratings with 30 percent of the respondents selecting each.

Description of Current Teaching Position

The locations of the current positions of these respondents are equally divided between urban, suburban, and rural communities. The majority (58%) are teaching at the senior high school level. The schools are predominately small in size, 50 percent have less than 500 students, and are predominately Caucasian, 65 percent have less than 5 percent minority students. The students that are being taught by the respondents were rated as having average motivation (66%). Ratings of the current classroom discipline indicated that very few teachers (6%) had many discipline problems; the greatest number (71%) indicated they had occasional discipline problems in the classroom. (See Tables 24 through 29.)

Measures of Performance

The majority of the individuals teaching (88%) were satisfied or somewhat satisfied with their jobs. Their feelings toward the teaching position are generally positive (56%) or very positive (24%). They rated their educational preparation as very useful (61%) or somewhat useful (37%) in their teaching positions. Regarding their preparation for the responsibilities of teaching, 46 percent stated they were well prepared for the majority of teaching responsibilities; 39 percent felt they were generally prepared. They are extremely confident about their teaching; 73 percent rated themselves as extremely confident and an additional 25 percent as somewhat confident. They also rated their teaching as moderately (51%) or very effective (49%). The most popular way teachers felt their effectiveness could be improved is by having fewer or smaller classes (33%). The next highest choice was more lesson preparation time (18%) and more support from other school personnel (18%). (See Tables 30 through 36.)

Professional Interaction in the School Setting

Within the school environment various interactions that take place were evaluated. The availability of assistance with discipline problems was generally rated as available and effective (55%). It should also be noted that the next highest rating (14%) was that assistance was available but ineffective.

The topic of extracurricular activities revealed that the majority of the teachers (73%) believed supervision of extracurricular activities was voluntary. Yet, 25 percent believed it was expected, but not required. Fifty-four percent of the teachers responding did supervise extracurricular activities, and 52 percent of those received pay for this additional responsibility.

Evaluation of the teachers performance was overwhelmingly (91%) performed by a principal or school administrator. This evaluation took place, most often, two to three times a year (41%). Also, 29 percent said they were evaluated once a year. Although formal evaluation occurs, teachers feel the most meaningful forms of evaluation are student improvement (40%) and students' feedback (25%).

For help in professional development, and support, and encouragement during the first year of teaching, a fellow teacher was noted as the primary source. Sixty-six percent selected a teaching colleague in the latter category and 17 percent selected a friend or relative. For assistance in professional development, 58 percent chose a teaching colleague and 19 percent selected an administrator. (See Tables 37 through 45.)

Teaching Perspective

The respondents' perspectives on three teaching beliefs were measured: (1) whether they view students as dependent on the teacher for direction or independent and capable of self-direction; (2) what they view as the most important learning outcomes; and (3) the appropriate selection and implementation of methods of instruction. A respondent could be directive or nondirective in his/her perspective. In general, the directive perspective is represented by a belief in firm teacher control over student behavior and the learning activities of the classroom. The nondirective perspective is represented by the belief that teachers should provide opportunities for student control over their own behavior and learning activities. The teachers' perspectives were primarily directive in beliefs about student characteristics and methods of instruction with 80% and 66%, respectively, selecting responses on the directive side of the continuum. The opposite was true of important learning outcomes with 79% selecting nondirective responses. Overall, only 8% and 7% of respondents indicated extreme directive and nondirective positions. Of the two middle positions, 48% selected the directive emphasis while 38% selected the nondirective emphasis. (See Tables 46 through 48.)

Comparisons on Program Area, Teaching Level and Sex

Analysis of the teaching subgroup to determine differences between program areas, levels of teaching and sex were performed utilizing the analysis of variance technique (Appendices D). Three significant differences were found by program area. They were teaching level (Appendix 1.1D), supervision in extra curricular activities (Appendix 1.2D), and the person most helpful in professional development (Appendix 1.3D). Response values on the teaching level variable were 1 for elementary, 2 for junior high school, and 3 for senior high school. The means for this variable ranged from 1 to 3. The response values for the item regarding whether or not a teacher participated in extracurricular activities were 1 for yes and 2 for no; the range of means was from 1 to 2. The responses for the item dealing with identifying the individual that was most helpful for professional development were 1 for administrator; 2 for teaching colleague; 3 for department head; 4 for counselor; and 5 for other. The mean responses for the program areas ranged from 1 to 5. There were no significant differences between any two program areas on any of these items.

The sex variable produced two significant differences. These two differences were found on the following questionnaire items: (1) classroom discipline (Appendix 1.4D); (2) teaching effectiveness (Appendix 1.5D). The classroom discipline item had the following three responses and corresponding values: (1) no problems -- 1; (2) occasional problems -- 2; and (3) many problems -- 3. The teaching effectiveness item's responses and values were as follows: 1 for ineffective; 2 for somewhat effective; 3 for moderately effective; and 4 for very effective. Female teachers (mean = 1.91) reported more classroom discipline problems than males (mean = 1.60). Yet, females (mean = 3.64) rated their teaching as more effective than males (mean = 3.24).

The teaching level produced a significant difference between elementary and senior high school on the size of the school variable (Appendix 1.6D). The size of school item's responses and their values are 1 for under 500, 2 for 500-1000, and 3 for over 1000. Elementary schools (mean = 1.15) were significantly smaller than senior high schools (mean = 1.94).

1980-1981 Sample

Method of Obtaining Employment

The 1980-1981 sample of teachers has 87 percent employed in their major field of study with 95 percent in a full-time capacity. Thirty-one percent found their first teaching position through a personal contact. Like the previous sample, the majority (59%) rated personal initiative as the most helpful method for securing employment. Twenty-six percent did not use the placement office's services, but 51 percent rated it as good or excellent. (See Tables 19 through 23.)

Description of Current Teaching Position

The locations of the teachers' positions are not as evenly divided as the previous sample year but the differences are not that great. Thirty-seven percent are teaching in a rural community, 34 percent are in a suburban setting and 28 percent are in an urban setting. Teachers are employed in schools that generally enroll under 500 students (56%); but 31 percent are in schools that have 500-1000 students. These schools (80%) have less than 5 percent minority students in attendance. Again, the majority of the teachers (54%) are teaching at the senior high school level. The students are of average motivation (59%) and present only occasional classroom discipline problems (64%). (See Tables 24 through 29).

Measures of Performance

The majority of the teachers (88%) are somewhat or very satisfied with their teaching positions. Accordingly, 86 percent have positive or very positive feelings toward teaching. They have rated their educational preparation as somewhat or very useful (100%) in their teaching positions. As a group they feel they were well prepared to face their teaching responsibilities; 72 percent rated themselves as generally or well prepared for the majority of the teaching responsibilities and an additional 26 percent said they were well prepared for all of the responsibilities. Accordingly, 97 percent said they were somewhat or extremely confident in carrying out these responsibilities; 93 percent rated themselves as moderately or very effective teachers. Like the previous sample, they felt their effectiveness could be improved by having fewer or smaller classes (27%) and having increased lesson preparation time (24%). (See Tables 30 through 36).

Professional Interaction in the School Setting

In rating the availability of assistance with discipline problems, the majority of the teachers (56%) said it was available and effective. The next highest rating (15%) was the availability of assistance in extreme circumstances.

Involvement in extracurricular activities was generally viewed as voluntary (55%); an additional 34 percent felt it was expected but not required. Fifty-nine percent of the teachers did supervise an activity and 75 percent of those supervising are paid for their efforts.

The evaluation of these teachers was performed primarily by a principal or school administrator (85%), usually two to three times a year (50%). The teachers feel that the most meaningful evaluation methods for them are student improvement (41%) and students' feedback (24%).

As in the 1978-1979 sample, the respondents selected a fellow teacher as the person most helpful in their professional development (54%) and most supportive and encouraging during their first year of teaching (41%). Also, on the latter item an administrator was selected by 19 percent of the teachers. (See Tables 37 through 45.)

Teaching Perspective

The teachers' perspectives were primarily directive in their view of student characteristics (64%), but nondirective in important learning outcomes (54%) and methods of instruction (54%). Overall, 6 percent and 14 percent indicated extreme directive and nondirective positions, while 46 percent and 33 percent indicated an emphasis on directive and nondirective perspectives. (See Tables 46 through 48.)

Comparisons on Program Area, Teaching Level, and Sex

The analyses to ascertain differences by program area, teaching level, and sex produced significant results on each variable. By program area, overall differences were found on size of the school (appendix 2.1D), teaching level (Appendix 2.2D) and expectations for supervision of extracurricular activities (Appendix 2.3D). The response values for the school size item were 1 for under 500; 2 for 500-1000; and 3 for over 1000. The mean responses ranged from 1 to 5. The response values for the teaching level item were 1 for elementary; 2 for junior high; and 3 for senior high. The mean responses for the program areas ranged from 1 to 3. The response item dealing with expectations for supervising extracurricular activities had the following response values: 1 for voluntary; 2 for expected; 3 for required; and 4 for a condition of employment. The range of mean responses was from 1 to 4. There was a difference found on the employment in major or minor field item, between health education with a mean response of 4 and elementary education with a mean response of 1. There was also a significant difference between social studies education with a mean response of 1 and elementary education with a mean response of 4 on the same item.

Although statistically these were significant differences, they are questionable for any practical purposes because the sample size for both social studies and health education was 1.

However, the sex variable produced the most differences. These differences demonstrated that there are more males in larger schools (mean = 1.92; female mean = 1.41) (Appendix 2.4D) and closely related to this finding, there are more males teaching in junior and senior high schools (mean = 2.77; female mean = 1.92) (Appendix 2.5D). Males also felt that extracurricular activities were expected (mean = 2.07) whereas females viewed them as being voluntary (mean = 1.30) (Appendix 2.70). Significantly more males (mean = 1.07) than females (mean = 1.58) supervised extracurricular activities (Appendix 2.80). Finally, females rated themselves more effective (mean = 3.62) than the male teachers (mean = 3.15) (Appendix 2.6D).

1981-1982 Sample

Method of Obtaining Employment

The 1981-1982 teaching subgroup contained 193 teachers. The majority of them (82%) was employed in their major field and an additional five percent were employed in their major and minor fields. Eighty-nine percent are full-time teachers. As with the two previous samples, these teachers (66%) felt personal initiative was the most helpful method for securing employment, and 30 percent stated they obtained their first teaching position through a personal contact. In addition, 24 percent obtained their first job through the placement office. Seventy-one percent of the teachers used the placement office, and 48 percent rated its services good or excellent. (See Tables 19 through 23.)

Description of Current Teaching Position

The location of the teachers in this sample is primarily in a rural community (44%), the next largest setting is suburban (35%) and the urban setting has 21 percent of the teachers. The schools are predominantly (54%) small in size and are senior high schools (54%). The schools' student populations are less than 5 percent minority students (75%). Fifty-two percent of the teachers rated their students' motivational level as average. The teachers overwhelmingly (71%) stated that they had occasional classroom discipline problems. (See Tables 24 through 29.)

Measures of Performance

The majority (85%) of the teachers is somewhat or very satisfied with teaching, and 82 percent have positive or very positive feelings toward teaching. The teachers (98%) have found their educational preparation somewhat or very useful in their jobs, and 77 percent of them feel they were generally or well prepared for the majority of the teaching responsibilities. An additional 20 percent felt they were well prepared for all teaching responsibilities. Ninety-five percent felt somewhat or extremely confident in carrying out their teaching responsibilities. Similarly, 98 percent feel their teaching is moderately or very effective. Yet, like the other two samples, they feel their effectiveness could be improved by having fewer or smaller classes (30%) and more time for lesson preparation (27%). (See Tables 30 through 36.)

Professional Interaction in the School Setting

The availability of assistance with discipline problems was rated similarly to the two previous samples. Sixty-seven percent rated their assistance as available and effective and 14 percent felt it was ineffective.

The teachers' view of what was expected of them in regard to supervising extracurricular activities was predominately (67%) voluntary. An additional 20 percent felt it was expected of them. Fifty-four percent do supervise extracurricular activities, and 58 percent of them are paid for supervising these activities.

Evaluation of the teachers' performance is performed by a principal or school administrator (81%). Fifty-seven percent are evaluated two to three times a year; 14 percent are evaluated four to six times a year. The teachers feel the most valuable evaluation methods are student improvement (44%) and student feedback (17%). An additional 12 percent feel self-evaluation is a meaningful method.

A teaching colleague and an administrator, in that order, were selected as the most supportive and encouraging person during the first year of teaching and most helpful people in professional development. In addition, a relative or friend was selected by 24 percent of the teachers as a supportive and encouraging individual. (See Tables 37 through 45.)

Teaching Perspective

The teachers' perspectives were primarily directive in their view of student characteristics (74%) and selecting and implementing methods of instruction (63%), but nondirective in important learning outcomes (75%). Overall, 10 percent and 11 percent, respectively, indicated extreme directive and nondirective perspectives. (See Tables 46 through 48.)

Comparisons on Program Area, Teaching Level, and Sex

The analyses to ascertain differences using the one-way analysis of variance technique produced a number of differences by the program area, teaching level and sex variables. Using program area, seven overall differences between program areas were identified. They include size of school, teaching level, satisfaction with current employment, teaching perspective on students, expectations for supervising extracurricular activities, supervision of extracurricular activities and placement office ratings (Appendices 3.1D to 3.7D). To limit repetitious information, only the response values of those items that have not been previously described will be presented in the remainder of the report. The item satisfaction with current employment had the following response values: 1 for very dissatisfied; 2 for somewhat dissatisfied; 3 for neutral; 4 for somewhat satisfied; and 5 for very satisfied. The three items dealing with teaching perspective had the following response values: 1 for strongly agree with position A; 2 for an emphasis on position A along with some elements of position B; 3 for an emphasis on position B along with some elements of A; and 4 for strongly agree with B. The first response values 1 and 2 represent a directive nature whereas response values 3 and 4 represent a nondirective nature. The teaching level item was the only one that produced a significant difference between two specific program areas: elementary education (mean = 1.72) and agricultural education (mean = 3.00); and English education (mean = 3.00), and elementary education (Appendix 3.2D).

On the teaching level variable ten more differences were identified. Seven of the questionnaire items had significant differences between elementary teachers and senior high school teachers. Elementary teachers rated their students as more highly motivated (mean = 2.25) than senior high teachers rated their students (mean = 1.83) (Appendix 3.15D). The teaching perspective on methods of instruction was more directive in nature for elementary teachers (mean = 2.60) than for senior high school teachers (mean = 2.20); the same was true of the teaching perspective on student work behavior (Appendices 3.19D and 3.20D). There was a significant difference between the size of elementary (mean = 1.35) and senior high schools (mean = 1.81); high schools have significantly more students (Appendix 3.16D). High school teachers rated supervision of extracurricular activities as being expected (mean = 1.74) or required whereas elementary teachers generally rated it as being voluntary (mean = 1.28) (Appendix 3.22D). Also, elementary teachers (mean = 4.59) were significantly more satisfied with teaching than senior high teachers (mean = 4.11) although both groups responded with favorable positions. Finally, the rating of the placement office was significantly higher for senior high teachers (mean = 3.32) than elementary teachers (mean = 2.38) (Appendices 3.18D and 3.24D).

Other differences by the teaching level variable include (1) ratings of teaching effectiveness: elementary teachers (mean = 3.65) rated themselves significantly more effective than either junior high (mean = 3.32) or senior high teachers (mean = 3.34) (Appendix 3.17D); (2) teaching perspective on learning outcomes: elementary teachers (mean = 3.18) were less directive than junior high teachers (mean = 2.59) and junior high teachers were less directive than senior high teachers (mean = 2.97) (Appendix 3.20D); and (3) supervision of extracurricular activities: fewer elementary teachers (mean = 1.86) than either junior high (mean = 1.56) or senior high teachers (mean = 1.21) supervised extra-curricular activities and fewer junior high than senior high teachers supervised extracurricular activities (Appendix 3.23D).

Seven significant differences were found by sex. There are more female teachers at the elementary level (mean = 2.11) and more males at the junior and senior high levels (mean = 2.74) (Appendix 3.9D). Female teachers rated their students as more motivated (mean = 2.08) than male teachers (mean = 1.72) (Appendix 3.8D), also females rated themselves as more effective (mean = 3.47) than males (mean = 3.27) (Appendix 3.10D). On teaching perspectives on students and methods of instruction, females (means = 2.26 and 2.47 respectively) are less directive than males (means = 1.78 and 1.91 respectively) (Appendices 3.11D and 3.12D). It was found that more males supervise extracurricular activities (mean = 1.21) than females (mean = 1.53) (Appendix 3.13D). Finally, males (mean = 3.5) rated the placement office services higher than females rated them (mean = 2.9) (Appendix 3.14D).

Comparisons Across Sample Years

The analysis to determine differences between the subgroup teaching by each sample year produced only two significant differences. The teachers in the 1978-1979 sample were significantly more confident (mean = 3.72) than the teachers in the 1981-1982 sample (mean = 3.45) (Appendix 4.2D). The other item which produced a significant difference was the number of times per year evaluation was done. The teachers who had graduated in 1979 were evaluated significantly fewer times per year (mean = 2.53) than the 1982 graduates (mean = 3.11) (Appendix 4.1D). This limited number of significant differences indicates that the teachers who responded to the questionnaire are basically the same. Therefore, the data can be combined to produce meaningful and valid analysis and discussion.

TABLE 20
Full-Time/Part-Time Employment

Subgroup: Teaching	1978-1979		1980-1981		1981-1982		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
(2) Full-time	55	97	37	95	171	89	263	91
(1) Part-time	2	4	2	5	22	11	26	9
Total	57	101*	39	100	193	100	289	100

*Rounding error

TABLE 21
Most Helpful Method For Securing Employment

Subgroup: Teaching	1978-1979		1980-1981		1981-1982		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
(1) Education Faculty Member	1	2	2	5	9	5	12	4
(2) Department Chairperson	1	2	3	8	8	4	12	4
(3) Placement Office	6	11	3	8	29	15	38	13
(4) Personal Initiative	46	81	23	59	126	66	195	68
(5) Other	3	5	8	21	19	10	30	10
Total	57	101*	39	101*	191	100	287	99*

*Rounding error

TABLE 22
Method for Obtaining First Position

Subgroup: Teaching	1978-1979		1980-1981		1981-1982		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
(1) Student Taught There	6	11	3	8	15	8	24	8
(2) Began as a Substitute	8	14	6	15	22	12	36	13
(3) Personal Contact	19	33	12	31	57	30	88	31
(4) Placement Office	6	11	6	15	45	24	57	20
(5) Other	18	32	12	31	52	27	82	29
Total	57	101*	39	100	191	101*	287	101*

*Rounding error

TABLE 23
Rating of the Education Placement Office

Subgroup: Teaching	1978-1979		1980-1981		1981-1982		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
(1) Did not use services	13	23	10	26	55	29	78	27
(2) Unsatisfactory	3	5	1	3	13	7	17	6
(3) Fair	17	30	8	21	31	16	56	20
(4) Good	17	30	14	36	56	29	87	30
(5) Excellent	7	12	6	15	36	19	49	17
Total	57	100	39	101*	191	100	287	100

*Rounding error

TABLE 24
Location of Current Position

Subgroup: Teaching	1978-1979		1980-1981		1981-1982		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
(1) Urban	18	33.3	11	29	41	21	70	25
(2) Suburban	18	33.3	13	34	68	35	99	35
(3) Rural	18	33.3	14	37	84	44	116	41
Total	54	100	38	100	193	100	285	101*
*Rounding error								

TABLE 25
Level of Teaching

Subgroup: Teaching	1978-1979		1980-1981		1981-1982		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
(1) Elementary	14	25	15	39	48	25	77	27
(2) Junior High	10	18	3	8	40	21	53	18
(3) Senior High	33	58	21	54	103	54	157	55
Total	57	101*	39	101*	191	100	267	100
*Rounding error								

TABLE 26
Size of Present School

Subgroup: Teaching	1978-1979		1980-1981		1981-1982		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
(1) Under 500	28	50	22	56	103	54	153	54
(2) 500 -- 1,000	18	32	12	31	56	29	86	30
(3) Over 1,000	10	18	5	13	31	16	46	16
Total	56	100	39	100	190	99*	285	100

*Rounding error

TABLE 27
Racial Mix of School

Subgroup: Teaching	1978-1979		1980-1981		1981-1982		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
(1) Less than 5% Minority	34	65	31	80	144	75	209	74
(2) 5 -- 25% Minority	9	17	6	15	23	12	38	13
(3) 25 -- 50% Minority	5	10	0	--	12	6	17	6
(4) More than 50% Minority	4	8	2	5	13	7	19	7
Total	52	100	39	100	192	100	283	100

TABLE 28
Motivation of Present Students

Subgroup: Teaching	1978-1979		1980-1981		1981-1982		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
(3) High	9	16	13	33	42	22	64	22
(2) Average	36	66	23	59	101	52	160	56
(1) Low	10	18	3	8	50	26	63	22
Total	55	100	39	100	193	100	287	100

TABLE 29
Present Classroom Discipline

Subgroup: Teaching	1978-1979		1980-1981		1981-1982		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
(1) No Problems	13	24	12	31	41	21	66	23
(2) Occasional Problems	39	71	25	64	136	71	200	70
(3) Many Problems	3	6	2	5	15	8	20	7
Total	55	101*	39	100	192	100	286	100

*Rounding error

TABLE 30
Satisfaction With Current Employment

Subgroup: Teaching	1978-1979		1980-1981		1981-1982		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
(5) Very Satisfied	26	46	20	51	97	51	143	50
(4) Somewhat Satisfied	24	42	14	36	65	34	103	36
(3) Neutral	3	5	7	3	10	5	14	5
(2) Somewhat Dissatisfied	3	5	4	10	13	7	20	7
(1) Very Dissatisfied	1	2	0	--	7	4	8	3
Total	57	100	39	100	192	101*	288	101

*Rounding error

TABLE 31
Feelings About Teaching

Subgroup: Teaching	1978-1979		1980-1981		1981-1982		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
(5) Very Positive	12	24	14	39	72	43	98	39
(4) Positive	28	56	17	47	66	39	111	44
(3) Neutral	7	14	4	11	22	13	33	13
(2) Negative	2	4	1	3	6	4	9	4
(1) Very Negative	1	2	0	--	2	1	3	1
Total	50	100	36	100	168	100	254	101*

*Rounding error

TABLE 32
Usefulness of Educational Preparation

Subgroup: Teaching	1978-1979		1980-1981		1981-1982		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
(3) Very Useful	35	61	26	67	103	53	164	57
(2) Somewhat Useful	21	37	13	33	87	45	121	42
(1) Not Useful	1	2	0	--	3	2	4	1
Total	57	100	39	100	193	100	289	100

TABLE 33
How Well Prepared to Teach

Subgroup: Teaching	1978-1979		1980-1981		1981-1982		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
(5) Was well prepared for <u>all</u> the responsibilities of teaching	7	12	10	26	39	20	56	19
(4) Was well prepared for the <u>majority</u> of the responsibilities of teaching	26	46	17	44	73	48	136	47
(3) Was <u>generally</u> prepared for the <u>majority</u> of the responsibilities of teaching	22	39	11	28	55	29	88	31
(2) Was <u>unprepared</u> for the majority of the responsibilities of teaching	2	4	1	3	5	3	8	3
(1) Was <u>unprepared</u> for <u>any</u> of the responsibilities of teaching	0	--	0	--	0	--	0	--
Total	57	101*	39	101*	192	100	288	100

*Rounding error

TABLE 34
Level of Confidence

Subgroup: Teaching	1978-1979		1980-1981		1981-1982		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
(4) Extremely Confident	41	73	25	64	93	48	159	55
(3) Somewhat Confident	14	25	13	33	91	47	118	41
(2) Somewhat Lacking in Confidence	1	2	1	3	7	4	9	3
(1) Extremely Lacking in Confidence	0	--	0	--	1	1	1	0
Total	56	100	39	100	192	100	287	99*

*Rounding error

TABLE 35
Teaching Effectiveness

Subgroup: Teaching	1978-1979		1980-1981		1981-1982		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
(4) Very Effective	28	49	19	49	83	43	130	45
(3) Moderately Effective	29	51	19	49	107	55	155	54
(2) Somewhat Ineffective	0	--	1	3	3	2	4	1
(1) Ineffective	0	--	0	--	0	--	0	--
Total	57	100	39	101*	193	100	289	100

*Rounding error

TABLE 35
Ways To Improve Effectiveness

Subgroup: Teaching	1978-1979		1980-1981		1981-1982		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
(1) Fewer or Smaller Classes	18	33	10	27	56	30	84	30
(2) Better Professional Preparation	8	15	5	14	28	15	41	15
(3) More Support From Other School Personnel	10	18	46	14	24	13	39	14
(4) More Lesson Preparation Time	10	18	9	24	50	27	69	25
(5) Other	9	16	8	22	30	16	47	17
Total	55	100	37	101*	188	101*	280	101*

*Rounding error

TABLE 37
Assistance With Discipline

Subgroup: Teaching	1978-1979		1980-1981		1981-1982		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
(7) Assistance Available and Effective	31	55	22	56	126	67	179	63
(6) Assistance Available but Ineffective	8	14	5	13	27	14	40	14
(5) Assistance Available in Extreme Circumstances	6	11	6	15	15	8	27	10
(4) No Assistance Available	2	4	0	--	1	1	3	1
(3) Assistance Available but a Sign of Weakness	2	4	1	3	7	4	10	4
(2) No Assistance Needed	6	11	4	10	11	6	21	7
(1) Other	1	2	1	3	2	1	4	1
Total	56	101*	39	100	189	101*	284	100

*Rounding error

TABLE 38
Expectations for Supervising Extracurricular Activities

Subgroup: Teaching	1978-1979		1980-1981		1981-1982		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
(1) Voluntary	41	73	21	55	119	66	181	66
(2) Expected	14	25	13	34	35	20	62	23
(3) Required	1	2	3	8	8	4	12	4
(4) Condition of Employment	0	--	1	3	17	9	18	7
Total	56	100	38	100	179	99*	273	100

*Rounding error

TABLE 39
Extracurricular Activities

Subgroup: Teaching	1978-1979		1980-1981		1981-1982		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
(1) Yes	31	54	23	59	101	54	155	55
(2) No	26	46	16	41	86	46	128	45
Total	57	100	39	100	187	100	283	100

TABLE 40
Pay for Supervising Extracurricular Activities

Subgroup: Teaching	1978-1979		1980-1981		1981-1982		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
(1) Yes	17	52	15	75	56	58	88	59
(2) No	16	49	5	25	40	42	61	41
Total	33	101*	20	100	96	100	149	100

*Rounding error

TABLE 41
Who Evaluates Teaching

Subgroup: Teaching	1978-1979		1980-1981		1981-1982		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
(1) Teaching Colleagues	1	2	0	--	10	5	11	4
(2) Department Head	3	5	5	13	10	5	18	6
(3) Students	1	2	1	3	2	1	4	1
(4) Curriculum Specialist	0	--	0	--	9	5	9	3
(5) Principal/Administrator	51	91	33	85	150	81	234	83
(6) Other	0	--	0	--	5	3	5	2
Total	56	100	39	101*	186	100	281	99*

*Rounding error

TABLE 42
How Many Times Evaluated

Subgroup: Teaching	1978-1979		1980-1981		1981-1982		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
(1) 0 Times	10	18	4	11	19	10	33	12
(2) 1 Time	16	29	7	18	21	12	44	16
(3) 2-3 Times	23	41	19	50	104	57	146	53
(4) 4-6 Times	3	5	4	11	25	14	32	12
(5) More than 6 Times	4	7	4	11	14	8	22	8
Total	56	100	38	101*	183	99*	277	101*

*Rounding error

TABLE 43
Most Meaningful Evaluation Method

Subgroup: Teaching	1978-1979		1980-1981		1981-1982		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
(1) Students' Test Scores	5	9	3	8	16	9	24	9
(2) Colleagues' Feedback	4	8	4	11	16	9	24	9
(3) Students' Feedback	13	25	9	24	31	17	53	20
(4) Student Improvement	21	40	15	41	80	44	116	43
(5) Formal Evaluation	1	2	3	8	11	6	15	6
(6) Self-Evaluation	6	11	2	5	22	12	30	11
(7) Other	3	6	1	3	4	2	8	3
Total	53	101*	37	100	180	99*	270	101*

*Rounding error

TABLE 44
Person Helpful In Professional Development

Subgroup: Teaching	1978-1979		1980-1981		1981-1982		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
(1) Administrator	10	19	7	19	48	27	65	25
(2) Teaching Colleague	30	58	20	54	90	51	140	53
(3) Department Head/Curriculum Specialist	4	8	7	19	9	5	20	8
(4) Counselor	0	--	1	3	3	2	4	2
(5) Other	8	15	2	5	26	15	36	14
Total	52	100	37	100	176	100	265	102*

*Rounding error

TABLE 45
Person Supportive and Encouraging

Subgroup: Teaching	1978-1979		1980-1981		1981-1982		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
(1) Administrator	6	11	8	22	48	27	62	23
(2) Counselor	0	--	0	--	5	3	5	2
(3) Fellow Teacher	35	66	15	41	71	40	121	45
(4) Relative or Friend	9	17	11	30	42	24	62	23
(5) No One Available	1	2	0	--	3	2	4	1
(6) Other	2	4	3	8	8	5	13	5
Total	53	100	37	101*	177	101*	267	99*

*Rounding error

TABLE 46
Teaching Perspective on Students

Subgroup: Teaching	1978-1979		1980-1981		1981-1982		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
(1) Strongly agree with A	9	16	5	13	35	19	49	17
(2) Emphasis on A with some elements of B	35	64	20	51	104	55	159	56
(3) Emphasis on B with some elements of A	10	18	11	28	44	23	65	23
(4) Strongly agree with B	1	2	3	8	6	3	10	4
Total	55	100	39	100	189	100	283	100

TABLE 47
Teaching Perspective on Methods

Subgroup: Teaching	1978-1979		1980-1981		1981-1982		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
(1) Strongly agree with A	4	7	2	5	23	12	29	10
(2) Emphasis on A with some elements of B	32	59	16	41	96	51	144	51
(3) Emphasis on B with some elements of A	16	30	17	44	58	31	91	32
(4) Strongly agree with B	2	4	4	10	13	7	19	7
Total	54	100	39	100	190	101*	283	100

*Rounding error

TABLE 48
Teaching Perspective on Learning Outcomes

Subgroup: Teaching	1978-1979		1980-1981		1981-1982		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
(1) Strongly agree with A	0	--	0	--	7	4	7	2
(2) Emphasis on A with some elements of B	12	22	18	46	40	21	70	25
(3) Emphasis on B with some elements of A	36	66	12	31	103	55	151	54
(4) Strongly agree with B	7	13	9	23	38	20	54	19
Total	55	101*	39	100	188	100	282	100

*Rounding error

TABLE 49
Full-Time/Part-Time Employment

Subgroup: Education related	1978-1979		1980-1981		1981-1982		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
(2) Full-time	20	83	13	52	63	34	96	41
(1) Part-time	4	17	12	48	123	66	139	59
Total	24	100	25	100	186	100	235	100

EDUCATION RELATED EMPLOYMENT

The individuals that comprise the education related employment subgroup are currently working in the education field but are not teaching. These individuals identified their present job as other school employment, i.e. counseling, administrating, curriculum design, etc; employment in post-secondary education; day-to-day substitution or other education related employment. They represent approximately 18 percent (N = 24) of the 1978-1979 sample; 22 percent (N = 25) of the 1980-1981 sample; and 31 percent (N = 189) of the 1981-1982 sample.

1978-1979 Sample

The 1978-1979 graduates who were in this category tended to be employed full time (83%) and found their educational preparation somewhat (42%) or very useful (50%) in their current positions. The majority had sought a teaching position (64%) and 33 percent regret that they are not teaching. Fifty-eight percent are very satisfied with their current employment and 29 percent somewhat satisfied. The three primary reasons this group is not teaching are: (1) salaries are too low; (2) chose to change professions; and (3) no jobs available. In this group, as with the noneducational employees, a large percentage (42%) did not use the services of the placement office. The next highest rating from this group was a good (21%). (See Tables 49 through 55).

The further analysis of this subgroup by the variables (a) program area and (b) sex produced no significant differences on the seven items examined.

1980-1981 Sample

The 1980-1981 sample gave responses similar to the 1978-1979 sample responses on the same seven items with the exception of reasons for not teaching. The majority of the respondents (52%) are employed full-time, and 100 percent found their educational preparation somewhat or very useful in their current employment. Sixty percent sought a teaching position and 67 percent regret they are not teaching. Yet 67 percent are somewhat or very satisfied with their current employment. The top three reasons they are not teaching were (1) no jobs available; (2) chose to change professions; and (3) not willing or unable to relocate. The ratings of the educational placement office were in the same general order as the 1978-1979 sample. Forty percent of the respondents to this item did not use the services and the next largest rating was good (32%). (See Tables 49 through 55).

The analyses of variance computed to ascertain any significant differences among program areas identified one variable that had a significant difference. On the variable whether or not an individual sought a teaching position, there was an overall difference but not between any two program areas (Appendix 2.2E). Analyses to ascertain differences between male and female respondents produced two items that had a significant difference. First, significantly more women than men sought teaching positions (Appendix 2.2E). In addition, more women regret not teaching than men (Appendix 2.3E).

1981-1982 Sample

The 1981-1982 sample had 189 respondents in its educational related employment subgroup. Sixty-six percent of the subgroup are employed full-time, and 95 percent find their educational preparation somewhat or very useful on their present jobs. Eighty-three percent of the respondents sought a teaching position, and a much smaller percentage (57%) than the previous years are somewhat or very satisfied with their current employment. A larger percentage (71%) also regret that they are not teaching. The top four reasons these individuals are not teaching are (1) no jobs available (56%); (2) not willing or unable to relocate (13%); (3) chose to change professions (5%); and (4) family responsibilities (5%). In rating the placement office the largest percentage (38%), smaller than the previous years, did not use the services. The next largest percentage rated the services as fair (21%); good was very close with 20 percent. (See Tables 49 through 55.)

The analyses of variance to ascertain differences within this subgroup produced four differences by program area and one by sex. On program area the four items that had significant overall differences were full-time or part-time employment (Appendix 3.1E); whether or not a teaching position was sought (Appendix 3.2E); regret about not teaching (Appendix 3.3E); and rating of the placement office (Appendix 3.4E). The variable that dealt with whether or not a teaching position was sought was the only variable that produced a significant difference between two specific program areas. The response value for this item was 1 for a response of yes and 2 for a response of no. The two program areas are elementary education and recreation education. Significantly more elementary education majors with a mean response of 1.0 sought a teaching position than the recreation majors with a mean response of 2.0 (Appendix 3.2E). The variable dealing with full-time or part-time employment was significantly different between females and males. Males tended to be employed full time (mean = 1.51), whereas females tended to be part-time (mean = 1.29) (Appendix 3.5E).

Comparisons Across Sample Years

Further statistical analyses of the education related employment group using analysis of variance were performed to ascertain differences among sample years. One-way analyses of variances of the seven items examined for this subgroup produced differences on two questionnaire items. The two items were full-time or part-time employment and level of satisfaction with current employment. The differences demonstrate that significantly more 1978-1979 graduates employed in an educational related job are working in a full-time capacity than 1981-1982 graduates (Appendix 4.1E). In addition, the level of satisfaction with current employment is significantly greater for those graduates in the 1978-1979 sample than those in either of the other two sample years (Appendix 4.2E). There was no significant difference between the two most recent samples. These findings indicate very little difference among the education related subgroup between the sample years; therefore, the data can be combined and produce meaningful analyses and discussion.

TABLE 50
Usefulness of Educational Preparation

Subgroup: Education related	1978-1979		1980-1981		1981-1982		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
(3) Very useful	12	50	11	46	92	49	115	49
(2) Somewhat useful	10	48	13	54	86	46	109	46
(1) Not useful	2	8	0	--	9	5	11	5
Total	24	100	24	100	187	100	235	100

TABLE 51
Sought a Teaching Position

Subgroup: Education related	1978-1979		1980-1981		1981-1982		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
(1) Yes	7	64	9	60	85	83	101	79
(2) No	4	36	6	40	17	17	27	21
Total	11	100	15	100	102	100	128	100

TABLE 52
Regret They Are Not Teaching

Subgroup: Education related	1978-1979		1980-1981		1981-1982		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
(1) Yes	3	33	10	67	66	71	79	68
(2) No	6	67	5	33	27	29	38	32
Total	9	100	15	100	93	100	117	100

TABLE 53
Satisfaction With Current Employment

Subgroup: Education related	1978-1979		1980-1981		1981-1982		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
(5) Very satisfied	14	58	3	13	39	21	56	24
(4) Somewhat satisfied	7	29	13	54	68	36	88	37
(3) Neutral	1	4	1	4	23	12	25	11
(2) Somewhat dissatisfied	1	4	5	21	39	21	45	19
(1) Very dissatisfied	1	4	2	8	20	11	23	10
Total	24	99*	24	100	189	101*	237	101*

*Rounding error

TABLE 54
Reasons For Not Teaching

Subgroup: Education related	1978-1979		1980-1981		1981-1982		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
(1) Chose to change professions	3	21	3	14	7	5	13	8
(2) No jobs available	2	14	9	43	77	56	88	51
(3) Salaries are too low	4	29	2	10	5	4	11	6
(4) Not willing or unable to relocate	0	--	3	14	18	13	21	12
(5) Family responsibilities	1	7	0	--	7	5	8	5
(6) Academic record	0	--	0	--	1	1	1	1
(7) Quality of my teacher education program	0	--	0	--	1	1	1	1
(8) Other	4	29	4	19	22	16	30	17
Total	14**	100	21	100	138	101*	173	101*

*Rounding error
**Respondents could select more than one

TABLE 55
Rating of the Education Placement Office

Subgroup: Education related	1978-1979		1980-1981		1981-1982		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
(5) Excellent	3	13	0	--	13	7	16	7
(4) Good	5	21	8	32	37	20	50	21
(3) Fair	4	17	3	12	39	21	46	20
(2) Unsatisfactory	2	8	4	16	26	14	32	14
(1) Did not use services	10	42	10	40	71	38	91	39
Total	24	101*	25	100	186	100	235	101*

*Rounding error

NONEDUCATION-RELATED EMPLOYMENT

The individuals in the noneducation-related subgroup are employed, but not in teaching or any other educational field. Some examples of the current positions in which these individuals are employed include waitress, waiter, retail buyer, fund raiser, teller, dental hygienist, research associate, customer service representative, insurance analyst, tour guide and a pediatric activity coordinator. It is evident from this list that the individuals in the noneducation-related subgroup are employed in a variety of areas. The percentage of graduates that fall into this category are 33 percent (N = 24), 38 percent (N = 25) and 32 percent (N = 189) for each respective sample year. There is no significant increase or decrease in the size of this group among the three years. Therefore, it can be concluded that approximately one-third of College of Education graduates are employed in a noneducation-related field.

In analyzing the responses of this group seven questionnaire items were examined. The seven items are item 6, full-time or part-time employment; item 7, level of satisfaction with current employment; item 8, usefulness of educational preparation in current job; item 9, rating of educational placement office; item 26, sought a teaching position; item 28, reasons for not teaching; and item 29, regret not teaching. (Tables 56 - 62).

1978 - 1979 Sample

In the 1978 - 1979 sample the majority (87%) of the noneducational employees were employed full-time. Twenty-six percent found their educational preparation very useful in their employment, and fifty-nine percent found it somewhat useful in their present position. Sixty-five percent of those that responded did seek employment as a teacher. Yet it appears that they are generally happy in their current positions, because only twenty-seven percent regret that they are not teaching and seventy-two percent are somewhat or very satisfied with their current employment.

The reasons these individuals selected for not teaching are numerous. The three major ones include (1) no jobs available (26%); (2) chose to change professions (24%) and (3) salaries too low (24%). A final item dealt with rating the services of the educational placement office. For this subgroup forty-nine percent did not use the services; the next largest percentage (23%) gave it a rating of fair. (See Tables 56 - 62).

Further analysis of the noneducationally employed subgroup, using the analysis of variance technique, produced overall difference between program areas on the item dealing with whether or not a teaching position

was sought after graduation and on the rating of the placement office. (Appendices 1.1F and 1.2F) The range of program areas' average ratings for the item dealing with seeking a teaching position was from a mean of 1 to a mean of 2. For the placement office item, the range was from a mean of 1 to a mean of 4. Follow-up procedures to identify specific differences between any two program areas produced no significant differences; this is due to the unequal sample sizes of the program areas. Analysis by sex produced no differences between the responses of females and males.

1980 - 1981 Sample

The 1980-1981 sample of noneducational employees yielded similar results. Ninety percent were engaged in full-time employment, and eighty percent found their educational preparation to be somewhat or very useful in their jobs. A slightly smaller percentage (54%) than the 1979 sample actually sought a teaching position, and a larger percentage (54%) regret not teaching. In line with these findings, a smaller percentage (69%) are very or somewhat satisfied with their current employment. The most frequently stated reasons for not teaching are in the same rank order with no jobs available, first, chose to change professions, second, and salaries are too low, third. The rating of the educational placement office for this subgroup demonstrated that fifty-six percent did not use the service and again the second highest rating was fair (21%). (See Tables 56 - 62).

Additional analyses produced an overall difference by program area on the average rating of the educational placement office. The average ratings of the placement office for the program areas ranged from a mean of 1.0 to a mean of 3.2. There were no differences found between any two program areas. Again this is due to the wholly unequal sample sizes, ranging from one to six, which results in no specific differences between two groups. (Appendix 2.1F). On the sex variable two significant differences were produced. On the usefulness of their educational preparation in their current employment, males rated it more useful with an average rating of 2.4 than females (mean = 1.86). More females (mean = 1.36) than males (mean = 1.77) indicated that they sought a teaching position. (Appendices 2.2F and 2.3F).

1981 - 1982 Sample

The 1981 - 1982 sample was a much larger sample, hence, the number of respondents in the subgroup was greater than the previous two years (39 each). Yet, the percentage (32%), was comparable to the other years which had 33 percent and 38 percent.

The majority of the respondents (82%) were engaged in full-time employment and found their educational preparation to be somewhat or very useful (70%) in their current employment. Fifty-two percent did seek teaching positions, yet a smaller percentage than the previous two years (61%) were somewhat or very satisfied with their current employment. The top three reasons these individuals were not teaching were the same as the previous years: (1) no jobs available (31%); (2) chose to change professions (15%); and (3) salaries too low (15%). In addition, another category, not willing or unable to relocate (15%), tied with the last two reasons. A comparable percentage (47%) regret they are not teaching. The rating of the educational placement office demonstrated that 46 percent did not use the services, and a rating of fair was the next largest choice (20%). But in this sample year the rating of good was not substantially different from the rating of fair, with 17 percent selecting it. (See Tables 56 - 62).

Further analyses to identify differences between program areas produced an overall significant difference on level of satisfaction (Appendix 3.1F), usefulness of educational preparation in current employment, (Appendix 3.2F), whether or not a teaching position was sought, (Appendix 3.3F), regrets about not teaching (Appendix 3.4F), and ratings of the educational placement office (Appendix 3.5F). Only regrets about not teaching produced a significant difference between any two groups (Appendix 3.4F). The two groups were dental hygiene and social studies education. The values for the responses to this item were 1 for a yes and 2 for a no. The dental hygiene majors with a mean response of 1.9, for the most part did not regret not teaching whereas the social studies majors with a mean response of 1.0 did regret not teaching. The fact that dental hygienists are also trained to practice their profession in a private dental practice probably accounts for their overwhelming lack of regret about not teaching. No significant differences were found by the variable sex.

Comparisons Across Sample Years

In the preceding discussions some comparisons were made between the years on the items studied just by examining the tables. Further statistical analysis of each item using a one-way analysis of variance by year produced only one significant difference. The item dealing with whether or not a graduate regretted not teaching produced statistical differences between the 1978-1979 graduates and the 1980-1981 graduates and between the 1978-1979 and 1981-1982 graduates (Appendix 4.1F). It appears that the graduates in this subgroup that have been in the job market the longest do not regret not teaching as much as the more recent graduates. The same results were obtained when the total sample was analyzed on this variable. Therefore, it can be concluded that with the exception of their feelings about not teaching, the graduates employed in a noneducational field generally have not changed over the three years studied. Furthermore, their regrets about not teaching lessen the longer they have been out of college. Finally, like the teaching and education related subgroups, the noneducation related subgroup data can be combined for the three sample years for analysis and discussion purposes.

COMPARISONS BY SUBGROUPS

The final analyses of the follow-up data, using the analysis of variance technique, were performed to ascertain differences by employment subgroups within each sample year and as a total sample. There were six items that had a significant difference when the total sample was used. Significantly more teachers (mean = 1.93) are employed full-time than individuals employed in the education related or the noneducation-related subgroups (means = 1.41; 1.84). In addition, significantly more individuals employed in a noneducational field are full-time than those in educational related employment (Appendix 1.1G). The level of satisfaction with their current employment is significantly higher for teachers (mean = 4.29) than either education related (mean = 3.46) or noneducational employees (mean = 3.69) (Appendix 1.2G). Teachers found their educational preparation significantly more useful (mean = 2.56) than those individuals in the noneducation-related subgroup (mean = 1.99); the education related group also found it more useful (mean = 2.44) than the noneducational group (Appendix 1.3G). There was no significant difference between the teachers and the education related group. Between the educational related group and the noneducational group more individuals in the educational related group (mean = 1.21; mean = 1.46) sought a teaching position (Appendix 1.4G), and they were more regretful (mean = 1.32) about not currently teaching than the noneducation group (mean = 1.55) (Appendix 1.5G). In the rating of the placement office the teachers rated its services significantly higher (mean = 3.05) than either the education related (mean = 2.44) or the noneducation related (mean = 2.22) subgroups (Appendix 1.6G).

1978-1979 Sample

There were only two items in this sample year that produced a significant difference in the responses of the employment subgroups. First, teachers rated the services of the educational placement office significantly higher (mean = 2.98) than the noneducation-related subgroup (mean = 2.13) (Appendix 2.1G). The second item that produced a significant difference between the employment subgroups dealt with the usefulness of their educational preparation on their current job. Teachers rated their preparation significantly more useful (mean = 2.61) than those individuals employed in the noneducation-related field. (Appendix 2.2G)

1980-1981 Sample

Four significant differences were produced in this sample year by employment subgroup. The results on the full-time or part-time item demonstrated that teachers are employed full-time significantly more (mean = 1.95) than the education related group (mean = 1.52); the noneducational

group (mean = 1.90) more than the education related group (Appendix 3.1G). The level of satisfaction with their current employment is significantly higher for teachers (mean = 4.35) than educational related employees (mean = 3.42), but not significantly higher than individuals in the noneducational field (mean = 3.77) (Appendix 3.2G). The usefulness of their educational preparation is higher for teachers (mean = 2.68) than noneducational related employees (mean = 2.00), and it is higher for the educational related (mean = 2.46) than the noneducational group, but there is no difference between teachers and educational related employees (Appendix 3.3G). These are the same results that were found in the total sample. Finally, the rating of the placement office services was only significantly different between the teachers (mean = 3.10) and the noneducational group (mean = 1.90) (Appendix 3.4G).

1981-1982 Sample

Six significant differences were found in this sample. These are the same six that were found in the total sample. On the full-time/part-time employment item teachers (mean = 1.92) and noneducation-related employees (mean = 1.82) rated themselves as primarily full-time employees. Both of these ratings were significantly different from the education related subgroup with a mean of 1.34 (Appendix 4.1G). The item satisfaction with current employment demonstrated that teachers (mean = 2.52) and education related employees (mean = 2.44) are significantly more satisfied than noneducation-related employees with a mean of 1.97 (Appendix 4.2G).

Between the educational related employees and the noneducation related employees, more of the former group (mean 1.17) sought a teaching position than the latter group (mean = 1.48) (Appendix 4.3G). In the education related subgroup significantly more (mean = 1.29) regret not teaching than the noneducation-related group (mean = 1.53) (Appendix 4.4G). Finally, the rating of the educational placement office's services were significantly higher for teachers (mean = 3.07) than either the education related subgroup (mean = 2.44) or the noneducation-related subgroup (mean = 2.30) (Appendix 4.5G).

TABLE 56
Full-Time/Part-Time Employment

Subgroup: Noneducation-related	1978-1979		1980-1981		1981-1982		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
(2) Full-time	34	87	35	90	150	82	219	84
(1) Part-time	5	13	4	10	32	18	41	16
Total	39	100	39	100	182	100	260	100

TABLE 57
Usefulness of Educational Preparation

Subgroup: Noneducation-related	1978-1979		1980-1981		1981-1982		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
(3) Very useful	10	26	8	21	49	27	67	26
(2) Somewhat useful	23	59	23	59	78	43	124	48
(1) Not useful	6	15	8	21	54	30	68	26
Total	39	100	39	101*	181	100	259	100

*Rounding error

TABLE 58
Sought A Teaching Position

Subgroup: Noneducation-related	1978-1979		1980-1981		1981-1982		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
(1) Yes	24	65	20	54	91	52.3	135	54
(2) No	13	35	17	46	83	47.7	113	46
Total	37	100	37	100	174	100	248	100

TABLE 59
Regret They Are Not 1. 3

Subgroup: Noneducation-related	1978-1979		1980-1981		1981-1982		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
(1) Yes	9	27	19	54	78	47	106	45
(2) No	24	73	16	46	88	53	128	55
Total	33	100	35	100	166	100	234	100

TABLE 60
Satisfaction With Current Employment

Subgroup: Noneducation-related	1978-1979		1980-1981		1981-1982		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
(5) Very satisfied	17	44	14	36	59	33	90	35
(4) Somewhat satisfied	11	28	13	33	50	28	74	29
(3) Neutral	6	15	4	10	28	16	38	15
(2) Somewhat dissatisfied	3	8	5	13	31	17	39	15
(1) Very dissatisfied	2	5	3	8	13	7	18	7
Total	39	100	39	100	181	101*	259	101*

*Rounding error

TABLE 61
Reasons For Not Teaching

Subgroup: Noneducation-related	1978-1979		1980-1981		1981-1982		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
(1) Chose to change professions	14	24	16	28	46	15	76	18
(2) No jobs available	15	26	17	29	93	31	125	30
(3) Salaries too low	14	24	8	14	46	15	68	16
(4) Not willing or unable to relocate	7	12	5	9	45	15	57	14
(5) Family responsibilities	3	5	1	2	15	5	19	5
(6) Academic record	1	2	0	--	0	--	1	0
(7) Quality of teacher education program	1	2	0	--	6	2	7	2
(8) Other	3	5	11	19	49	16	63	15
Total	58	100	58	101*	300	99*	416	100

*Rounding error

TABLE 62
Rating of Education Placement Office

Subgroup: Noneducation-related	1978-1979		1980-1981		1981-1982		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
(5) Excellent	1	3	0	--	13	7	14	5
(4) Good	6	15	5	13	31	17	42	16
(3) Fair	9	23	8	21	37	20	54	21
(2) Unsatisfactory	4	10	4	10	18	10	26	10
(1) Did not use services	19	49	22	56	83	46	124	48
Total	39	100	39	100	182	100	260	100

TABLE 63
Location of Student Teaching

Subgroup: All	1978-1979		1980-1981		1981-1982		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
(1) Urban	42	33	29	27	187	32	258	32
(2) Suburban	73	58	67	62	312	54	452	56
(3) Rural	12	9	12	11	80	14	104	13
Total	127	100	108	100	579	100	814	101*

*Rounding error

STUDENT TEACHING

The following discussion is based on the five questionnaire items (18, 19, 20, 21 and 22) that dealt with the individuals student teaching experience. The descriptive statistics used for this section were computed on each total sample year. (See Tables 63 to 67)

1978-1979 Sample

The majority (58%) of the graduates had their student teaching experience in a suburban setting. Thirty-three percent of students taught in an urban school. The large majority of the graduates did not have many classroom discipline problems. Fifty-eight percent stated they had occasional problems and 32 percent stated they had no problems. The students encountered during the student teaching experience were rated by the majority (64%) of the graduates as at grade level in terms of academic ability. Twenty-three percent rated their students as below grade level, and 14 percent rated the students above grade level.

The relationship the respondents had with their cooperating teacher and the overall student teaching experience was rated high; eighty-six percent of the respondents rated their relationship with their cooperating teacher as very good or good. Only four percent rated it as poor or very poor. In terms of the overall student teaching experience, 98 percent rated it as somewhat successful or successful.

1980-1981 Sample

This sample was similar to the 1978-1979 year in regard to the location of their student teaching experience. Sixty-four percent were in suburban schools, twenty-seven percent in urban schools and eleven percent in rural schools. The classroom discipline problems encountered were virtually the same. The largest percentage (59%) had occasional problems and a little over a third (35%) had no problems. The students in those classes were rated by the majority of respondents (60%) at grade level. Twenty-seven percent rated their students above grade level.

An overwhelming majority (91%) of respondents rated their relationship with their cooperating teacher as very good or good. Seventy-eight percent rated their student teaching experience as successful and 21 percent as somewhat successful.

1981-1982 Sample

As student teachers these respondents primarily were placed in suburban locations (54%). Thirty-two percent were in urban schools and 14 percent in rural settings. This was the largest percentage in rural schools for the three sample years. Examination of table 63 indicates a slight increase in the rural school placements from year to year. As with the previous two samples the majority of the respondents (58%) stated they had occasional problems and almost one third stated they had no problems. In addition, the ability level of the student taught during their student teaching experience was rated at grade level by fifty-six percent of the respondents. Ability above grade level and below grade level were each selected by 22 percent of the respondents.

This sample also was generally pleased with their cooperating teacher and their overall student teaching experience. Eighty-seven percent rated their relationship with their cooperating teacher as very good or good. Furthermore, eighty-one percent rated their student teaching experience as successful with an additional 17 percent rating it as somewhat successful.

Comparison of Student Teaching Items by Year

The five items dealing with the graduates' student teaching experiences were subjected to a series of one-way analyses of variance to ascertain any differences among sample years. The results of these analyses produced a significant difference on only one questionnaire item. The item dealt with the graduates' rating of the ability level of the students during their student teaching experience. The 1980-1981 graduates rated their students' ability significantly higher (mean = 2.14) than the 1978-1979 graduates (mean = 1.90) (Appendix 1.1H).

Overall, the ratings of the student teaching experience, the placement of the students and the problems with classroom discipline have not changed during the three years. According to this data, it is safe to conclude that the student teaching experiences from 1978-1979 to 1981-1982 have been relatively consistent.

TABLE 64
Classroom Discipline During Student Teaching

Subgroup: All	1978-1979		1980-1981		1981-1982		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
(1) No problems	41	32	38	35	187	32	266	33
(2) Occasional problems	73	58	64	59	339	58	476	58
(3) Many problems	13	10	6	6	54	9	73	9
Total	127	100	108	100	580	99*	815	100
Mean	1.78		1.70		1.77			
Standard Deviation	.62		.57		.60			
*Rounding error								

TABLE 65
Success of Student Teaching Experience

Subgroup: All	1978-1979		1980-1981		1981-1982		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
(3) Successful	96	76	85	78	468	81	649	80
(2) Somewhat successful	28	22	23	21	97	17	148	18
(1) Unsuccessful	2	2	1	1	15	3	18	2
Total	126	100	109	100	580	101*	815	100
Mean	2.74		2.77		2.78			
Standard Deviation	.47		.44		.47			
*Rounding error								

TABLE 66
Relationship With Cooperating Teacher

Subgroup: All	1978-1979		1980-1981		1981-1982		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
(5) Very good	77	61	82	75	406	70	565	70
(4) Good	31	25	17	16	96	17	144	18
(3) Fair	13	10	8	7	53	9	74	9
(2) Poor	2	2	2	2	15	3	19	2
(1) Very poor	3	2	0	--	8	1	11	1
Total	126	100	109	100	578	100	813	100
Mean	4.41		4.64		4.52			
Standard Deviation	.91		.70		.87			

TABLE 67
Ability Level of Students During Student Teaching

Subgroup: All	1978-1979		1980-1981		1981-1982		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
(3) Above grade level	17	14	29	27	126	22	172	21
(2) At grade level	80	64	64	60	325	56	469	58
(1) Below grade level	29	23	14	13	128	22	171	21
Total	126	101*	107	101	579	100	812	100
Mean	1.91		2.14		1.99			
Standard Deviation	.60		.62		.66			

*Rounding error

IDENTIFIED CURRICULUM AREAS FOR INCREASED EMPHASIS

Although 77 percent of the graduates who are teaching rated themselves as well prepared or generally prepared for the majority of the responsibilities of teaching, and an additional 19 percent rated themselves as well prepared for all the responsibilities of teaching, they identified areas of the teacher education program in which they feel they need additional or better preparation. Tables 68, 69, and 70 contain a list of areas identified by the teachers for each sample year. As expected, dealing with discipline is the most frequently identified area for the sample years 1980-1981 and 1981-1982. The most frequently identified area for the 1978-1979 sample year was increased practical experience. This category included comments regarding the everyday activities and problems associated with teaching and individualizing instruction. Discipline was the second most frequently identified area for this sample year.

For the 1980-1981 sample year, the second and third highest areas of concern were communication skills in dealing with parents, administrators, and the community and more practical experience, respectively. The teachers in the 1981-1982 sample year identified content area preparation and lesson/curriculum planning and student evaluation, respectively, as their second and third areas for additional work.

These findings do not indicate any one overwhelming area of concern for all three sample years. Yet, discipline appeared in all three sample years in the top three ranked areas; the same is true for an increase in practical experience regarding individualizing instruction and the everyday activities and problems of teaching. Furthermore, an examination of Tables 68-70 indicates the range of areas identified by the teachers. An analysis of these responses by program area has been provided to each respective program. This should prove valuable to the individual program areas because many of the responses were specific to the teachers' majors.

TABLE 68
 Identified Curriculum Areas for Increased Emphasis
 1978-1979

	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
Teacher-Parent, Administrator, Teacher, Public Relations	5	9
Discipline	9	16
Content Area Preparation	4	7
Lesson Planning and Evaluation of Students	5	9
Organization and Time Management	2	4
Administrative and Extra-Curricular Duties	3	5
More Practical Experience	14	25
Using Media and Outside Resources	4	7
Legal Rights and Responsibilities	3	5
Motivating Students	2	4
Teaching Adults	1	2
Effective Methods and Implementation	2	4
Professionalism	1	2
Total	55	99%*

*Rounding error

TABLE 69
Identified Curriculum Areas for Increased Emphasis
1980-1981

	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
Substitute Teaching	1	2
Teacher-Parent, Administrator, Teacher, Public Relations	8	16
Discipline	14	29
Content Area Planning	5	10
Lesson Planning and Evaluation of Students	4	8
Organization and Time Management	4	8
Administrative and Extra-Curricular Duties	4	8
More Practical Experience	7	14
Using Media and Outside Resources	2	4
Total	49	99%*

*Rounding error

TABLE 70

Identified Curriculum Areas for Increased Emphasis
1981-1982

	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
Teacher-Parent, Administrator, Teacher, Public Relations	8	3
Discipline	75	32
Content Area Preparation	24	10
Lesson/Curriculum Planning and Evaluation of Students	19	8
Organization and Time Management	10	4
Administrative and Extra-Curricular Duties	8	3
More Practical Experience	6	3
Using Media and Outside Resources	3	1
Legal Rights and Responsibilities	4	2
Motivating Students	14	5
Teaching Grades 6-8	6	3
Effective Methods and Implementation	10	4
Computers	3	1
Teaching Handwriting Skills	3	1
More Training in Secondary Areas	1	4
Stress and Burn-Out	2	1
Individualization and Mainstreaming	10	4
Substitute Teaching	7	3
Standardized Testing	6	3
Reading Instruction	8	3
Professionalism	1	4
Effective Questioning	<u>1</u>	<u>4</u>
Total	238	99%*

*Rounding error

SUMMARY

The 1983 Follow-Up Study was performed utilizing three sample years of graduates: 1978-1979; 1980-1981; and 1981-1982. Information was collected from a 20 percent random sample stratified by program area (academic major) for the 1978-1979 and 1980-1981 sample years and the total population for the 1981-1982 sample year.

The follow-up questionnaire mailed to the subjects yielded a large amount of information about the graduates surveyed from the three sample years. Both the 1980-1981 sample and the 1981-1982 sample proved to be representative of their populations on both program area and sex. The 1978-1979 sample was representative of its population on the sex variable but not on the program area variable. The nonrepresentativeness on the program area variable was due to the over sampling of small program areas in order to include enough subjects to produce stable statistical results for these program areas. The impact of this situation on the outcome of the study was found to be negligible and therefore the results present a valid profile of graduates of the college. Analyses indicated that there was very little difference among the sample years. In addition, the comparisons made between sex, among program areas (academic majors), employment subgroups and teaching produced some interesting and important findings. Briefly, some of those findings are:

1. The majority of the graduates (75%) are female; yet there has been a progressive increase in the number of male graduates from sample year to sample year.
2. Over 90 percent of the graduates are employed but approximately one third are in noneducation-related positions.
3. Although the graduates are generally satisfied with their current positions, those teaching are significantly more satisfied than those in education related or noneducation related employment.
4. The majority of the students (73%) felt that personal initiative was the most important strategy for securing employment.
5. Within the teaching employment subgroup, those individuals teaching the longest were more satisfied with their jobs than the more recent teachers.

6. The location of the graduates' current teaching positions can be grouped into the following community types:

Urban	25%
Suburban	35%
Rural	41%

7. Fifty-five percent of the teachers are teaching at the senior high level; 27 percent are teaching at the elementary level and 18 percent at the junior high level.
8. Sixty-six percent of the teachers feel that supervision of extracurricular activities is voluntary and 55 percent of the teachers actually supervise extracurricular activities.
9. Generally, the graduates reported their student teaching experience to be quite successful. For example, 98 percent of the graduates rated their experience as somewhat successful or successful; 88 percent reported having a good or very good relationship with their cooperating teacher.
10. Seventy-five percent of the students completed all four years at The Ohio State University.
11. Approximately 50 percent expressed a desire to obtain an advanced degree in education; another 25 percent plan to obtain one in a noneducation field.

Because the samples, primarily, were representative of their populations, these findings can be generalized with confidence to the target populations of College of Education graduates or specific program areas.

APPENDICES

FOLLOW-UP DEMOGRAPHICS/SCHOOL CLIMATE
COLLEGE OF EDUCATION
THE OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS: IF YOU ARE NOT TEACHING FULL OR PART TIME, COMPLETE QUESTIONS 1-29.
IF YOU ARE A REGULAR CLASSROOM TEACHER (FULL TIME, PART TIME, OR PERMANENT SUBSTITUTE)
COMPLETE QUESTIONS 1-29 AND 30-55.

Circle the appropriate letter.

1. Age
 a. 20-25 d. 36-40
 b. 26-30 e. over 40
 c. 31-35

2. Sex
 a. female
 b. male

3. Racial-ethnic background
 a. Asian-American
 b. Black, non-Hispanic
 c. Hispanic
 d. Native American (American Indian)
 e. White
 f. Other (specify) _____

CURRENT EMPLOYMENT

4. Are you currently employed?
 a. yes
 b. no
 If yes, answer questions 5-9. If no, go to question 9.
5. Which of the following describes your current employment?
 a. regular classroom teaching (include art, music, reading, etc.)
 b. other school employment (counseling, administering, curriculum design, media, etc.)
 c. employed in post secondary education
 d. permanent substitution
 e. day to day substitution
 f. other education related (specify) _____
 g. other non-education related (specify) _____
 What is your job title? _____
6. Is this position considered
 a. full time
 b. part time
 Specify average hours per week _____
7. Which one of the following best describes your level of satisfaction with your present position?
 a. very satisfied d. somewhat dissatisfied
 b. somewhat satisfied e. very dissatisfied
 c. neutral
8. Has your educational preparation been useful in your present position?
 a. very useful
 b. somewhat useful
 c. not useful
9. How would you rate the Educational Personnel Placement Office services?
 a. excellent d. unsatisfactory
 b. good e. did not use services
 c. fair

EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUND

10. Were you a transfer student?
 a. No, I completed my entire undergraduate career at OSU.
 b. Yes, I entered OSU as a freshman.
 c. Yes, I entered OSU as a sophomore.
 d. Yes, I entered OSU as a junior.
 e. Yes, I entered OSU as a senior.
 f. Other (specify) _____
11. Quarter and year of graduation _____
12. Identify your undergraduate program area (major) from the list of program areas on the attached list and write the appropriate number in the space provided. _____

13. If you are considering further professional study, please circle the appropriate description below.
 a. professional study in education--Master's degree
 b. professional study in education--Doctorate degree
 c. professional study in education--Specialist degree
 d. professional study in field other than education (specify) _____
 e. not considering further professional study

14. If you have started graduate studies, how many credit hours have you completed? _____

Answer questions 15-17 if you have completed a graduate degree.

15. Circle the highest degree you have completed beyond the Bachelor's degree.
 a. Master's degree
 b. Ph.D.
 c. Specialist degree

16. In what field of study did you receive the degree circled in question 15? _____

17. At what institution did you complete the degree circled in question 15? _____

Circle the category that best describes your student teaching situation.

18. Location:
 a. urban
 b. suburban
 c. rural

19. Classroom discipline:
 a. no problems
 b. occasional problems
 c. many problems

20. Ability level of students:
 a. above grade level
 b. at grade level
 c. below grade level

21. Student teaching experience:
 a. successful
 b. somewhat successful
 c. unsuccessful

22. Relationship with cooperating teacher:
 a. very good d. poor
 b. good e. very poor
 c. fair

23. How many years of full time teaching experience, including this year, have you had?
 a. none d. three
 b. one e. four or more
 c. two

24. Which one of the following best describes your present feelings about teaching as a career?
 a. very positive d. negative
 b. positive e. very negative
 c. neutral

25. List your major reasons for entering a preservice teacher education program. _____

INDIVIDUALS NOT TEACHING

If you are not teaching complete questions 25-29, check the accuracy of your address and return the questionnaire in the enclosed envelope. Thank you for your assistance.

25. Have you ever sought a teaching position?
 1 a. yes
 2 b. no
27. If yes, which of the following did you utilize in seeking a teaching position? (Circle all that apply.)
 1 a. Educational Personnel Placement Office
 2 b. other placement services on campus
 3 c. letters written to prospective employers
 4 d. private or public employment agencies
 5 e. other (specify) _____
28. Why are you not teaching at the present time? (Circle all that apply.)
 1 a. chose to change professions
 2 b. no jobs available
 3 c. salaries are too low
 4 d. not willing or unable to relocate
 5 e. family responsibilities
 6 f. academic record
 7 g. quality of my teacher education program
 8 h. other (specify) _____
29. Do you regret that you are not teaching?
 1 a. yes
 2 n. no

You are finished with the questionnaire. Please check your answers for accuracy and return the questionnaire in the enclosed envelope.

INDIVIDUALS TEACHING FULL OR PART TIME

Complete questions 30-55 if you are a regular classroom teacher (full time, part time or permanent substitute).

30. Which one of the following best describes your current position in terms of your educational background?
 1 a. employed in major field
 2 b. employed in minor field
 3 c. employed in major and minor field
 4 d. employed in an educational field other than those prepared for at OSU (specify) _____
31. Please indicate which one of the following was most helpful to you in securing employment.
 1 a. College of Education faculty member
 2 b. Department or program chairperson
 3 c. Educational Personnel Placement Office
 4 d. personal initiative
 5 e. other (specify) _____
32. How did you obtain your first teaching position?
 1 a. found a job in the district in which I student taught
 2 b. began as a substitute and was later hired as a regular teacher
 3 c. personal contact (friends, relatives)
 4 d. Placement Office or other university assistance
 5 e. other (specify) _____

Circle the category that best describes your current teaching situation.

33. Location.
 1 a. urban
 2 b. suburban
 3 c. rural
34. Typical student motivation:
 3 a. high
 2 b. average
 1 c. low
- Classroom discipline:
 1 a. no problems
 2 b. occasional problems
 3 c. many problems
36. Racial mix:
 1 a. less than 5% minority students (Black, Hispanic, etc.)
 2 b. 5-25% minority students
 3 c. 25-50% minority students
 4 d. more than 50% minority students

37. School size:
 1 a. under 500
 2 b. 500-1000
 3 c. over 1000
38. Which grades or grade level do you spend the major part of your time teaching? _____
39. How would you rate your teaching?
 4 a. very effective
 3 b. moderately effective
 2 c. somewhat ineffective
 1 d. ineffective
40. Which one factor would be most helpful in improving your teaching effectiveness?
 1 a. fewer or smaller classes
 2 b. better professional preparation
 3 c. more support from other school personnel
 4 d. more lesson preparation time
 5 e. other (specify) _____
41. Overall, to what extent did your program in teacher education provide the knowledge and skills necessary for successful teaching in your area?
 5 a. I was well prepared to take on all the responsibilities of teaching.
 4 b. I was well prepared to take on the majority of the responsibilities of teaching.
 3 c. I was generally prepared to take on the majority of the responsibilities of teaching.
 2 d. I was unprepared to take on the majority of the responsibilities of teaching.
 1 e. I was unprepared to take on any of the responsibilities of teaching.
 If you chose b, c, d or e, identify those areas in which you would like additional and/or better preparation.
42. In general, how would you judge your level of confidence in carrying out the responsibilities of teaching this year?
 4 a. extremely confident
 3 b. somewhat confident
 2 c. somewhat lacking in confidence
 1 d. extremely lacking in confidence
43. Do we have your permission to contact your immediate supervisor to obtain general information?
 1 a. yes
 2 b. no
 If yes, please identify your supervisor by name and give the appropriate address.

PROFESSIONAL INTERACTIONS IN THE SCHOOL SETTING

44. Describe the assistance you receive with discipline problems.
 7 a. assistance available and effective
 6 b. assistance available, but ineffective
 5 c. assistance available only in extreme circumstances
 4 d. no assistance available
 3 e. assistance available, but request for assistance viewed as a weakness on the part of the teacher
 2 f. no assistance needed
 1 g. other (specify) _____
45. Supervision of extracurricular activities is:
 1 a. completely voluntary on my part
 2 b. expected by the school administration
 3 c. required by the school administration
 4 d. a condition of my employment with the district

(CONTINUED ON NEXT PAGE)

PROFESSIONAL INTERACTIONS IN THE SCHOOL SETTING (Continued)

46. Are you currently supervising extracurricular activities?
 / a. yes
 2 b. no
47. If you answered "yes" to question 46, are you paid for this responsibility?
 / a. yes
 2 b. no
48. Which one of the following had the primary responsibility for evaluating your teaching?
 / a. teaching colleagues
 2 b. department head
 3 c. students
 4 d. curriculum specialist
 5 e. principal/administrator
 6 f. other (specify) _____
49. How many times this year has this person observed and evaluated your teaching?
 / a. 0 times
 2 b. 1 time
 3 c. 2-3 times
 4 d. 4-6 times
 5 e. more than 6 times

50. Which one of the following methods is most meaningful to you in evaluating your teaching effectiveness?
 / a. student test scores from standardized and teacher-made tests
 2 b. colleagues' feedback
 3 c. students' feedback
 4 d. student improvement
 5 e. formal performance evaluation
 6 f. self evaluation
 7 g. other (specify) _____
51. Which one of these people has been most helpful to your professional development?
 / a. administrator
 2 b. teaching colleague
 3 c. department head or curriculum specialist
 4 d. counselor
 5 e. other (specify) _____
52. During your first year of teaching, which one of these people provided support and encouragement?
 / a. administrator or instructional coordinator
 2 b. counselor
 3 c. a fellow teacher
 4 d. a relative or friend
 5 e. no one available
 6 f. other (specify) _____

TEACHING PERSPECTIVE

Using the continuum described below for items 53-55, circle the number which best denotes your general position in regard to the three teaching beliefs listed below which could serve to guide your decisions and actions in the classroom.

1 Strongly agree with A	2 A represents my emphasis but my position includes some elements of Position B	3 B represents my emphasis but my position includes some elements of Position A	4 Strongly agree with B
<u>Position A</u>		<u>Position B</u>	
53. <u>Students</u> Students are dependent on the teacher for direction; they work and learn best when they are required to complete specifically delineated learning assignments.	1 2 3 4	Students are independent of the teacher and are capable of being self-directed; they work and learn best when given the opportunity to set individual goals and learning activities.	
54. <u>Learning Outcomes</u> The most important learning outcomes are the predetermined cognitive knowledge outcomes related to the particular subject(s) being taught.	1 2 3 4	The most important learning outcomes are the emerging affective and process outcomes developed through activities in and outside the classroom.	
55. <u>Methods</u> Methods for carrying out instructions should be determined in advance and should provide specific directions for how each learning activity and assignment is to be performed.	1 2 3 4	Methods for carrying out instructions should provide opportunities for students to make decisions about and direct their own learning.	

PLEASE CHECK THE ACCURACY OF YOUR ADDRESS AND RETURN THE QUESTIONNAIRE IN THE ENCLOSED ENVELOPE. THANK YOU FOR YOUR ASSISTANCE IN THIS EFFORT. WE ARE LOOKING FORWARD TO HEARING FROM YOU IN THE NEAR FUTURE.

This label will be detached before we analyze your responses. We attached your label only to avoid sending you another questionnaire. If your address has changed, please correct.

What is your phone number? () _____

THE OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY
COLLEGE OF EDUCATION

UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAM AREAS
(Question 12)

1. Agriculture Education
2. Art Education
3. Biological Science Education
4. Broadcast Communications Education
5. Business Education
6. Dance Education
7. Dental Hygiene Education
8. Distributive Education (Voc-Tech)
9. Earth Science Education
10. Elementary Education
11. Elementary-Special Education
12. English Education
13. English Communications Education
14. Exceptional Children Education
15. Foreign Language Education
16. Health Education
17. Home Economics Education
18. Industrial Technology Education
19. Interscholastic Sports Education
20. Journalism Education
21. Mathematics Education
22. Media Education
23. Music Education
24. Physical Education
25. Physical Sciences Education
26. Recreation Education
27. Science Education
28. Social Studies Education
29. Speech-Theatre Education
30. Trade and Industrial Education



The Ohio State University

Office of the Dean
Follow-up Project060-A Ramseyer Hall
29 West Woodruff Avenue
Columbus, Ohio 43210

March 14, 1983

Dear Graduate:

We need your assistance! It won't take long and it will help us plan for the future. The College of Education is attempting to collect information regarding the status of its graduates. The enclosed questionnaire contains questions that address your current job situation and your educational courses and experiences. Your response to the questionnaire will enable the college to ascertain how and what its former students are currently doing. In addition, this information will assist us in modifying our current programs to better prepare students for their professional careers.

We would appreciate you taking time from your busy schedule to complete the enclosed questionnaire before April 11, 1983. A postage paid return envelope has been provided for your convenience.

Your individual responses will remain strictly confidential. Thank you for your interest and cooperation.

Sincerely,

Handwritten signature of William E. Loadman in cursive.

William E. Loadman, Ph.D.
Coordinator, Measurement and
Evaluation Services

Handwritten signature of Russell J. Spillman in cursive.

Russell J. Spillman, Ph.D.
Acting Dean
College of Education



The Ohio State University

Office of the Dean
College of Education
1945 North High Street
Columbus, Ohio 43210-1172
Phone 614 422-5790

June 1, 1983

Dear Graduate:

We are still in need of your assistance! As mentioned in our initial correspondence we are attempting to collect information regarding the status of the College of Education's masters and doctoral graduates. Your response to the enclosed questionnaire will enable the college to ascertain how and what its graduates are currently doing. In addition, with this information we will be able to modify our current programs to better prepare our graduates.

We are aware of how busy your schedule is and we would appreciate you taking a few extra moments to complete our questionnaire. A postage paid envelope has been enclosed for your convenience. Please return the questionnaire by June 20, 1983.

Your individual responses will remain strictly confidential. Thank you for your time, interest and cooperation.

Sincerely,

William E. Loadman, Ph.D.
Coordinator, Measurement
and Evaluation Services

Robert A. Burnham
Dean

P.S. If you have already completed a copy of the questionnaire, please disregard this letter.

APPENDIX C
Significant ANOVAS for Sample Year Profiles

APPENDIX 1C

SEX BY YEAR

SOURCE	D.F.	S.S.	F
Between Groups	2	2.9225	7.480
Within Groups	856	167.2141	
TOTAL	858	170.1366	

p = .006

SUMMARY STATISTICS

GROUP	N	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION
1978 - 1979	135	1.39	.532
1979 - 1980	114	1.28	.451
1980 - 1981	610	1.22	.418
TOTAL	859	1.26	.445

APPENDIX 2C

SOURCE	FULL TIME OR PART TIME EMPLOYMENT BY YEAR		
	D.F.	S.S.	F
Between Groups	2	5.8707	15.702
Within Groups	781	145.997	
TOTAL	783	151.8680	

p = .0000

SUMMARY STATISTICS

GROUP	N	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION
1978 - 1979	120	1.91	.2898
1979 - 1980	103	1.83	.3816
1980 - 1981	561	1.68	.4651
TOTAL	784	1.74	.4324

APPENDIX 3C

SATISFACTION WITH CURRENT EMPLOYMENT BY YEAR			
SOURCE	D.F.	S.S.	F
Between Groups	2	20.1155	6.675
Within Groups	781	1176.7530	
TOTAL	783	1196.8685	

$p = .0013$

SUMMARY STATISTICS

GROUP	N	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION
1978 - 1979	120	4.18	1.0344
1980 - 1981	102	3.88	1.1882
1981 - 1982	562	3.73	1.2714
TOTAL	784	3.82	1.2364

APPENDIX D

Significant ANOVAS For Teaching Subgroup

APPENDIX 1D
Teaching Subgroup 1978-1979

APPENDIX 1.1D

TEACHING LEVEL BY PROGRAM AREA			
SOURCE	D.F.	S.S.	F
Between Groups	13	27.5440	7.869
Within Groups	40	10.7708	
TOTAL	53	38.3148	

p = 0.0000

SUMMARY STATISTICS

GROUP	N	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION
GRP01	1	3.00	0.0
GRP05	3	3.00	.704
GRP10	16	1.69	0.0
GRP11	2	1.00	0.0
GRP12	3	3.00	0.0
GRP14	1	1.00	
GRP17	5	3.00	0.0
GRP18	2	3.00	0.0
GRP21	2	3.00	0.0
GRP23	3	1.67	.578
GRP24	3	1.67	1.155
GRP27	6	3.00	0.0
GRP28	6	3.00	0.0
GRP30	1	3.00	
TOTAL	54	2.35	.850

APPENDIX 1.20

SUPERVISION OF EXTRACURRICULAR ACTIVITIES			
SOURCE	D.F.	S.S.	F
Between Groups	13	5.2996	2.063
Within Groups	40	7.9042	
TOTAL	53	13.2037	

$p = .0399$

SUMMARY STATISTICS

GROUP	N	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION
GRP01	1	2.00	
GRP05	3	1.33	.577
GRP10	16	1.69	.479
GRP11	2	1.50	.707
GRP12	3	1.66	.577
GRP14	1	1.00	
GRP17	5	1.20	.447
GRP18	2	1.50	.707
GRP21	2	1.00	
GRP23	3	1.00	
GRP24	3	1.00	
GRP27	6	1.00	
GRP28	6	1.66	.516
GRP30	1	2.00	
TOTAL	54	1.43	.499

APPENDIX 1.3D

HELPEFUL PERSON IN PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT BY PROGRAM AREA			
SOURCE	D.F.	S.S.	F
Between Groups	13	33.3606	2.975
Within Groups	35	30.1905	
TOTAL	48	63.5510	

p = .0051

SUMMARY STATISTICS

GROUP	N	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION
GRP01	1	5.00	
GRP05	3	1.66	.57
GRP10	14	1.71	.469
GRP11	2	2.00	0.0
GRP12	2	2.00	0.0
GRP14	1	5.00	
GRP17	5	3.00	1.871
GRP18	2	2.00	1.414
GRP21	2	2.00	0.0
GRP23	2	1.50	.707
GRP24	2	2.00	0.0
GRP27	6	2.66	1.211
GRP28	6	2.16	.753
GRP30	1	5.00	
TOTAL	49	2.26	1.150

APPENDIX 1.4D

CLASSROOM DISCIPLINE BY SEX			
SOURCE	D.F.	S.S.	F
Between Groups	1	1.1544	5.011
Within Groups	50	11.5187	
TOTAL	51	12.6731	

$p = .0297$

SUMMARY STATISTICS

GROUP	N	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION
FEMALES	32	1.91	.390
MALES	20	1.60	.598
TOTAL	52	1.79	.498

APPENDIX 1.5D

TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS BY SEX			
SOURCE	D.F.	S.S.	F
Between Groups	1	2.0356	9.248
Within Groups	52	11.4459	
TOTAL	53	13.4815	

$p = .0037$

SUMMARY STATISTICS

GROUP	N	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION
FEMALES	33	3.64	.488
MALES	21	3.24	.436
TOTAL	54	3.48	.504

APPENDIX 1.6D

SIZE OF SCHOOL BY TEACHING LEVEL			
SOURCE	D.F.	S.S.	F
Between Groups	2	5.6065	5.483
Within Groups	50	25.5632	
TOTAL	52	31.1697	

$p = .00\%$

SUMMARY STATISTICS

GROUP	N	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION
ELEMENTARY	13	1.15	.376
JUNIOR HIGH	9	1.66	.500
SENIOR HIGH	31	1.94	.854
TOTAL	53	1.69	.774

APPENDIX 2D
Teaching Subgroup 1980-1981

APPENDIX 2.10

SIZE OF SCHOOL BY PROGRAM AREA

SOURCE	D.F.	S.S.	F
Between Groups	16	12.5856	2.484
Within Groups	20	6.3333	
TOTAL	36	18.9189	

p = .0281

SUMMARY STATISTICS

GROUP	N	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION
GRP01	1	1.00	
GRP03	1	2.00	
GRP05	2	3.00	0.0
GRP08	1	3.00	
GRP10	12	1.33	.492
GRP11	2	1.00	0.0
GRP12	2	2.00	1.414
GRP15	2	1.50	.707
GRP16	1	2.00	
GRP17	3	1.33	.577
GRP18	1	1.00	
GRP21	2	2.00	0.0
GRP23	2	2.50	.707
GRP24	1	1.00	
GRP27	1	2.00	
GRP28	1	1.00	
GRP30	2	1.00	0.0
TOTAL	37	1.59	.725

APPENDIX 2.2D

TEACHING LEVEL BY PROGRAM AREA			
SOURCE	D.F.	S.S.	F
Between Groups	16	24.0203	3.639
Within Groups	20	8.2500	
TOTAL	36	32.2703	

p = .0037

SUMMARY STATISTICS

GROUP	N	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION
GRP01	1	3.00	
GRP03	1	3.00	
GRP05	2	3.00	0.0
GRP08	1	3.00	
GRP10	12	1.25	.452
GRP11	2	2.00	1.414
GRP12	2	3.00	0.0
GRP15	2	2.00	1.414
GRP16	1	3.00	
GRP17	3	3.00	0.0
GRP18	1	3.00	
GRP21	2	3.00	
GRP23	2	2.00	0.0
GRP24	1	1.00	1.414
GRP27	1	3.00	
GRP28	1	3.00	
GRP30	2	3.00	
TOTAL	37	2.22	.947

APPENDIX 2.3D

EXPECTATIONS FOR SUPERVISING EXTRACURRICULAR ACTIVITIES BY PROGRAM AREA			
SOURCE	D.F.	S.S.	F
Between Groups	16	13.9015	2.410
Within Groups	19	6.8485	
TOTAL	35	20.7500	

$p = .0347$

SUMMARY STATISTICS

GROUP	N	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION
GRP01	1	3.00	
GRP03	1	2.00	
GRP05	2	1.50	.707
GRP08	1	2.00	
GRP10	11	1.27	.647
GRP11	2	1.00	0.0
GRP12	2	1.50	.707
GRP15	2	1.50	.707
GRP16	1	2.00	
GRP17	3	1.33	.577
GRP18	1	4.00	
GRP21	2	2.00	0.0
GRP23	2	2.50	.707
GRP24	1	1.00	
GRP27	1	2.00	
GRP28	1	1.00	
GRP30	2	1.00	0.0
TOTAL	36	1.58	.770

APPENDIX 2.4D

SOURCE	SIZE OF SCHOOL BY SEX		F
	D.F.	S.S.	
Between Groups	1	2.1625	4.517
Within Groups	35	16.7564	
TOTAL	36	18.9189	

$p = .0407$

SUMMARY STATISTICS

GROUP	N	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION
FEMALE	24	1.42	.654
MALES	13	1.92	.759
TOTAL	37	1.59	.725

APPENDIX 2.5D

TEACHING LEVEL BY SEX			
SOURCE	D.F.	S.S.	F
Between Groups	1	6.1292	8.206
Within Groups	35	26.1410	
TOTAL	36	32.2701	

$p = .0070$

SUMMARY STATISTICS

GROUP	N	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION
FEMALE	24	1.92	.974
MALE	13	2.77	.599
TOTAL	37	2.2	.947

APPENDIX 2.6D

TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS BY SEX			
SOURCE	D.F.	S.S.	F
Between Groups	1	1.8719	7
Within Groups	35	9.3173	
TOTAL	36	11.1892	

$p = .0120$

SUMMARY STATISTICS

GROUP	N	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION
GRP01	24	3.63	.576
GRP02	13	3.15	.376
TOTAL	37	3.46	.558

APPENDIX 2.7D

EXPECTATIONS FOR SUPERVISING EXTRACURRICULAR ACTIVITIES BY SEX

SOURCE	D.F.	S.S.	F
Between Groups	1	4.9573	10.673
Within Groups	34	15.7926	
TOTAL	35	20.7500	

p = .0025

SUMMARY STATISTICS

GROUP	N	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION
FEMALES	23	1.30	.559
MALES	13	2.08	.862
TOTAL	36	1.58	.770

APPENDIX 2.80

SUPERVISION OF EXTRACURRICULAR ACTIVITIES			
SOURCE	D.F.	S.S.	F
Between Groups	1	2.1625	11.202
Within Groups	35	6.7564	
TOTAL	36	8.9189	

$p = .0020$

SUMMARY STATISTICS

GROUP	N	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION
FEMALES	24	1.58	.504
MALES	13	1.08	.277
TOTAL	37	1.41	.498

APPENDIX 3D
Teaching Subgroup 1980-1981

APPENDIX 3.1D

SIZE OF SCHOOL BY PROGRAM AREA			
SOURCE	D.F.	S.S.	F
Between Groups	17	19.3014	2.116
Within Groups	149	79.9319	
TOTAL	166	99.2333	

p = .0089

SUMMARY STATISTICS

GROUP	N	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION
GRP01	11	1.73	1.104
GRP02	1	3.00	
GRP05	2	1.50	.707
GRP08	2	1.00	0.0
GRP10	70	1.41	.625
GRP11	4	1.75	.500
GRP12	9	2.33	1.000
GRP13	1	2.00	
GRP14	9	1.44	.727
GRP15	5	2.00	.707
GRP16	1	1.00	
GRP17	7	2.00	.817
GRP18	7	2.00	1.000
GRP21	3	2.67	.577
GRP23	19	1.53	.612
GRP24	9	1.44	.727
GRP27	3	2.33	.577
GRP28	4	1.50	1.000
TOTAL	4	1.62	.773

APPENDIX 3.2D

TEACHING LEVEL BY PROGRAM AREA			
SOURCE	D.F.	S.S.	F
Between Groups	17	53.3392	6.450
Within Groups	151	73.4536	
TOTAL	168	126.7928	

p = 0.0000

SUMMARY STATISTICS

GROUP	N	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION
GRP01	11	3.00	0.0
GRP02	1	3.00	
GRP05	2	3.00	0.0
GRP08	2	3.00	0.0
GRP10	70	1.71	0.819
GRP11	4	2.75	.500
GRP12	9	3.00	0.0
GRP13	1	3.00	
GRP14	9	1.89	1.054
GRP15	6	2.83	.408
GRP16	1	3.00	
GRP17	7	2.14	1.215
GRP18	7	3.00	0.0
GRP21	3	3.00	0.0
GRP23	20	2.45	.605
GRP24	9	2.80	.333
GRP27	3	3.00	0.0
GRP28	4	3.00	0.0
TOTAL	169	2.29	.869

APPENDIX 3 30

SATISFACTION WITH CURRENT EMPLOYMENT BY PROGRAM AREA			
SOURCE	D.F.	S.S.	F
Between Groups	17	34.6243	2.219
Within Groups	150	137.6607	
TOTAL	167	172.2851	

p = .0057

SUMMARY STATISTICS

GROUP	N	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION
GRP01	11	3.36	1.433
GRP02	1	5.00	
GRP05	2	3.50	2.121
GRP08	2	3.00	1.414
GRP10	69	4.52	.868
GRP11	4	4.75	.500
GRP12	9	4.67	.500
GRP13	1	2.00	
GRP14	9	4.44	.527
GRP15	6	4.00	1.549
GRP16	1	5.00	
GRP17	7	4.29	.756
GRP18	7	4.57	.787
GRP21	3	4.67	.577
GRP23	20	3.80	1.152
GRP24	9	4.33	.707
GRP27	3	3.67	1.528
GRP28	4	4.75	.500
TOTAL	168	4.29	1.016

APPENDIX 3.40

PERSPECTIVE ON STUDENTS BY PROGRAM AREA

SOURCE	D.F.	S.S.	F
Between Groups	17	17.3449	2.076
Within Groups	147	72.2303	
TOTAL	164	89.5753	

p = .0106

SUMMARY STATISTICS

GROUP	N	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION
GRPC1	10	2.20	.633
GRPD2	1	2.00	
GRPO5	2	2.00	0.0
GRPO8	1	1.00	
GRP10	69	2.32	.795
GRP11	4	2.00	.817
GRP12	9	2.33	.500
GRP13	1	3.00	
GRP14	9	2.33	.500
GRP15	6	1.67	.817
GRP16	1	2.00	
GRP17	7	2.57	.787
GRP18	7	1.57	.535
GRP21	3	1.33	.577
GRP23	20	1.85	.671
GRP24	8	2.00	0.0
GRP27	3	1.33	.577
GRP28	4	1.50	.577
TOTAL	165	2.12	.739

APPENDIX 3.5D

PERSPECTIVE ON INSTRUCTIONAL METHODS BY PROGRAM AREA			
SOURCE	D.F.	S.S.	F
Between Groups	17	25.2819	3.009
Within Groups	148	73.1515	
TOTAL	165	98.4333	

p = .0002

SUMMARY STATISTICS

GROUP	N	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION
GRP01	11	2.18	.405
GRP02	1	3.00	
GRP05	2	3.00	0.0
GRP08	1	1.00	
GRP10	69	2.64	.747
GRP11	4	2.00	0.0
GRP12	9	2.22	.441
GRP13	1	3.00	
GRP14	9	2.33	.866
GRP15	6	1.83	.983
GRP16	1	2.00	
GRP17	7	2.71	.756
GRP18	7	2.43	.787
GRP21	3	2.00	0.0
GRP23	20	1.75	.550
GRP24	8	2.13	.991
GRP27	3	1.33	.577
GRP28	4	1.75	.500
TOTAL	166	2.33	.772

APPENDIX 3.6D

SUPERVISION OF EXTRACURRICULAR ACTIVITIES BY PROGRAM AREA			
SOURCE	D.F.	S.S.	F
Between Groups	17	11.9543	3.611
Within Groups	147	28.6275	
TOTAL	164	40.5818	

p = .0000

SUMMARY STATISTICS

GROUP	N	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION
GRP01	11	1.18	.404
GRP02	1	1.00	---
GRP05	2	1.50	.707
GRP08	2	1.00	.000
GRP10	68	1.72	.452
GRP11	4	1.50	.577
GRP12	9	1.22	.441
GRP13	1	1.00	---
GRP14	9	1.50	.527
GRP15	6	1.33	.516
GRP16	1	1.00	---
GRP17	6	1.33	.516
GRP18	7	1.00	.000
GRP21	2	1.50	.707
GRP23	20	1.15	.366
GRP24	9	1.22	.441
GRP27	3	1.00	.00
GRP28	4	1.25	.500

APPENDIX 3.7D

RATING OF EDUCATION PLACEMENT OFFICE BY PROGRAM AREA			
SOURCE	D.F.	S.S.	F
Between Groups	17	94.0243	2.878
Within Groups	150	288.2550	
TOTAL	167	382.2793	

p = .0003

SUMMARY STATISTICS

GROUP	N	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION
GRP01	11	1.64	1.433
GRP02	1	5.00	
GRP05	2	4.50	.707
GRP08	2	1.50	.707
GRP10	69	2.61	1.437
GRP11	4	2.75	1.258
GRP12	9	3.69	1.054
GRP13	1	3.00	
GRP14	9	3.11	1.764
GRP15	6	3.50	1.378
GRP16	1	5.00	
GRP17	7	3.57	1.813
GRP18	7	3.00	1.291
GRP21	3	3.33	2.082
GRP23	20	4.20	.768
GRP24	9	3.33	1.414
GRP27	3	3.67	.577
GRP28	4	4.00	2.00
TOTAL	168	3.065	1.513

APPENDIX 3.8D

MOTIVATION OF PRESENT STUDENTS BY SEX

SOURCE	D.F.	S.S.	F
Between Groups	1	4.3687	9.470
Within Groups	166	76.5770	
TOTAL	167	80.9456	

p = .0024

SUMMARY STATISTICS

GROUP	N	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION
FEMALE	121	2.08	.726
MALE	47	1.72	.540
TOTAL	168	1.98	.697

APPENDIX 3.9D

SOURCE	SIZE OF SCHOOL BY SEX		F
	D.F.	S.S.	
Between Groups	1	13.7460	20.276
Within Groups	166	112.5387	
TOTAL	167	126.2847	

p = .0000

SUMMARY STATISTICS

GROUP	N	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION
FEMALE	127	2.11	.920
MALE	47	2.74	.488
TOTAL	168	2.29	.870

APPENDIX 3.100

TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS BY SEX			
SOURCE	D.F.	S.S.	F
Between Groups	1	1.2805	4.881
Within Groups	166	43.5525	
TOTAL	167	44.8329	

$p = .0285$

SUMMARY STATISTICS

GROUP	N	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION
FEMALE	118	2.75	1.480
MALE	45	3.22	1.506
TOTAL	163	2.88	1.498

APPENDIX 3.110

PERSPECTIVE ON STUDENT CHARACTERISTICS BY SEX			
SOURCE	D.F.	S.S.	F
Between Groups	1	7.6291	15.318
Within Groups	162	80.6813	
TOTAL	163	88.3104	

$p = .0001$

SUMMARY STATISTICS

GROUP	N	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION
FEMALE	118	2.26	.733
MALE	46	1.78	.629
TOTAL	164	2.13	.736

APPENDIX 3.12D

PERSPECTIVE ON INSTRUCTIONAL METHODS BY SEX			
SOURCE	D.F.	S.S.	F
Between Groups	1	10.5288	20.171
Within Groups	163	85.0826	
TOTAL	164	95.6115	

p = .0000

SUMMARY STATISTICS

GROUP	N	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION
FEMALE	118	2.47	.770
MALE	47	1.91	.584
TOTAL	164	2.32	.764

APPENDIX 3.130

SUPERVISION OF EXTRACURRICULAR ACTIVITIES BY SEX			
SOURCE	D.F.	S.S.	F
Between Groups	1	3.3726	14.760
Within Groups	162	37.0172	
TOTAL	163	40.3898	

$p < .0002$

SUMMARY STATISTICS

GROUP	N	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION
FEMALE	117	1.53	.501
MALE	47	1.21	.414
TOTAL	164	1.44	.498

APPENDIX 3.14D

RATING OF EDUCATION PLACEMENT OFFICE BY SEX			
SOURCE	D.F.	S.S.	F
Between Groups	1	12.5933	5.638
Within Groups	165	368.5424	
TOTAL	166	381.1355	

$p = .0187$

SUMMARY STATISTICS

GROUP	N	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION
FEMALE	120	2.90	1.514
MALE	47	3.51	1.443
TOTAL	167	3.07	1.515

APPENDIX 3.15D

MOTIVATION OF PRESENT STUDENTS BY TEACHING LEVEL			
SOURCE	D.F.	S.S.	F
Between Groups	2	5.6992	6.292
Within Groups	164	74.2762	
TOTAL	166	79.9754	

p = .0023

SUMMARY STATISTICS

GROUP	N	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION
ELEMENTARY	40	2.25	.630
JUNIOR HIGH	34	2.12	.591
SENIOR HIGH	93	1.83	.717
TOTAL	167	1.99	.694

APPENDIX 3.16D

SIZE OF SCHOOL BY TEACHING LEVEL			
SOURCE	D.F.	S.S.	T
Between Groups	2	7.0538	6.252
Within Groups	162	91.3942	
TOTAL	164	98.4480	

p = .0024

SUMMARY STATISTICS

GROUP	N	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION
ELEMENTARY	40	1.35	.622
JUNIOR HIGH	34	1.47	.615
SENIOR HIGH	91	1.81	.842
TOTAL	165	1.63	.775

APPENDIX 3.17D

TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS BY TEACHING LEVEL			
SOURCE	D.F.	S.S.	F
Between Groups	2	2.9609	5.846
Within Groups	164	41.5302	
TOTAL	166	44.4911	

$p = .0035$

SUMMARY STATISTICS

GROUP	N	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION
ELEMENTARY	40	3.65	.483
JUNIOR HIGH	34	3.32	.535
SENIOR HIGH	93	3.34	.499
TOTAL	167	3.41	.518

APPENDIX 3.18D

SATISFACTION WITH CURRENT EMPLOYMENT BY TEACHING LEVEL			
SOURCE	D.F.	S.S.	F
Between Groups	2	7.0972	3.514
Within Groups	163	164.5950	
TOTAL	165	171.6923	

$p = .0320$

SUMMARY STATISTICS

GROUP	N	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION
ELEMENTARY	39	4.59	.785
JUNIOR HIGH	34	4.41	.821
SENIOR HIGH	93	4.11	1.137
TOTAL	166	4.28	1.020

APPENDIX 3.190

PERSPECTIVE ON STUDENT CHARACTERISTICS BY TEACHING LEVEL			
SOURCE	D.F.	S.S.	F
Between Groups	2	7.8154	8.380
Within Groups	160	74.6136	
TOTAL	162	82.4290	

$p = .0003$

SUMMARY STATISTICS

GROUP	N	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION
ELEMENTARY	40	2.45	.714
JUNIOR HIGH	34	2.15	.702
SENIOR HIGH	89	1.92	.661
TOTAL	163	2.09	.713

APPENDIX 3.20D

PERSPECTIVE ON IMPORTANT LEARNING OUTCOMES BY TEACHING LEVEL

SOURCE	D.F.	S.S.	F
Between Groups	2	6.4771	6.567
Within Groups	160	78.9087	
TOTAL	162	85.3858	

p = .0018

SUMMARY STATISTICS

GROUP	N	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION
ELEMENTARY	40	3.18	.781
JUNIOR HIGH	34	2.59	.701
SENIOR HIGH	89	2.97	.665
TOTAL	163	2.94	.726

APPENDIX 3.21D

PERSPECTIVE ON INSTRUCTIONAL METHODS BY TEACHING LEVEL

SOURCE	D.F.	S.S.	F
Between Groups	2	4.6386	4.238
Within Groups	161	88.1171	
TOTAL	163	92.7557	

p = .0161

SUMMARY STATISTICS

GROUP	N	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION
ELEMENTARY	40	2.60	.810
JUNIOR HIGH	34	2.24	.699
SENIOR HIGH	90	2.20	.722
TOTAL	164	2.30	.754

APPENDIX 3.220

EXPECTATIONS ABOUT EXTRACURRICULAR ACTIVITIES BY TEACHING LEVEL			
SOURCE	D.F.	S.S.	F
Between Groups	2	5.9052	3.404
Within Groups	152	131.8362	
TOTAL	154	137.7414	

p = .0358

SUMMARY STATISTICS

GROUP	N	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION
ELEMENTARY	36	1.28	.513
JUNIOR HIGH	33	1.48	.972
SENIOR HIGH	86	1.74	1.043
TOTAL	155	1.58	.946

APPENDIX 3.22D

SUPERVISION OF EXTRACURRICULAR ACTIVITIES BY TEACHING LEVEL			
SOURCE	D.F.	S.S.	F
Between Groups	2	12.3162	35.497
Within Groups	160	27.7574	
TOTAL	162	40.0736	

p = .0000

SUMMARY STATISTICS

GROUP	N	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION
ELEMENTARY	38	1.87	.347
JUNIOR HIGH	34	1.56	.504
SENIOR HIGH	91	1.21	.409
TOTAL	163	1.44	.497

APPENDIX 3.24D

RATING OF EDUCATION PLACEMENT OFFICE BY TEACHING LEVEL			
SOURCE	D.F.	S.S.	F
Between Groups	2	24.4533	5.697
Within Groups	163	349.8169	
TOTAL	165	374.2700	

p = .0041

SUMMARY STATISTICS

GROUP	N	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION
ELEMENTARY	39	2.38	1.388
JUNIOR HIGH	34	3.15	1.617
SENIOR HIGH	93	3.32	1.438
TOTAL	166	3.07	1.506

APPENDIX 4D

Total Teaching Subgroup for All Sample Years

APPENDIX 4.1D

NUMBER OF EVALUATIONS PER YEAR BY YEAR			
SOURCE	D.F.	S.S.	F
Between Groups	2	13.6886	7.609
Within Groups	247	222.1658	
TOTAL	249	235.8545	

$p = .0006$

SUMMARY STATISTICS

GROUP	N	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION
1978 - 1979	53	2.53	1.03
1980 - 1981	36	3.03	1.00
1981 - 1982	161	3.11	.91
TOTAL	250	2.97	.95

APPENDIX 4.2D

LEVEL OF CONFIDENCE BY YEAR			
SOURCE	D.F.	S.S.	F
Between Groups	2	3.0906	4.976
Within Groups	256	79.4951	
TOTAL	258	82.5857	

$p = .0076$

SUMMARY STATISTICS

GROUP	N	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION
1978 - 1979	53	3.72	.495
1980 - 1981	37	3.59	.550
1981 - 1982	169	3.45	.576
TOTAL	259	3.52	.566

APPENDIX E
Significant ANOVAS for Education Related Subgroup

APPENDIX 1E
Education Related Subgroup 1978-1979
(No Significant ANOVAS)

APPENDIX 2E
Education Related Subgroup 1980-1981

APPENDIX 2.1E

SOUGHT A TEACHING POSITION BY PROGRAM AREA			
SOURCE	D.F.	S.S.	F
Between Groups	7	2.8500	3.800
Within Groups	7	.7500	
TOTAL	14	3.600	

$p = .0496$

SUMMARY STATISTICS

GROUP	N	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION
GRP02	1	1.00	
GRP07	1	2.00	
GRP10	5	1.00	
GRP13	1	1.00	
GRP16	1	2.00	
GRP23	1	1.00	
GRP24	4	1.75	.500
GRP30	1	2.00	
TOTAL	15	1.40	.507

APPENDIX 2 2E

SOUGHT A TEACHING POSITION BY SEX			
SOURCE	D.F.	S.S.	F
Between Groups	1	1.8778	14.174
Within Groups	13	1.7222	
TOTAL	14	3.6000	

$p = .0024$

SUMMARY STATISTICS

GROUP	N	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION
FEMALE	9	1.11	.333
MALE	6	1.83	.408
TOTAL	15	1.40	.507

APPENDIX 2 3E

REGRET NOT TEACHING BY SEX			
SOURCE	D.F.	S.S.	F
Between Groups	1	2.5000	39.000
Within Groups	13	.8333	0
TOTAL	14	3.3333	

p = 0.0000

SUMMARY STATISTICS

GROUP	N	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION
FEMALE	9	1.00	0.0
MALE	6	1.83	.408
TOTAL	15	1.33	.488

APPENDIX 3E
Education Related Subgroup 1981-1982

APPENDIX 3.1E

FULL TIME/PART TIME EMPLOYMENT BY PROGRAM AREA			
SOURCE	D.F.	S.S.	F
Between Groups	20	7.3827	1.955
Within Groups	165	33.6785	
TOTAL	185	41.6612	

p = .0118

SUMMARY STATISTICS

GROUP	N	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION
GRP01	2	2.00	0.0
GRP02	6	1.00	0.0
GRP03	3	1.33	.577
GRP05	4	1.75	.500
GRP07	2	2.00	0.0
GRP08	1	2.00	
GRP10	95	1.28	.453
GRP11	1	1.00	
GRP12	12	1.33	.492
GRP14	6	1.50	.548
GRP15	1	2.00	
GRP16	3	1.67	.578
GRP17	4	1.25	.500
GRP18	2	1.00	0.0
GRP21	1	1.00	
GRP23	4	1.25	.500
GRP24	21	1.38	.498
GRP25	4	1.75	.500
GRP27	1	1.00	
GRP28	10	1.10	.316
GRP30	3	2.00	0.0
TOTAL	186	1.34	.475

APPENDIX 3.2E

SOUGHT A TEACHING POSITION BY PROGRAM AREA			
SOURCE	D.F.	S.S.	F
Between Groups	17	6.2167	3.864
Within Groups	84	7.9500	
TOTAL	101	14.1667	

$p = .0000$

SUMMARY STATISTICS

GROUP	N	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION
GRPO2	4	1.25	.500
GRPO3	2	1.00	0.0
GRPO5	2	1.50	.707
GRPO7	1	2.00	
GRPO8	1	2.00	
GRP10	45	1.07	.252
GRP11	1	1.00	
GRP12	7	1.00	0.0
GRP14	4	1.00	0.0
GRP16	3	1.67	.577
GRP17	3	1.00	0.0
GRP18	1	1.00	
GRP23	1	1.00	
GRP24	15	1.20	.414
GRP26	4	2.00	0.0
GRP27	1	1.00	
GRP28	6	1.67	.408
GRP30	1	1.00	
TOTAL	102	1.17	.375

APPENDIX 3.3E

REGRET NOT TEACHING BY PROGRAM AREA

SOURCE	D.F.	S.S.	F
Between Groups	16	6.5708	2.479
Within Groups	76	12.5905	
TOTAL	92	19.1613	

p = .0044

SUMMARY STATISTICS

GROUP	N	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION
GRP02	4	1.25	.500
GRP03	2	1.00	0.0
GRP05	2	2.00	0.0
GRP07	1	2.00	
GRP08	1	2.00	
GRP10	41	1.09	.300
GRP11	1	1.00	
GRP12	6	1.17	.408
GRP14	4	1.75	.500
GRP16	2	1.50	.707
GRP17	3	1.33	.577
GRP18	1	1.00	
GRP23	1	1.00	
GRP24	13	1.46	.519
GRP26	4	1.75	.500
GRP27	1	1.00	
GRP28	6	1.50	.548
TOTAL	93	1.29	.456

APPENDIX 3.4E

RATING OF EDUCATION PLACEMENT OFFICE BY PROGRAM AREA			
SOURCE	D.F.	S.S.	F
Between Groups	20	66.0532	1.991
Within Groups	165	273.6721	
TOTAL	185	339.7251	

p = .0100

SUMMARY STATISTICS

GROUP	N	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION
GRP01	2	1.00	0.0
GRP02	6	2.50	1.643
GRP03	3	1.73	1.000
GRP05	4	2.75	1.258
GRP07	2	1.00	0.0
GRP08	1	3.00	
GRP10	96	2.30	1.291
GRP11	1	1.00	
GRP12	12	2.83	1.642
GRP14	6	4.33	.817
GRP15	1	1.00	
GRP16	3	1.67	1.154
GRP17	3	2.67	1.528
GRP18	2	2.00	0.0
GRP21	1	4.00	
GRP23	4	2.75	1.709
GRP24	21	3.00	1.265
GRP26	4	1.00	0.0
GRP27	1	3.00	
GRP28	10	2.30	1.059
GRP30	3	1.00	0.0
TOTAL	186	2.44	1.355

APPENDIX 3.5E

FULL TIME/PART TIME EMPLOYMENT BY SEX

SOURCE	D.F.	S.S.	F
Between Groups	1	1.2201	5.582
Within Groups	183	40.0010	
TOTAL	184	41.2211	

p = .0192

SUMMARY STATISTICS

GROUP	N	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION
FEMALE	154	1.29	.459
MALE	31	1.51	.508
TOTAL	185	1.34	.473

APPENDIX 4E

Total Education Related Subgroup for All Sample Years

APPENDIX 4.1E

FULL-TIME/PART-TIME EMPLOYMENT BY YEAR

SOURCE	D.F.	S.S.	F
Between Groups	2	5.5483	12.562
Within Groups	232	51.2337	
TOTAL	234	56.7820	

p = .0000

SUMMARY STATISTICS

GROUP	N	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION
1978 - 1979	24	1.83	.381
1980 - 1981	25	1.52	.509
1981 - 1982	186	1.34	.475
TOTAL	235	1.41	.493

APPENDIX F

Significant ANOVAS for Noneducation-Related Subgroup

APPENDIX 1F

Noneducation-Related Subgroup 1978-1979

APPENDIX 1.1F

SOUGHT A TEACHING POSITION BY PROGRAM AREA

SOURCE	D.F.	S.S.	F
Between Groups	16	6.3056	3.744
Within Groups	19	2.0000	
TOTAL	35	8.3056	

p = .0036

SUMMARY STATISTICS

GROUP	N	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION
GRP01	4	1.50	.577
GRP02	1	2.00	
GRP03	2	1.50	.707
GRP07	2	2.00	0.0
GRP08	3	1.00	0.0
GRP10	4	1.00	0.0
GRP12	2	1.00	0.0
GRP15	2	2.00	0.0
GRP16	2	1.50	.707
GRP17	1	1.00	
GRP18	2	1.00	0.0
GRP23	1	2.00	
GRP24	4	1.00	0.0
GRP26	2	2.00	0.0
GRP27	1	2.00	
GRP28	2	1.00	0.0
GRP29	1	1.00	
TOTAL	36	1.36	.487

APPENDIX 1.2F

RATING OF EDUCATION PLACEMENT OFFICE BY PROGRAM AREA			
SOURCE	D.F.	S.S.	F
Between Groups	17	38.5965	2.500
Within Groups	20	18.1667	
TOTAL	37	56.7632	

p = .0261

SUMMARY STATISTICS

GROUP	N	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION
GRP01	4	3.75	.957
GRP02	1	1.00	
GRP03	2	3.00	1.414
GRP05	1	4.00	
GRP07	2	1.00	0.0
GRP08	3	1.66	1.154
GRP10	4	1.50	1.000
GRP12	2	2.50	2.121
GRP15	2	1.00	0.0
GRP16	2	1.00	0.0
GRP17	1	1.00	
GRP18	2	3.00	0.0
GRP23	2	1.00	0.0
GRP24	4	2.25	.957
GRP26	2	2.25	.707
GRP27	1	4.00	
GRP28	2	1.00	0.0
GRP29	1	2.00	
TOTAL	38	2.08	1.239

APPENDIX 2F
Noneducation-Related Subgroup 1980-1981

APPENDIX 2.1E

RATING OF EDUCATION PLACEMENT OFFICE BY PROGRAM AREA			
SOURCE	D.F.	S.S.	F
Between Groups	15	31.679	2.720
Within Groups	22	17.0833	
TOTAL	37	48.7632	

p = .0163

SUMMARY STATISTICS

GROUP	N	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION
GRP01	2	1.00	0.0
GRP02	2	3.00	1.414
GRP07	5	1.00	0.0
GRP10	6	3.17	.408
GRP12	1	1.00	
GRP13	2	2.50	.707
GRP15	1	1.00	
GRP16	3	1.00	0.0
GRP18	2	1.00	0.0
GRP21	1	1.00	
GRP23	2	2.00	1.414
GRP24	4	2.75	1.500
GRP27	1	1.00	
GRP28	4	2.50	1.291
GRP29	1	1.00	
GRP30	1	1.00	
TOTAL	38	1.92	1.148

APPENDIX 2.2E

USEFULNESS OF EDUCATIONAL PREPARATION BY SEX			
SOURCE	D.F.	S.S.	F
Between Groups	1	2.1517	5.749
Within Groups	37	13.8483	
TOTAL	38	15.9999	

$p = .0217$

SUMMARY STATISTICS

GROUP	N	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION
FEMALE	29	1.86	.639
MALE	10	2.40	.516
TOTAL	39	2.00	.649

APPENDIX 2 3E

SOUGHT A TEACHING POSITION BY SEX			
SOURCE	D.F.	S.S.	F
Between Groups	1	1.2051	5.283
Within Groups	35	7.9841	
TOTAL	36	9.1892	

$p = .0276$

SUMMARY STATISTICS

GROUP	N	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION
FEMALE	28	1.36	.488
MALE	9	1.77	.441
TOTAL	37	1.46	.505

155

APPENDIX 3F
Noneducation-Related Subgroup 1981-1982

APPENDIX 3.1F

SATISFACTION WITH CURRENT EMPLOYMENT BY PROGRAM AREA			
SOURCE	D.F.	S.S.	F
Between Groups	18	55.2477	2.027
Within Groups	159	240.7744	
TOTAL	177	296.0220	

p = .0111

SUMMARY STATISTICS

GROUP	N	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION
GRP01	6	3.67	1.033
GRP02	10	3.50	.972
GRP05	8	3.75	1.488
GRP07	25	4.36	.757
GRP10	40	3.03	1.441
GRP11	1	5.00	
GRP12	11	3.45	1.128
GRP13	1	2.00	
GRP14	3	3.67	.577
GRP15	2	3.00	0.0
GRP16	8	4.13	1.356
GRP17	11	3.45	1.293
GRP18	2	5.00	0.0
GRP23	10	3.40	1.578
GRP24	13	3.62	1.193
GRP26	15	4.33	.976
GRP27	1	5.00	
GRP28	10	3.10	1.524
GRP30	1	2.00	
TOTAL	178	3.62	1.293

APPENDIX 3.2F

USEFULNESS OF EDUCATIONAL PREPARATION BY PROGRAM AREA

SOURCE	D.F.	S.S.	F
Between Groups	18	20.2046	2.213
Within Groups	159	80.6549	
TOTAL	177	100.8595	

p = .0048

SUMMARY STATISTICS

GROUP	N	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION
GRP01	7	2.00	.817
GRP02	10	2.00	.667
GRP05	8	2.13	.641
GRP07	25	2.56	.507
GRP10	39	1.62	.748
GRP11	1	2.00	
GRP12	11	1.73	.647
GRP13	1	1.00	
GRP14	3	2.00	1.000
GRP15	2	2.00	.414
GRP16	8	1.75	.707
GRP17	11	2.27	.647
GRP18	2	1.50	.707
GRP23	10	1.70	.675
GRP24	13	1.85	.689
GRP26	15	2.33	.817
GRP27	1	2.00	
GRP28	10	1.90	.876
GRP30	1	2.00	
TOTAL	178	1.97	.755

APPENDIX 3.3E

SOUGHT A TEACHING POSITION BY PROGRAM AREA			
SOURCE	D.F.	S.S.	F
Between Groups	18	13.2020	3.788
Within Groups	152	29.4297	
TOTAL	170	42.6316	

p = .0000

SUMMARY STATISTICS

GROUP	N	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION
GRP01	7	1.57	.535
GRP02	9	1.67	.500
GRP05	8	1.63	.518
GRP07	25	1.92	.277
GRP10	39	1.26	.442
GRP11	1	2.00	
GRP12	11	1.36	.505
GRP13	1	1.00	
GRP14	3	1.00	0.0
GRP15	2	1.50	.707
GRP16	8	1.38	.518
GRP17	9	1.33	.500
GRP18	2	1.00	0.0
GRP23	10	1.70	.483
GRP24	13	1.23	.439
GRP26	11	1.82	.405
GRP27	1	1.00	
GRP28	10	1.20	.422
GRP30	1	1.00	
TOTAL	171	1.47	.501

APPENDIX 3.4E

REGRET NOT TEACHING BY PROGRAM AREA			
SOURCE	D.F.	S.S.	F
Between Groups	18	16.0439	5.221
Within Groups	144	24.5818	
TOTAL	162	40.6257	

p = .0000

SUMMARY STATISTICS

GROUP	N	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION
GRP01	7	1.86	.378
GRP02	8	1.25	.463
GRP05	8	1.88	.354
GRP07	24	1.92	.282
GRP10	39	1.36	.486
GRP11	1	2.00	
GRP12	11	1.36	.505
GRP13	1	1.00	
GRP14	3	1.33	.577
GRP15	2	1.00	0.0
GRP16	5	1.60	.548
GRP17	9	1.44	.527
GRP18	2	2.00	0.0
GRP23	10	1.80	.422
GRP24	13	1.23	.489
GRP26	9	2.00	0.0
GRP27	1	1.00	
GRP28	9	1.00	0.0
GRP30	1	1.00	
TOTAL	163	1.53	.501

APPENDIX 3.5F

RATING OF EDUCATION PLACEMENT OFFICE BY PROGRAM AREA			
SOURCE	D.F.	S.S.	F
Between Groups	18	82.2009	2.905
Within Groups	160	251.5081	
TOTAL	178	333.7090	

p = .0002

SUMMARY STATISTICS

GROUP		MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION
GRP01		1.71	1.254
GRP02		2.10	1.663
GRP05		2.63	1.768
GRP07	2	1.20	.707
GRP10	40	2.80	1.181
GRP11	1	3.00	
GRP12	11	2.64	1.433
GRP13	1	1.00	
GRP14	4	4.33	.577
GRP15	2	2.50	2.121
GRP16	8	1.25	1.500
GRP17	11	2.18	.982
GRP18	2	2.50	.707
GRP23	10	2.50	1.650
GRP24	13	3.08	1.553
GRP26	15	2.13	1.356
GRP27	1	4.00	
GRP28	10	2.40	1.174
GRP30	1	1.00	
TOTAL	179	2.30	1.370

APPENDIX 4F

Total Noneducation-related Subgroup for All Sample Years

APPENDIX A 1F

REGRET NOT TEACHING BY YEAR			
SOURCE	D.F.	S.S.	F
Between Groups	2	1.9323	3.854
Within Groups	232	58.1519	
TOTAL	234	60.0842	

$p = .0226$

SUMMARY STATISTICS

GROUP	N	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION
1978 - 1979	34	1.76	.496
1980 - 1981	35	1.45	.505
1981 - 1982	166	1.53	.506

APPENDIX 4.2E

SATISFACTION WITH CURRENT EMPLOYMENT BY YEAR			
SOURCE	D.F.	S.S.	F
Between Groups	2	20.4539	6.32
Within Groups	234	378.4102	
TOTAL	236	398.8641	

$p = .0021$

SUMMARY STATISTICS

GROUP	N	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION
1978 - 1979	24	4.33	1.05
1980 - 1981	24	3.41	1.21
1981 - 1982	189	3.35	1.30
TOTAL	237	3.46	1.27

APPENDIX G
Significant ANOVAS by Employment Subgroup (All Sample Years)

APPENDIX 1G**Significant ANOVAS by Employment Subgroup Total Sample**

APPENDIX 1.1G

FULL-TIME OR PART-TIME EMPLOYMENT BY EMPLOYMENT SUBGROUP			
SOURCE	D.F.	S.S.	F
Between Groups	2	38.0024	132.220
Within Groups	752	108.0689	
TOTAL	754	146.0713	

p = .0000

SUMMARY STATISTICS

GROUP	N	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION
Teaching	260	1.93	.254
Education Related	235	1.41	.493
Noneducation-related	260	1.84	.365
TOTAL	755	1.74	.440

167

APPENDIX 1.26

SATISFACTION WITH CURRENT EMPLOYMENT BY EMPLOYMENT SUBGROUP			
SOURCE	D.F.	S.S.	F
Between Groups	2	92.1313	32.514
Within Groups	752	1065.4167	
TOTAL	754	1157.5479	

p = .0000

SUMMARY STATISTICS

GROUP	N	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION
Teaching	259	4.29	.975
Education Related	237	3.46	1.300
Noneducation-related	259	3.69	1.278
TOTAL	755	3.82	1.239

APPENDIX 1.36

USEFULNESS OF EDUCATIONAL PREPARATION BY EMPLOYMENT SUBGROUP			
SOURCE	D.F.	S.S.	F
Between Groups	2	45.7842	60.327
Within Groups	751	284.9814	
TOTAL	753	330.7654	

$p = .0000$

SUMMARY STATISTICS

GROUP	N	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION
Teaching	260	2.56	.519
Education Related	235	2.44	.585
Noneducation-related	259	1.99	.723
TOTAL	754	2.33	.663

APPENDIX 1.46

SOUGHT A TEACHING POSITION BY EMPLOYMENT SUBGROUP			
SOURCE	D.F.	S.S.	F
Between Groups	1	5.0555	22.831
Within Groups	374	82.8150	
TOTAL	375	87.8705	

$p = .0000$

SUMMARY STATISTICS

GROUP	N	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION
Education Related	128	1.21	.409
Noneducation-related	248	1.46	.499
TOTAL	376	1.37	.484

170

APPENDIX 1.5G

REGRET THEY ARE NOT TEACHING BY EMPLOYMENT SUBGROUPS			
SOURCE	D.F.	S.S.	F
Between Groups	1	4.0752	16.635
Within Groups	350	85.7415	
TOTAL	351	89.8167	

$p = .0001$

SUMMARY STATISTICS

GROUP	N	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION
Education Related	117	1.33	.470
Noneeducation-related	235	1.55	.507
TOTAL	352	1.48	.495

APPENDIX 1.66

<u>RATING OF THE EDUCATION PLACEMENT OFFICE BY EMPLOYMENT SUBGROUPS</u>			
<u>SOURCE</u>	<u>D.F.</u>	<u>S.S.</u>	<u>F</u>
Between Groups	2	97.4512	25.289
Within Groups	751	1446.9919	
TOTAL	753	1544.4431	

p = .0000

SUMMARY STATISTICS

<u>GROUP</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>MEAN</u>	<u>STANDARD DEVIATION</u>
Teaching	259	3.05	1.462
Education Related	235	2.44	1.365
Noneducation-related	260	2.22	1.333
TOTAL	754	2.57	1.432

APPENDIX 2G

Significant ANOVAS by Employment Subgroup 1978 - 1979

APPENDIX 2.16

RATING OF THE EDUCATION PLACEMENT OFFICE BY EMPLOYMENT SUBGROUP			
SOURCE	D.F.	S.S.	F
Between Groups	2	16.6156	4.525
Within Groups	114	209.2981	
TOTAL	116	225.9137	

$p = .0128$

SUMMARY STATISTICS

GROUP	N	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION
Teaching	54	2.98	1.339
Education Related	24	2.54	1.532
Noneeducation-related	39	2.13	1.260
TOTAL	117	2.61	1.396

174

APPENDIX 2.26

USEFULNESS OF EDUCATIONAL PREPARATION BY EMPLOYMENT SUBGROUP			
SOURCE	D.F.	S.S.	F
Between Groups	2	5.8634	8.302
Within Groups	114	40.2564	
TOTAL	116	46.1197	

p = .0004

SUMMARY STATISTICS

GROUP	N	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION
Teaching	54	2.61	.529
Education Related	24	2.42	.654
Noneducation-related	39	2.10	.641
TOTAL	117	2.40	.631

175

APPENDIX 3G

Significant ANOVAS by Employment Subgroup 1980 - 1981

APPENDIX 3.16

FULL-TIME/PART-TIME EMPLOYMENT BY EMPLOYMENT SUBGROUP			
SOURCE	D.F.	S.S.	F
Between Groups	2	3.0704	12.835
Within Groups	98	11.7216	
TOTAL	100	14.7920	

9 p = .0000

SUMMARY STATISTICS

GROUP	N	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION
Teaching	37	1.95	.229
Education Related	25	1.52	.509
Noneeducation-related	39	1.89	.307
TOTAL	101	1.82	.385

APPENDIX 3.26

SATISFACTION WITH CURRENT EMPLOYMENT BY EMPLOYMENT SUBGROUP			
SOURCE	D.F.	S.S.	F
Between Groups	2	13.8110	5.351
Within Groups	97	125.1884	
TOTAL	99	138.9995	

p = .0062

SUMMARY STATISTICS

GROUP	N	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION
Teaching	37	4.35	.888
Education Related	24	3.42	1.213
Noneducation-related	39	3.77	1.287
TOTAL	100	3.90	1.185

178

APPENDIX 3.3G

USEFULNESS OF EDUCATIONAL PREPARATION BY EMPLOYMENT SUBGROUP			
SOURCE	D.F.	S.S.	F
Between Groups	2	8.9736	14.475
Within Groups	97	30.0664	
TOTAL	99	39.0400	

$p = .0000$

SUMMARY STATISTICS

GROUP	N	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION
Teaching	37	2.68	.475
Education Related	24	2.46	.509
Noneducation-related	39	2.00	.649
TOTAL	100	2.36	.628

APPENDIX 3.46

RATING OF THE EDUCATION PLACEMENT OFFICE BY EMPLOYMENT SUBGROUP			
SOURCE	D.F.	S.S.	F
Between Groups	2	28.1321	8.359
Within Groups	98	164.9169	
TOTAL	100	193.0490	

p = .0004

SUMMARY STATISTICS

GROUP	N	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION
Teaching	37	1.43	.235
Education Related	25	1.32	.264
Noneducation-related	39	1.14	.183
TOTAL	101	1.39	.138

APPENDIX 4G

Significant ANOVAS by Employment Subgroup 1981 - 1982

APPENDIX 4.16

FULL-TIME/PART-TIME EMPLOYMENT BY EMPLOYMENT SUBGROUPS			
SOURCE	D.F.	S.S.	F
Between Groups	2	34.9381	115.346
Within Groups	534	80.8736	
TOTAL	536	115.8116	

$p = .0000$

SUMMARY STATISTICS

GROUP	N	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION
Teaching	169	1.92	.277
Education Related	186	1.34	.475
None education-related	182	1.82	.382
TOTAL	537	1.69	.465

182

APPENDIX 4.26

SATISFACTION WITH CURRENT EMPLOYMENT BY EMPLOYMENT SUBGROUPS

SOURCE	D.F.	S.S.	F
Between Groups	2	80.9946	27.341
Within Groups	535	792.4513	
TOTAL	537	873.4458	

p = .0000

SUMMARY STATISTICS

GROUP	N	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION
Teaching	168	4.29	1.016
Education Related	189	3.35	1.303
Noneducation-related	181	3.61	1.293
TOTAL	538	3.73	1.275

APPENDIX A.3i

SOUGHT A TEACHING POSITION BY EMPLOYMENT SUBGROUPS			
SOURCE	D.F.	S.S.	F
Between Groups	1	6.1934	29.475
Within Groups	274	57.5738	
TOTAL	275	63.7672	

p = .0000

SUMMARY STATISTICS

GROUP	N	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION
Education Related	102	1.17	.375
Noneducation-related	174	1.48	.501
TOTAL	276	1.36	.412

184

APPENDIX 4.4G

REGRET THEY ARE NOT TEACHING BY EMPLOYMENT SUBGROUPS

SOURCE	D.F.	S.S.	F
Between Groups	1	3.4277	14.558
Within Groups	257	60.5098	
TOTAL	258	63.9375	

p = .0002

SUMMARY STATISTICS

GROUP	N	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION
Education Related	93	1.29	.456
Noneeducation-related	166	1.53	.501
TOTAL	259	1.44	.498

APPENDIX 4.5G

RATING OF THE EDUCATION PLACEMENT OFFICE BY EMPLOYMENT SUBGROUP			
SOURCE	D.F.	S.S.	F
Between Groups	2	57.4932	14.368
Within Groups	533	1066.3643	
TOTAL	535	1123.8572	

$p = .0000$

SUMMARY STATISTICS

GROUP	N	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION
Teaching	168	3.07	1.513
Education Related	186	2.44	1.355
Noneducation-related	182	2.30	1.379
TOTAL	536	2.59	1.449

186

APPENDIX H
Significant ANOVAS on Student Teaching Items

APPENDIX 1.1H

ABILITY LEVEL OF STUDENTS DURING STUDENT TEACHING BY YEAR			
SOURCE	D.F.	S.S.	F
Between Groups	2	3.2505	3.870
Within Groups	809	339.7420	
TOTAL	811	342.9924	

p = .0212

SUMMARY STATISTICS

GROUP	N	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION
1978 - 1979	126	1.90	.599
1980 - 1981	107	2.14	.621
1981 - 1982	579	1.99	.663
TOTAL	812	2.00	.650

APPENDIX I

Population and Sample Sizes by Program Area

APPENDIX 11
1978 - 1979
POPULATION AND SAMPLE SIZES

<u>PROGRAM AREA</u>	<u>POPULATION</u>	<u>TARGET SAMPLE</u>	<u>ACTUAL SAMPLE</u>
AGRICULTURE EDUCATION	37	8	5
ART EDUCATION	32	6	2
BIOLOGICAL SCIENCE EDUCATION	8	5	2
BUSINESS EDUCATION	8	5	4
DANCE EDUCATION	0	0	0
DENTAL HYGIENE EDUCATION	36	7	3
DISTRIBUTIVE EDUCATION(VOC-TECH)	11	5	4
ELEMENTARY EDUCATION	267	53	34
ENGLISH EDUCATION	34	7	7
ENGLISH COMMUNICATION	9	5	0
EXCEPTIONAL CHILDREN	22	0	2
FOREIGN LANGUAGE	16	5	3
HEALTH EDUCATION	10	5	4
HOME ECONOMICS	40	8	7
INDUSTRIAL TECHNOLOGY	33	7	7
MATHEMATICS	16	5	2
MUSIC EDUCATION	59	12	7
PHYSICAL EDUCATION	72	14	13
RECREATION EDUCATION	40	8	4
SCIENCE EDUCATION	13	8	8
SOCIAL STUDIES EDUCATION	78	16	8
SPEECH-THEATRE EDUCATION	6	5	2
TRADE AND INDUSTRIAL EDUCATION	6	3	2

APPENDIX 2I

1980 - 1981

POPULATION AND SAMPLE SIZES

<u>PROGRAM AREA</u>	<u>POPULATION</u>	<u>TARGET SAMPLE</u>	<u>ACTUAL SAMPLE</u>
AGRICULTURE EDUCATION	37	7	3
ART EDUCATION	38	8	4
BIOLOGICAL SCIENCE EDUCATION	1	1	1
BUSINESS EDUCATION	13	3	2
DANCE EDUCATION	3	3	1
DENTAL HYGIENE EDUCATION	38	8	6
DISTRIBUTIVE EDUCATION(VOC-TECH)	7	1	1
ELEMENTARY EDUCATION	315	60	37
ENGLISH EDUCATION	40	8	4
ENGLISH COMMUNICATION	5	5	3
EXCEPTIONAL CHILDREN	35	7	3
FOREIGN LANGUAGE	10	2	4
HEALTH EDUCATION	7	1	5
HOME ECONOMICS	30	6	3
INDUSTRIAL TECHNOLOGY	22	4	4
MATHEMATICS	17	3	3
MUSIC EDUCATION	50	10	7
PHYSICAL EDUCATION	71	14	9
RECREATION EDUCATION	56	11	0
SCIENCE EDUCATION	10	2	2
SOCIAL STUDIES EDUCATION	51	10	6
SPEECH-THEATRE EDUCATION	1	1	1
TRADE AND INDUSTRIAL EDUCATION	8	2	4

APPENDIX 3I
1981 - 1982
POPULATION AND SAMPLE SIZES

<u>PROGRAM AREA</u>	<u>POPULATION</u>	<u>TARGET SAMPLE</u>	<u>ACTUAL SAMPLE</u>
AGRICULTURE EDUCATION	35		23
ART EDUCATION	34		19
BIOLOGICAL SCIENCE EDUCATION	6		3
BROADCAST COMMUNICATIONS EDUCATION	1		0
BUSINESS EDUCATION	18		16
DANCE EDUCATION	1		0
DENTAL HYGIENE EDUCATION	35		28
DISTRIBUTIVE EDUCATION(VOC-TECH)	6		3
ELEMENTARY EDUCATION	403		246
ENGLISH EDUCATION	52		38
ENGLISH COMMUNICATION	3		2
EXCEPTIONAL CHILDREN	18		24
FOREIGN LANGUAGE	11		10
HEALTH EDUCATION	11		12
HOME ECONOMICS	31		22
INDUSTRIAL TECHNOLOGY	22		14
MATHEMATICS	8		4
MUSIC EDUCATION	55		35
PHYSICAL EDUCATION	75		45
RECREATION EDUCATION	46		22
SCIENCE EDUCATION	4		6
SOCIAL STUDIES EDUCATION	63		30
SPEECH-THEATRE EDUCATION	3		0
TRADE AND INDUSTRIAL EDUCATION	6		4

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY
FOLLOW-UP SURVEY OF TEACHER EDUCATION
GRADUATES 1978-1979, 1980-1981, and 1981-1982
COLLEGE OF EDUCATION
THE OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY

OVERVIEW

The following is an executive summary of Technical Report #8 of the Follow-Up Study of The Ohio State University's Teacher Education Programs. The present study is on graduates of the College of Education for the academic years 1978-1979, 1980-1981, and 1981-1982. This study is one in a series of studies on the College of Education's graduates conducted since 1977. These studies are conducted in part to meet the standards of the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) and the Ohio State Department of Education's standards for evaluating teacher education students.

In the past years only a sample of first year teachers were surveyed for the follow-up study; this year in addition to all 1982 graduates, a 20 percent random sample, stratified by program area, of 1978-79 graduates and 1980-1981 were surveyed. This method allows for more accurate comparisons between sample years and allows for assessment, over time, of such factors as satisfaction with employment, usefulness of educational preparation and feelings about the teaching profession. The sample sizes were as follows:

1981-1982	Graduates	961 (entire population)
1980-1981	Graduates	193
1978-1979	Graduates	213

The response rate for each year is:

1981-1982	597	62%
1980-1981	113	59%
1978-1979	138	65%

In addition to the changes in the sampling procedure, changes were made in the data collection techniques. The questionnaire was studied and changes in the wording of certain items were made, other items were eliminated and new items included. The questionnaire was structured to obtain information regarding: present job status; satisfaction with job; student teaching experience; attitudes toward preservice academic training; educational background and aspirations; and demographics.

Statistical Analysis and Reporting

In previous years the data collected from the follow-up questionnaire were analyzed primarily by computing frequencies and percentages for each item. From that analysis a profile was developed of the sample and some comparisons made with the previous year. The analysis for this year was more extensive.

First a chi-square to determine the representativeness of the respondents by program area and sex for each sample year was performed. In addition, descriptive statistics including means, standard deviations, frequencies, and percentages were produced for each item.

From these results a description or profile of the students was developed for each sample year. Comparisons between sample years were made and differences examined using analysis of variance techniques. Comparisons were also made between the following groups within each year:

- (1) Program Areas
- (2) Teaching Level (elementary, middle, secondary)
- (3) Sex
- (4) Current Employment Subgroups

Results

The follow-up questionnaire yielded a large amount of information about the graduates surveyed from the three sample years. The 1980-1981 sample and the 1981-1982 samples both proved to be representative of their populations on both program area and sex. The 1978-1979 sample was representative of its population on the sex variable but not on the program area variable. The nonrepresentativeness on the program area variable was due to the over sampling of small program areas in order to include enough subjects to produce stable statistical results for these program areas. The impact on this situation on the outcome of the study was found to be negligible and therefore the results present a valid profile of graduate of the college. Analyses indicated that there was very little difference among the sample years. In addition, the comparisons made between sex, among program areas (academic majors), employment subgroups and teaching produced some interesting and important findings. Briefly, some of those findings are:

1. The majority of the graduates (75%) are female; yet there has been a progressive increase in the number of males graduates from sample year to sample year.

2. Over 90 percent of the graduates are employed but approximately 1/3 are in noneducation related positions.
3. Although the graduates are generally satisfied with their current positions, those teaching are significantly more satisfied than those in education related or noneducation related employment.
4. The majority of the students (73%) felt that personal initiative was the most important strategy for securing employment.
5. Within the teaching employment subgroup, those individuals teaching the longest were more satisfied with their jobs than the more recent teachers.
6. The location of the graduates' current teaching positions can be grouped into the following community types:

Urban	25%
Suburban	35%
Rural	41%
7. Fifty-five percent of the teachers are teaching at the senior high level; 27 percent are teaching at the elementary level and 18 percent at the junior high level.
8. Sixty-six percent of the teachers feel that supervision of extracurricular activities is voluntary and 75 percent of the teachers actually supervisor extracurricular activities.
9. Generally, the graduates reported their student teaching experience to be quite successful. For example, 98% of the graduates rated their experience as somewhat successful or successful; 88 percent reported having a good or very good relationship with their cooperating teacher.

10. Seventy-five percent of the students completed all four years at The Ohio State University.
11. Approximately 50 percent expressed a desire to obtain an advanced degree in education; another 25 percent plan to obtain one in a noneducation field.

Because the samples, primarily, were representative of their populations, these findings can be generalized with confidence to the target populations of College of Education graduates or specific program areas. The complete Technical Report of the follow-up process and findings can be obtained from William Loadman at (614) 422-1257. In addition, individual program area results can also be requested.

1/19/84