AN ABSTRACT OF THE THESIS OF

Leo Charles Gainor for the ___Doctor of Education___ in ___Education___
　　(Name)　　　　　　　　　　　(Degree)　　　　　　　(Major)

Date thesis is presented _____August 12, 1964_____

Title ___A Comparison of the Teaching Performance with the Academic___

___Record of Oregon State University Graduates in Elementary Education___

Abstract approved ___Signature redacted for privacy.___
　　　　　　　　　　　　　　(Major Professor)

Purpose of the Study:

The purpose of this study was to evaluate the Oregon State University undergraduate elementary education program. More specifically, the investigation sought answers to the following questions:

1. What are the graduates' judgments of pertinent areas of the elementary teacher education program?

2. To what extent does the graduates' academic records affect their judgments concerning the elementary teacher education program?

3. How do the graduates' administrators rate the graduates' teaching competencies?

4. Is there a relationship between administrators' ratings of graduates and graduates' academic record?

Procedures:

The study utilized two questionnaires and follow-up interviews

as methods of obtaining the desired data. Background information was collected for 121 graduates. All tabulations were recorded as percentages with the significance of differences determined by critical ratios.

Selected Findings

The five-point rating scale used for the questionnaires was structured with values: 5 - superior, 4 - above average, 3 - average, 2 - below average, and 1 - inferior. A zero column was provided for "no response," or "no opinion" or "did not have the experience." These will be the values referred to hereafter in the findings.

1. Graduates rated Student Teaching, Reading, and Children's Literature highest and School in American Life and Educational Psychology significantly low in professional education courses.

2. Graduates with the high 25 percent grade point average and ACE entrance examinations versus the low 25 percent rated professional education courses: (1) more frequently in the below average and inferior values and (2) less frequently in the superior and above average values.

3. Graduates rated Speech Correction highest and Physical Education and General Psychology significantly low in general education courses.

4. Graduates with the high 25 percent grade point average and student teacher grades versus the low 25 percent rated general education courses: (1) more frequently in the superior and above average values and (2) more frequently in below average and inferior values.

5. Graduates rated Reading and Arithmetic highest and Music and Health lowest concerning value received in their student teaching experience.

6. Graduates rated the student teacher seminar more frequently in below average and inferior values.

7. Administrators rated graduates' teaching competencies under Methods of Instruction and Evaluation as significantly low in:

> Helping children in music
> Helping children in physical education
> Helping children to speak effectively
> Helping children in social studies
> Helping children express themselves in writing
> Helping children in art
> Helping children in problem solving
> Diagnostic and remedial methods

8. Administrators rated the low 25 percent grade point average graduates 57 percent less frequently in below average and inferior values when compared to the high 25 percent.

9. Administrators rated the low 25 percent student teacher grade graduates versus the high 25 percent: (1) seven

percent more frequently in superior and above average values and (2) 50 percent less frequently in below average and inferior values.

10. Administrators rated the high 25 percent ACE entrance examination graduates versus the low 25 percent as significantly higher in five teacher competencies:

> Helping children in arithmetic
> Helping children in problem solving
> Helping children in expressing themselves in
>   writing
> Helping children in learning to write and spell
> Understanding the age level in child growth
>   and development

11. Graduates emphasized as most urgent and immediate needs in the elementary teacher education program: (1) evaluating professional education courses for excessive amount of overlapping and duplication, (2) improving teaching methods of School of Education faculty, (3) more classroom observation and first-hand experience with children before student teaching assignment, (4) lengthening student teaching time, and (5) structuring the student teacher seminar for more practical experiences.

12. Graduates indicated a definite interest in the "satisfactory" - "not satisfactory" grading policy for student teaching.

13. Administrators were unanimous in their confidence toward the elementary education program as appraised in follow-up interviews.

A COMPARISON OF THE TEACHING PERFORMANCE WITH
THE ACADEMIC RECORD OF OREGON STATE UNIVERSITY
GRADUATES IN ELEMENTARY EDUCATION

by

LEO CHARLES GAINOR

A THESIS

submitted to

OREGON STATE UNIVERSITY

in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for the
degree of

DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

August 1964

APPROVED:

Signature redacted for privacy.

Professor of Education

In Charge of Major

Signature redacted for privacy.

Head of Department of Education

Signature redacted for privacy.

Dean of Graduate School

Date thesis is presented   August 12, 1964

Typed by Betty Hostetter

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

A COMPARISON OF THE TEACHING PERFORMANCE WITH
THE ACADEMIC RECORD OF OREGON STATE UNIVERSITY
GRADUATES IN ELEMENTARY EDUCATION

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Background of the Problem

A reappraisal of teacher education in America at this time is
necessary for many reasons. There is public clamor for better
quality in education and a coincident concern within the profession
for better preparation of teachers. This necessity for more com-
petent teaching grows out of the nation's efforts to realize more
fully the democratic aim of a free, universal education and the
problems of the schools in bringing performance into harmony with
social, humanitarian, and intellectual goals. These objectives were
summarized by Smith (56, p. 1) as editor for a 1962 conference
sponsored by the Fund for the Advancement of Education.

Four areas which have contributed to the ever-increasing de-
mands and the additional responsibilities that must be assumed by
the institutions of higher education in the preparation of teachers
are emphasized by Eurich (24, p. 195-196): (1) the enrollment
explosion, (2) the explosion of knowledge which affects the courses
of study, (3) the new role that education has assumed in our pattern

of national survival and advancement, and (4) the development of new tools of teaching and learning.

To provide the caliber of elementary teacher who possesses the ability and potential for this task, Oregon State University must continually appraise its program. This appraisal should be directed toward the content of the courses offered, the appropriateness of methodology presented in these courses, the effectiveness of the student teaching program, and the competence of the graduates of Oregon State University who are teaching.

To Woodring (63, p. 110), the responsibility of the institution is primary and without good teachers for the elementary and secondary school there can be no colleges. He goes on to say that unless we have teachers, we can have no engineers, lawyers, accountants, physicians, or ministers, for all professional education must rest upon sound elementary and secondary education. If the lower education deteriorates for lack of competent teachers, it follows that college and professional education must deteriorate.

Barr, one who has spent a large part of a productive educational life in research on teacher competence, has emphasized that teachers at the elementary level may need qualities different from those needed in another area. He suggests such qualities as teacher behaviors, teacher characteristics, and the effects of these variables in terms of changes in pupil behavior, changes in the operation of

the school, or changes in the community in its relation to the school.

He refers to these qualities of the teacher in the areas affected as

the "multidimensional" concept of teacher effectiveness. Barr be-

lieves that the effective teacher portrays different qualities at dif-

ferent stages of his career and that the beginning teacher could be

expected at least to be different in degree and perhaps even in kind

of behavior from the teacher of long experience (6, p. 641-658).

William H. Cartwright, summarizes eight essential points of

what he considers the heart of Conant's, The Education of American

Teachers. Five of these items are pertinent to teacher education:

(1) there is little certain knowledge to justify many universal require-

ments in the preparation of teachers; (2) a great deal of research

about teaching is needed; (3) for initial certification the state should

require only a bachelor's degree from a legitimate institution; (4) the

organized profession should advise and encourage institutions of

teacher education and should not mandate anything; and (5) institutions

of teacher education should accept the major responsibility for develop-

ing programs of teacher preparation (10, p. 197).

Reynolds (50, p. 194) reflects on the tremendous task of pre-

paring the elementary teacher for the job that lies ahead.

> When I think on the responsibility of the elementary teacher
> in subject-matter competency, I shudder at the inadequacies
> she must feel. How can we, in four short years in college,

expect her to acquire the information necessary for a feeling of security on her part in instructing in the many subject-matter areas expected?

During the 1962 Fort Collins Conference on Professional Imperatives, Bush (8, p. 43) in his report emphasized that the proper preparation of a teacher calls for a variety of skills and persons. He feels the highly complicated process of becoming a teacher requires great skill, energy, and imagination. Bush also indicates there is a need for personalized attention to be given to the student by those who impart content and theory in addition to helping with method and supervising practice.

Ryans, (53, p. 2-3) a well known American educator over the past years for his research in teacher education, has this to say about effective teaching:

> Educators seem to be similarly in disagreement with respect to the specific contributors to effective teaching. Those associated with licensing groups (e.g., state departments of education) believe good teaching to be a result of the teacher's training in certain college or university courses. Some believe it to be a matter of the teacher's "dynamic personality," which is diversely defined. And some are convinced it is revealed in the discipline the teacher is able to maintain in the classroom.

The end-product of a teacher education program should be improvement of learning by the elementary and secondary school pupils served by its graduates, Anderson perceives (2, p. 12). The success of the graduates, he explains, is in turn related to: the ability of pupils taught; the philosophy, practices, and staff of

the institution; attitude of the parents toward the teachers; public

moral and financial support; and the quality of local supervision.

Conant (16, p. 147), in his most recent book, is very specific

in the area of what the future offers in elementary education:

> Clearly, whether teachers of the future are to teach all
> subjects in a self-contained classroom or are to be
> specialists teaching only one subject throughout the
> grades is profoundly significant in considering the edu-
> cation these teachers are to receive. What one needs
> is a reliable crystal ball, for prophecy must precede
> planning. My guess is that, in spite of all the talk about
> the importance of specialists in the elementary school,
> self-contained classrooms will continue to be the domi-
> nant pattern for kindergarten and the first three grades
> during the next ten years. During these years, however,
> there will be an increasing tendency to use specialists
> in grades four through six.

Referring to the public's view of a competent teacher, Howsam

(34, p. 14) states that, "Everyone has an idea about what makes a

good teacher. In our society almost everyone has attended school

and experienced a variety of teachers." He expands this to point

out the experiences that parents have had with their school children

and how they have formed some idea of the ideal teacher.

The layman's recognition of the importance of teacher pre-

paration is indicated by Goodwin (31, p. 1) who says, "Most Ameri-

can citizens today recognize that public schools are the backbone

of the democratic system, and one of the most important social

institutions in the perpetuation of the American way of life." He

feels the professional educator is conscious of this mission and

knows that the realization of these goals depends primarily upon the quality and capabilities of the classroom teacher.

When the problem is presented in this fashion, it is clear that a great responsibility is placed on teacher educators. The challenge to provide an increasing number of teachers with sufficient competence will require a high level of effectiveness in our teacher education programs. The problem of determining quality in teaching becomes even more formidable when the review of much research and study has not as yet been able to produce a clear and decisive definition of teacher competence.

McMurrin (44, p. 3) lends optimism to the solution of this problem in the final section of his address to the Fort Collins Conference concerning the responsibility of the institutions engaged in the recruitment and education of teachers:

> The events of recent years have clearly shown that these institutions are capable of making enormous strides in the improvement of education. Much has been done, but much remains to be done. Nowhere is there greater promise for the future of education.

There is no easy or quick way for teacher educators to resolve this dilemma as far as Cartwright is concerned (10, p. 193). The institutions must approach it in their own way with much diligence. He believes that colleges or universities that prepare teachers must play one of the major roles in the production of quality teachers and they must take their job seriously. To

accomplish this task it is mandatory for the institutions to find out

what it is that teachers must do and decide in what ways they can best

contribute to helping teachers get that job done.

This study will be concerned with the interests and objectives

of the School of Education at Oregon State University in obtaining in-

formation concerning what is expected of its graduates and just how

the institution can best provide the kind of instruction and experiences

that will contribute to the preparation of quality elementary teachers.

Statement of the Problem

The purpose of this study is to evaluate the Oregon State Uni-

versity undergraduate elementary teacher education program to:

1. Determine if the many competencies necessary for

   successful teaching are being adequately developed

   for the graduate by the professional education courses,

   the general education courses, and student teaching.

2. Determine if the teacher competence as evaluated by

   the graduate's supervising administrator can be re-

   lated in a significant manner to the graduate's academic

   record, his student teacher grade, his scores on

   American Council on Education entrance examinations,

   and his final grade point average at graduation.

To make basic changes needed to improve the elementary

program of teacher education at Oregon State University, it is imperative that the institution obtain knowledge of the results of the present practices and the degree to which these practices have met the needs of the graduate. This is paramount if the School of Education is to make changes and improvements in its instructional program to help the undergraduate obtain more understanding and skill in the use of the many aids to learning which new technology has brought about.

This study should help to stress essential areas of competency needed to develop successful teachers and to identify areas in the elementary teacher education program at Oregon State University which should be revised and improved.

Definition of Terms

(1) Graduate. In this study, graduate will refer to 1961 and 1962 elementary teacher graduates of Oregon State University who have completed more than one-half of their academic work at the University and who have taught one or more years in the State of Oregon.

(2) Supervising Administrator. The term supervising administrator will be used to refer to the principal, supervisor, or superintendent to whom the graduate is or has been immediately responsible for supervision.

Limitations of the Study

(1) Limitation by definition. The study is limited to the evaluation of the Oregon State University undergraduate elementary teacher education program.

(2) The sampling is limited to the 1961 and 1962 elementary teacher graduates of Oregon State University who have completed more than one-half of their academic work at the University and who have taught one or more years in the State of Oregon.

(3) The sampling is limited to candidates as defined in (2) above who have taught in kindergarten through the eighth grade.

(4) The sampling does not include any elementary interns.

(5) This study is restricted to judgments of the graduates and their supervising administrators.

This study is limited to graduates who have taught in Oregon as defined in (2) above. The limitation provides an opportunity for a more intensive study. A personal interview is to be conducted with approximately five percent of the sample group of participating graduates and administrators.

Procedure

The questionnaires in this study were developed after detailed study of comparable investigations of: Teacher Competence, Its

Nature and Scope (15), Evelyn Piper, An Evaluation of the Under-
graduate Elementary Education Program at the University of Oregon,
Based on the Opinions of Graduates (48), Chester Squire, An Evalua-
tion of the Elementary Teacher Education Program at Southern Ore-
gon College (57), and other studies and literature in the field.

A list of the 1961 and 1962 Oregon State University education
graduates was obtained from the registrar's office. Elementary
graduates were verified through the IBM listings obtained from the
office of the Dean of the School of Education.

The addresses of the elementary graduates were obtained
from the Oregon State University teacher placement service and
alumni office, the State Department of Education, and Oregon city
and county school directories.

A more detailed account of the selection of items for the
questionnaires, the difficulties encountered in locating the graduates,
and procedures entailed in the delivery of the questionnaires to
graduates and their supervising administrators are included in
Chapter III of this study.

Summary

This chapter has briefly reviewed the problem of setting
general standards for and describing the important factors in the
evaluation of elementary teaching competencies.

This writer solicited the judgments of the graduates concerning the effectiveness of their undergraduate preparation and the judgments of the supervising administrators concerning the graduates' teaching competence.

Chapter II of this study pertains to the historical development, the judgments of authorities, and the literature related to teacher education and teacher evaluation in the United States.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE RELATED LITERATURE

The literature reviewed for this study includes studies of

teacher education, research in teacher evaluation, and judgments

of authorities concerning teacher education and teacher evaluation.

The literature in this chapter will be treated in two major

divisions. The first major division is an overview of teacher edu-

cation with three sub-sections: (1) historical development, (2) judg-

ments of authorities, and (3) related studies. The second major

division is an overview of teacher evaluation with three sub-sections:

(1) historical development, (2) judgments of authorities, and (3) re-

lated studies. Each division, teacher education and teacher evalua-

tion, will be developed chronologically.

Teacher Education, Historical Development

For the purposes of this study the historical development of

teacher education will be restricted to the main institutions for edu-

cating teachers as they developed in the United States: (1) normal

schools, (2) teachers colleges, (3) departments of education, and

(4) schools or colleges of education. The area covered will be es-

pecially significant and relative to progress in teacher education.

Teachers were recruited from all classes of society in colonial

American history. Many clergymen combined the teaching of Latin and Greek with their other duties. This type of instruction was at the more advanced stages of education while servants and even slaves were often used as elementary teachers with the emphasis almost entirely upon subject matter with little attention paid to those being taught (4, p. 351-352).

The normal school was part of the movement to establish a special school for the purpose of preparing teachers. Thomas Gallaudet (4, p. 136), known as the promoter of normal schools, established the first school for the deaf in America at Hartford, Connecticut in 1816. Gallaudet published a series of articles on education in the Hartford newspapers in 1825 entitled, "Plan of Seminary for the Education of Instructors of Youth," almost simultaneously with a series of articles by James Carter in the Boston newspapers entitled, "Outline of an Institution for the Education of Teachers" (9, p. 387-388). These two essays were reprinted and circulated in New England and started a chain reaction which resulted in having the problems of teacher education discussed widely in newspapers and had the effect of bringing the issue before the literate public.

Carter, a farmer's son, had become interested in education while attending Harvard College. As a member of the Massachusetts legislature he secured, with the assistance of Horace Mann, the

passage of a law in 1837 that created a state board of education.

Carter (4, p. 105) was also instrumental in establishing a state

school fund to assist the towns in maintaining more efficient instruc-

tors.

Mann (4, p. 105), one of the foremost educational statesmen

in America, accepted the office of secretary of the new Massachu-

setts Board of Education. In this office he lectured and wrote volu-

minous reports to publish his views on the need for improvement

in education. His crusade for public education spread to practically

every other state.

In 1839, fourteen years after Gallaudet and Carter published

their series of articles, the first public normal school in America

was established in Lexington, Massachusetts under the leadership

of Horace Mann (9, p. 396).

The number of normal schools grew slowly and were closely

associated with rural education. They received most of their pupils

from the rural area and returned many graduates to the country

schools (29, p. 213-214).

The first normal schools were established to prepare teachers

for the elementary schools. Usually they included one year of prep-

aration beyond the high school level but some students were admitted

on the basis of their elementary school record (18, p. 168). Many

of the early students attended only one term. Gradually it became

apparent to educational leaders that teachers had to be prepared over a period of years rather than in one or two terms. The quality as well as the quantity of instruction had to be altered. Instead of equipping the prospective teachers with a bag of tricks, it was necessary to prepare them for teaching and living with children (21, p. 344).

Gradually the requirements were extended to a two-year course in the normal school and in some states three years became mandatory. The normal school idea spread until by 1900 all 45 states in the Union had established normal schools (9, p. 396-397).

Two other significant events affecting teacher education during this era were the: (1) establishment of the United States Department of Education in 1867, and (2) entry of women into the profession.

The first commissioner of the U.S. Department of Education was Henry Barnard who had been the Connecticut State Superintendent of Schools. It was truly fitting for him to be assigned this position for he had pioneered for the improvement of education along with Gallaudet, Carter, and Mann.

In the basic law creating the position of commissioner, the three main duties were: the collecting of statistics and facts, diffusing of information about the schools, and otherwise promoting the cause of education (21, p. 22). Early in 1946 the Office of Education was reorganized to include eight divisions: school administration, auxiliary services, central services, international

education relations, elementary education, secondary education, vocational education, and higher education (18, p. 97). 1953 was a landmark year for the Office of Education. President Eisenhower sent Congress a reorganization plan for all Federal activities in health, education and social security. With the creation on April 11, 1953, of the U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, the word "education" appeared for the first time in American history as a part of the title of a cabinet-level department of the Federal Government (60, p. 159-163).

A radical break with academic tradition and one in which the United States was a pioneer was the provision of higher education for women. In 1837 Oberlin College in Ohio (18, p. 23) admitted four women as fully matriculated students on an equal basis with men students.

In 1838 Mary Lyon, a teacher, established the first women's college, Mount Holyoke in Massachusetts. This example was followed by the creation of other colleges for women such as Vassar College at Poughkeepsie, New York in 1861; Wellesley College at Wellesley, Massachusetts in 1870; and Smith College at Northampton, Massachusetts in 1871 (18, p. 24).

The idea of segregated schools as to sex was almost entirely an eastern and southern ideal. The University of Mississippi admitted women in 1882, but in most of the Southern states, including

Mississippi, separate state colleges for women were opened in towns remote from the state university (29, p. 474). Florida, for example, had a state university for men at Gainesville and a state college for women at Tallahassee, both of which are now coeducational.

While women in the East were having a struggle to secure the advantages of collegiate instruction, those in the West were finding their way to this goal through new institutions open to both sexes. Out on the frontier the State University of Iowa and the University of Wisconsin admitted women to degree courses in the middle sixties (29, p. 473). When the University of Maine and Cornell University in the early seventies became coeducational, other eastern institutions of this class were swept into the same strong current.

Today coeducational institutions and women's colleges have gained for women the right and the opportunity to obtain higher learning comparable with that for men. Not only is general education available to women today, but also a wide selection of professional curricula. Women now outnumber men in the teaching profession, especially at the elementary level (21, p. 220).

The rapid growth of the normal schools continued in the twentieth century, both in terms of the number of institutions and the upward extension of their programs. As the requirements for entrance were raised to graduation from high school and the program of study was extended to four years, a movement began to convert

the normal schools into teachers colleges. The Michigan State Normal School at Ypsilanti was the first school to make this change, being converted into a teachers college by an act of the Michigan legislature in 1897 (9, p. 405). In 1903 the new school was authorized to grant the B. A. degree and the movement was underway. The pace was set for this period by Teachers College, Columbia University, which was established as a degree-granting professional school for the preparation of teachers (18, p. 168).

Initially the rise of the teachers college caused some consternation in academic circles (4, p. 353). Liberal arts colleges had voiced no particular complaints about the degrees in pedagogy awarded by normal schools, but raised grave objections when teachers colleges began to issue A. B. degrees. Their contention was that teachers college graduates had not acquired enough points in subject matter because they were taking so many courses in pedagogy.

As the years went on, the normal or professional schools gradually put more emphasis on the academic studies and pared the courses in pedagogy (4, p. 353). By 1920, 46 other teachers colleges were in existence (9, p. 405) and by 1940 most of the state normal schools received legislative sanction to become teachers colleges and grant degrees in elementary education (1, p. 9-10).

The old normal school has developed into a modern teachers college. The emphasis has shifted from teaching to learning, from

teaching the how, what and when to teach to providing opportunities to learn how pupils learn. Whereas the old normal school prepared teachers for elementary service only, the teachers college has spread its offerings to include the education of secondary and special education teachers and some, to educate teachers for colleges and universities (21, p. 348).

The first department of education established in a liberal arts college was introduced at New York University in 1832. From that beginning, departments of education have continued to be established in many colleges and universities in the United States (18, p. 169).

The development of teacher education in colleges and universities following 1890 differed in a significant respect with that in normal schools and teachers colleges. By this date the normal school was generally accepted but in colleges and universities provisions for the professional education of teachers was at the beginning level. At this time 114 colleges and schools of education of 415 such institutions were offering teacher courses (45, p. 307).

This change was caused by a widespread interest in the education of secondary teachers which became an important aspect of teacher education at the beginning of the twentieth century (18, p. 169). The development of professional education for secondary teachers in colleges and universities originated with scholars and professional men who were unimpressed by the teachers being employed at the

secondary level. These men along with faculty members of colleges and universities were instrumental in the development of departmentalized teacher's courses (45, p. 308).

The pattern followed in most schools was to first establish a chair in education or pedagogy, then expand it into a department as additional staff members were added, and finally into a school or college of education as a separate administrative unit controlling its own program and granting its own degrees. Even today not all universities that educate teachers have schools or colleges of education. Some have kept the departmental arrangement within a larger division such as social science or liberal arts (9, p. 406).

This section on Teacher Education, Historical Development, would not be complete without the mention of two very important organizations that have done much to improve the quality of teaching, The Association of Student Teaching and the Future Teachers of America.

Today almost every teacher-education institution provides facilities for students to experience actual teaching in a campus laboratory school or in a public school. Student teaching is now regarded as a major part of the professional curriculum. The Association of Student Teaching founded in 1920 (41, p. 17) has offered a tremendous impetus to professional laboratory experience in teacher education.

The Future Teachers of America is sponsored by the National Education Association and was founded in 1938 (39, p. 488-490). The purpose of this organization is to provide the opportunity for students enrolled in teacher-education institutions and high school students contemplating a teaching career, to become active, participating members of the National Education Association and state associations.

Teacher Education, Judgment of Authorities

For the purposes of this investigation the judgments of authorities in teacher education will begin at the turn of the century when some normal schools were being converted to teachers colleges.

Russell in 1900 was aware of the importance of the integration of teacher education with other disciplines at Columbia (52, p. 10):

> The science of education - I refer merely to that system-
> atized body of knowledge which has to do with education -
> needs to be developed and made over to fit modern con-
> ditions. What these conditions are, how they have come
> to be and wherein they are subject to change, are questions
> which can be answered only in a university. No purely
> professional school can economically undertake the re-
> search and investigation involved in furthering a study
> with so many ramifications as education. Theoretically,
> then, a university professional school for teachers is con-
> cerned with the advancement of all the arts and sciences
> of which a university takes cognizance.

In 1921 Pearson (47, p. 107-108) expressed his concern for an academic degree to attest teaching ability:

> In the fuller development of educational ideals and school
> economics, we shall need an additional degree to attest

teaching ability. Neither the bachelor's degree, nor the
master's degree nor yet the doctorate is an infallible
guarantee of teaching power. In fact, there are those
who have achieved all these decorations whose teaching
ability does not rise above the plane of mediocrity. It
is obviously impossible to indicate teaching power by
means of academic degrees. Scholarship is one thing,
but ability to teach is quite another, and we may all fer-
vently hope that, all in good time, the wisdom of educa-
tors may contrive a degree that will attest the real teach-
ing power of the one whom it is conferred. Toward such
a consummation every teacher may look with hope, for
there can be no doubt in the mind of any thoughtful per-
son that the profession of teaching is coming into its own.

Charters and Waples in 1929 referred to the need for a change

in the curriculum of teacher education (11, p. v.):

A radical reorganization of the curricula of teacher-
training institutions is demanded by a variety of con-
ditions. Teacher-training curricula, like others, have
been developed without clear definition of objectives and
with no logical plan of procedure.

Another opinion in 1929 alluded to college teachers of education.

Haggerty (32, p. 662) directed his statement to their classroom per-

formance:

Until college teachers of education learn to improve
their own classroom performances, they may well sit
in humility at the feet of master teachers in academic
fields, one or more of whom almost every college num-
bers among its present staff. The immediate import
of educational inadequacy is that teachers of education
should go slowly in offering courses in college education.

Watson and others in 1938 intimated the need for leadership in

the education of teachers (61, p. 104):

It is not sufficient for teachers colleges to turn out
teachers who are well educated. They must take a

much more aggressive leadership in the formation of
public attitudes which will sustain and foster educa-
tional progress.

Dewey in 1940 (20, p. 366) wrote about extreme change of the
social life in the United States and the need for education to transmit
the emotion and the idea of the great American traditions from gener-
ation to generation:

> It is because the conditions of life change, that the prob-
> lem of maintaining a democracy becomes new, and the
> burden that is put upon the school, upon the educational
> system, is not that of stating merely the ideas of the men
> who made this country, their hopes and their intentions,
> but of teaching what a democratic society means under
> existing conditions.

Four generalizations were made by Armstrong, Hollis and
Davis (3, p. 302-303) in 1944 of the necessity for the student in a
teacher education program to know where he is going, why he is
going there and what he may expect on arrival:

1. We maintain that students will need to share much
   more actively than they ordinarily have in the past
   in planning and appraising their education as they
   go along.

2. The breadth of view and grasp are best furthered
   by an alternation of direct experience with theoreti-
   cal discussion and intensive outside reading. While
   we put great stock in this method for all learning,
   we consider it quite indispensable for the subjects
   pertaining to professional education.

3. A particular emphasis is called for on understand-
   ing the nature of human growth and motivation, and
   the process of social change.

4. Group action representing each department of the

institution with emphasis on the student will be-
come increasingly important in the years im-
mediately ahead.

The cooperative effort of all faculty members was also Mon-

roe's theme in 1952 (45, p. 420) with reference to the teacher edu-

cationists:

Developing a more effective technical-professional pro-
gram is the responsibility of educationists. Some recent
efforts in this direction are probably to be commended,
but, in general, it appears that much remains to be done.
In addition to developing more functionally effective
courses and programs of courses, more attention should
be given to engendering greater respect for technical-
professional study. The continued criticism of education
courses and colleges of education suggests that education-
ists have not been sufficiently concerned about "selling"
their work to their academic colleagues. Salesmanship
in this connection will not be easy, but educationists
should recognize it as a challenge.

Rugg (51, p. 273), 1952, indicated that teacher education in the

next 25 years must pay in hard intellectual work and creative imagina-

tion:

I have said time and again that enough is known to design
and build a great teacher education. It is; but it is not
known as yet by the right people. It is known only by the
scholars of the Science and Art of Man, and they are not
in a position to build the educational program. More-
over the knowledge must be known by all the teachers of
teachers including their administrative officers. Let us
not forget that the teacher-education program can be no
better than the conceptual knowledge and the design of the
men who build it. Concepts do not emerge full-blown
from a passive listening process. They are hammered
out on the anvil of creative thought.

In an article in the Thirty-Seventh Yearbook of The Association

for Student Teaching published in 1958, Shane, Callis, and Merideth

reported on trends in teacher education methods courses (55, p. 41-

42):

> In general, professional methods courses show symp-
> toms of becoming more functional. That is, a number
> of instructors are endeavoring to help students learn
> in a manner comparable to that in which these students
> subsequently can help their pupils learn effectively.
> There are other indications that instructors are making
> diligent efforts to insure that methods courses have
> substance so that students are not placed in the anomalous
> position of learning about, say, methods in elementary
> science or mathematics, when they lack sufficient back-
> ground in the subject to teach it.

Recommendations made by the Second Bowling Green Confer-

ence held in 1958 were summarized by Cohen (14, p. 14-16):

1. Greater cooperation between academic subject-
   matter fields and professional schools of education
   in all teacher training programs as their joint re-
   sponsibility, and particularly so in behalf of greater
   mastery of subject matter.

2. More liberal education and more general education
   for teachers.

3. Reappraisal of all present teacher training programs,
   with particular attention to the offerings of teachers
   colleges.

4. Screening for quality of all candidates for the teach-
   ing profession; the abolition of all two-year prepara-
   tory programs in teacher training and the restriction
   of professional status to four-year degree people only.

5. Introduction of five-year programs of teacher training.

6. In-service training and internship training of elemen-
   tary and secondary school teachers.

Stiles, Barr and others in 1960 (58, p. 466) referred to the importance of diversity and common effort of a faculty team by their involvement in defining staff positions, selecting new associates, assigning function, and encouraging professional development:

> It takes many different types of persons with different interests, kinds of intelligence, training, and background of experience to constitute a good team of teacher educators. There is too much homogeneity in the staffs of most teacher education institutions. This arises in many ways: (1) There is the cultural leveling to whose forces everyone is subjected. (2) Other types of sameness are achieved by the common agreement reached in professional meetings, year books, publications, and committee actions. (3) Some institutions permit too much inbreeding through the continual employment of their own graduates or those of a very closely related institution. (4) Some administrators have a stereotype to which all appointees must conform. Modern society is too complex to be represented by a single stereotype. A faculty team is more like a baseball team with pitchers, catchers, infielders and outfielders. The best approach is to have some of each. The common bond between them will be scholarly teaching, research, and service.

Trump and Baynham (59, p. 123), 1961, suggested a potential first step in improving teacher education would be to employ teacher trainees as clerks and instruction assistants in the schools. They emphasized the practicality of this venture in four ways: (1) that students who are being educated to become teachers should work in the schools throughout their college years, (2) the experience would make their college courses more meaningful by providing opportunities for learning by doing, (3) provide money to defray college

expenses, and (4) school and college staff would both benefit from the mutual planning and supervision of the trainee.

The federal government has done much to assist higher education through the leadership of our Presidents. When the new administration of President Kennedy sent its education bill to Congress on February 20, 1961, the President had this to say about education (29, p. 591):

> Our progress as a nation can be no swifter than our progress in education....... The human mind is our fundamental resource. We are educating a greater proportion of our youth to a higher competency than any other nation on earth.

Goodlad (30, p. 167) indicated in 1962 four areas of what teacher preparation should include beyond knowledge of the subjects taught:

1. Identify significant educational decisions and decision-making processes.

2. Identify the data sources appropriate to understanding the nature of these decisions and to participating intelligently in their making.

3. Identify the roles demanded of the teacher in the understanding and effecting of educational decisions.

4. Project a curriculum designed to develop in teachers the behavior deemed essential to the fulfillment of such roles.

Woodring's unifying theory of teacher education, 1962 (64, p. 140), rests upon clearly stated assumptions about the meaning and

purpose of education, the role of the school as an institution, the

limitations of the school's responsibility, the role of the teacher

within the school, the nature of the learning process, and the con-

tent of the curriculum. He feels that the present-day programs for

educating elementary teachers reflect a set of assumptions that

first came into prominence in the early part of the nineteenth cen-

tury and any similarity to his unifying theory are implied rather

than stated.

Hanna and Jacks (33, p. 130-131) in 1962 pointed to the need

for good elementary teachers and emphasized the importance of

their position:

> There are many good teachers in the elementary schools
> today, but there is need for many more. Good teachers
> are particularly important in the elementary school,
> where the foundations of education are laid. The signifi-
> cance of the teacher as a model is sometimes overlooked.
> The young child learns much by imitation, and, if he
> doesn't have the kind of teacher who inspires him to do
> his very best, he is not likely to set high standards for
> himself and develop his talents fully. This factor is
> compounded by the self-contained classroom, where the
> typical child has a single teacher for a year and some-
> times longer.

The Forty-First Yearbook of The Association for Student

Teaching, 1962, observed six trends in teacher education programs

in recent years (62, p. 32): (1) the application of guidance principles

and policies, (2) an increased interest in content and methods of

teacher education courses, (3) provision for more professional

laboratory experiences, (4) a realization that programs must be ex-

tended, (5) increased attention to research and professional litera-

ture, and (6) changes in student teacher-supervisor relationships.

In concluding this section, the remaining statements by Conant,

Koerner, McMurrin, and Denemark were presented on teacher edu-

cation in 1963.

Conant believes the curriculum for elementary education could

be revitalized and indicates three ways in which this could be done

(16, p. 155-156):

> Unquestionably there is a body of material worthy of
> inclusion in the education of elementary school teachers,
> but in many institutions, there is a considerable amount
> of duplication and repetition. To remedy this situation
> I make three suggestions. First, the total time allocat-
> ed to courses in special content and method, frequently
> amounting to almost two semesters, should be reduced
> to the equivalent of one semester's work ..... Second,
> these courses in special content and method should be
> taken in the student's senior year and should be taken
> concurrently with actual experience in an elementary
> school classroom........ Third, these courses in
> special content and method should be taught by a team
> of clinical faculty members whose own education and
> teaching experience qualify them in both the content
> and the methodology of the specific subject.

Koerner indicates the lack of direction to teacher education in

his book, The Miseducation of American Teachers (36, p. 2):

> Despite the uncountable experiments that have been con-
> ducted in modern education, the tireless application of
> scientific method, the endless statistics, and all that
> which passes for research, education programs in the
> United States continue to be constructed, and education-
> al decisions continue to be made, on other than "objective"

grounds; they continue to be chiefly acts of faith, hope or charity. And educational books continue as always to be arguments based more on their authors' personal convictions than on any sort of recognized and accepted data.

McMurrin (43, p. 23) presents a future for teacher education as one of many decisions and hard work:

> Education in the art of teaching has too commonly been narrowly conceived in terms of psychological studies descriptive of the learning process. Teaching is an art that must be rooted in the entire gamut of the behavioral sciences as well as in psychology, involving such disciplines as sociology, descriptive ethics, and cultural anthropology. But far more than this, even a simple comprehension of the proper aims of education involves necessarily an intimate knowledge of the value structure of the intellectual and moral tradition. ... To put it briefly, there is no easy road in the preparation of teachers of the kind that we must now guarantee our schools.

Denemark further observes the problem of the teacher preparation programs (19, p. 22):

> A major unsolved problem facing us today is that of determining the proper blend between the practical and the theoretical in teacher education curricula. It is clear that student teaching and other field experiences are highly valuable to beginning teachers. It also seems clear, however, that the theoretical bases for understanding teaching and learning, their nature and potential, must be established if we are to avoid producing only proficient technicians who are incapable of perceiving and working toward an image of what teaching and learning might become.

Teacher Education, Related Studies

Studies specifically relevant to the aims and purposes of teacher

education and particularly related to this investigation are chosen on the basis of studies involving elementary education students or graduates. Related studies concerned primarily with teacher evaluation are placed under Teacher Evaluation, Related Studies. Two of the studies were done in the State of Oregon and the writer conducted a personal interview with the authors Piper (48) and Squire (57), to acquire further details and to supplement this Oregon study.

Scherwitzky Study

Title. Attitudes of Students Toward Education Courses at State University College at Oneonta, New York (54).

Purpose. The study was three-fold: (1) to construct an instrument to measure the attitudes of students toward education courses; (2) to use the instrument at the University; and (3) to compare the students' attitudes, as revealed through their responses, with the opinions of critics of education courses.

Procedure. An analysis was made of the criticisms of education courses as found in the literature for the period 1949 - 1959 and an attitude scale was developed using the Likert method. A scale of 90 items was administered to 1337 students attending the college. Scale scores were analyzed in relationship to six variables; sex, college class, curriculum major, father's occupation, grade-point average and plans

for teaching.

Summary of Findings and Recommendations. Freshman and

junior women had more favorable attitudes than men. College

class and curriculum major were found to be significant fac-

tors in regard to favorableness of attitude. No significant re-

lationship was found between favorableness of attitude toward

education courses and fathers' occupations, grade-point aver-

age, or students' plans for teaching.

The item analysis disclosed that 63 percent of the 90

items elicited favorable responses from students in all classes.

Students in the freshman, sophomore, and junior classes re-

sponded favorably to 86 percent of the items. Senior replies

were unfavorable to 37 percent of the items. Unfavorable re-

actions centered around items concerned with repetition,

theoretical approach, development of teacher-pupil relations,

and the poor student "getting by" in education courses.

Student replies, as a whole, refuted critics' opinions

that knowledge of subjects to be taught is adequate preparation

for teaching, that there is too much emphasis on "methods,"

that education courses are easy and a waste of time, and that

course content is of little value.

Piper Study

Title. An evaluation of the Undergraduate Elementary Teacher

Education Program at the University of Oregon, Based on the

Opinions of Graduates (48).

Purpose. To determine graduates' and their principals' opin-

ions of the adequacy of the pre-service elementary teacher

education program. It also attempted to determine the extent

to which the graduates' ability, grade point average, year of

graduation, years of teaching experience and the grade level

of teaching affected their opinions in regard to their experiences.

Procedure. Questionnaires were sent to graduates of the ele-

mentary teacher education program, to their principals, and

to selected faculty members who taught required professional

courses in the elementary teacher education program. The

data were classified separately and a mean rating was deter-

mined for each graduate according to the principal's evaluation

of the effectiveness of each graduate as a teacher.

Summary of Findings and Recommendations. There was some

evidence of agreement among the three groups of respondees

in regard to the areas in which inadequate preparation had been

provided. There were three competencies from among the

first seven competencies indicated by all three groups as

having received less than adequate emphasis: (1) using diagnostic and remedial procedures effectively, (2) managing the class effectively, and (3) evaluating the achievement of children.

There was even more evidence of agreement among the three groups of respondees in regard to the category of more than adequate emphasis having been provided. From the seven competencies for which the largest number in each of the three groups of respondents replied, these appeared on each of the three lists: (1) maintaining an atmosphere in the classroom that is conducive to learning, (2) understanding the way children learn; using effective teaching procedures, (3) assisting in maintaining good relations between school and the rest of the community, and (4) understanding the age level with which they are working.

There was evidence that various factors affected the responses of the graduates. Graduates with psychological ratings in the lower four stanines felt more adequately prepared than did the graduates with psychological ratings in the upper four stanines. Graduates who had not taught indicated more dissatisfaction with the program than those who were teaching.

Cornish Study

Title. A Study of the State University of Iowa Undergraduate

Elementary Teacher Education Program and Its Graduates
1956 - 61 (17).

Purpose. This study involved an investigation of the charac-
ter of the graduates, their teaching experiences, their opinions
about their professional preparation and the identification of
various variables that would serve as predictors of future
teaching success.

Procedure. The scores on the College Entrance Examination
were recorded for all the elementary education graduates and
254 graduates or 82 percent were predicted for better than
average teaching success. The California Psychological In-
ventory was administered to 363 graduates and scores were
available on 333 students who did not complete their training.
Questionnaires were sent to graduates concerning their under-
graduate preparation. Background information pertinent to
the study was obtained from the students' permanent record.

Summary of Findings and Recommendations. Student Teach-
ing, Speech, Pathology, Arithmetic Methods, and Art Methods
were the courses rated highest by the respondents in terms of
their value in preparing to teach. Introduction to Geography
and Introduction to Elementary Teaching received the lowest
ratings.

The graduates felt that student teaching was the most

valuable part of their training but would like to have had the
period lengthened to involve two sessions at different grade
levels. They also recommended more observation of the stu-
dent teacher by the college supervisor.

Weaknesses mentioned were the repetition among courses,
large college classes, no classroom contact before student
teaching or methods courses, and not enough methods courses
required. The graduates placed a high value on classroom
projects in college to be used later in their own classroom.

Squire Study

Title. An Evaluation of the Elementary Teacher Education
Program at Southern Oregon College (57).

Purpose. This study was directed toward determining the
adequacy of the elementary teacher education program by
soliciting the opinions of teacher graduates, their principals,
and members of the college faculty. It was designed to seek
answers to: (1) the extent the graduates believed the teacher
preparation program contributed to their competence as
teachers, (2) how the principals would appraise the teacher
effectiveness of the education graduates, and (3) what extent
did the selected college faculty members believe they provided
specific teaching competencies in the courses taught.

Procedure. Only those graduates who completed their four years of preparation at the College and were currently engaged as teachers were sent questionnaires. Of the 183 graduates identified as fitting the selected criteria, 125, or 68 percent, returned acceptable responses. Ninety-four percent of the principals and all of the faculty members teaching required professional education courses responded.

Summary of Findings and Recommendations. The selected teacher competencies for which graduates, principals, and faculty members agreed pre-service preparation was least adequate were:

1. For helping children to understand and appreciate their cultural heritage.

2. For using adequate procedures for evaluating the achievement of children.

3. For using diagnostic and remedial practices.

4. For collecting and using significant counseling data as well as working with guidance specialists.

Some of the other findings resulting from the study were:

1. Primary, intermediate, and upper grade teachers tended to differ significantly regarding the value of their preparation.

2. Graduates who received the bachelor degree prior to

having field experience consistently rated their preparation
higher than did graduates who taught before completing de-
gree requirements.

3. Graduates rated high by principals consistently evaluated
   their preparation higher than did those rated low by princi-
   pals.

4. Duplication in education courses was noted by graduates
   as being excessive.

5. Poor instruction rather than content was regarded by
   graduates as one important reason for rating the effective-
   ness of some courses low.

6. Help received by students from supervising teachers and
   college supervisors was considered by graduates to be
   generally satisfactory.

Teacher Evaluation, Historical Development

While objective study of teacher effectiveness began about
1891, it was not until the years 1913-17 that some momentum of
quantitative studies based upon objective data was attained. Domas
and Tiedeman (22, p. 12-13) placed the number of studies during
this period as approximately 60 per year. Research into teacher
competence continued unabated from 1913 to 1928 where it peaked
at over 250 studies and then leveled off in 1933 with approximately

150 studies a year through 1952.

As the cumulative total of research in teacher evaluation grew it became important that the findings be brought together in one place. Barr (5, p. 203-283) in 1948 reviewed 139 research reports. His reviews of studies started with Meriam's 1905 report, "Normal School Education and Efficiency in Teaching," and ended with Witty's 1948, "Evaluation of Studies of the Effective Teachers."

In choosing the studies for his summary, Barr included research broadly interpreted as having any and all factual investigations of a more systematic sort. The studies were all alike in that they represented new appeals to educational experience and were actual evaluations. Barr looked at his summary as research concerned merely with the common elements of teacher evaluation which permeated different situations, persons, and conditions. He felt that little research to that time had been devoted to differential prediction such as differences in requirements for different subjects, grades, and school community situations.

Domas and Tiedeman in 1950 (22, p. 3) prepared an annotated bibliography of 1007 studies. Their list of references of teacher competence studies was obtained from The Education Index, the Encyclopedia of Educational Research, and The Measurement and Prediction of Teaching Efficiency: A Summary of Investigations. Domas and Tiedeman's bibliography was one of a series of three reports

which evolved from a study of teacher competence for the purpose of

conducting basic research on the administrative problem of identify-

ing and grading competence in the teaching service of the public

school. The annotations of these investigations described the major

ideas and investigations of teacher competence which were included

in each reference.

Morsh and Wilder in 1954 did an analysis and summary of

quantitative studies of teacher effectiveness, 1900-1952, in an attempt

to identify the effective instructor for the United States Air Force

which included a bibliography of 392 studies (34, p. 20).

Barr, Domas and Tiedeman, and Morsh and Wilder's biblio-

graphies provided a summary of most of the quantitative research

up to 1952 but by no means exhausted all the publications on teacher

effectiveness. These investigators excluded the vast majority of

studies with purely discursive and subjective material unsupported

by objective data and represented the more serious efforts of research

in teacher evaluation.

Research in the area of teacher competence in the last two

decades has provided studies of large-scale, long-term projects.

Some of the more significant and promising contributions have been

those of: Barr and his studies at the University of Wisconsin (5);

the American Education Research Association, National Education

Association (7); Ryans and his associates in the Teacher

Characteristics Studies at the University of California, Los Angeles
(53); McCall's study in North Carolina (42); The Commission on
Teacher Education, California Teachers Association (15); and the
National Commission on Teacher Education and Professional Stan-
dards, National Education Association (38). A more detailed refer-
ence to these studies will be covered later in this chapter under
Teacher Evaluation, Judgments of Authorities.

In the past decade, broader concepts of both the purposes and
methods of teacher evaluation have developed. The adoption of new
psychological viewpoints has been a major factor in influencing the
changes being made. There is evidence of a cooperative approach
to teacher evaluation by the approach of Cogan (13) in his perception
analysis, and Flanders (27) in his interaction analysis. More detail
on Cogan's and Flanders' work will be discussed later in this chap-
ter under Teacher Evaluation, Judgments of Authorities.

Teacher Evaluation, Judgments of Authorities

A good teacher in one culture or community may be a poor one
in another since value judgments of the appraiser may vary in dif-
ferent localities or situations. The definition of a good teacher de-
pends on the goals and purposes of the schools (15, p. 11).

Barr's (5, p. 226) judgment of teacher evaluation after his
1948 review of studies in the field was one of optimism:

By and large, the overall picture and future for the
measurement and prediction of teaching efficiency and
its prerequisites seems promising.......With more
accurate definitions of teaching, with judicious choice
of aspects of teaching to be studied, better data-
gathering devices, with more attention to the situation
into which teachers go and in which they are likely to
succeed, better criteria of efficiency, and improved
statistical procedures the results should be greatly
improved and stabilized.

Teaching efficiency is the product of many things. No
one may contribute much but taken together they con-
stitute teaching efficiency. At present we tend to dupli-
cate measurements in certain areas to the partial
neglect or exclusion of others. To get better predictions
one must get a better spread of the aspects of teaching
considered. With a better spread of aspects of teaching
studied, and due consideration to other demands of the
situation, reasonably accurate predictions should be
the rule rather than the exception.

Ten years later, in 1958, Barr and Jones in their work with

the American Research Association cited five points in looking to

the future in teacher evaluation (7, p. 261):

1. Teachers and teaching are part of a complex situa-
   tion involving pupils, purposes, values, activities,
   and products and can be studied from many points
   of view.

2. Even though teachers and teaching are very com-
   plex, most of the studies to date have dealt with the
   surface aspects of teaching and the teacher.

3. While an immense amount of time and thought have
   been given to the criteria of teacher efficiency, re-
   searchers continue to find low correlations among
   the more important sources of criteria such as
   supervisory ratings, measures of pupil growth and
   achievement, pupil evaluations, and teacher tests of
   what are thought to be fundamental knowledge, atti-
   tudes, and skills.

4. A clearer distinction needs to be made between
   ability and achievement.

5. There is need for greater continuity in teacher
   evaluation research. Many things are started
   but few finished.

Ryan's project with the Teacher Characteristics Study, which

began its work in 1948 (53), represents one of the most extensive

research programs that has been directed at the objective study of

teachers. During the six years of the major study, approximately

100 separate research projects were carried out, and more than

6,000 teachers in 1,700 schools and about 450 school systems par-

ticipated in various phases of the research. Many of the basic

studies involved extensive classroom observations, by trained ob-

servers, of teachers in public schools for the purpose of discover-

ing significant patterns of teacher behavior and of pupil behavior

reflecting teacher behavior.

In the summary of his book, Ryans has this to say about cri-

teria for predicting teacher effectiveness (53, p. 371):

> It is not surprising to note the difficulties that have con-
> fronted those seeking to establish criteria of teacher ef-
> fectiveness, the dearth of testable hypotheses produced
> in research which has been undertaken, and the general
> lack of understanding of the problem of the characteris-
> tics of effective teachers. Two very important reasons
> why effective and ineffective teachers cannot be described
> with any assurance are the wide variation in the value
> concepts underlying descriptions of desirable teaching
> objectives and the differences in teacher role at different
> educational levels, in different subjects, and with differ-
> ent pupils.

But in addition to these considerations, and important
in its own right as a deterrent to the study of teacher
effectiveness, is the fact that there is a lack of any
clear knowledge of the patterns of behaviors that typify
individuals who are employed as teachers. It seems
probable that, without losing sight of the importance of
developing means of recognizing "good" teachers,
attention of the researcher might first more properly
and profitably be directed at the identification and es-
timation of some of the major patterns of personal and
social characteristics of teachers.

The California Council on Teacher Education undertook an ex-

tensive seven-year study to develop a definition of teacher compe-

tence. The definition represented the cooperative work of many ed-

ucators working under the leadership of a special committee. The

final statement was published in 1952 by the California Teachers

Association (35).

Levin in 1954 (37, p. 105) approached new perspectives in

teacher evaluation in this manner:

It is my belief in light of encouraging preliminary results
that we should not despair of getting research answers to
some of the momentous problems concerning teachers and
children. Our new view leads us not to expect that we can
identify teachers who everyone would agree are good.
Rather, careful definitions and theory building have led
us into little explored avenues. We can only hope that
they will be rewarding.

Another California Teachers Association publication in 1957

(15, p. 7), credits the California definition of teacher competence

referred to above as demonstrating its value as

a basis for program development, revealing neglected areas in the

preparation of teachers, testing the effectiveness of processes for selection and appraisal, and, in general, completing the picture of the teacher's total professional role.

The National Commission on Teacher Education and Professional Standards after 18 national conferences has done much in the area of teacher evaluation. In the 1962 publication (38), the adoption of the new psychological viewpoints of Hughes, Smith, and Flanders are reviewed. The researchers in the Hughes' study collected many classroom records and from the analysis of those records defined the character of teaching as decision making in interaction with pupils, and that the product of the teacher's decision was the responses he made to a child or a group with whom he was interacting (38, p. 96).

Smith and his associates have isolated particular aspects of teaching which recognize the complexity of teaching situations and the variation in roles performed by teachers. One area they have isolated is classified as verbal and Smith reacts to this influence:

> It is difficult, if not impossible, to teach anyone anything
> without the use of language. And it is equally true that
> most of the knowledge we teach in school is expressed
> in word and other symbolic forms and that apart from the
> language system, there would be little or no knowledge to
> teach at all (38, p. 96).

While the Hughes study focuses on the whole range of the teacher's interaction with pupils and the Smith study is concerned primarily with the language of the teacher, the work of Flanders

and his group is focused on classroom climate. Flanders also recognizes the complexity of a classroom situation and the experience going on within it. In describing his study, Flanders indicates:

> The ultimate goal of studying teacher influence in the classroom is to understand teacher-pupil interaction and, in particular, to specify conditions in which learning is maximized (27, p. 96).

Cogan summarized his findings concerning perception analysis in 1958 (13, p. 101-103):

1. The individual pupils' ratings tend to differ for different teachers, in their perception of the teachers' behaviors and in the amount of work performed.

2. The principals' rating of the teacher behaviors are not consistently related to the pupils' rating of the teachers.

3. The teachers' estimate of their pupils required and self-initiated work are significantly related to the pupils' own estimate of their work.

4. The relationship of the preclusive behavior to the work scores is not clear, the evidence being inconclusive.

5. Strong evidence is adduced to show that in the perception of the pupils, scores on inclusive and conjunctive behavior of teachers are related to scores on the performance of required and self-initiated work of pupils.

Cogan in 1963 stated that the times are propitious for the initiation of a new phase in the research on the classroom behavior of teachers. He cites the instruments of modern technology which are now available to capture the data needed for teacher evaluation. With

the use of sound film cameras and projectors, kinescopes, and video-
tape recorders it opens the way for research on a level of rigor, re-
liability, and meticulous analysis almost totally absent before in re-
search on teacher competencies (12, p. 243).

Teacher Evaluation, Related Studies

Studies specifically relevant to the aims and purposes of
teacher evaluation and particularly related to this investigation are
chosen on the basis of studies involving elementary education students
or graduates. Related studies concerned primarily with teacher ed-
ulation are placed under Teacher Education, Related Studies.

Regier Study

Title. An Evaluation of Teacher Competence of a Selected
Group of Graduates of the School of Education, University of
Kansas (49).

Purpose. This study included an evaluation of the graduate's
teaching competence, an identification of the competencies
deemed essential to the success of beginning teachers, and a
partial evaluation of the teacher education program.

Procedure. A questionnaire listing 52 items describing teacher
competencies was sent to teacher education graduates. The
directions attached to the questionnaires asked each principal

to rate the competence of the graduate and the graduate was asked to make a self-evaluation, using a five-point scale. Each respondent was asked to indicate the appropriate time for the development of each of the 52 listed competencies either during the "pre-service" or the "in-service" period.

Summary of Findings and Recommendations. A relatively high positive correlation, .91 for the "pre-service" responses and .88 for those marked "in-service," indicated that teachers and administrators were in close agreement when percentages were compared using Spearman Rank Correlation Coefficients. This agreement made it possible to separate the 52 question-naire items into two lists. One list included 21 items to be developed "pre-service" and another included 22 items for the "in-service" period.

Ratings of teacher competence, using a five-point scale, were relatively high. Comparing mean ratings of competence there were 34 out of the 52 items in which administrators rated teachers higher than teachers rated themselves. Dif-ferences in mean ratings were significant for 14 of the 52 items, either at the five percent or the one percent level of probability, using the "t" test.

Teachers received relatively high ratings for those items relating to mastery of subject matter and to personality

traits. The lowest mean ratings were for those competencies

relating to: understanding behavior of the learner, meeting

needs of individuals, appraising instruction, and providing

remedial instruction.

Park Study

Title. A Study of Relationships between Personnel Records

and Success of Elementary and Secondary Student Teachers at

Northwestern University (46).

Purpose. This investigation was an attempt to explore the

possibilities of predicting the probable success of elementary

and secondary student teachers enrolled during the academic

year of 1961-1962 using data obtained from their cumulative

personnel records.

Procedure. Three criterion estimates and 22 measures of

certain student teacher characteristics were the basic data for

the statistical analysis. Data on success in student teaching

were based on the three general ratings of student teaching:

one by university supervisors and two by cooperating teachers.

Summary of Findings and Recommendations. All of the re-

lationships between the data obtained from personnel records

and success in student teaching were moderately high but too

low for individual prediction, there being a range of correlations

from -. 270 to . 783. Through the use of multiple regression analysis it was found that the best combination of variables consisted of four variables: leadership demonstrated in extra-curricular activities, grade point average in speech courses, grade point average in student teaching, and interview ratings. This combination produced a multiple R of .901 ± 1.785.

The other possible best combination of variables for prediction purposes consisted of three: leadership qualities, speech factors, and interview ratings. This combination produced a multiple R of .670 ± 2.366. The variables other than the four variables listed above were found to be negligible.

MacPhail Study

Title. The Effect of Television Training on the Quality of Lesson Presentation (40).

Purpose. This study was designed to explore the possibility of a cause and effect relationship between training in the use of television techniques and improved teacher competency.

Procedure. An experimental training program was administered to elementary student teachers, randomly assigned to two experimental groups, and the effects of this training were measured by comparing the performance of these students with the performance of another group of students who received

no experimental training. A single rating was recorded for
each student. Films of each student's performance before and
after the training period were judged by three raters and the
average gain scores of these subjective judgments were sta-
tistically analyzed for variability between and within experi-
mental groups.

Summary of Findings and Recommendations. The television
experience was designed to be consistent with procedures usu-
ally used to train television teachers, but the experimental
circumstances under which it was developed and administered
pointed out certain refinements in the process that may have
direct application to television teaching. An aspect of the
training which may have indirect use for improving teaching
proficiency was the successful attempt to measure performance
by subjective examination of certain aspects of the teaching act.

Eustice Study

Title. The Relationship of the Non-Academic Pre-Service
Experiences of Teachers and Teaching Success (25).

Purpose. This study was designed to determine how subjects
in contrasting teaching success groups participated in selected
pre-service experiences, their reactions to these experiences,
and what relationships existed between teaching success and

such experiences.

Procedure. Background information was collected for 109

University of Wisconsin education students in a structured

questionnaire used in a number of Wisconsin studies. Teach-

ing success ratings were obtained from supervisory personnel

using an adaptation of Barr's teacher rating blank. Three con-

trasting success groups - "upper," "middle" and "lower" -

were formed. Backgrounds and experiences of the success

groups were compared, data tabulated in two-way contingency

tables, and relationships tested by chi-square.

Summary of Findings and Recommendations. Two items were

found to be significantly related to success ratings. The upper

success group reported 77 percent, the middle group 80 per-

cent, and the lower 50 percent participating in speech activi-

ties. Fifty-three percent of the upper, 86 percent of the mid-

dle and 65 percent of the lower groups reported "favorable"

reactions (enjoyed or benefited by experiences) to the worth-

whileness of their living quarters experiences. Chi-square

in each case was significant at the five percent level, support-

ing the observed differences in percents. Chi-squares were

not significant in testing relationships between teacher success

ratings and each of the following: parents' level of education,

birthplace, national background, marital status; participation

in extra-curricular activities; financial responsibility; or
reasons for teaching.

Summary

The scope of the information in this chapter includes the prog-
ress of teacher education and teacher evaluation since the turn of the
century. This review shows little unanimity of opinion on the general
principles of preparing or evaluating teachers. The authorities do,
however, appear to agree that the major responsibility for providing
competent teachers for the elementary and secondary schools rests
with the education profession.

Information concerning the collection of data for this investiga-
tion is reported in Chapter III, Procedures.

CHAPTER III

PROCEDURES

Introduction

The purpose of this study is to evaluate the Oregon State University undergraduate elementary teacher education program. Specifically, as indicated in Chapter I, this investigation will attempt to show: (1) the graduates' judgments of pertinent areas of the teacher education program, (2) the extent to which the graduates' academic records affected their judgments in regard to the teacher education program, (3) the supervising administrators' ratings of the graduates' teaching competencies, and (4) a relationship between the administrators' ratings of the graduates and the graduates' academic record.

The data for this investigation were collected by four separate procedures: (1) a questionnaire to graduates, (2) a questionnaire to the graduate's supervising administrator, (3) a follow-up interview with a selected group of graduates, and (4) a follow-up interview with a selected group of supervising administrators.

The graduate's questionnaire was prepared to evaluate the teacher education program in: (a) professional education courses, (b) general education courses, and (c) student teaching. Throughout

the questionnaire space was provided for the graduate to write in

comments or recommendations if a check in the objective section of

the questionnaire was not sufficient to transmit his complete answer.

The supervising administrator's questionnaire was arranged

with four major sections of teacher competencies for evaluation of

the Oregon State University graduate's: (a) classroom management,

(b) methods of instruction and evaluation, (c) child growth and de-

velopment, and (d) school and community relations. A section was

provided at the end of the questionnaire for the administrator to

give the graduate an overall rank of competence as a teacher.

Personal interviews were conducted with the graduates and

administrators as a follow-up to the questionnaires to provide ad-

ditional information for this study. The purpose of the interviews

with the graduates pertained to their philosophy of education as in-

fluenced or affected by their undergraduate studies at Oregon State

University. The purpose for personal contact with the administra-

tors concerned the educational philosophy of the Oregon State Uni-

versity School of Education graduates participating in this study.

Construction of the questionnaires and the techniques of inter-

views followed procedures and considerations recommended by

Good, Barr, and Scates (28, p. 324-390).

Construction of the Questionnaires

The development of the first list of evaluative items for the graduate's questionnaire and the teacher competencies for the supervising administrator's questionnaire was prepared after a thorough investigation of the literature in Chapter II. A careful analysis of Teacher Competence, Its Nature and Scope (15) was undertaken as part of the preparation for the supervising administrator's questionnaire. Two related doctoral studies completed in the State of Oregon were reviewed as a part of the development of evaluative items and teacher competencies for both questionnaires. A personal interview was conducted with the writers of the two studies done in the State of Oregon, Piper (48) and Squire (57), to obtain as much pertinent information as possible concerning the preparation of the questionnaires used in their studies.

Each questionnaire was reviewed during the construction period by the writer's major professor and administered to a Graduate Continuing Education class in Research Procedures. Both questionnaires were reviewed for clarity, conciseness, and format as a result of these reviews.

The graduate's questionnaire contained 21 questions with a total of 81 items, four pages in length. The supervising administrator's questionnaire of one page included 28 items and a section

for ranking the graduate. Each questionnaire was reproduced by

multi-lithograph. The graduate's and administrator's questionnaires

are placed in Appendices B and C respectively of this study.

Follow-up Interviews

One of the criteria for inclusion in the study was one or more

years of teaching experience in the State of Oregon. This limitation

made it possible to include a personal interview with graduates and

supervising administrators as part of this investigation.

To supplement the information received by questionnaire, it

was decided that the personal interview should be structured to ac-

quire judgments from the graduates and administrators concerning

educational philosophy of the study participants.

The personal interview with the graduates was conducted to

ascertain the influence of their undergraduate studies on their es-

tablished philosophy of education. Specifically, to what extent did

their instructors in undergraduate work at Oregon State University

effect the graduates present philosophy of education toward their

overall responsibilities as a teacher in an elementary school.

The interview with the supervising administrator was con-

cerned with the judgment of the administrator toward the graduate's

educational philosophy. The administrator was questioned about

the participant's interest in children, adjustment to individual

differences of children, and overall attitude and interest for profes-

sional growth.

To insure informality and possibly confidentiality, notes were

not taken during the interview period with the graduate or the super-

vising administrator. Interviews were recorded in detail as soon

as possible after the completion of the discussion period.

A total of 14 interviews were conducted in five Oregon cities:

Albany, Coos Bay, Eugene, Portland, and Salem.

Selection of Graduates and Supervising Administrators

The criterion of at least one full year of elementary teaching

in the State of Oregon was adopted in order that a follow-up could

be made through personal interviews with a selected group of grad-

uates and supervising administrators. At the same time it was felt

that recent graduates would be better qualified to make judgments

concerning their undergraduate teacher education work in profes-

sional and general education courses and student teaching. On the

basis of these criteria all 1961 and 1962 elementary teacher grad-

uates who had completed more than one-half of their academic work

at Oregon State University and who had taught one or more years at

kindergarten through eighth grade level in the State of Oregon com-

prised the study population.

A list of the 1961 and 1962 elementary education graduates

was obtained from the University's registrar and School of Education

offices. This list included a potential total of 280 graduates who

could meet the criteria for the sample population of the study.

The home or school addresses and other information were ob-

tained on 249 of the 280 graduates from the Oregon State University

teacher placement and alumni offices, the State Department of Edu-

cation, and Oregon city and county school directories. A dittoed

information form was then sent to 123 of the 249 graduates for

whom some information had already been obtained to ascertain if

they had actually taught in an elementary school in Oregon since

their graduation. A total of 111 graduates returned their informa-

tion form after the initial mailing and one follow-up request.

Through the cooperation of the State Department of Education,

the University teacher placement and alumni offices, and with the

information received by correspondence a total of 150 graduates

were considered to meet the criteria of inclusion.

Questionnaires were mailed to the 150 aforementioned grad-

uates and 134 or 89 percent were returned. Thirteen or about nine

percent of the 134 questionnaires were either incomplete or upon

receipt of full information the graduate did not fulfill the criteria

for inclusion. The actual sample group was a total of 134 graduates

with 121 valid questionnaires. The 121 valid questionnaires amount-

ed to an 88 percent return on the part of the graduates.

A questionnaire was sent to the administrators after the graduate's questionnaire had been validated. All of the supervising administrators responded for a commendable 100 percent return.

Additional information was obtained for the graduates from the Oregon State University's registrar office concerning their undergraduate academic record. The student teacher grade, the American Council on Education entrance examination, and the final grade point average at graduation were recorded from data in the graduate's cumulative personnel record.

Objective information from both questionnaires was placed on IBM cards to facilitate the recording of data. Sections on the graduate's questionnaire requesting personal comments were categorized and tallied.

Two follow-up questionnaires were sent to graduates and administrators after the initial mailing. Fourteen of the questionnaires returned by the graduates were invalidated as not meeting the criteria of the study.

Summary

The information obtained from the questionnaires of the graduates and the supervising administrators, as described in this chapter, is presented in tabular form in Appendix A of this study. The tally of the ratings placed on the questionnaires by the respondents

will be recorded on the tables as percentage of response by each

group for clarity and understanding.

Information acquired from the personal interviews with the

graduates and administrators will be presented in Chapter IV in

summary form.

The specific procedures used in presenting the data are dis-

cussed in detail in Chapter IV, Presentation of the Findings.

CHAPTER IV

PRESENTATION OF THE FINDINGS

Introduction

As indicated in Chapter III, there were four sources of data
for this study: (1) a questionnaire to graduates, (2) a questionnaire
to the graduate's supervising administrator, (3) a follow-up inter-
view with a selected group of graduates, and (4) a follow-up inter-
view with a selected group of supervising administrators.

The study findings are presented in 11 major divisions derived
from the four sources of data as indicated above: (1) General Infor-
mation, (2) Evaluation of Professional Education Courses by Grad-
uates, (3) Evaluation of General Education Courses by Graduates,
(4) Evaluation of Student Teaching by Graduates, (5) Evaluation of
the University Faculty Advisor by Graduates, (6) Evaluation of the
University Teacher Placement Service by Graduates, (7) Rating of
Competencies of Graduates by Administrators, (8) A Comparison of
the Ratings by Administrators with the Academic Records of the
Graduates, (9) Follow-up Interviews with Graduates, (10) Follow-up
Interviews with Administrators, and (11) Chapter Summary.

Organization of Findings

The data in this chapter are treated in two separate ways. First, the subjective areas of the graduate's questionnaire, the information obtained from the follow-up interviews, and the interpretive narration of the tabular section are presented in the body of this chapter. Second, the objective areas of both questionnaires, where responses are derived from six values on a rating scale, are recorded in tabular form and reproduced in Appendix A of this study.

An explanation of the six values for the rating scale of each questionnaire is given at the beginning of each of seven appropriate divisions of this chapter. The values are the same for each questionnaire with the exception of the zero value. On the graduate's questionnaire the zero value is described as "did not have the course" or "no response." On the administrator's questionnaire the zero value is described as "no opinion." The division headings follow the format of the questionnaires and the follow-up interviews.

General Information

This section on the graduate's questionnaire relates the year of graduation and the grade level taught. The number of graduates for 1961 and 1962 was almost identical. There were 60 graduates of the 1961 class and 61 graduates of the 1962 class included in this

study.

With regard to grade level, there were 62 graduates of 52 percent teaching kindergarten through third grade, 55 graduates or 46 percent teaching grades four through six, two graduates taught a grade three-four combination, one graduate taught seventh grade, and one graduate was a special instructor in grades one through eight. The latter three classifications, which included four graduates, constituted the remaining three percent of the 121 participants.

Evaluation of Professional Education Courses by Graduates

The findings of the graduates' judgments toward professional education courses are presented in this section. The tabular response has been reproduced on Tables 1 through 11 in Appendix A of this study. The values for the ratings listed on the tables are:

5. Superior value   2. Below average value

4. Above average value   1. Inferior value

3. Average value   0. Did not have course -
                             no response

Reference to these values throughout this section will be confined mostly to the five ratings which denote a definite value reaction on the part of the respondents. The superior and above average

values will usually be referred to as the two top or high values while the below and inferior values will be designated as the two low values.

Findings.   Total ratings of professional education courses by the 1961-62 graduates (Table 1, Appendix A) indicated Student Teaching, Reading and Children's Literature with a high percentage of marks in the two top value columns. School in American Life and Educational Psychology received the smallest percentage of response in these same high value columns. Reading versus School in American Life and Educational Psychology showed critical ratios of 9.48 and 6.12 which were significant at the one percent level. Children's Literature versus the same subjects had critical ratios of 8.80 and 5.39. Differences were significant at the one percent level. Student Teaching with a greater spread of difference than Reading and Children's Literature was significant at the one percent level when compared with the two low rated courses. Field Experience was checked in the zero column by 18.9 percent of the graduates.

The 1961 and 1962 graduates viewed separately showed a similar pattern of response to the total group in some areas but quite a variation in others (Tables 2 and 3, Appendix A). The 1961 graduates rated Field Experience, Art, Science and Mathematics, and Student Teaching higher in the top value but critical ratios of 1.71, 1.13, 1.67, and 1.19 respectively were not significant. Reading was rated higher in the top value column by the 1962 graduates

but a critical ratio of 1.66 was not significant. The 1962 group checked the two low value columns 18 percent more often than the 1961 group and the high two values three percent more frequently.

The low and high grade point average graduates demonstrated a distinct variation on the total response (Tables 4 and 5, Appendix A). The high GPA (grade point average) group checked the two lower values 33 percent more frequently and the low GPA group of graduates marked the high two values 18 percent more frequently. The low GPA graduates checked Children's Literature more frequently in the superior value column, but not significantly so, with a critical ratio of 1.06. The critical ratio for the two groups on Elementary Physical Education was not significant (1.62).

A comparison of the low and high STG (student teacher grade) of graduates demonstrated a larger response in the two top values for Educational Psychology and Psychology of Childhood by the high STG group (Tables 6 and 7, Appendix A). These comparisons were not significant, being 1.80 and 1.30. The high STG group marked the two top values 25 percent above and the two low value columns 17 percent less than the low STG group. Sixteen percent of the low STG graduates and 30 percent of the high STG graduates checked the zero column for Field Experience.

The ratings by the low and high ACE (American Council on Education) entrance examinations indicated that the high ACE

graduates checked the two low values 55 percent more frequently than the low ACE graduates (Tables 8 and 9, Appendix A). In contrast, the high group designated Children's Literature five times as often in the top value column. With a critical ratio of 3.85, this was significant at the one percent level. The low ACE group rated Field Experience and Science and Mathematics higher in the two top values but with critical ratios of 1.44 and 1.05 were not significant.

The graduates teaching primary (Kdgn.-3rd grade) and those teaching upper elementary (grades 4-6) demonstrated a similar overall evaluation but had different views on certain courses (Tables 10 and 11, Appendix A). The upper elementary group rated Mathematics and Art much higher than the primary group in the two top values but neither were significant having critical ratios of 1.55 and 1.58. The primary graduates checked Music well above the upper elementary graduates although it was not significant with a critical ratio of 1.93. Both groups rated the low and high values about the same with the upper elementary eight percent higher on the two low values. Zero checks for Field Experience were also similar.

Comments and recommendations by the graduates concerning professional education courses were requested on the questionnaire following the objective ratings. Courses mentioned most often for revision, elimination, or combining with another course were:

Mathematics for Elementary Teachers - Twelve graduates

suggested revision with eight stating that modern mathematics

be included. Two graduates felt this course would be more

valuable if given in the junior or senior year.

Field Experience - Five respondents requested an extension

of this course with more time for classroom observation.

School in American Life - Thirty-five graduates suggested a

revision and two wanted it eliminated. Four respondents in-

dicated it should be combined with the Educational Psychology

course.

Art in the Elementary Schools - Eight graduates indicated a

need for revision and two suggested combining the two terms

into one quarter.

Educational Psychology - Eight respondents related need for

revision of this course while four suggested it be combined

with School in American Life.

Methods in Reading - Seven graduates indicated a need for an

extension to two terms while five respondents wanted the

course divided into primary and upper grades. More phonics

were requested by seven graduates.

Student Teaching - Eleven graduates felt a need for two terms

of student teaching.

Areas mentioned for additional instruction - Graduates re-

quested more instruction in discipline, parent and public

relations, professional responsibilities, recent trends in education, audio-visual aids, and the maladjusted child.

Evaluation of General Education Courses by Graduates

The findings of the graduates' judgments toward general education courses are presented in this section. The tabular response has been reproduced on Tables 12 through 22 in Appendix A of this section. The values for ratings listed on the tables are:

5. Superior value   2. Below average value

4. Above average value   1. Inferior value

3. Average value   0. Did not have course -
                                    no response

Reference to these values throughout this section will be confined mostly to the five ratings which denote a definite value reaction on the part of the respondent. The superior and above average values will usually be referred to as the two top or high values while the below average and inferior values will be designated as the two low values.

Findings. The total ratings of general education courses by the 1961-62 graduates (Table 12, Appendix A) indicated two courses rated significantly low at the two top values. These two courses, Physical Education and General Psychology, versus Speech Correction expressed critical ratios of 4.52 and 4.50 which were significant

at the one percent level. The average value column for general edu-
cation courses dominated the ratings with 32 percent as the lowest
and 50 percent as the highest total. The two top value columns were
checked four and one-half times as often as the two low value columns
by the graduates.

The 1961 and 1962 graduates analyzed separately indicated a
similar pattern of response to the total group with the 1962 group
rating most courses slightly higher in the two top values (Tables 13
and 14, Appendix A). The largest difference between the two class-
es was found in the ratings of History of American Civilization with
a critical ratio of 1.80 which was not significant. Each group rated
the two low and two high values somewhat differently. The 1961
graduates checked the two low values 23 percent more frequently
and the 1962 graduates checked the two high values 10 percent more
frequently.

The low and high GPA (grade point average) graduates pre-
sented only a few outstanding differences in their ratings (Tables
15 and 16, Appendix A). The high GPA group rated General Psy-
chology, Physical Science, and Speech higher in the two top value
columns. General Psychology showed the greatest difference but
was not significant with a critical ratio of 1.77. The high GPA
graduates checked the two high values and the two low values 48
and 9 percent more frequently than the low GPA graduates.

A comparison of the low and high STG (student teacher grade) graduates showed that the high STG group checked both low and high values more often in the general education courses (Tables 17 and 18, Appendix A). The high group checked the two low values and two high values 27 and 9 percent more often. The low STG graduates marked Literature higher and General Psychology lower but critical ratios of 1.28 and 1.78 were not significant. The high group checked the two low values for Physical Education more frequently but a critical ratio of 1.40 expressed no significance.

The low and high ACE (American Council on Education) entrance examinations related a very similar response by the two groups (Tables 19 and 20, Appendix A). Both the low ACE and high ACE graduates checked the two low and two high values about the same. The low ACE group marked Speech 20 percent higher in the two top values but a critical ratio of 1.46 showed no significance.

After rating the general education courses the graduates were asked to list the three general education courses that contributed the most to their effectiveness as a teacher and the three courses that contributed least. A compilation of the courses listed by graduates showed that English Composition, Speech Correction, and General Biology were rated most favorable and Physical Education, General Psychology, and Speech as least helpful to classroom effectiveness.

Additional course work suggested by the graduates in the general education area is listed in the order of number of recommendations: science, 15; mathematics, 11; history, 11; art, 4; psychology, 4; and sociology, 3.

Elective courses listed most often by the graduates as being helpful in their teaching experience were: Diagnostic and Remedial Reading, 14; Recreational Use of Arts and Crafts, 10; History of the Pacific Northwest, 7; Audio-Visual Aids, 5; and Western Civilization, 5.

Evaluation of Student Teaching by Graduates

The findings of the graduates' judgments toward their student teaching experience are presented in this section. The tabular response has been reproduced on Tables 23 and 24 in Appendix A of this study. The value for the ratings listed on the tables are:

5. Superior value
4. Above average value
3. Average value

2. Below average value
1. Inferior value
0. Did not have course - no response

Reference to these values throughout this section will be confined mostly to the five ratings which denote a definite value reaction on the part of the respondent. The superior and above average values will usually be referred to as the two top or high values while

the below average and inferior values will be designated as the two

low values.

Findings. The subject matter areas in Student Teaching rated

by the 1961-62 graduates (Table 23, Appendix A) indicated Reading

and Arithmetic as receiving the largest percentage of response in

the two top value columns. Reading versus Music and Health ex-

pressed critical ratios of 7.21 and 6.25, significant at the one per-

cent level. Arithmetic versus Music and Health showed critical

ratios of the same values and were significant at the one percent

level. The inferior value received only a small percentage of the

graduates overall rating with Music obtaining the most response.

Music was also checked by one out of every five graduates as not

having had that experience.

Comments and recommendations by the graduates concerning

their student teaching experience were requested on the question-

naire following the objective ratings. Comments made by 15 per-

cent of the graduates indicated that they enjoyed their student teach-

ing and felt it was the most valuable phase of their teacher educa-

tion program.

The graduates were also requested to give a value rating for

the three individuals most responsible for their student teaching

experience: (1) the University supervisor, (2) the cooperating

teacher, and (3) the school principal.

The University supervisor was rated by 41 percent of the

graduates in the two high values and by 34 percent of the respondents

in the lower two values. Fourteen percent of the graduates rated

their University supervisor in the inferior value column. Approx-

imately 15 percent of the graduates commented on the lack of thorough

supervision on the part of the University supervisor. Many felt the

need to be observed at least one period a week for evaluative assist-

ance.

The graduate's cooperating teacher was rated in the two top

values by 83 percent of the respondents and in the two low values

by six percent of the graduates. Most of the comments of the grad-

uates relating to their cooperating teacher were complimentary.

The adverse comments were directed toward the selection of cooper-

ating teachers and the need for preliminary orientation meetings be-

tween the cooperating teacher and the University.

The school principal was rated by 50 percent of the graduates

in the two top values and 19 percent of the respondents in the two

low values. There were few references directed toward the princi-

pals but some of the graduates commented on the assistance and

encouragement provided by the school administrators.

The graduate's rating of the Student Teaching Seminar (Table

24, Appendix A) indicated that the two low values were checked 17

percent more often than the two top values. Teacher placement and

problems in subject matter were rated highest in the two top values while measuring pupil growth and recent educational trends were checked most frequently in the two lower values. Some of the comments by the graduates with reference to the Student Teaching Seminar were: (1) the group was too large for individual-type discussions, (2) the seminar should be held in primary and upper-grade sections, and (3) the studentteachers should have some time during this period set aside for small group meetings with their University supervisor.

The amount of responsibility given to the graduates by their cooperating teacher was rated by the respondents as:

Too much	- 3 percent
About right	- 94 percent
Too little	- 3 percent

In regard to the length of the student teaching the graduate's response was:

Insufficient	- 22 percent
About right	- 75 percent
More than necessary	- 3 percent

About 35 percent of the respondents suggested more classroom observation before student teaching, more than one semester of student teaching, block program of observing and student teaching for one year, and student teaching at more than one grade level.

Evaluation of the Faculty Advisor by the Graduates

This section of the graduate's questionnaire requested the judgments of the graduates concerning the advice received from their University faculty advisor. Specifically, the question read, "What is the most important fact relative to the advice you received from your faculty advisor?"

Findings. The respondents rated the question pertaining to the faculty advisor as follows:

Did not seek advice	- 18 percent
Was given good advice	- 51 percent
Advisor was indifferent	- 26 percent
Was given poor advice	- 5 percent

Many graduates seemed well satisfied with their University advisor but those who were critical commented that: (1) the advisor could have been more interested in their problems, and (2) the advisor should be available for conferences with the student.

Evaluation of the University Teacher Placement Service by Graduates

This section of the graduate's questionnaire requested the judgments of the graduates concerning the assistance offered to them by the University Teacher Placement Service. Specifically, the question read, "Were you pleased with the assistance offered you by the

University Placement Office in obtaining a teaching position?"

Findings. The graduate's response to the assistance offered

to them toward obtaining a teaching position upon graduation was:

I was pleased — 63 percent

No, I was not pleased — 8 percent

I did not ask for help — 29 percent

The last question on the graduate's questionnaire requested

the respondent to make any further comments relative to desirable

changes or modifications in the Oregon State University elementary

teacher education program. Some of the more prevalent comments

made by the graduates were: (1) more practical work should be pro-

vided in methods courses, (2) methods courses should be planned to

reduce repetition of subject matter, (3) University instructors teach-

ing predominately teacher education courses should return to the

public school classroom every four or five years, (4) student teach-

ing should be on a "satisfactory" - "not satisfactory" grading policy,

and (5) more classroom experiences and observations are needed

prior to the student teaching experience.

Rating of Competencies of Graduates by Administrators

The findings of the ratings of the competencies of the graduates

by the administrators are presented in this section. The tabular re-

sponse has been reproduced in Table 25 in Appendix A of this study.

The values for the ratings listed on the tables are:

5. Superior   2. Below average

4. Above average   1. Inferior

3. Average   0. No opinion

Reference to these ratings throughout this section will be confined mostly to the five values which denote a definite value reaction on the part of the respondents. The superior and above average ratings will usually be referred to as the two top or high values while the below average and inferior ratings will be designated as the two low values.

Findings. The total ratings of the graduates by the administrators indicated that the two higher values were checked 60 percent of the time while the two low values were marked six percent or one-tenth as often as the high values (Table 25, Appendix A). The top rated competencies under the four major headings were: atmosphere conducive to learning, planning effectively, understanding the age level, and working with teachers and administrators. The competencies receiving the most checks in the two low values of the four classifications were: effective classroom control, helping children to listen effectively, adapting the principles in guiding children, and relations between school and community.

The competencies which showed a significance in the administrators' ratings were all included under the major heading, Methods

of Instruction and Evaluation. Planning effectively, the highest rated

competency under this heading, versus the other 16 competencies

revealed a significance of difference for eight competencies. Five

of the competencies were significant at the one percent level: help-

ing children in music, helping children in physical education, help-

ing children to speak effectively, helping children in social studies,

and diagnostic and remedial methods of instruction and evaluation.

The other three competencies were significant at the five percent

level: helping children express themselves in writing, helping chil-

dren in art, and helping children in problem solving. The critical

ratios for these eight competencies in the order listed were: 8.63,

3.15, 3.15, 3.03, 3.83, 2.46, 2.46, and 2.05.

The zero column, no opinion, was checked two and one-half

percent of the total ratings by the administrators. Music and art

were checked almost one-half of this total due to special teachers

assigned in these areas.

A Comparison of the Ratings by Administrators With the Academic Records of the Graduates

The findings of the administrator's rating of the graduate ver-

sus the graduate's academic record are presented in this section.

The tabular response has been reproduced on Tables 26 through 33

in Appendix A of this study. The values for the ratings listed on the

tables are:

5.	Superior	2.	Below average
4.	Above average	1.	Inferior
3.	Average	0.	No opinion

Reference to these ratings throughout this section will be confined mostly to the five values which denote a definite value reaction on the part of the respondents. The superior and above average ratings will usually be referred to as the two top or high values while the below average and inferior ratings will be designated as the two low values.

Findings. A section at the bottom of the administrator's questionnaire requested the administrators to rank the graduate in one of three areas in relation to other teachers of comparable experience and education. These areas were entitled upper one-third, middle one-third, and lower one-third. The total ranking for the graduates was: 81 graduates in the upper one-third, 35 graduates in the middle one-third, and five graduates in the lower one-third.

Since it would have been of little value to compare 81 graduates to only five, the graduates were ranked from 1 to 121 as rated by the administrators on the 28 competencies of the administrators' questionnaires.

A comparison of the low and high ranked graduates (Tables 26 and 27, Appendix A) indicated that the high ranked group was checked

five and one-half times as often in the two top values as the low rank-
ed group. The top ranked graduates received all their ratings in the
two top values for 21 of the 28 competencies while the low ranked
graduates received the larger percentage of their ratings in average
or below average columns. Competencies of the high ranked group
receiving 100 percent of the ratings in the two top values versus the
two top values of helping children in music (56.1 percent) expressed
a critical ratio of 4.10, significant at the one percent level. The
highest ranked competency of the low ranked graduates in the two
top values was helping children in science (23.1 percent). Helping
children in music versus the next to lowest rated competency in the
two top values, effective teaching procedures, showed a critical
ratio of 1.54 which is not significant.

The low and high GPA (grade point average) graduates demon-
strated two distinct variations on the total response of the adminis-
trators (Tables 28 and 29, Appendix A). The high GPA group had
28 percent more marks in the high two values but the low GPA group
had 57 percent fewer marks in the lower two values. The two top
values of the high GPA graduates in using significant data, helping
children express themselves in writing, and evaluating achievement
versus the same competencies of the low GPA graduates showed
critical ratios of 2.18, 2.30, and 2.85 respectively. These three
competencies were significant at the five percent level. The high

GPA group versus the low GPA group expressed critical ratios of 3.13 and 3.45 in understanding the age level in child growth and adapting the principles in guiding children which were significant at the one percent level.

The administrators' ratings of the low and high STG (student teacher grade) graduates pointed to the low STG group as receiving seven percent more checks in the top two values and 50 percent less marks in the low two values (Tables 30 and 31, Appendix A). The low STG group in the top two values showed significance in one competency at the five percent level, school activities, with a critical ratio of 3.00. In other competencies in the top two values, the low STG group was rated higher: in helping children in music, adapting principles in guiding children, effective teaching procedures, and working with teachers and administrators. These competencies expressed critical ratios of 1.01, 1.46, 1.59, and 1.86 respectively and were not significant. The high STG graduates versus the low STG graduates in helping children in critical thinking produced a critical ratio of 1.08 which was not significant.

The ratings of the low and high ACE (American Council on Education) entrance examinations ranked by the Administrators indicated the high ACE group receiving 20 percent more checks in the high two values (Tables 32 and 33, Appendix A). The high ACE graduates' ratings showed that three competencies were significant

at the five percent level and two competencies at the one percent

level. Helping children in problem solving, expressing themselves

in writing, and learning to write and spell expressed critical ratios

of 2.15, 2.46, and 2.56 for significance at the five percent level.

Helping children in arithmetic and understanding the age level were

significant at the one percent level with critical ratios of 3.05 and

3.56.

Follow-up Interviews with Graduates

The findings of the personal interviews with the graduates are

presented in this section. The results of the interviews with regard

to the graduates' philosophy of education toward their overall respon-

sibilities as a teacher are primarily subjective evaluations.

Findings. Graduates of the Oregon State University elemen-

tary teacher education program had one of three judgments toward

the most influential factors leading to their established philosophy

of education.

Some of the graduates maintained that their philosophy was

well established before entering college. This group placed the re-

sponsibility for their personal feelings with regard to teaching as

having originated in elementary and secondary school. They had

planned to become a teacher during this period of their lives and

developed a personal philosophy through the pupil-teacher relationship

previous to entering college.

The second judgment of origin of philosophy led substantially from the influence of the graduates' instructors and their student relations with the administration of the University. These graduates generally believed their most influential instructors were closely associated with the basic methods courses and their student teaching experience.

The third group placed their most direct influence of educational philosophy to the first year or so of their actual teaching experience. These graduates referred to the school principal, other teachers on the faculty, and the philosophy of their school district as most influential in the formative years of their teaching career.

Follow-up Interviews with Administrators

The findings of the personal interviews with the administrators are presented in this section. The results of the interviews concerning administrators' judgments of the graduates' educational philosophy are primarily subjective evaluations.

Findings. The judgments of the administrators in five cities of Oregon were generally in agreement as to the educational philosophy of the Oregon State University elementary education graduates.

The administrators felt that the Oregon State University elementary graduates under their supervision had a genuine interest

in children, were adequately prepared to adapt to the needs of the children, and exhibited an interest in professional growth.

They were particularly impressed with the cooperative attitude of the graduates and their adaptability to the many changes so inherent in the daily elementary school program.

As a whole, the administrators were well pleased with the graduates and expressed confidence in the Oregon State University elementary teacher education program.

Summary

The data compiled from the judgments of the graduates and their administrators concerning the Oregon State University elementary teacher education program and the graduates' teacher competencies were subjected to analysis in this chapter by the following procedures:

1. A percentage of the judgments of the graduates and administrators as checked on the questionnaires.

2. A compilation of the comments and recommendations as listed on the questionnaires.

3. Critical ratios of the percentage differences to ascertain their significance.

The data revealed that the undergraduate academic record of the graduate had some effect upon the kinds of judgments made

toward certain areas of the Oregon State University elementary

teacher education program. In contrast, the judgments of the ad-

ministrators concerning the graduates' competencies indicated no

perceptible evidence of the graduates' academic record.

The significant findings and recommendations for this study

are presented in Chapter V, Summary of Findings and Recommen-

dations.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY OF THE FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Analysis of the Findings

The follow-up interview with administrators, as reported in Chapter IV of this study, indicates a highly satisfactory judgment toward the graduates of the Oregon State University elementary teacher education program. The unanimous appraisal by the administrators interviewed relates a definite confidence in the educational preparation and philosophy of the graduates under their supervision.

The investigator analyzed the data discussed in Chapter IV to determine the significant findings as revealed by this study. All selected findings of individual subjects treated in Chapter V express a significance of difference at either the one or five percent level.

It is understandable that courses which are not immediately applicable to classroom teaching are perceived by graduates less favorably than those courses which have a direct relationship to the teaching goals of the graduate. This could account to a certain extent for the low ratings of necessary background courses, such as psychology, taken early in the graduates' teacher education program.

Each finding in this chapter is immediately followed by pertinent

recommendations. These findings and the recommendations will be reported in the following order: (1) Professional Education, (2) General Education, (3) Student Teaching, and (4) Teaching Competencies of Graduates.

Professional Education

Important Findings and Recommendations

Finding:

1. School in American Life and Educational Psychology are the two courses given the lowest ratings by the graduates.

Recommendation:

The role of these courses in the professional education program should be carefully evaluated to determine the reasons for the low ratings.

Finding:

2. School Health Education is given the second lowest rating in the superior value column of the rating scale.

Recommendation:

The relationship of this course to the teacher education program should be studied to determine the reasons for the low evaluation.

Finding:

3. Field Experience is checked as "did not have the course" or "no response"

by one out of five graduates.

Recommendation: Consideration should be given to making Field Experience mandatory.

Finding: 4. The 1962 graduates check the below average or inferior value rating 18 percent more often than the 1961 graduates.

Recommendation: A follow-up study should be directed toward identifying the reasons for the 1962 graduates' lower evaluation of professional education courses.

Finding: 5. The high GPA graduates check the below average or inferior value rating 33 percent more frequently than the low GPA graduates.

Recommendation: An evaluation should be made to determine if these professional education courses are fulfilling the purposes for which they are designed.

Finding: 6. The high ACE graduates check the below average or inferior value rating 55 percent more frequently than the low ACE graduates.

Recommendation: As in five above, the professional

education courses should be appraised

to determine the basis for this finding.

Finding: 7. Graduates, as indicated by the written

comments, request more instruction

in parent and public relations, disci-

pline, professional responsibilities,

recent trends in education, audio-visual

aids, and the maladjusted child.

Recommendation: Consideration should be given to the

possibility of more intense coverage

of these needs to alleviate some of the

alleged deficiences noted in the profes-

sional education program.

Finding: 8. Comments by graduates indicate the

need for more laboratory experiences

in methods courses.

Recommendation: A study of the content of methods

courses should be directed toward pro-

viding for these opportunities. The

use of video-tape would strengthen this

area considerably.

Finding: 9. The graduates indicate the amount of

overlapping and duplication in professional

education courses is excessive.

Recommendation: An evaluation of the courses in the professional education program should be made to determine if the repetition as perceived by the graduates is actually duplication or the reinforcement of ideas.

Finding: 10. Comments by the graduates suggest that instructors who teach education courses should keep closer contact with the public school classroom.

Recommendation: The administration should encourage the faculty to engage in experiences which will keep them in close contact with children in classroom situations such as consultants to the public schools or supervising student teachers.

General Education

Important Findings and Recommendations

Finding: 1. Physical Education and General Psychology are the two courses given the lowest ratings by the graduates.

Recommendation: A study should be made to appraise

these courses in relation to the teacher

education program to determine the

reasons for the low ratings.

Finding: 2. The high GPA graduates check the

superior or above average ratings 48

percent more frequently than the low

GPA graduates.

Recommendation: An appraisal of the general education

courses might give some indication of

significance of this finding.

Finding: 3. The graduates rate Physical Education,

General Psychology and Speech as the

three general education courses con-

tributing the least to their effectiveness

as a classroom teacher.

Recommendation: The relationship of these courses to

the teacher education program should

be studied to determine the reason for

the low evaluations.

Finding: 4. Science, mathematics, and history are

recommended most frequently by the

graduates as additional course areas

for the general education requirements.

Recommendation: Some consideration should be given toward the addition of course work in these three areas.

Finding: 5. Diagnostic and Remedial Reading, Recreational Use of Arts and Crafts, and History of the Pacific Northwest are listed by the graduates as elective courses most helpful in their teaching experience.

Recommendation: Faculty advisors should be alert to the graduates' favorable response with respect to these courses.

Student Teaching

Important Findings and Recommendations

Finding: 1. Music and Health are the two subjects given the lowest ratings by the graduates.

Recommendation: The relationship of these two subjects to the student teaching experience should be studied to emphasize pertinent areas for improvement.

Finding: 2. Music is checked by one out of five

graduates as "did not have this exper-

ience."

Recommendation: Adequate provisions for teaching music,

necessary for teachers in a self-

contained elementary classroom, should

be an integral part of the student teach-

ing experience.

Finding: 3. One out of three graduates rate the Uni-

versity supervisor "below average" or

"inferior."

Recommendation: The administration should study this

important facet of the student teacher

program to determine the reasons for

this low evaluation.

Finding: 4. Fifteen percent of the graduates com-

ment on the lack of adequate University

supervision.

Recommendation: The role of the University supervisor

should be studied to insure adequate

supervision of all student teachers.

Finding: 5. The student teacher seminar is rated

more often in the below average and

inferior values than in the superior or
above average values.

Recommendation: An evaluation of the student teacher
seminar is needed to determine if it is
fulfilling the purposes for which it is
designed.

Finding: 6. Comments by graduates indicate an in-
terest in having the student teacher
seminar in sections, by primary and
upper grades.

Recommendation: The feasibility of this suggestion should
be investigated as a possible means of
providing for smaller groups and con-
fining student teacher discussions of
problems to appropriate grade level.

Finding: 7. Graduates comment on the need for
more classroom observation and first-
hand experience with children before
their student teaching assignment.

Recommendation: More opportunities should be provided
for students to observe children in typi-
cal classroom situations and to have
first-hand experience with children

prior to student teaching. The use of
video-tape would strengthen this area
considerably.

Finding: 8. Nearly one out of three graduates rate
the University faculty advisor as "indif-
ferent" or "was given poor advice."

Recommendation: The role of the University faculty ad-
visor should be evaluated to determine
the reasons for the graduates' low rat-
ing.

Finding: 9. Twenty-nine percent of the graduates
indicate they did not utilize the services
of the teacher placement office.

Recommendation: Although there is an excellent program
to encourage the use of the placement
services, other measures should be
taken to reach more graduates. Con-
ditions change after the graduate obtains
his first position and closer contact
should be maintained with the placement
office for future needs.

Teaching Competencies of Graduates

Important Findings and Recommendations

Finding: 1. The lowest rated competency by the

administrators is "helping children in

music. "

Recommendation: The relationship of the required music

courses to the teacher education pro-

gram should be evaluated with particular

emphasis on the value of content and

procedures.

Finding: 2. Under Methods of Instruction and Evalua-

tion the administrators rate the follow-

ing competencies as significantly low:

In helping children in music

In helping children in physical
education

In helping children to speak
effectively

In helping children in social studies

In helping children express them-
selves in writing

In helping children in art

In helping children in problem
solving

		Diagnostic and remedial methods
Recommendation: :		Although courses and experiences in the teacher education program are currently offering these competencies, there may be need for strengthening these particular areas.
Finding:	3.	The administrators rate the competencies of the low GPA graduates 57 percent less frequently in the below average and inferior values compared to the high GPA graduates.
Recommendation:		An evaluation should be made to determine if the teacher education courses are fulfilling the purposes for which they are designed.
Finding:	4.	The low STG graduates when compared with the high STG graduates are rated higher in the superior and above average values by the administrators and given 50 percent less marks in the below average and inferior values.
Recommendation:		A re-examination of the grading policy is indicated by this finding. The use

of the "satisfactory" - "unsatisfactory" grading scale for student teachers might alleviate this discrepancy.

Finding: 5. The administrators rate the low STG graduates significantly higher in one teacher competency, "participation and cooperation in school activities."

Recommendation: Some study should be directed toward identifying the reasons for this higher rating.

Finding: 6. The high ACE graduates are rated significantly higher by the administrators in five teacher competencies:

> Helping children in arithmetic
>
> Helping children in problem solving
>
> Helping children in expressing themselves in writing
>
> Helping children in learning to write and spell
>
> Understanding the age level in child growth and development

Recommendation: An evaluation of the courses should be made to determine the reasons for these higher ratings.

Recommendations for Further Study

In gathering data for this investigation there would seem to be a need for further research in related topics. The following areas are suggested as possible bases for additional investigation:

1. Efforts should be made to discover the relative importance of teacher attitude to teacher success.

2. A study be made of the Oregon State University secondary education program with goals similar to this investigation.

3. A study could be made of the relationship between the evaluation of the courses from the data in this study to the grades received in the courses by the graduates.

4. A follow-up of this study should be undertaken in about five years to ascertain the revisions, modifications or improvements that have been made in the School of Education elementary education program.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Anderson, Earl W. A survey of some phases of teacher education in the Oregon State System of Higher Education. Eugene, Oregon State Board of Higher Education, 1953. 145 p.

2. ———————— The setting of teacher education. In: Thirty-seventh Yearbook of the Association for Student Teaching. Improving instruction in professional education. Cedar Falls, State College of Iowa, 1958. p. 12-15.

3. Armstrong, W. Earl, Ernest V. Hollis and Helen E. Davis (eds). The college and teacher education. Washington, Commission on Teacher Education, American Council on Education, 1944. 311 p.

4. Atkinson, Carroll and Eugene T. Maleska. The story of education. Philadelphia, Chilton, 1952. 492 p.

5. Barr, A.S. The measurement and predictions of teaching efficiency: A summary of investigations. Journal of Experimental Education 16:203-283. June 1948.

6. Barr, A.S. et al. Sound report of the Committee on Criteria of Teacher Effectiveness. Journal of Educational Research 46:641-658. May 1953.

7. Barr, Arvis S. and Robert E. Jones. The measurement and prediction of teacher efficiency. Review of Educational Research 28:256-264. June 1958.

8. Bush, Robert N. Self-determination and self-regulation in the profession of teaching. In: Report of the NCTEPS Fort Collins Conference. Professional imperatives: Expertness and self-determination. Washington, National Education Association, 1962. p. 37-53.

9. Callahan, Raymond E. An introduction to education in American society. New York, Knopf, 1960. 467 p.

10. Cartwright, William H. Improving the preparation of teachers. The Educational Forum 28:187-197. Jan. 1964.

11. Charters, W. W. and Douglas Waples. The commonwealth teacher-training study. Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1929. 666 p.

12. Cogan, Morris L. Research on the behavior of teachers: A new phase. Journal of Teacher Education 14:238-243. Sept. 1963.

13. ───────── The behavior of teachers and the productive behavior of their pupils. I. Perception analysis. Journal of Experimental Education 27:89-105. Dec. 1958.

14. Cohen, Joseph W. The purposes of education -- implications for teacher education. In: Report of the Second Bowling Green Conference. The education of teachers: New perspectives. Washington, National Education Association, 1958. p. 3-16.

15. Commission on Teacher Education. Teacher competence. Its nature and scope. San Francisco, California Teachers Association, 1957. 48 p.

16. Conant, James B. The education of American teachers. New York, McGraw-Hill, 1963. 275 p.

17. Cornish, Robert Lee. A study of the State University of Iowa undergraduate elementary teacher education program and its graduates 1956-61. Doctoral dissertation. Des Moines, University of Iowa, 1962. 200 numb. leaves.

18. Crow, Lester D. and Alice Crow. Introduction to education. Fundamental principles and modern practices. Rev. ed. New York, American Book, 1960. 566 p.

19. Denemark, George W. A symposium on teacher education. Journal of Teacher Education 14:22-23. March 1963.

20. Dewey, John. Education today. New York, Putnam's, 1940. 373 p.

21. DeYoung, Chris A. Introduction to American public education. 3d ed. New York, McGraw-Hill, 1955. 604 p.

22. Domas, Simeon J. and D. V. Tiedeman. Teacher competence: An annotated bibliography. Journal of Experimental Education 19:101-218. Dec. 1950.

23. Ellena, William J., Margaret Stevenson and Harold Webb (eds).
Who's a good teacher? Washington, American Associa-
tion of School Administrators and Department of Class-
room Teachers, National Education Association, 1961.
54 p.

24. Eurich, Alvin C. Planning for more effective teaching. In:
Teacher education: A reappraisal. Report of a confer-
ence sponsored by the Fund for the Advancement of Edu-
cation. Elmer R. Smith (ed). New York, Harper and
Row, 1962. p. 195-203.

25. Eustice, David Edward. The relationship of the non-academic
pre-service experiences of teachers and teaching suc-
cess. Doctoral dissertation. Madison, University of
Wisconsin, 1962. 218 numb. leaves.

26. Flanders, Ned A. Intent, action and feedback: A preparation
for teaching. Journal of Teacher Education 14:251-260.
Sept. 1963.

27. ─────────────── Teacher influence in the classroom. I. Class-
room climate. Paper presented at the Teachers College
(Columbia University) Conference on teaching, Spring
1962. p. 2 (Mimeographed). In: Report of the NCTEPS
Fort Collins Conference. Professional Imperatives: Ex-
pertness and self-determination. Washington, National
Education Association, 1962. p. 96.

28. Good, Carter V., A.S. Barr and Douglas E. Scates. The
methodology of educational research. New York, D.
Appleton-Century, 1936. 882 p.

29. Good, Harry Gehman. A history of American education. 2d ed.
New York, Macmillan, 1962. 610 p.

30. Goodlad, John I. Education decision making and teacher edu-
cation. In: Teacher education: A reappraisal. Report
of a conference sponsored by the Fund for the Advance-
ment of Education. New York, Harper and Row, 1962.
p. 164-182.

31. Goodwin, Jack C. Principles and practices of teacher evalua-
tion programs in the elementary schools of the United
States. San Francisco, California Teachers Association,
(Research Bulletin no. 97), Dec. 1956. 36 p.

32. Haggerty, M. E. Institutional resources available for collegiate educational research. School and Society 29:653-664. May 1929.

33. Hanna, Paul R. and Lee L. Jacks (eds). Education: An instrument of national goals. New York, McGraw-Hill, 1962 210 p.

34. Howsam, Robert B. (ed). Who's a good teacher? Problems and progress in teacher evaluation. Burlingame, Joint Committee on Personnel Procedures of the California School Boards Association and the California Teachers Association, 1960. 48 p.

35. Kinney, Lucien B. Measure of a good teacher. San Francisco, California Teachers Association, 1952. 36 p.

36. Koerner, James D. The miseducation of American teachers. Boston, Houghton-Mifflin, 1963. 360 p.

37. Levin, Harry. A new perspective on teacher competence research. Harvard Educational Review 24:98-105. 1954.

38. Lindsey, Margaret. Expertness in teaching: Approaches to the study and definition of professional competence. In: Report of the NCTEPS Fort Collins Conference. Professional imperatives: Expertness and self-determination. Washington, National Education Association, 1962. p. 88-102.

39. MacLean, Malcolm S. and Edwin A. Lee. Change and process in education. New York, Dryden Press, 1956. 520 p.

40. MacPhail, Ned Brown. The effect of television training on the quality of lesson presentation. Doctoral dissertation. Nashville, George Peabody College for Teachers, 1962. 148 numb. leaves.

41. McAllister, Jane Ellen. Glimpses from the past. In: Forty-first yearbook of the Association for Student Teaching. The outlook in student teaching. Cedar Falls, State College of Iowa, 1962. p. 3-26.

42. McCall, W. A. Measurement of teacher merit. Publication No. 284. Raleigh, State Superintendent of Public

Instruction, 1952. 40 p. In: Who's a good teacher?
William J. Ellena, Margaret Stevenson and Harold Webb
(eds). Washington, American Association of School Ad-
ministrators and Department of Classroom Teachers,
National Education Association, 1961. p. 33.

43. McMurrin, Sterling M. A crisis of conscience. In: American
education today. Paul Woodring and John Scanlon (eds).
New York, McGraw-Hill, 1963. p. 17-25.

44. —————————— Some basic issues in teacher education. In:
Report of the NCTEPS Fort Collins Conference. Profes-
sional imperatives: Expertness and self-determination.
Washington, National Education Association, 1962.
p. 3-15.

45. Monroe, Walter S. Teaching-learning theory and teacher edu-
cation 1890 to 1950. Urbana, University of Illinois
Press, 1952. 426 p.

46. Park, Young Horn. A study of relationships between personnel
records and success of elementary and secondary student
teachers at Northwestern University. Doctoral disser-
tation. Evanston, Northwestern University, 1963. 302
numb. leaves.

47. Pearson, Francis B. The teacher. New York, Schribner's,
1921. 142 p.

48. Piper, Evelyn. An evaluation of the undergraduate elementary
education program at the University of Oregon, based on
the opinions of graduates. Doctoral dissertation.
Eugene, University of Oregon, 1960. 257 numb. leaves.

49. Regier, Herold. An evaluation of teacher competence of a
selected group of graduates of the School of Education,
University of Kansas. Doctoral dissertation. Manhattan,
University of Kansas, 1962. 127 numb. leaves.

50. Reynolds, J. Paul. Develop real competency. In: Report of
the Second Bowling Green Conference. The education of
teachers: new perspectives. Washington, National Edu-
cation Association, 1958. p. 194.

51. Rugg, Harold. The teacher of teachers. New York, Harper and Brothers, 1952. 308 p.

52. Russell, James E. The functions of the university in the training of teachers. Teachers College Record 1:1-11. Jan. 1900.

53. Ryans, David G. Characteristics of teachers. A research study. Washington, American Council on Education, 1960. 416 p.

54. Scherwitzky, Marjorie. Attitudes of students toward education courses at State University College at Oneonta, New York. Doctoral dissertation. New York, Columbia University, 1962. 193 numb. leaves.

55. Shane, Harold, Mary A. Callis and Howard V. Merideth. Improving instruction in elementary education. In: Thirty-seventh yearbook of the Association of Student Teaching. Improving instruction in professional education. Cedar Falls, State College of Iowa, 1958. p. 41-42.

56. Smith, Elmer R. (ed). Teacher education: A reappraisal. Report of a conference sponsored by the Fund for the Advancement of Education. New York, Harper and Row, 1962. 213 p.

57. Squire, Chester C. An evaluation of the elementary teacher education program at Southern Oregon College. Doctoral dissertation. Eugene, University of Oregon, 1962. 206 numb. leaves.

58. Stiles, Lindley J. et al. Teacher education in the United States. New York, Ronald Press, 1960. 512 p.

59. Trump, J. Lloyd and Dorsey Baynham. Focus on change. Guide to better schools. Chicago, Rand McNally, 1961. 147 p.

60. U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Annual report. Washington, 1953. 293 p.

61. Watson, Goodwin, Donald P. Cottrell, and Esther M. Lloyd-Jones. Redirecting teacher education. New York, Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1938. 105 p.

62. Watters, Edith and Jessie Mae Halstead. Changes during relatively recent years. In: Forty-first yearbook of the Association for Student Teaching: The outlook in student teaching. Cedar Falls, State College of Iowa, 1962. p. 27-45.

63. Woodring, Paul. A fourth of a nation. New York, McGraw-Hill, 1957. 255 p.

64. ———————————— The need for a unifying theory of teacher education. In: Teacher education: A reappraisal. Report of a conference sponsored by the Fund for the Advancement of Education. New York, Harper and Row, 1962. p. 140-163.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

EVALUATION TABLES

TABLE 1

EVALUATION OF PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION COURSES
(N=121)

All Graduates - 1961, 1962

Course (Responses by %)	Rating					
	5	4	3	2	1	0
Math. for Elem. Teachers	10.7	18.0	36.1	24.6	9.0	.8
Field Experience	17.2	24.6	24.6	7.4	6.6	18.9
School in American Life	.8	3.3	27.9	30.3	35.3	1.6
Art in the Elem. School	13.1	23.8	30.3	21.3	9.0	1.6
Educational Psychology	4.9	19.7	45.1	20.5	5.7	3.3
School Health Education	2.5	25.4	49.2	13.1	3.3	5.7
Methods in Reading	33.6	36.9	20.5	2.5	4.9	.8
Methods in Language Arts	18.9	34.4	32.0	9.0	2.5	2.5
Methods in Science and Math.	8.2	19.7	49.2	16.4	4.9	.8
Methods in Social Science	5.7	23.8	41.0	22.1	3.3	3.3
Music for Elem. Teachers	15.6	41.0	32.8	5.7	2.5	1.6
Children's Literature	25.4	40.2	23.0	6.6	.8	3.3
Student Teaching: Elem.	74.6	13.1	7.4	3.3	.0	.8
Elem. Physical Education	14.8	50.0	30.3	.8	2.5	.8
Psychology of Childhood	9.8	31.2	50.0	3.3	4.1	.8

TABLE 2

EVALUATION OF PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION COURSES
(N=60)

1961 Graduates

Course (Responses by %)	Rating					
	5	4	3	2	1	0
Math. for Elem. Teachers	13.3	16.6	34.9	24.9	8.3	1.7
Field Experience	23.2	26.6	21.6	8.3	3.3	16.6
School in American Life	1.7	1.7	24.9	36.5	33.2	1.7
Art in the Elem. School	16.6	24.9	34.9	14.9	6.6	1.7
Educational Psychology	3.3	11.6	58.1	19.9	5.0	1.7
School Health Education	3.3	24.9	49.8	13.3	5.0	3.3
Methods in Reading	26.6	36.5	28.2	1.7	6.6	.0
Methods in Language Arts	18.3	33.2	36.5	8.3	1.7	1.7
Methods in Science and Math.	13.3	14.9	51.5	18.3	1.7	.0
Methods in Social Science	3.3	21.6	48.1	19.9	5.0	1.7
Music for Elem. Teachers	11.6	49.8	31.5	5.0	1.7	.0
Children's Literature	24.9	41.5	24.9	5.0	.0	3.3
Student Teaching: Elem.	81.3	14.9	1.7	.0	.0	1.7
Elem. Physical Education	13.3	54.8	29.9	.0	1.7	.0
Psychology of Childhood	11.6	23.2	59.8	1.7	3.3	.0

TABLE 3

EVALUATION OF PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION COURSES
(N=61)

1962 Graduates

			Rating			
Course (Responses by %)	5	4	3	2	1	0
Math. for Elem. Teachers	8.2	19.6	37.5	24.4	9.8	.0
Field Experience	11.7	22.8	27.7	6.5	9.8	21.2
School in American Life	.0	4.9	31.0	24.4	37.5	1.6
Art in the Elem. School	9.8	22.8	26.1	27.7	11.4	1.6
Educational Psychology	6.5	27.7	32.6	21.2	6.5	4.9
School Health Education	1.6	26.1	48.9	13.0	1.6	4.9
Methods in Reading	40.7	37.5	13.0	3.3	3.3	1.6
Methods in Language Arts	19.6	35.8	27.7	9.8	3.3	3.3
Methods in Science and Math.	3.3	24.4	47.3	14.7	8.2	1.6
Methods in Social Science	8.2	26.1	34.2	22.8	3.3	4.9
Music for Elem. Teachers	19.6	32.6	34.2	6.5	3.3	3.3
Children's Literature	26.1	39.1	21.2	8.2	1.6	3.3
Student Teaching: Elem.	68.5	11.4	13.0	6.5	.0	.0
Elem. Physical Education	16.3	45.6	31.0	1.6	3.3	1.6
Psychology of Childhood	8.2	39.1	40.7	4.9	4.9	1.6

TABLE 4

EVALUATION OF PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION COURSES
(N=30)

Grade Point Average
Graduates with 2. 10-2. 48 - Low 25%

| | Rating | | | | | |
Course (Responses by %)	5	4	3	2	1	0
Math. for Elem. Teachers	16.5	13.2	42.9	23.1	3.3	.0
Field Experience	23.1	29.7	26.4	3.3	3.3	13.2
School in American Life	3.3	.0	26.4	39.6	26.4	3.3
Art in the Elem. School	23.1	23.1	26.4	19.8	3.3	3.3
Educational Psychology	6.6	13.2	49.5	26.4	.0	3.3
School Health Education	3.3	23.1	59.4	9.9	.0	3.3
Methods in Reading	29.7	46.2	19.8	3.3	.0	.0
Methods in Language Arts	13.2	46.2	26.4	9.9	.0	3.3
Methods in Science and Math.	6.6	26.4	49.5	13.2	3.3	.0
Methods in Social Science	9.9	33.0	36.3	19.8	.0	.0
Music for Elem. Teachers	6.6	36.3	36.3	9.9	6.6	3.3
Children's Literature	26.4	39.6	23.1	6.6	.0	3.3
Student Teaching: Elem.	75.9	19.8	.0	3.3	.0	.0
Elem. Physical Education	16.5	56.1	26.4	.0	.0	.0
Psychology of Childhood	16.5	36.3	39.6	3.3	.0	3.3

TABLE 5

EVALUATION OF PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION COURSES
(N=30)

	Rating					
Course (Responses by %)	5	4	3	2	1	0
Math. for Elem. Teachers	13.2	23.1	26.4	29.7	6.6	.0
Field Experience	13.2	26.4	26.4	9.9	13.2	9.9
School in American Life	.0	3.3	19.8	39.6	36.3	.0
Art in the Elem. School	13.2	19.8	26.4	29.7	6.6	3.3
Educational Psychology	9.9	29.7	39.6	13.2	3.3	3.3
School Health Education	.0	26.4	52.8	6.6	6.6	6.6
Methods in Reading	46.2	26.4	16.5	3.3	6.6	.0
Methods in Language Arts	16.5	36.3	33.0	9.9	3.3	.0
Methods in Science and Math.	6.6	33.0	46.2	9.9	3.3	.0
Methods in Social Science	3.3	26.4	39.6	26.4	.0	3.3
Music for Elem. Teachers	16.5	39.6	26.4	9.9	3.3	3.3
Children's Literature	16.5	39.6	26.4	13.2	3.3	.0
Student Teaching: Elem.	82.5	3.3	6.6	6.6	.0	.0
Elem. Physical Education	6.6	46.2	36.3	.0	6.6	3.3
Psychology of Childhood	16.5	29.7	42.9	6.6	3.3	.0

Grade Point Average
Graduates with 3.04-3.94 - High 25%

TABLE 6

EVALUATION OF PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION COURSES
(N=30)

Student Teacher Grade
Graduates with 1.53-3.00 - Low 25%

Course (Responses by %)	Rating					
	5	4	3	2	1	0
Math. for Elem. Teachers	13.2	13.2	39.6	26.4	6.6	.0
Field Experience	13.2	23.1	29.7	13.2	3.3	16.5
School in American Life	3.3	3.3	36.3	23.1	33.0	.0
Art in the Elem. School	16.5	26.4	23.1	26.4	3.3	3.3
Educational Psychology	9.9	6.6	42.9	33.0	3.3	3.3
School Health Education	3.3	19.8	56.1	16.5	3.3	.0
Methods in Reading	19.8	52.8	19.8	.0	3.3	3.3
Methods in Language Arts	9.9	36.3	36.3	9.9	3.3	3.3
Methods in Science and Math.	3.3	9.9	56.1	19.8	6.6	3.3
Methods in Social Science	13.2	19.8	36.3	23.1	.0	6.6
Music for Elem. Teachers	13.2	33.0	42.9	6.6	3.3	.0
Children's Literature	23.1	36.3	33.0	3.3	.0	3.3
Student Teaching: Elem.	59.4	16.5	13.2	6.6	.0	3.3
Elem. Physical Education	13.2	56.1	26.4	3.3	.0	.0
Psychology of Childhood	13.2	19.8	62.7	3.3	.0	.0

TABLE 7

EVALUATION OF PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION COURSES
(N=30)

	Student Teacher Grade Graduates with 3.50-4.00 - High 25%					
			Rating			
Course (Responses by %)	5	4	3	2	1	0
Math. for Elem. Teachers	16.5	26.4	16.5	26.4	13.2	.0
Field Experience	26.4	23.1	13.2	.0	6.6	29.7
School in American Life	.0	3.3	33.0	33.0	29.7	.0
Art in the Elem. School	9.9	23.1	36.3	16.5	9.9	3.3
Educational Psychology	6.6	29.7	49.5	9.9	3.3	.0
School Health Education	3.3	33.0	42.9	6.6	3.3	9.9
Methods in Reading	39.6	39.6	19.8	.0	.0	.0
Methods in Language Arts	33.0	42.9	16.5	3.3	3.3	.0
Methods in Science and Math.	13.2	36.3	33.0	9.9	6.6	.0
Methods in Social Science	9.9	26.4	49.5	9.9	.0	3.3
Music for Elem. Teachers	9.9	42.9	26.4	13.2	3.3	3.3
Children's Literature	33.0	33.0	19.8	13.2	.0	.0
Student Teaching: Elem.	82.5	9.9	6.6	.0	.0	.0
Elem. Physical Education	19.8	42.9	29.7	.0	6.6	.0
Psychology of Childhood	6.6	42.9	42.9	3.3	3.3	.0

TABLE 8

EVALUATION OF PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION COURSES
(N=25)

College Entrance - ACE Scores
Graduates with 55-90 - Low 25%

Course (Responses by %)	Rating					
	5	4	3	2	1	0
Math. for Elem. Teachers	12	20	40	24	4	0
Field Experience	20	28	28	12	0	12
School in American Life	0	0	32	36	32	0
Art in the Elem. School	16	20	24	24	12	4
Educational Psychology	4	8	68	12	0	8
School Health Education	4	32	52	12	0	0
Methods in Reading	32	40	20	0	4	4
Methods in Language Arts	32	28	28	8	0	4
Methods in Science and Math.	16	20	48	16	0	0
Methods in Social Science	8	32	36	16	4	4
Music for Elem. Teachers	12	44	36	0	8	0
Children's Literature	8	60	32	0	0	0
Student Teaching: Elem.	68	20	8	4	0	0
Elem. Physical Education	16	48	32	4	0	0
Psychology of Childhood	12	32	56	0	0	0

TABLE 9

EVALUATION OF PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION COURSES
(N=25)

	College Entrance - ACE Scores Graduates with 120-149 - High 25%					
Course (Responses by %)	5	4	3	2	1	0
Math. for Elem. Teachers	16	16	20	28	16	4
Field Experience	8	24	24	8	16	20
School in American Life	0	0	20	32	44	4
Art in the Elem. School	12	20	32	24	12	0
Educational Psychology	8	24	36	20	8	4
School Health Education	0	20	68	8	0	4
Methods in Reading	24	44	16	4	12	0
Methods in Language Arts	16	40	16	16	12	0
Methods in Science and Math.	4	16	64	8	8	0
Methods in Social Science	8	28	32	28	4	0
Music for Elem. Teachers	20	28	32	12	4	4
Children's Literature	40	24	20	12	4	0
Student Teaching: Elem.	68	12	12	8	0	0
Elem. Physical Education	8	60	28	0	4	0
Psychology of Childhood	16	44	32	8	0	0

Rating (column headers: 5 4 3 2 1 0)

TABLE 10

EVALUATION OF PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION COURSES
(N=62)

				Rating			
	Primary Grades - Group 1						
	Graduates Teaching Kdgn. -3rd Grade						
Course (Responses by %)		5	4	3	2	1	0
Math. for Elem. Teachers		4.8	16.1	46.7	27.4	4.8	.0
Field Experience		17.7	27.4	22.5	9.7	3.2	19.3
School in American Life		.0	3.2	25.8	32.2	37.0	1.6
Art in the Elem. School		9.7	16.1	37.0	27.4	8.0	1.6
Educational Psychology		3.2	16.1	45.1	24.1	8.0	3.2
School Health Education		.0	27.4	48.3	14.5	4.8	4.8
Methods in Reading		35.4	40.3	17.7	.0	4.8	1.6
Methods in Language Arts		20.9	37.0	33.8	3.2	1.6	3.2
Methods in Science and Math.		8.0	17.7	58.0	16.1	.0	.0
Methods in Social Science		4.8	24.1	45.1	20.9	3.2	1.6
Music for Elem. Teachers		24.1	46.7	24.1	3.2	1.6	.0
Children's Literature		20.9	49.9	24.1	.0	.0	4.8
Student Teaching: Elem.		77.3	9.7	11.3	.0	.0	1.6
Elem. Physical Education		12.9	53.1	29.0	1.6	3.2	.0
Psychology of Childhood		8.0	32.2	54.7	.0	3.2	1.6

TABLE 11

EVALUATION OF PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION COURSES
(N=55)

Upper Elementary Grades - Group 2 Graduates Teaching 4th-6th Grades						
			Rating			
Course (Responses by %)	5	4	3	2	1	0
Math. for Elem. Teachers	16.3	21.7	27.1	19.9	12.7	1.8
Field Experience	18.1	21.7	27.1	5.4	9.0	18.1
School in American Life	1.8	3.6	30.8	29.0	32.6	1.8
Art in the Elem. School	16.3	30.8	23.5	16.3	10.9	1.8
Educational Psychology	5.4	25.3	47.1	14.5	3.6	3.6
School Health Education	5.4	23.5	50.7	10.9	1.8	7.2
Methods in Reading	34.4	34.4	21.7	5.4	3.6	.0
Methods in Language Arts	18.1	30.8	32.6	14.5	1.8	1.8
Methods in Science and Math.	9.0	23.5	39.8	16.3	9.0	1.8
Methods in Social Science	7.2	21.7	38.0	23.5	3.6	5.4
Music for Elem. Teachers	7.2	36.2	41.6	7.2	3.6	3.6
Children's Literature	29.0	32.6	21.7	12.7	1.8	1.8
Student Teaching: Elem.	72.4	18.1	3.6	5.4	.0	.0
Elem. Physical Education	16.3	45.3	34.4	.0	.0	3.6
Psychology of Childhood	10.9	30.8	47.1	5.4	5.4	.0

TABLE 12

EVALUATION OF GENERAL EDUCATION COURSES
(N=121)

All Graduates - 1961, 1962

Course (Responses by %)	Rating					
	5	4	3	2	1	0
English Composition	17.2	29.5	45.1	4.1	2.5	.8
General Biology	17.2	38.5	35.3	1.6	.0	6.6
General Psychology	7.4	22.1	50.8	12.3	4.1	2.5
Hist. of Amer. Civilization	14.8	24.6	45.9	5.7	.0	8.2
Introductory Geography	17.2	35.3	40.2	3.3	.0	3.3
Literature	13.9	26.2	49.2	9.0	.0	.8
Physical Education	8.2	18.9	46.7	18.0	2.5	4.9
Physical Science	12.3	29.5	32.0	10.7	4.9	9.8
Speech Correction	15.6	41.0	32.8	4.9	4.1	.8
Speech	15.6	28.7	43.5	4.1	4.1	3.3

TABLE 13

EVALUATION OF GENERAL EDUCATION COURSES
(N=60)

1961 Graduates

Course (Responses by %)	Rating					
	5	4	3	2	1	0
English Composition	16. 6	31. 5	44. 8	6. 6	. 0	. 0
General Biology	18. 3	33. 2	38. 2	3. 3	. 0	5. 0
General Psychology	8. 3	16. 6	53. 1	13. 3	5. 0	3. 1
Hist. of Amer. Civilization	13. 3	18. 3	46. 5	8. 3	. 0	10. 0
Introductory Geography	19. 9	33. 2	39. 8	1. 7	. 0	1. 7
Literature	13. 3	26. 6	48. 1	11. 6	. 0	. 0
Physical Education	10. 0	19. 9	48. 1	13. 3	3. 3	3. 3
Physical Science	16. 6	23. 2	26. 6	14. 9	8. 3	8. 3
Speech Correction	11. 6	44. 8	31. 5	3. 3	6. 6	1. 7
Speech	11. 6	26. 6	48. 1	1. 7	5. 0	5. 0

TABLE 14

EVALUATION OF GENERAL EDUCATION COURSES
(N=61)

1962 Graduates

Course (Responses by %)	5	4	3	Rating 2	1	0
English Composition	17.9	27.7	45.6	1.6	4.9	1.6
General Biology	16.3	44.0	32.6	.0	.0	6.5
General Psychology	6.5	27.7	48.9	11.4	3.3	1.6
Hist. of Amer. Civilization	16.3	31.0	45.6	3.3	.0	3.3
Introductory Geography	14.7	37.5	40.7	4.9	.0	1.6
Literature	14.7	26.1	49.5	6.5	.0	1.6
Physical Education	6.5	17.9	45.6	22.8	1.6	3.3
Physical Science	8.2	35.8	37.5	6.5	1.6	8.2
Speech Correction	19.6	37.5	34.2	6.5	1.6	.0
Speech	19.6	31.0	39.1	6.5	3.3	.0

TABLE 15

EVALUATION OF GENERAL EDUCATION COURSES
(N=30)

	Grade Point Average Graduates with 2.10-2.48 - Low 25%					
Course (Responses by %)	5	4	3	2	1	0
English Composition	19.8	36.3	36.3	3.3	3.3	.0
General Biology	19.8	42.9	26.4	.0	.0	9.9
General Psychology	9.9	13.2	62.7	6.6	3.3	3.3
Hist. of Amer. Civilization	23.1	26.4	39.6	6.6	.0	3.3
Introductory Geography	26.4	36.3	36.3	.0	.0	.0
Literature	16.5	39.9	42.9	.0	.0	.0
Physical Education	6.6	19.8	56.1	9.9	.0	6.6
Physical Science	16.5	26.4	33.0	9.9	3.3	9.9
Speech Correction	6.6	52.8	29.7	3.3	6.6	.0
Speech	16.5	16.5	59.4	.0	6.6	.0

TABLE 16

EVALUATION OF GENERAL EDUCATION COURSES
(N=30)

Grade Point Average
Graduates with 3.04-3.94 - High 25%

Course (Responses by %)	5	4	Rating 3	2	1	0
English Composition	26.4	23.1	42.9	3.3	3.3	.0
General Biology	23.1	42.9	26.4	.0	.0	6.6
General Psychology	13.2	39.6	36.3	9.9	.0	.0
Hist. of Amer. Civilization	29.7	23.1	33.0	3.3	3.3	6.6
Introductory Geography	23.1	42.9	33.0	.0	.0	.0
Literature	9.9	29.7	39.6	19.8	.0	.0
Physical Education	6.6	13.2	46.2	26.4	3.3	3.3
Physical Science	19.8	39.6	26.4	6.6	3.3	3.3
Speech Correction	16.5	42.9	26.4	6.6	3.3	3.3
Speech	19.8	33.0	29.7	9.9	3.3	3.3

TABLE 17

EVALUATION OF GENERAL EDUCATION COURSES
(N=30)

Student Teacher Grade
Graduates with 1.53-3.00 - Low 25%

Course (Responses by %)	5	4	Rating 3	2	1	0
English Composition	16.5	29.7	49.5	3.3	.0	.0
General Biology	23.1	36.3	33.0	3.3	.0	3.3
General Psychology	3.3	16.5	62.7	9.9	3.3	3.3
Hist. of Amer. Civilization	19.8	16.5	42.9	9.9	.0	9.9
Introductory Geography	16.5	36.3	42.9	.0	.0	3.3
Literature	26.4	23.1	46.2	3.3	.0	.0
Physical Education	6.6	23.1	52.8	9.9	.0	6.6
Physical Science	9.9	36.3	26.4	6.6	3.3	16.5
Speech Correction	9.9	46.2	29.7	9.9	3.3	.0
Speech	16.5	29.7	42.9	.0	6.6	3.3

TABLE 18

EVALUATION OF GENERAL EDUCATION COURSES
(N=30)

Student Teacher Grade
Graduates with 3.50-4.00 - High 25%

Course (Responses by %)	5	4	3	2	1	0
English Composition	23.1	36.3	36.3	3.3	.0	.0
General Biology	16.5	42.9	26.4	.0	.0	13.2
General Psychology	3.3	36.3	46.2	9.9	.0	3.3
Hist. of Amer. Civilization	19.8	33.0	33.0	3.3	.0	9.9
Introductory Geography	23.1	36.3	29.7	6.6	.0	3.3
Literature	13.2	19.8	52.8	13.2	.0	.0
Physical Education	9.9	19.8	42.9	16.5	6.6	3.3
Physical Science	19.8	33.0	23.1	13.2	.0	9.9
Speech Correction	29.7	23.1	36.3	3.3	3.3	3.3
Speech	13.2	23.1	42.9	6.6	6.6	6.6

(Rating columns headed: 5 4 3 2 1 0)

TABLE 19

EVALUATION OF GENERAL EDUCATION COURSES
(N=25)

College Entrance - ACE Scores
Graduates with 55-90 - Low 25%

Course (Responses by %)	Rating					
	5	4	3	2	1	0
English Composition	28	28	44	0	0	0
General Biology	28	36	32	4	0	0
General Psychology	0	28	52	16	4	0
Hist. of Amer. Civilization	8	24	56	8	0	4
Introductory Geography	12	36	52	0	0	0
Literature	8	32	56	4	0	0
Physical Education	8	20	48	20	0	4
Physical Science	12	32	32	16	8	0
Speech Correction	24	52	24	0	0	0
Speech	8	44	40	0	4	4

TABLE 20

EVALUATION OF GENERAL EDUCATION COURSES
(N=25)

College Entrance - ACE Scores Graduates with 120-149 - High 25%						
			Rating			
Course (Responses by %)	5	4	3	2	1	0
English Composition	16	40	40	0	0	4
General Biology	24	32	36	4	0	4
General Psychology	8	16	56	12	4	4
Hist. of Amer. Civilization	20	28	36	4	0	12
Introductory Geography	24	40	32	0	0	4
Literature	20	24	40	12	0	4
Physical Education	4	24	44	20	0	8
Physical Science	20	28	24	12	0	16
Speech Correction	4	40	40	12	4	0
Speech	12	20	48	4	16	0

TABLE 21

EVALUATION OF GENERAL EDUCATION COURSES
(N=62)

Primary Grades - Group I Graduates Teaching Kdgn. -3rd Grade						
Course (Responses by %)	Rating					
	5	4	3	2	1	0
English Composition	11.3	33.8	49.9	4.8	.0	.0
General Biology	8.0	38.6	48.3	3.2	.0	1.6
General Psychology	3.2	30.6	46.7	14.5	3.2	1.6
Hist. of Amer. Civilization	6.4	27.4	54.7	8.0	.0	3.2
Introductory Geography	4.8	30.6	56.4	6.4	.0	1.6
Literature	8.0	25.8	58.0	8.0	.0	.0
Physical Education	6.4	22.5	41.9	22.5	1.6	4.8
Physical Science	1.6	25.8	41.9	16.1	9.7	4.8
Speech Correction	19.3	45.1	32.2	1.6	1.6	.0
Speech	12.9	35.4	45.1	3.2	.0	3.2

TABLE 22

EVALUATION OF GENERAL EDUCATION COURSES
(N=55)

Upper Elementary Grades - Group 2 Graduates Teaching 4th-6th Grades						
	Rating					
Course (Responses by %)	5	4	3	2	1	0
English Composition	21.7	27.1	39.8	3.6	5.4	1.8
General Biology	25.3	39.8	21.7	.0	.0	12.7
General Psychology	12.7	12.7	54.3	10.9	5.4	3.6
Hist. of Amer. Civilization	21.7	21.7	38.0	3.6	.0	14.5
Introductory Geography	29.0	41.6	23.5	.0	.0	5.4
Literature	18.1	27.1	43.4	9.0	.0	1.8
Physical Education	10.9	16.3	48.9	14.5	3.6	5.4
Physical Science	23.5	30.8	23.5	5.4	.0	16.3
Speech Correction	12.7	38.0	32.6	7.2	7.2	1.8
Speech	18.1	23.5	41.6	5.4	7.2	3.6

TABLE 23

EVALUATION OF STUDENT TEACHING
(N=121)

All Graduates - 1961, 1962

Subject (Response by %)				Rating			
	5	4	3	2	1	0
Reading	39.4	29.5	19.7	9.0	.8	.8
Writing	28.7	25.4	38.5	8.2	2.5	4.1
Speaking	18.0	36.9	36.9	6.6	.8	.0
Listening	14.8	32.8	38.5	9.0	2.5	1.6
Arithmetic	27.9	41.0	23.8	4.9	1.6	.0
Social Studies	29.5	33.6	27.9	6.6	.8	.8
Science	23.0	32.8	28.7	13.1	.0	1.6
Music	13.9	13.9	31.2	14.8	4.9	20.5
Art	23.0	31.2	28.7	10.7	3.3	2.5
Physical Education	18.0	34.4	34.4	9.0	.8	2.5
Health	8.2	23.8	44.3	10.7	2.5	9.8

TABLE 24

EVALUATION OF THE STUDENT TEACHING SEMINAR
(N=121)

All Graduates - 1961, 1962

Methods and Techniques (By %)	Rating					
	5	4	3	2	1	0
Classroom control	3.3	19.7	46.7	18.0	9.0	2.5
Pupil motivation	6.6	16.4	46.7	18.0	7.4	4.1
Measuring pupil growth	2.5	6.6	46.7	28.7	6.6	8.2
Discipline	3.3	23.8	46.7	15.6	6.6	3.3
Problems in subject matter	3.3	25.4	42.6	15.6	6.6	5.7
Instructional materials	4.1	21.3	38.5	19.7	9.8	5.7
Recent educational trends	4.9	13.1	36.9	24.6	10.7	9.0
Parent-teacher relations	9.0	12.3	43.5	17.2	6.6	10.7
Teacher placement	14.8	17.2	36.1	15.6	5.7	9.8

TABLE 25

COMPETENCIES OF GRADUATES AS RATED BY ADMINISTRATORS
(N=121)

All Graduates - 1961, 1962

(Response by %)	Rating					
	5	4	3	2	1	0
CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT						
Atmosphere conducive to learning	23.8	44.3	25.4	4.1	1.6	.0
Effective classroom control	28.7	36.1	26.2	4.9	3.3	.0
Using significant data	13.1	41.8	34.4	5.7	.8	3.3
METHODS OF INSTRUCTION & EVALUATION						
Effective teaching procedures	18.9	46.7	27.1	6.6	.0	.0
Planning effectively	23.0	45.9	23.0	6.6	.8	.0
Diagnostic and remedial	5.7	40.2	44.3	7.4	.0	1.6
Evaluating achievement	12.3	45.1	32.0	6.6	.0	3.3
In Helping Children:						
To speak effectively	13.1	36.9	41.8	5.7	.0	2.5
To listen effectively	10.7	46.7	29.5	8.2	1.6	2.5
To do critical thinking	12.3	40.2	33.6	6.6	1.6	4.9
In problem solving	10.7	45.9	34.4	6.6	.0	1.6
Express themselves in writing	11.5	42.6	38.5	4.9	.0	1.6
To learn to write and spell	13.1	46.7	32.0	4.9	.0	2.5
To learn to read	17.2	47.6	28.7	3.3	.0	2.5
In arithmetic	21.3	40.2	31.2	3.3	.8	2.5
In science	16.4	36.9	38.5	4.9	.8	1.6
In social studies	19.7	41.0	31.2	4.9	.0	2.5
In art	19.7	34.4	36.1	5.7	.0	3.3
In music	6.6	14.8	43.5	6.6	1.6	26.2
In physical education	17.2	32.8	36.9	4.1	.8	7.4
CHILD GROWTH AND DEVELOPMENT						
How children learn	13.9	43.5	36.9	2.5	.8	1.6
Understanding the age level	14.8	45.9	33.6	4.1	.8	.0
Adapting the principles in guiding children	12.3	45.1	32.8	5.7	.8	2.5
SCHOOL & COMMUNITY RELATIONS						
School activities	32.8	38.5	23.0	4.1	.8	.0
Professional growth	32.8	37.7	21.3	4.9	1.6	.8
Working with teachers and administration	40.2	32.8	18.0	7.4	.8	.0
Relations between school and community	30.3	38.5	21.3	8.2	.0	.8
Working with parents	27.1	37.7	25.4	6.6	1.6	.8

TABLE 26

COMPETENCIES OF GRADUATES AS RATED BY ADMINISTRATORS
(N=30)

Lowest Ranked Graduates - Low 25%

(Response by %)	Rating					
	5	4	3	2	1	0
CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT						
Atmosphere conducive to learning	.0	13.2	62.7	16.5	6.6	.0
Effective classroom control	6.6	16.5	49.5	13.2	13.2	.0
Using significant data	.0	9.9	62.7	19.8	3.3	3.3
METHODS OF INSTRUCTION & EVALUATION						
Effective teaching procedures	.0	3.3	69.3	26.4	.0	.0
Planning effectively	.0	13.2	59.4	23.1	3.3	.0
Diagnostic and remedial	.0	6.6	62.7	26.4	.0	3.3
Evaluating achievement	.0	16.5	56.1	26.4	.0	.0
In Helping Children:						
To speak effectively	.0	9.9	72.6	16.5	.0	.0
To listen effectively	.0	16.5	49.5	26.4	6.6	.0
To do critical thinking	.0	19.8	39.6	26.4	6.6	6.6
In problem solving	.0	13.2	56.1	26.4	.0	3.3
Express themselves in writing	.0	13.2	66.0	19.8	.0	.0
To learn to write and spell	.0	23.1	52.4	19.8	.0	3.3
To learn to read	3.3	19.8	59.4	13.2	.0	3.3
In arithmetic	3.3	13.2	66.0	9.9	3.3	3.3
In science	.0	23.1	49.5	19.8	3.3	3.3
In social studies	.0	19.8	56.1	19.8	.0	3.3
In art	3.3	16.5	66.0	9.9	.0	3.3
In music	.0	3.3	49.5	13.2	6.6	23.1
In physical education	.0	19.8	56.1	16.5	3.3	3.3
CHILD GROWTH AND DEVELOPMENT						
How children learn	.0	9.9	75.9	9.9	3.3	.0
Understanding the age level	.0	6.6	72.6	16.5	3.3	.0
Adapting the principles in guiding children	.0	6.6	69.3	19.8	3.3	.0
SCHOOL & COMMUNITY RELATIONS						
School activities	3.3	33.0	49.5	9.9	3.3	.0
Professional growth	3.3	33.0	36.3	16.5	9.9	.0
Working with teachers and administration	6.6	29.7	39.6	19.8	3.3	.0
Relations between school and community	3.3	26.4	46.2	19.8	3.3	.0
Working with parents	3.3	19.8	52.8	13.2	9.9	.0

TABLE 27

COMPETENCIES OF GRADUATES AS RATED BY ADMINISTRATORS
(N=30)

Highest Ranked Graduates - High 25%

(Response by %)	Rating 5	4	3	2	1	0
CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT						
Atmosphere conducive to learning	75.9	23.1	.0	.0	.0	.0
Effective classroom control	69.3	29.7	.0	.0	.0	.0
Using significant data	42.9	56.1	.0	.0	.0	.0
METHODS OF INSTRUCTION & EVALUATION						
Effective teaching procedures	56.1	42.9	.0	.0	.0	.0
Planning effectively	59.4	39.6	.0	.0	.0	.0
Diagnostic and remedial	23.1	66.0	6.6	.0	.0	3.3
Evaluating achievement	36.3	59.4	.0	.0	.0	3.3
In Helping Children:						
To speak effectively	46.2	52.8	.0	.0	.0	.0
To listen effectively	42.9	56.1	.0	.0	.0	.0
To do critical thinking	39.6	56.1	3.3	.0	.0	.0
In problem solving	36.3	62.7	.0	.0	.0	.0
Express themselves in writing	33.0	59.4	.0	.0	.0	6.6
To learn to write and spell	49.5	42.9	.0	.0	.0	6.6
To learn to read	56.1	36.3	.0	.0	.0	6.6
In arithmetic	59.4	36.3	.0	.0	.0	3.3
In science	46.2	46.2	6.6	.0	.0	.0
In social studies	56.1	42.9	.0	.0	.0	.0
In art	46.2	39.6	9.9	.0	.0	3.3
In music	26.4	29.7	23.1	3.3	.0	16.5
In physical education	46.2	36.3	9.9	.0	.0	6.6
CHILD GROWTH AND DEVELOPMENT						
How children learn	46.2	52.8	.0	.0	.0	.0
Understanding the age level	52.8	46.2	.0	.0	.0	.0
Adapting the principles in guiding children	46.2	52.8	.0	.0	.0	.0
SCHOOL & COMMUNITY RELATIONS						
School activities	69.3	29.7	.0	.0	.0	.0
Professional growth	72.6	23.1	3.3	.0	.0	.0
Working with teachers and administration	92.4	6.6	.0	.0	.0	.0
Relations between school and community	79.2	19.8	.0	.0	.0	.0
Working with Parents	75.9	23.1	.0	.0	.0	.0

TABLE 28

COMPETENCIES OF GRADUATES AS RATED BY ADMINISTRATORS
(N=30)

Grade Point Average, 2.10-2.48 - Low 25%

(Response by %)	Rating					
	5	4	3	2	1	0
CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT						
Atmosphere conducive to learning	23.1	42.9	29.7	3.3	.0	.0
Effective classroom control	36.3	23.1	33.0	6.6	.0	.0
Using significant data	9.9	36.3	46.2	6.6	.0	.0
METHODS OF INSTRUCTION & EVALUATION						
Effective teaching procedures	16.5	42.9	33.0	6.6	.0	.0
Planning effectively	16.5	42.9	33.0	6.6	.0	.0
Diagnostic and remedial	6.6	39.6	46.2	6.6	.0	.0
Evaluating achievement	6.6	39.6	42.9	3.3	.0	6.6
In Helping Children:						
To speak effectively	13.2	26.4	52.8	3.3	.0	3.3
To listen effectively	13.2	46.2	33.0	6.6	.0	.0
To do critical thinking	3.3	59.4	29.7	.0	3.3	3.3
In problem solving	9.9	46.2	39.6	3.3	.0	.0
Express themselves in writing	13.2	36.3	46.2	3.3	.0	.0
To learn to write and spell	16.5	42.9	36.3	3.3	.0	.0
To learn to read	23.1	42.9	29.7	3.3	.0	.0
In arithmetic	19.8	36.3	39.6	3.3	.0	.0
In science	13.2	42.9	46.2	.0	.0	.0
In social studies	26.4	29.7	36.3	3.3	.0	3.3
In art	23.1	33.0	36.3	3.3	.0	3.3
In music	3.3	13.2	56.1	6.6	.0	19.8
In physical education	29.7	26.4	33.0	3.3	.0	6.6
CHILD GROWTH AND DEVELOPMENT						
How children learn	9.9	39.6	49.5	.0	.0	.0
Understanding the age level	16.5	26.4	56.1	.0	.0	.0
Adapting the principles in guiding children	13.2	36.3	46.2	3.3	.0	.0
SCHOOL & COMMUNITY RELATIONS						
School activities	36.3	46.2	16.5	.0	.0	.0
Professional growth	33.0	52.8	13.2	.0	.0	.0
Working with teachers and administration	36.3	46.2	16.5	.0	.0	.0
Relations between school and community	33.0	49.5	16.5	.0	.0	.0
Working with parents	26.4	49.5	23.1	.0	.0	.0

TABLE 29

COMPETENCIES OF GRADUATES AS RATED BY ADMINISTRATORS
(N=30)

Grade Point Average, 3.04-3.94 - High 25%

(Response by %)	Rating					
	5	4	3	2	1	0
CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT						
Atmosphere conducive to learning	33.0	46.2	13.2	6.6	.0	.0
Effective classroom control	33.0	46.2	13.2	3.3	3.3	.0
Using significant data	29.7	42.9	19.8	3.3	3.3	.0
METHODS OF INSTRUCTION & EVALUATION						
Effective teaching procedures	36.3	49.5	6.6	6.6	.0	.0
Planning effectively	36.3	46.2	13.2	3.3	.0	.0
Diagnostic and remedial	6.6	62.7	23.1	6.6	.0	.0
Evaluating achievement	23.1	56.1	13.2	6.6	.0	.0
In Helping Children:						
To speak effectively	26.4	46.2	19.8	6.6	.0	.0
To listen effectively	16.5	56.1	23.1	3.3	.0	.0
To do critical thinking	29.7	39.6	16.5	6.6	.0	6.6
In problem solving	16.5	56.1	16.5	6.6	.0	3.3
Express themselves in writing	23.1	59.4	9.9	6.6	.0	.0
To learn to write and spell	26.4	52.8	13.2	6.6	.0	.0
To learn to read	33.0	49.5	13.2	3.3	.0	.0
In arithmetic	42.9	36.3	19.8	.0	.0	.0
In science	33.0	36.3	19.8	9.9	.0	.0
In social studies	39.6	36.3	16.5	6.6	.0	.0
In art	23.1	39.6	29.7	6.6	.0	.0
In music	13.2	13.2	36.3	6.6	3.3	26.4
In physical education	19.8	26.4	36.3	6.6	.0	9.9
CHILD GROWTH AND DEVELOPMENT						
How children learn	23.1	56.1	13.2	3.3	3.3	.0
Understanding the age level	26.4	52.8	13.2	6.6	.0	.0
Adapting the principles in guiding children	23.1	56.1	13.2	3.3	.0	.0
SCHOOL AND COMMUNITY RELATIONS						
School activities	49.5	33.0	13.2	.0	3.3	.0
Professional growth	56.1	23.1	16.5	.0	3.3	.0
Working with teachers and administration	62.7	19.8	6.6	9.9	.0	.0
Relations between school and community	49.5	29.7	16.5	3.3	.0	.0
Working with parents	52.8	23.1	16.5	6.6	.0	.0

TABLE 30

COMPETENCIES OF GRADUATES AS RATED BY ADMINISTRATORS
(N=30)

Student Teacher Grade, 1.53-3.00 - Low 25%

| (Response by %) | Rating | | | | | |
	5	4	3	2	1	0
CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT						
Atmosphere conducive to learning	23.1	36.3	39.6	.0	.0	.0
Effective classroom control	23.1	26.4	36.3	13.2	.0	.0
Using significant data	3.3	49.5	42.9	.0	.0	3.3
METHODS OF INSTRUCTION AND EVALUATION						
Effective teaching procedures	13.2	33.0	42.9	9.9	.0	.0
Planning effectively	23.1	42.9	23.1	9.9	.0	.0
Diagnostic and remedial	3.3	29.7	59.4	3.3	.0	3.3
Evaluating achievement	6.6	42.9	42.9	3.3	.0	3.3
In Helping Children:						
To speak effectively	9.9	42.9	39.6	3.3	.0	3.3
To listen effectively	9.9	49.5	19.8	16.5	.0	3.3
To do critical thinking	9.9	36.3	42.9	.0	3.3	6.6
In problem solving	3.3	49.5	42.9	3.3	.0	.0
Express themselves in writing	9.9	39.6	46.2	3.3	.0	.0
To learn to write and spell	9.9	46.2	33.0	6.6	.0	3.3
To learn to read	16.5	36.3	39.6	3.3	.0	3.3
In arithmetic	13.2	46.2	29.7	3.3	.0	6.6
In science	3.3	52.8	39.6	.0	.0	3.3
In social studies	6.6	49.5	36.3	3.3	.0	3.3
In art	23.1	36.3	33.0	.0	.0	6.6
In music	6.6	16.5	46.2	13.2	.0	16.5
In physical education	9.9	36.3	36.3	6.6	.0	9.9
CHILD GROWTH AND DEVELOPMENT						
How children learn	9.9	46.2	42.9	.0	.0	.0
Understanding the age level	13.2	39.6	46.2	.0	.0	.0
Adapting the principles in guiding children	9.9	49.5	36.3	3.3	.0	.0
SCHOOL AND COMMUNITY RELATIONS						
School activities	29.7	56.1	9.9	3.3	.0	.0
Professional growth	36.3	42.9	16.5	3.3	.0	.0
Working with teachers and administration	36.3	42.9	13.2	6.6	.0	.0
Relations between school and community	29.7	39.6	23.1	6.6	.0	.0
Working with parents	19.8	39.6	33.0	3.3	3.3	.0

TABLE 31

COMPETENCIES OF GRADUATES AS RATED BY ADMINISTRATORS
(N=30)

Student Teacher Grade, 3.50-4.00 - High 25%

(Response by %)	5	4	3	2	1	0
CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT						
Atmosphere conducive to learning	16.5	49.5	23.1	6.6	3.3	.0
Effective classroom control	9.9	52.8	26.4	3.3	6.6	.0
Using significant data	13.2	36.3	36.3	13.2	.0	.0
METHODS OF INSTRUCTION AND EVALUATION						
Effective teaching procedures	19.8	46.2	23.1	9.9	.0	.0
Planning effectively	19.8	42.9	26.4	6.6	3.3	.0
Diagnostic and remedial	3.3	42.9	39.6	13.2	.0	.0
Evaluating achievement	19.8	29.7	33.0	13.2	.0	3.3
In Helping Children:						
To speak effectively	6.6	33.0	49.5	6.6	.0	3.3
To listen effectively	3.3	42.9	36.3	9.9	6.6	.0
To do critical thinking	6.6	36.3	33.0	16.5	.0	6.6
In problem solving	3.3	46.2	39.6	9.9	.0	.0
Express themselves in writing	.0	49.5	39.6	6.6	.0	3.3
To learn to write and spell	3.3	46.2	36.3	9.9	.0	3.3
To learn to read	9.9	52.8	26.4	6.6	.0	3.3
In arithmetic	16.5	42.9	29.7	9.9	.0	.0
In science	16.5	42.9	29.7	9.9	.0	.0
In social studies	9.9	46.2	29.7	6.6	.0	6.6
In art	23.1	36.3	29.7	9.9	.0	.0
In music	3.3	3.3	42.9	9.9	.0	39.6
In physical education	6.6	39.6	46.2	3.3	.0	3.3
CHILD GROWTH AND DEVELOPMENT						
How children learn	13.2	29.7	49.5	3.3	.0	3.3
Understanding the age level	6.6	42.9	39.6	9.9	.0	.0
Adapting the principles in guiding children	6.6	36.3	42.9	13.2	.0	.0
SCHOOL AND COMMUNITY RELATIONS						
School activities	33.0	19.8	36.3	9.9	.0	.0
Professional growth	26.4	36.3	23.1	6.6	6.6	.0
Working with teachers and administration	42.9	13.2	33.0	9.9	.0	.0
Relations between school and community	23.1	39.6	23.1	13.2	.0	.0
Working with parents	23.1	36.3	29.7	9.9	.0	.0

TABLE 32

COMPETENCIES OF GRADUATES AS RATED BY ADMINISTRATORS
(N=25)

ACE Scores, 55-90 - Low 25%

(Response by %)	Rating					
	5	4	3	2	1	0
CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT						
Atmosphere conducive to learning	24	48	24	4	0	0
Effective classroom control	32	32	24	12	0	0
Using significant data	8	48	40	0	0	4
METHODS OF INSTRUCTION AND EVALUATION						
Effective teaching procedures	16	44	32	8	0	0
Planning effectively	24	44	20	12	0	0
Diagnostic and remedial	0	44	56	0	0	0
Evaluating achievement	8	48	40	4	0	0
In Helping Children:						
To speak effectively	12	44	36	8	0	0
To listen effectively	12	56	16	16	0	0
To do critical thinking	4	48	40	0	8	0
In problem solving	4	44	44	8	0	0
Express themselves in writing	12	32	44	8	0	4
To learn to write and spell	12	40	36	8	0	4
To learn to read	12	48	28	8	0	4
In arithmetic	16	36	48	0	0	0
In science	12	44	44	0	0	0
In social studies	12	52	32	4	0	0
In art	20	44	32	0	0	4
In music	8	24	56	8	0	4
In physical education	12	40	44	0	0	4
CHILD GROWTH AND DEVELOPMENT						
How children learn	12	48	40	0	0	0
Understanding the age level	16	40	44	0	0	0
Adapting the principles in guiding children	12	60	28	0	0	0
SCHOOL AND COMMUNITY RELATIONS						
School activities	24	52	24	0	0	0
Professional growth	40	40	20	0	0	0
Working with teachers and administration	28	56	16	0	0	0
Relations between school and community	36	36	24	4	0	0
Working with parents	24	48	28	0	0	0

TABLE 33

COMPETENCIES OF GRADUATES AS RATED BY ADMINISTRATORS
(N=25)

ACE Scores, 120-149 - High 25%

(Response by %)	Rating					
	5	4	3	2	1	0
CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT						
Atmosphere conducive to learning	36	36	30	4	0	0
Effective classroom control	44	36	16	4	0	0
Using significant data	16	60	20	0	0	4
METHODS OF INSTRUCTION AND EVALUATION						
Effective teaching procedures	32	48	16	4	0	0
Planning effectively	24	52	20	4	0	0
Diagnostic and remedial	12	56	28	4	0	0
Evaluating achievement	24	56	16	4	0	0
In Helping Children:						
To speak effectively	20	48	28	4	0	0
To listen effectively	12	60	20	4	0	4
To do critical thinking	24	36	28	0	0	12
In problem solving	12	64	20	0	0	4
Express themselves in writing	12	64	20	4	0	0
To learn to write and spell	16	64	12	8	0	0
To learn to read	36	44	20	0	0	0
In arithmetic	32	56	8	4	0	0
In science	20	56	16	4	0	4
In social studies	36	48	8	4	0	4
In art	32	40	24	0	0	4
In music	4	20	32	4	0	40
In physical education	20	36	24	8	0	12
CHILD GROWTH AND DEVELOPMENT						
How children learn	20	52	20	4	0	4
Understanding the age level	20	68	8	4	0	0
Adapting the principles in guiding children	16	52	24	0	0	8
SCHOOL AND COMMUNITY RELATIONS						
School activities	48	28	12	12	0	0
Professional growth	48	20	28	4	0	0
Working with teachers and administration	64	12	16	8	0	0
Relations between school and community	40	32	24	4	0	0
Working with parents	44	24	28	4	0	0

APPENDIX B

1. Cover letter for questionnaire sent to graduates.

2. First follow-up letter sent to graduates.

3. Second follow-up letter sent to graduates.

4. Questionnaire sent to graduates.

Milner Crest School
Coos Bay, Oregon

Dear

The School of Education of Oregon State University is interested in obtaining judgments from its elementary teacher education graduates to assist in making changes or modifications to improve teacher preparation. You are the most important source for evaluating the teacher education program and the degree to which this preparation has met your needs.

This research study has been developed with the approval of Dean Zeran and under the direction of Dr. J. V. Hall of the School of Education.

The purposes of the study are to:

1. Evaluate the effectiveness of the quantity and quality of the present undergraduate program to develop competent elementary teachers.

2. Present constructive recommendations for the implementation of changes or improvements to the undergraduate program to be used in the curriculum where applicable.

It is extremely important for each graduate to complete the attached questionnaire to provide a sound basis of valid and reliable information that could be used for any revision to the teacher education program.

With the knowledge that there are many demands on your time, the questionnaire was developed in as clear and concise a format as possible. All information received will be held in the strictest confidence. If you wish a copy of the summary and recommendations of the study it will be made available to you upon request.

Your cooperation is very much appreciated.

Sincerely,

Signature redacted for privacy.

Encl.

Leo Gainor

Milner Crest School
Coos Bay, Oregon

Dear

Recently you received a questionnaire concerning a research study
designed to evaluate the elementary teacher education program at
Oregon State University.

If you have already completed and returned your questionnaire,
please ignore this request. If you have not returned yours, I would
appreciate receiving it by <u>March 18.</u>

You are a member of the select group of graduates included in the
study, therefore it is particularly significant that your evaluation
be included in the final tabulation.

Your cooperation is very much appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

Signature redacted for privacy.

Leo Gainor

Milner Crest School
Coos Bay, Oregon

Dear

Last month you received a questionnaire concerning an evaluation of the undergraduate elementary education program at Oregon State University.

Many questionnaires have been completed and returned but the evaluation can be valid only to the extent each graduate's opinions are included.

I realize my request is an imposition upon your time. However, I sincerely believe the professional contribution you can make toward this study will be well worth the time spent.

It is quite possible that you may have misplaced the original questionnaire, so I have enclosed a duplicate for your convenience.

Sincerely yours,

Signature redacted for privacy.

Leo Gainor

AN EVALUATION OF THE ELEMENTARY STUDENT TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAM AT OREGON STATE UNIVERSITY

The purpose of this questionnaire is to determine the effectiveness of the elementary teacher education program at Oregon State University. The findings will be of value to the School of Education in its continuous effort to improve elementary teacher preparation.

GENERAL INFORMATION

1. Check the approximate number of quarter hours you received while attending O.S.U.

    Less than 30 ___
    31-60 ___
    90 or more ___

2. Date of graduation: 1961 ___   1962 ___

3. List grades taught since graduation. If experience was different than a regular homeroom type class, list grade(s) and subject(s) taught:

Year	Grade Level	Variations from homeroom class, i.e., nongraded, team teaching, dept., etc.	School District - Principal or Supervisor

PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION

4. Directions: Check the column which represents the value you feel the course contributed to your teaching competence.

> 5. Superior value
> 4. Above average value
> 3. Average value
> 2. Below average value
> 1. Inferior value
> 0. Did not have the course

Qtr. Hrs.	Name of Course or Sequence	5	4	3	2	1	0
6	Mathematics for Elementary Teachers (Math. 111, 112)						
2	Field Experience (Ed. 200)						
3	School in American Life (Ed. 310)						
6	Art in the Elementary Schools (AA 311, 313)						
3	Educational Psychology: Learning (Ed. 312)						
3	School Health Education (S. Ed. 321)						
3	Methods in Reading (Ed. 350)						
3	Methods & Materials: Language Arts (Ed. 367)						
5	Methods & Materials: Science & Math. (Ed. 368)						
3	Methods & Materials: Social Science (Ed. 369)						
6	Music for Elementary Teachers (Mus. 371, 373)						
3	Children's Literature (Lib. 388)						
12 or 15	Student Teaching: Elementary (Ed. 415)						
3	Elementary Physical Education (PE 420)						
3	Psy. of Childhood (Ed. 460) or Human Dev. (Psy. 311)						
		5	4	3	2	1	0

5. Were any of the professional courses of so little value to you that you would recommend eliminating them from the teacher education program?

    Yes ___
    No ___

    If yes, name the course(s) and briefly list reasons.

_____   _____

_____   _____

_____   _____

(Course)   (Comments)

Professional Education, (Cont'd.)

6. On the basis of your teaching experience would you recommend the addition of new courses or the extension of any existing courses?

Yes ____
No ____

If yes, name the course(s) and briefly describe.

_____   _____

_____   _____

_____   _____
   (Course)   (Comments)

GENERAL EDUCATION

7. Directions: Check the column which represents the value you feel the course contributed to your teaching competence.
>   5. Superior value
>   4. Above average value
>   3. Average value
>   2. Below average value
>   1. Inferior value
>   0. Did not have the course

Qtr. Hrs.	Name of Course or Sequence	5	4	3	2	1	0
9	English Composition (Wr. 111, 112, 113)						
8	General Biology (GS 101, 102)						
6	General Psychology (Psy. 201, 202)						
9	History of American Civilization (Hst. 224, 225, 226)						
6	Introductory Geography (Geog. 105, 106)						
6	Literature						
6	Physical Education (other than methods) (PE 180, 190)						
8	Physical Science (GS 104, 105)						
3	Prin. & Tech. of Speech Correction (Sp. 493)						
3	Speech						
		5	4	3	2	1	0

List any comments on elective courses that were helpful in your teaching experience.

_____

_____

_____

8. Of the general education areas noted above, list in order the three which contributed most to your effectiveness as a classroom teacher.

   (Area contributing most)   (Comments)

   A. _____   _____

   B. _____   _____

   C. _____   _____

9. Of the general education areas noted above, list in order the three which contributed least to your effectiveness as a classroom teacher.

   (Area contributing least)   (Comments)

   A. _____   _____

   B. _____   _____

   C. _____   _____

General Education, (Cont'd.)

10. Would you recommend more course work be required in any area? Yes ____
    If yes, name the area(s) and briefly list reasons.   No ____
    Area(s) : _____
    Comments: _____
    _____
    _____

11. Would you recommend a reduction of course work in any area? Yes ____
    If yes, name the area(s) and briefly list reasons.   No ____
    Area(s): _____
    Comments: _____
    _____
    _____

STUDENT TEACHING

12. List the grade level(s) in which you did student teaching. _____

13. To what extent do you feel your student teaching experience helped you in learning to teach the following:

		5	4	3	2	1	0
	Reading						
	Writing						
5. Superior value	Speaking						
4. Above average value	Listening						
3. Average value	Arithmetic						
2. Below average value	Social Studies						
1. Inferior value	Science						
0. Did not have this experience	Music						
	Art						
	Physical Education						
	Health						
		5	4	3	2	1	0

_____

(Comments and Recommendations)

14. Using the same key of values as above (less 0 value), indicate the way you feel about the help you
    received as a student teacher from your:

	5	4	3	2	1
University Supervisor (from OSU staff					
Cooperating Teacher (where you did student teaching)					
School Principal (where you did student teaching)					

_____

(Comments and Recommendations)

Student Teaching, (Cont'd.)

15. To what extent do you feel your student teaching seminars helped you in the following:

		5	4	3	2	1	0
5. Superior value	Classroom control						
4. Above average value	Pupil motivation						
3. Average value	Measuring pupil growth						
2. Below average value	Discipline						
1. Inferior value	Problems in teaching subject matter						
0. Did not have this	Evaluating instructional materials						
experience	Recent educational trends						
	Parent-teacher relations						
	Teacher placement						
		5	4	3	2	1	0

_____

_____

(Comments and Recommendations)

16. How would you rate the amount of responsibility given to you by your public school teacher supervisor?

    Too much ____
    About right ____
    Too little ____

_____

_____

(Comments and Recommendations)

17. Do you feel the amount of student teaching you received was:

    (Please list any recommendations for improving student teaching)

    Insufficient ____
    About right ____
    More than necessary ____

_____

_____

18. Check the term in which you did your student teaching.   F ____   W ____   S ____

19. What is the most important fact relative to the advice you received from your faculty advisor?

    Did not seek advice ____
    Was given good advice ____
    Advisor(s) was indifferent ____
    Was given poor advice ____

20. Were you pleased with the assistance offered you by the University Placement Office in obtaining a teaching position?

    I was ____
    No, I was not ____
    I did not ask for help ____

21. Please make any further comments relative to desirable changes or modifications in the elementary teacher education program.

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

APPENDIX C

1. Cover letter for questionnaire sent to administrators.

2. First follow-up letter sent to administrators.

3. Second follow-up letter sent to administrators.

4. Questionnaire sent to administrators.

Milner Crest School
Coos Bay, Oregon

Dear

As a part of my doctoral program at Oregon State University, I am conducting an evaluation of the elementary teacher education program with the approval of Dr. Franklin Zeran, Dean of the School of Education.

This research study is a follow-up of recent graduates who have had one or more years of active teaching. Many of these graduates have completed a questionnaire concerning judgments as to the adequacy of their undergraduate teacher preparation. The graduate named on the attached check list has completed a questionnaire and is now or was a teacher under your supervision.

In order to obtain an appraisal of the graduate's teaching competence, each administrator or participating teachers in the study has been asked to complete the check list and return it at his earliest convenience. Your evaluation will be helpful in determining changes or modifications to the undergraduate elementary teacher preparation program at Oregon State University.

There will be no identification of administrators, teachers, or schools in the study. The information received will be held in the strictest confidence. If you wish a copy of the summary and recommendations of the study it will be made available to you upon request.

Your cooperation is appreciated.

Sincerely,

Signature redacted for privacy.

Leo Gainor

Encl.

Milner Crest School
Coos Bay, Oregon

Dear

Recently you received a questionnaire concerning a study designed
to evaluate the elementary teacher education program at Oregon
State University.

If you have already completed and returned your questionnaire,
please ignore this request. If you have not returned yours, I would
appreciate receiving it by April 29.

The teacher under your supervision is a member of a select group
of graduates included in the study, therefore it is particularly sig-
nificant that your evaluation be included in the final tabulation.

Your cooperation is very much appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

Signature redacted for privacy.

Leo Gainor

Milner Crest School
Coos Bay, Oregon

Dear

Last month you received a questionnaire concerning an evaluation of the undergraduate elementary education program at Oregon State University.

Many questionnaires have been completed and returned but the evaluation can be valid only to the extent that an evaluation is made by each of the graduate's administrators.

I realize my request is an imposition upon your time. However, I sincerely believe the professional contribution you can make toward this study will be well worth the time spent.

It is quite possible that you may have misplaced the original questionnaire so I have enclosed a duplicate for your convenience.

Sincerely,

Signature redacted for privacy.

Leo Gainor

AN EVALUATION OF THE ELEMENTARY STUDENT
TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAM AT
OREGON STATE UNIVERSITY

The purpose of this questionnaire is to determine the effectiveness of the elementary teacher education program at Oregon State University. The findings will be of value to the School of Education in its continuous effort to improve elementary teacher preparation.

Please check (✓) the appropriate numbers to represent your appraisal of _____ _____ while under your supervision. The basis for this evaluation should be in relation to other teachers of comparable experience and education with whom you have worked.

5. Superior		2. Below average	
4. Above average		1. Inferior	
3. Average		0. No opinion	

	5	4	3	2	1	0	
CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT							
1. Maintaining an atmosphere in the classroom that is conducive to learning.							(1)
2. Maintaining effective classroom control.							(2)
3. Collecting and using significant data.							(3)
METHODS OF INSTRUCTION AND EVALUATION							
4. Using effective teaching procedures.							(4)
5. Planning effectively.							(5)
6. Using effective diagnostic and remedial procedures.							(6)
7. Evaluating the achievement of children.							(7)
In Helping Children:							
8. To speak effectively.							(8)
9. To listen effectively.							(9)
10. To do critical thinking.							(10)
11. To make effective choices in problem solving.							(11)
12. To express themselves in writing.							(12)
13. To learn to write and spell.							(13)
14. To learn to read.							(14)
15. In arithmetic.							(15)
16. In science.							(16)
17. In social studies.							(17)
18. In art.							(18)
19. In music.							(19)
20. In physical education.							(20)
CHILD GROWTH AND DEVELOPMENT							
21. In understanding the way children learn.							(21)
22. In understanding the age level with which the teacher is working.							(22)
23. In adapting the principles of child growth and mental hygiene in guiding children.							(23)
SCHOOL AND COMMUNITY RELATIONS							
24. Participation and cooperation in school activities.							(24)
25. Attitude toward professional growth.							(25)
26. Working with other teachers and the administration.							(26)
27. Maintaining good relations between the school and the community.							(27)
28. In working with parents.							(28)
	5	4	3	2	1	0	

Please give this teacher an over-all rank in relation to all teachers of comparable experience and education with whom you have worked.

CHECK ONE:

Upper one-third	
Middle one-third	
Lower one-third	