

is accompanied by the first swells of a formidable surf of artistic rebellion. Playwrights are reaching out for more universal themes. The plays of Maxwell Anderson are illustrations in point: *Valley Forge*, *Mary of Scotland*, *Winterset*. Clifford Odets, in *Awake and Sing* and *Paradise Lost*, has gathered power for future great playwriting. *Peace on Earth, They Shall Not Die*, and *Stevedore* were authentic voices of protest, whatever may be said on both sides of the savagely debated question, "Is propaganda art?" The work of the stage designers, Bel Geddes, Gorelik, Robert Edmond Jones, Jo Mielziner, and Lee Simonson, is certainly not based on merely mercenary considerations. Broadway does not lack first-rate directors such as Guthrie McClintic, Alexander Dean, Lee Strasberg, and Rouben Mamoulian. And there seems to be no doubt even in the minds of the most chronic carpers that acting today is better than it has ever been, that few of the traditionally great companies could compare in all-around effectiveness with the companies of Katharine Cornell, Eva Legallienne, and the Group Theatre. The trouble seems to lie somewhere close to the producers, though it is only fair to them to repeat their forlorn cry, "When we get good plays, we'll produce 'em. But there aren't any good plays."

In any event, something seems to be happening. Whether it is the triumph of Hollywood or the burgeoning of a vast federal theatre or the greater development of the regional theatre or the slow advance of art out of the box-office within the professional theatre itself, no one can tell. Whatever it is, it must have the five qualities that Edith Isaacs in a study of "The Irresistible Theatre; A National Playhouse for America" (*Theatre Arts Monthly*, August, 1934) lists as essential in any living theatre: "It must have an entity, an organism that can be recognized, as you recognize a human being, by certain

traits of character and of physical presence that are marks of personal life. It must have permanence in one or more of its fundamentals. It may be a permanence of place or of leadership . . . , of repertory, of company, or of idea . . . , or of any two of three of these combined; but something it must be that stands firm and rooted, something not too transitory, in that transitory world of the theatre where performances die as they live, each day, as a production is set up, played through, and struck. It must have the power of growth, of progress, both in its permanent and its impermanent factors, because times change and it must change with them so that '*Plus ça change, plus c'est la même chose.*' It must bear within itself the power of generation, the element of renewal, a force that having flowed out of its own inner strength and integrity, can bring back fresh strength from a newer, younger world. And finally it must have a goal that is essentially a theatre goal."

ARGUS TRESIDDER

STUDENT TEACHING IN OHIO COLLEGES

RECENTLY the College of Wooster faced the problem of the modification of its arrangements with the public schools in regard to compensation for observation, participation, student teaching, and the method of co-operation between the college and the public schools. In order to get some help in the solution of this problem, it was decided to make inquiry of some twelve other colleges of the state with situations similar to our own. A questionnaire was sent out bearing upon these two phases of teacher training: compensation and co-operation. This investigation yielded results which may be of interest to others.

Reprinted from The Educational Research Bulletin, March 18, 1936, pp. 76-80.

A definition of terms as used in this report seems necessary since disagreement in usage exists among those concerned with student teaching:

"Supervising" teacher is used rather than "critic" teacher because of the connotation of the term "critic." Supervising teacher is a more dignified term and describes more exactly the work of the public school staff member who conducts student teaching.

"Student" teacher is used rather than "practice" teacher. It is true that the student is "practicing" frequently in the same sense in which a bass-drum player practices on his instrument, but guiding a child in learning is far from being of that sort of practice? Then, too, what parent wishes to have his own child practiced upon? Here again "student teacher" describes the responsibility and the work of the student more definitely than does the term "practice teacher."

We will use the term "director" to mean the member of the education staff of the college or the administrative staff of the school system who directs the work of the supervising teacher in conjunction with that of student teaching.

Including Wooster, fourteen colleges responded. Each of the colleges responded "yes" to the first three questions:

Do you use the public schools for student training?

Do you use the public schools for observation and participation?

Do you compensate the public schools for this service?

In summarizing the replies to other questions it seems desirable to divide the colleges into two groups. For one reason or another some of the colleges pay to the public schools a lump sum. These colleges bear a somewhat different relation to the schools than do those colleges which compensate in terms of the services of supervising teachers or in terms of student teachers.

A study of the returns from the lump-sum

colleges gives the general impression that often the colleges wished the arrangements were on other terms, in as much as compensation in a lump sum does not fix responsibility and causes a break in the co-operation of college and public school. Most colleges recognize that the compensation should be in terms of service rendered by individuals rather than through a general arrangement with a school board. It seems to be generally recognized that the stress of special preparation for the supervision of student-teaching rests upon the supervising teacher, that the public school profits by the fact that its regular staff is improved because of the requirements set up for supervising teachers. Four of the colleges mentioned in this investigation have special lump-sum arrangements with school boards, and the only way in which their procedures can be explained in this regard is to give description in terms of the individual college. This report will not include these specific college arrangements.

This elimination of four colleges leaves ten colleges sufficiently similar in plan to draw some conclusions. Nine of the ten colleges use the student-teacher basis for compensation and one uses supervising-teacher basis. By student-teacher basis we mean that the supervising teacher is paid in terms of the number of student teachers supervised per semester. By supervising-teacher basis we mean that the supervising teacher is paid in terms of supervision per semester regardless of the number of students. Three of the ten colleges use a graduated scale in the payment of compensation. These colleges base their scale of compensation on experience and the holding of a Master's degree by the supervising teacher. Seven of the colleges do not have a graduated scale but pay the same amount to the beginner as to the experienced supervisor. For example, in one college the supervising teacher is paid in terms of the number of student teachers she supervises each semes-

ter. For this she receives \$15 per student teacher. When she has supervised five student teachers her compensation is increased to \$20. When she has supervised ten, her compensation is increased to \$25 per student teacher. And when she has had experience with fifteen student teachers, her compensation is increased to \$30 per student teacher per semester.

Nine of the ten colleges compensate the supervising teacher. Some of these send checks to the supervising teachers through the school board for distribution, while the others send the check directly to the supervising teacher. One of the colleges did not reply to this question.

In answer to the question, How much do you pay for observation and participation for a group of observers per semester? eight of the ten colleges do not compensate the public schools for observation of the students. One college pays from one-third to one-half as much for observation and participation as for student teaching, while another college pays at the same rate as for student teaching. In this case the college sends observers to the school in groups of from four to six during a semester to observe a particular class exercise. This latter college has an arrangement with the supervising teacher whereby she is kept posted as to the nature of the observation proposed and as to the time to expect the group of observers to attend the class. The supervising teacher is provided with copies of the textbook used in the education classes in which observation is carried on and the notebook, if any, used by the student. The teacher then makes a definite effort to demonstrate the problem or principle being discussed in the education class of which the observation is a part. The college feels that such work is of as much value to the training of students as is the guidance of the student teacher. Consequently, the pay is the same.

The practice among these ten colleges in

regard to the compensation for student teaching varies somewhat. The range of compensation per student teacher per semester varies from \$15 to \$30. Eight of the colleges gave their compensation for student teaching in such form that comparisons can be made. The average of these eight is \$25.81. One college doubles its compensation to the supervising teacher who holds the Master's degree. One college graduates its scale from \$15 to the inexperienced teacher to \$30 to the experienced teacher holding a Master's degree.

In a similar study made by the writer in 1932 the compensation was a few dollars above these figures. The lower rate mentioned in 1936 is probably due to depression measures. In 1932 the fees charged by the college for student teaching varied from \$2 per credit hour to \$25, averaging \$15.58.

Questions were also asked in regard to the relation of the superintendent of the public-school system to teacher training. In one college the superintendent is the assistant director of teacher training and shares responsibility with the head of the department of education or with the director of teacher training of the college. In another college he seems to have about the same power but does not hold the title. In still another college the student teachers are regarded as members of the teaching staff of the school in which they teach. In two colleges the superintendent exercises the same supervision of student teachers as that of the staff teachers of the school. In three colleges he approves the selection of the student teachers. In several colleges he has no connection with the teacher-training program.

In answering the question in regard to the number of times the superintendent visits student teaching and what relation he bears to supervision of the teacher's work, the replies range from no connection to one visit each semester to five or six times per semester.

Does the superintendent report or confer with the director of teacher training in regard to his observation of student teachers? Replies again range from "no" to "close co-operation." Many colleges seem to have no definite plan for supervision by the superintendent or at least do not report it.

In regard to the compensation received by the superintendent from the college for his specialized supervision, seven say "nothing"; two say "yes"; and one does not answer. The amount of compensation is mentioned by the two colleges and varies. One pays \$50 per semester, and the other pays a yearly salary of \$400.

The same questions were asked in regard to the connection with teacher training of the high-school principal as in the case of the superintendent. In the main, the principal has a closer connection with the work of student teaching than the superintendent and, in some cases, less. In some colleges he is the one consulted by the college teacher-training official or officials and co-operates in the selection and supervision of student teaching rather than the superintendent. In two colleges he visits the student teacher several times a semester. Several colleges fail to answer this question. In five colleges he advises with the student teacher as well as with the supervising teacher and the director. About one-half of the ten colleges answer that the principal does not supervise the work of the student teacher, whereas the remaining colleges have failed to answer this question.

Three of the ten colleges offer no compensation or honorarium to the principal for his supervision. Three of the colleges, however, offer \$75, \$200, and \$275, respectively.

By way of conclusion one might say that each college seems to be trying to meet the conditions under which it finds itself. At the same time it is apparent that the colleges could profit by an interchange of experience in this complex field of teacher training.

After reading these reports one begins to wonder just how much the supervision of student teaching, on the part of the supervising teacher, superintendent, and principal, is really worth and as to whether the college and public schools are not missing much that would benefit in the better training of teachers and a better safeguarding of the interests of the pupil if there were a more definite and thoroughgoing plan in the matter of supervising.

Judging from college experience, as indicated by these returns, it would seem that compensation should be paid to those engaged in the actual procedures of supervision rather than the school system as a whole. The public schools profit by the increased preparation and skill in supervision of these better trained teachers without much, if any, increase in salary.

One is impressed, too, with the fact that a number of the colleges are dissatisfied with their present arrangements with the public schools and would like to have them changed but are apparently groping without much hope of arriving at a workable basis. It would seem that the State Department of Education could strengthen this whole matter by setting up more definite standards for the preparation of supervisors and backing up the colleges in their attempt to lift teacher-training requirements.

GEORGE C. FRACKER

ON BEANS WHEN THE BAG IS OPENED

PHILLIP GUEDALLA tells the tale (in his *Fathers of the American Revolution*, as I recall) of one who came to Pontius Pilate, when Pilate was an aged man, to ask, "Was not Jesus of Nazareth crucified during your procuratorship of Palestine?"

"Jesus?" replied the old man, "Jesus of Nazareth? I don't remember."

Doubtless the tale is true, essentially if