1964

An Appraisal of Student Teachers in Off-Campus Elementary Schools

Marie Maud Foote
Loyola University Chicago

AN APPRAISAL OF STUDENT TEACHERS IN OFF-CAMPUS ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS

by

Marie M. Foote

A Dissertation Submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate School of Loyola University in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of Doctor of Education

June

1964

LIFE OF AUTHOR

Marie Maud Foote, a native of Chicago, attended both elementary and high school at Saint Xavier Academy, graduating in June, 1928. She received her teacher's certificate from Chicago Teachers College South (Chicago Normal College) in June, 1931. During the depression years she substituted in Chicago Public Schools and worked as librarian in the Calvert Library.

Assigned to the Chicago Public Schools in January, 1937, she attended Loyola University evening school and was graduated in January, 1940 with the degree of Bachelor of Philosophy. In August, 1946 she was graduated from De Paul University, Chicago, with the degree of Master of Arts. In September, 1958 she was invited to join the faculty of Chicago Teachers College South, where she has worked since in the Department of Student Teaching.

During her years of service in Chicago Public Schools she has taught all grades from 1B through 8A, and has worked as a classroom teacher with student teachers during the regular school year and summer session in cooperation with the Student Teaching Program of Chicago Teachers College South as well as with programs of other colleges and universities. In 1953 she served on the oral board for the Elementary Teacher's Certification Examination, Grades 3-8. She conducted experimental projects with gifted children as an assigned teacher. She was a teacher representative to

the Curriculum Council, and throughout her service in Chicago Public Schools has worked with children of all levels of achievement.

The writer has published an article on reading: "Using Content Subjects to Promote Reading Interests in Grades Seven through Nine," University of Chicago Press, Supplementary Educational Monographs, Number 84 (December, 1956), 149-153. She contributed the article entitled "Illinois" which appears in Volume I of Encyclopaedia Britannica Junior (1962), 20-22, 22A-22J, 23-24. She has been a consultant and researcher for Encyclopaedia Britannica Senior and for The Educator, Publishers House, Lake Bluff, Illinois.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author wishes to express thanks to all those who by their interest and help made possible this study.

Grateful acknowledgements are made to the following: Dean Raymond M. Cook of Chicago Teachers College South, who gave permission to the writer to engage in this research; to Miss Marie Tierney, Chairman of the Department of Student Teaching, who has played a major role in the development of the program of student teaching; to Dr. Louise E. Dieterle and Miss Marianne Garbel, the counselors who served as raters; to all the principals and cooperating teachers who rated the student teachers; to the ninety-nine student teachers who participated in this study; to Mr. Carter N. Frieberg, the adviser of this dissertation; and to each member of the advisory board of the Department of Education of Loyola University for assistance and encouragement.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter		Page
I.	INTRODUCTION	1
	Purpose - History of Chicago Teachers College South - Description of Student Teaching Program - Role of the Cooperating Teacher - Role of the Counselor - Role of the Student Teacher - Definition of Terms - Statement of the Problem	
II.	REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	21
	Significant Studies - Influence of the Tyler Rationale - Differences in This Study from Those Described	
III.	METHODS OF PROCEDURE AND SOURCES OF DATA	37
	Scope of Study - Descriptive Rating Scale - Multidimensionality of Objectives - Educational Backgrounds of Student Teachers - Causal Comparative Method - Test Data	
IV.	ANALYSIS OF ITEM RESPONSES ON THE RATING SCALE	52
	Categorization - Comparison - Analysis-Synthesis - Number in the Sample - Interpretation of Item Responses in Terms of Levels of Performance - Rank Order of Item Responses - Differences between Raters	
V.	ANALYSIS OF PERFORMANCE	96
	Results of the Certification Examination - Comparisons with Entering Scores - Correlations - Interpretation	
VI.	SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS	118
	Brief Overview of Study - Conclusions Showing Influence of the Tyler Rationale - Recommendations Based on the Complementary Dimensions of Quantitative Measurements and Qualitative Factors	

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Cont'd)

Chapter Page

BIBLIOGRAPHY 133

APPENDIXES:

I. TWO-DIMENSIONAL CHART STATING OBJECTIVES FOR STUDENT TEACHING PROGRAM, CHICAGO TEACHERS COLLEGE SOUTH 136

II. DESCRIPTIVE RATING SCALE 138

III. COVER LETTER 142

IV. PERSONAL DATA SHEET 144

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
I.	Age Distribution of Ninety-Nine Student Teachers . . .	41
II.	Educational Backgrounds of the Student Teachers . . .	41
III.	Enrollment in Undergraduate Teacher Training Program	42
IV.	ACE Scores for Seventy-Eight Student Teachers	45
V.	SCAT Scores for Fourteen Transfer Students	46
VI.	Cooperative English Test Scores for Eighty-Five Student Teachers	47
VII.	Mathematics Scores for Eighty Student Teachers	48
VIII.	Range in Grade Point Averages	49
IX.	Cumulative Grade Point Average Distribution	50
X.	Results of Certification Examination Taken by Sixty-Five Student Teachers for Elementary Teacher Certificate	51
XI.	Analysis of Responses Made by Group A, Cooperating Teachers Who Rated Student Teachers in Terms of the Evaluation Instrument	54
XII.	Analysis of Responses Made by Group A, Cooperating Teachers Showing Descending Order of Satisfactory Ratings	56
XIII.	Analysis of Responses Made by Group A, Cooperating Teachers Showing Descending Order of Unsatisfactory Ratings	57
XIV.	Analysis of Responses Made by Group A, Cooperating Teachers Showing Number of Students by Levels Indicated on Rating Scale	59
XV.	Analysis of Responses Made by Group A, Cooperating Teachers Showing Levels of Performance in Per Cent	60

LIST OF TABLES (Cont'd)

Table		Page
XVI.	Analysis of Responses Made by Group B, Cooperating Teachers Who Rated 99 Student Teachers in Terms of Evaluation Instrument	62
XVII.	Analysis of Responses Made by Group B, Cooperating Teachers Showing Descending Order of Satisfactory Ratings	63
XVIII.	Analysis of Responses Made by Group B, Cooperating Teachers Showing Descending Order of Unsatisfactory Ratings	64
XIX.	Analysis of Responses Made by Group B, Cooperating Teachers Showing Number of Students by Levels Indicated on Rating Scale	65
XX.	Analysis of Responses Made by Group B, Cooperating Teachers Showing Levels of Performance in Per Cent	66
XXI.	Analysis of Combined Responses Made by Group A, and Group B, Cooperating Teachers Who Rated 99 Student Teachers in Terms of the Evaluation . .	68
XXII.	Analysis of Combined Responses Made by Group A, and Group B, Cooperating Teachers Showing Descending Order of Satisfactory Ratings	70
XXIII.	Analysis of Combined Responses Made by Group A, and Group B, Cooperating Teachers Showing Descending Order of Unsatisfactory Ratings	71
XXIV.	Analysis of Combined Responses Made by Group A, and Group B, Cooperating Teachers Showing Number of Ratings by Levels Indicated on Evaluation Instrument	72
XXV.	Analysis of Responses Made by Group A, and Group B, Cooperating Teachers Showing Levels of Performance in Per Cent	74
XXVI.	Analysis of Responses Made by Group D, Counselors Who Rated 99 Student Teachers in Terms of the Evaluation Instrument	76

LIST OF TABLES (Cont'd)

Table		Page
XXVII.	Analysis of Responses Made by Group D, Counselors Showing Descending Order of Satisfactory Ratings	77
XXVIII.	Analysis of Responses Made by Group D, Counselors Who Rated 99 Student Teachers Showing Descending Order of Unsatisfactory Ratings	78
XXIX.	Analysis of Responses Made by Group C, Counselors Showing Number of Students by Levels Indicated on Rating Scale	80
XXX.	Analysis of Responses Made by Group D, Counselors Showing Levels of Performance in Per Cent	81
XXXI.	Analysis of Responses Made by Group E, 99 Student Teachers Who Rated Themselves in Terms of the Evaluation Instrument	83
XXXII.	Analysis of Responses Made by Group E, Student Teachers Showing Descending Order of Satisfactory Ratings	84
XXXIII.	Analysis of Responses Made by Group E, Student Teachers Showing Descending Order of Unsatisfactory Ratings	85
XXXIV.	Analysis of Responses Made by Group E, 99 Student Teachers Who Rated Themselves Showing Number of Students by Levels Indicated on Rating Scale	86
XXXV.	Analysis of Responses Made by Group E, Student Teachers Who Rated Themselves Showing Levels of Performance in Per Cent	88
XXXVI.	Summary of Responses Made by Group A, Group B, Group D, and Group E, Showing Number of Students and Per Cent in Terms of Performance at the Level of Excellent (L_1)	89
XXXVII.	Summary of Responses Made by Group A, Group B, Group D, and Group E, Showing Number of Students and Per Cent in Terms of Performance at the Level of Satisfactory (L_2)	90

LIST OF TABLES (Cont'd)

Table		Page
XXXVIII.	Summary of Responses Made by Group A, Group B, Group D, and Group E, Showing Number of Students and Per Cent in Terms of Performance at the Level of Unsatisfactory (L_3)	91
XXXIX.	Summary of Differences between Groups Showing Number of Students and Per Cent in Terms of Performance at the Level of Excellent (L_1)	92
XL.	Summary of Differences between Groups Showing Number of Students and Per Cent in Terms of Performance at the Level of Satisfactory (L_2) . .	93
XLI.	Summary of Differences between Groups Showing Number of Students and Per Cent in Terms of Performance at the Level of Unsatisfactory (L_3) . . .	94
XLII.	Successful Results of Certification Examination for Elementary Teachers, Grades 3-8, Taken by Fifty-Nine Student Teachers	98
XLIII.	Failure Results of Certification Examination for Elementary Teachers, Grades 3-8, Taken by Six Student Teachers	102
XLIV.	Distribution of Total Grades for Fifty-Nine Students Who Were Successful in the Certification Examination	104
XLV.	Spearman Rank Difference Method of Correlation between Certification Total Grades and ACE Scores for Fifty Student Teachers	105
XLVI.	Scattergram Showing Cumulative Grade Point Averages at the Beginning of Student Teaching . . .	108
XLVII.	Scattergram Showing Certification Total Grades for Fifty-Two Student Teachers	110
XLVIII.	Spearman Rank Difference Method of Correlation between Certification Total Grades and Math Scores for Forty-Nine Student Teachers	112
XLIX.	Final Grades and Other Data for Thirty-Four Student Teachers Who Did not Take the Certification Examination	115

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

American education today is faced with numerous and complex problems. Certainly among questions uppermost in the minds of many and often asked are: What is good teaching? What makes a good teacher? This is no time to evade such considerations or to settle for mediocrity because of lack of information. Pursuit of excellence in terms of teacher preparation means continuous planning, implementation of plans, appraisal and reappraisal of results. Quantitative measurements and qualitative factors suggest the use of complementary dimensions in evaluation of on-going programs.

This study encompasses a fourfold purpose which is (1) to appraise the performance of a selected group of student teachers in off-campus Chicago Public Elementary Schools; (2) to determine the degree of relationship between entering scores and success in student teaching; (3) to appraise objectives of the student teaching program; and (4) to improve two-way communication between the cooperating schools and the college. It focuses on the culminating semester of the organizational pattern of the program of student teaching as offered prior to the changeover to trimester organization which took place in September, 1962 by Chicago Teachers College South.

Chicago Teachers College South, located in the heart of Englewood on twenty acres of land at 6800 Stewart Avenue, is an educational landmark on Chicago's south side. Its bilateral origin stems from two sources, one which started in the city of Chicago in 1855 and the other in the county of Cook in 1867. The establishment of county normal schools was authorized by the General Assembly of Illinois in the session of 1869, and the Cook County Normal School, having the distinction of being the first such institution in the country, was founded. The official seal of the college records 1869 as the founding date.

One of the historical sketches reveals that:

> In 1896, the merger of the Training Class for Cadets (also known as the North Side Training School) and the Cook County Normal School took place, the Board of Education establishing standards of admission for residents of the city and granting those who completed the course certificates to teach in the elementary schools of the city. Graduates of county high schools were to be admitted upon recommendation of the County Superintendent and, upon graduation, to be eligible to teach in the county schools.[1]

In its embryonic stage the college attracted the creativity of Colonel Francis Wayland Parker, who directed the school from 1883 to 1899. Throughout the years it has been guided by such leaders as Dr. Arnold Tompkins, Dr. Ella Flagg Young (who later became Superintendent of Chicago Public Schools), Dr. William Bishop Owen, Mr. Butler Laughlin, Dr. Verne O. Graham, Dr. John A. Bartky, and presently by Dean Raymond M. Cook.

A single purpose, degree granting, coeducational institu-

---

[1]Chicago Teachers College, Announcements 1949-1951, p. 11.

tion, legally authorized to train teachers, it is characterized by the dimensions of stability, flexibility, and challenge. Its early history discloses the fact that this institution took its place as one of the pioneer teacher training institutions west of the Alleghenies which contributed to educational progress in the state of Illinois as well as in the city of Chicago. Pages of its later history describe an awareness to the speed of change which challenges the college's inner resources to meet the need of the hour intellectually, socially, and economically.

Throughout the years the college has changed its name at various times. It was first known as Cook County Normal School and today is recognized as Chicago Teachers College South, having one branch called Crane located on the west side. Two north side branches were closed in the summer of 1961 and students transferred to the newly organized college known as Chicago Teachers College North.

With full accreditation from the North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools at both the undergraduate and graduate levels, Chicago Teachers College South is fully recognized by the Department of Instruction of the State of Illinois and has received approval for veterans' training.

At the graduate level a recent report states:

> The courses leading to the master's degree are all offered in the Extended Day (after-school hours) and in summer sessions and are for the training of teachers already in service. Other in-service training is given in Extended Day courses to teachers not seeking a master's degree; these courses, some of which are on the undergraduate level, are taken by teachers wishing to validate temporary

certificates, to qualify for another certificate, to qualify for the third lane on the Chicago salary schedule (36 hours beyond the master's degree), or to satisfy their own desire for additional training and education.[2]

Requirements for the degree of Bachelor of Education are the following:

The degree of Bachelor of Education is conferred upon the recommendation of the faculty of the College, subject to the following provisions:

1. Successful completion of one of the authorized curricula (see pages 35-45). The total number of credit hours required for graduation depends on the particular curriculum.

2. At least 30 credit hours of course work, normally the last 30 hours, must have been taken at Chicago Teachers College. Transfer credits must have been earned at an institution accredited by a regional association or at an institution to which the State University grants full transfer credit. Courses taken at a junior college in excess of a total of sixty-six credit hours may not be transferred to the Chicago Teachers College. Credit for student teaching received elsewhere may not be transferred; it must be earned in the regular academic session at the Chicago Teachers College in order to be counted for degree purposes. Exceptions to this rule may be made only by vote of the faculty of the College.

3. A minimum cumulative grade point average of 2.0 is required for all work attempted at Chicago Teachers College. Courses with a grade of "C," or better, earned at a regionally accredited college and applicable to the Chicago Teachers College curriculum selected by the student, may be used to meet graduation requirements within the limits stated in paragraph two (2) above.

4. Passing a test on the constitutions of the United States and Illinois is required by statute.[3]

Admission requirements are clearly stated in Section 6-5

---

[2]Chicago Teachers College South, Report on the Teacher Education Programs (Chicago, Illinois, 1962), p. 3.

[3]Chicago Teachers College Bulletin, General Announcements, Undergraduate Catalog, 1961-1963 (Chicago, 1961), p. 33.

of the Rules of the Board of Education:

> Admission to Chicago Teachers College shall be limited to those graduates of recognized high schools who signify an intention to teach in the public schools of Illinois and who meet proficiency standards approved by the General Superintendent of Schools and administered by the Chicago Teachers College.[4]

Individuals are eligible for admission if they meet the following general requirements:

> 1. Graduation from a four-year high school recognized by the State Superintendent of Public Instruction.
> 2. Successful completion of a test of college aptitude.
> 3. United States citizenship. (This requirement may be waived in the case of applicants who are in the process of attaining citizenship and who may be expected to gain it before graduation.)
> 4. Legal residence in the State of Illinois for a period of at least one year immediately preceding the expected date of admission to Chicago Teachers College. (Non-residents of Illinois may be admitted only on payment of full cost tuition. See Schedule of Fees.)
> 5. Certification of intention to teach in the public schools of the State of Illinois.[5]

Various phases of the present curriculum meet current trends and are appraised and reappraised in terms of modern rationale. Pursuing excellence in American education stimulates tracing the threads of philosophy, history, mores, politics, economics, language, geography, technology, science, fine arts, rate of speed of change, equal opportunity, and freedom to excel, all of which are woven into the pattern of democracy. By virtue of this democratic framework appraisal considers the two-dimensional aspects of the pursuit of excellence in American education. Some contradictions which teacher education must face up to may be described as:

---

[4] Ibid., p. 25.

[5] Ibid.

1) universality versus excellence
2) equality of educational opportunity versus student's abilities
3) slums versus suburbs
4) Jeffersonian principle versus selectivity
5) mobility versus stability
6) individual differences versus group cohesion
7) rate of speed of change in the constituency of society versus rate of speed of change in pedagogical tasks.

The community of Englewood is planning a new look. Urban renewal plans are in the stage of metamorphosis with promises of assistance at the local, state, and national levels. Land clearance is under way and programs of rehabilitation are being evaluated. Through ninety-five years of neighborhood changes Chicago Teachers College South has moved forward in the program of teacher education. Its physical location has kept it in touch with a wide range of educational problems which exist within a large metropolitan public school system.

The training program in teacher education includes laboratory experience from kindergarten through eighth grade at the elementary level, and from seventh through twelfth in a variety of fields at the secondary level. Also, in certain fields the college confers a Master of Education degree.

Objectives for teacher education have been selected to produce graduates who have:

1. A broad liberal education: familiarity in the areas of the social, behavioral, and natural sciences; the humanities (including art, literature, music, and language); and mathematics.

2. Professional knowledge: knowledge and understanding of educational philosophy, educational psychology, and the history of education.

3. Professional skills: skills in managing a classroom, working with children, supervising learning.

4. Knowledge and understanding of the subject matter or areas to be taught.

5. Desirable personal attributes: physical health and vigor, good command of written and spoken English.[6]

Terminology in this study coincides with terms recognized by the Association for Student Teaching and the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education. The only exception is the term counselor frequently used throughout this report. However, the definition of counselor is consistent with the definition for college supervisor accepted by the two aforementioned associations.

These terms have been clearly stated by Michaelis:

Student teaching is a period of guided teaching in which the student takes increasing responsibility for the work with a group of learners over a period of consecutive weeks.

It is a part of the total program of professional laboratory experiences which have been defined as all those contacts with children, youth, and adults (through observation, participation, and teaching) which make a direct contribution to an understanding of individuals and their guidance in the teaching-learning process.

A laboratory school is any school, public or private, which a teacher-education institution utilizes as a resource for professional laboratory experiences.

---

[6]Chicago Teachers College South, loc. cit., p. 4.

A cooperating school is a school used by the college to provide professional laboratory experiences, but is not administered by, staffed by, or under the major jurisdiction of the college.

A college supervisor is an individual employed by the teacher-education institution to work cooperatively with supervising teachers and/or cooperating teachers to assist the student teachers in deriving the greatest possible values from experiences.[7]

The program of student teaching at Chicago Teachers College South provides a learning situation for the student teacher in terms of practical experience within the cooperating school and theoretical experience through seminars at the college. The basic purpose of the course is to help him meet, understand, and interpret more fully the kinds of problems which are common to schoolrooms, as well as to acquire some insights, methods, and techniques by which these basic problems may be attacked. It offers the student teacher a rationale for adapting to the learning situation which he finds at the cooperating school in which he does his student teaching. It helps him to prepare for future assignment in any of the many different kinds of schools within a system.

Assigned to a cooperating school for twenty weeks, the intermediate-upper grade student teacher teaches at two grade levels and in two different subject areas. The upper grade teaching major teaches in grades seven and eight, where he works with various aspects of his field of specialization. The intermediate-upper grade student teacher reports to the school from 8:30 to 11:30 A.M. four

---

[7]John U. Michaelis, "Teacher Education--Student Teaching and Internship," Encyclopedia of Educational Research (New York, 1960), p. 1474.

days a week and on Thursday for one full day from 8:30 to 3:15 P.M. The upper grade teaching major reports to the school from 8:30 to 11:30 A.M. five days a week. Both the intermediate-upper grade student and the upper grade teaching major report to the college for seminars two afternoons a week and for counseling appointments whenever indicated.

The morning total block of time consists of 120 minutes and is divided into three periods, two of which are teachig periods and one observation period. The observation, sometimes referred to as the non-teaching period, is divided between two cooperating teachers; the student teacher works with one cooperating teacher for the first ten weeks and with the second cooperating teacher from the eleventh week through the twentieth. He teaches for eighteen weeks in each cooperating teacher's room and for the initial two weeks of the semester he assists and observes both teachers for the total time.

A statement of the objectives for the student teaching program at Chicago Teachers College South are included in an unpublished study made by the writer in January, 1962. In terms of the rationale of Ralph W. Tyler,[8] student behaviors are outlined. Since the multiple relationships of the program present a very lengthy list of the content aspect, a two-dimensional chart listing these in detail may be found in the appendix.[9]

[8]Ralph W. Tyler, Basic Principles of Curriculum and Instruction, Syllabus Division, The University of Chicago Press (Chicago, 1950).

[9]See Appendix I for Two-Dimensional Chart stating Objectives for Student Teaching Program, Chicago Teachers College So.

BEHAVIORAL ASPECT OF OBJECTIVES FOR
STUDENT TEACHING PROGRAM

1. Ability to satisfy basic human needs.
2. Development of sensitivities.
3. Ability to interpret and apply an educational philosophy.
4. Ability to identify and apply various theories of learning.
5. Ability to understand and organize basic curriculum concepts.
6. Ability to select adequate devices of evaluation.
7. Ability to collect and interpret data and/or keep records.
8. Development of personal social adjustment.
9. Development of appreciations.
10. Ability to demonstrate readiness.
11. Ability to carry out administrative policies.
12. Development of social attitudes.
13. Ability to plan.
14. Development of effective ways of thinking.
15. Development of teaching ability.

The Department of Student Teaching is staffed by college teachers who are called counselors and assume four distinct roles of coordinator, supervisor, counselor, and evaluator. Duties of each counselor include the following:

1) Serves as liaison person between the cooperating school and the college.

2) Supervises and advises the student teacher.

3) Works with the principal in organizing the student's program.

4) Assists the classroom teacher in working efficiently with the student.

5) Confers with the classroom teacher concerning needs of the student teacher.

6) Plans to set up procedures whereby the student teacher will gain teaching strength.

7) Reads and analyzes student's units, plans, and logs throughout the semester, and advises student about necessary revisions.

8) Visits the student at frequent intervals.

9) Confers with cooperating teacher, principal, and student after each visit.

10) Works with various departments at the college to complement the student's program.

11) Interprets the purposes of the student teaching program to the whole faculty so that all teachers may have the opportunity to serve the student teacher.

12) Conducts seminars twice a week with all of the students for whom he assumes counseling responsibility.

Each student is given the opportunity to list three schools of his choice when he applies for the program of student teaching.

According to the chairman of the department:

> Selections of schools may vary from semester to semester because of certain needs of students in the fields of their specializations, because of requests from the cooperating schools in view of their total educational programs, and because of proximity of transportation for students.[10]

Working cooperatively with the city school system, Chicago Teachers College South is granted permission to place teachers in this way:

> The General Superintendent of Schools offers to the Chicago Teachers College the use of the facilities of the schools through the Associate Superintendent in Charge of Instruction. He, in turn, authorizes the several District Superintendents to grant permission to the Dean of the College to work with the various schools in their respective districts. From time to time, they submit to the Dean lists of schools whose principals have indicated the willingness of their staffs to contribute to the preparation of teachers. Direct requests to use the services of the schools are made to the principals through the Department of Student Teaching of the College.[11]

If the schools decide to cooperate in the program of student teaching they are described as cooperating schools which are off-campus Chicago Public Elementary Schools. The supervising classroom teacher who works directly with the student teacher in the cooperating school is called the cooperating teacher.

The principal chooses the cooperating teacher because of:

1) professional background and preparation;

2) professional interest in preparation of teachers;

3) understanding of needs of beginners in the field of student teaching;

---

[10]Marie Tierney, "Our Student Teaching Program," Chicago Schools Journal, May-June, 1953, p. 203.

[11]Ibid.

4) ability to demonstrate teaching skills;

5) current semester's program allowing cooperating teacher enough time to counsel and supervise the student teacher.

The student teacher is permitted to indicate his choice of cooperating teachers but the final decision is made by the principal after consultation with the counselor of the Department of Student Teaching.

Throughout the semester the cooperating teacher follows a planned program of observation, helps the student teacher to make the transition from student to teacher, helps the student to become a co-worker in terms of taking on professional status, helps pupils to adjust to the student as a teacher, and helps the student teacher to assume responsibilities for pupils, counsels and guides the student in his planning. The cooperating teacher supervises the student teacher in the following ways:

1) observing full and partial lessons;

2) making comments about daily teaching;

3) performing supervisory role best by sitting in the back of the room and exerting as little remote control as possible on the pupils.

The cooperating teacher serves as a link between the cooperating school and the college. Daily supervising and counseling find the cooperating teacher engaged in such activities as:

1) analyzing the basic needs of the student teacher for encouragement, security, significance, understanding, confidence building, and control;

2) sharing with the student teacher the joy that comes from experiencing a job well done;

3) adding responsibility gradually so that the student teacher develops the ability of assuming responsibility for handling a classroom at the end of a semester;

4) helping the student teacher to understand how

a) classroom morale is built,

b) democratic control is established,

c) obtainable goals are reached.

The student teacher is a senior in the undergraduate teacher training program. Depending upon the curriculum which he is following, he is a student in either his seventh or eighth semester of the four-year teacher education program. The student teacher has the opportunity to be enrolled in one of the following curricula:

Kindergarten-Primary

Elementary Program - Grades 3-8
Physical Education
Library Science

Upper Grade Teaching Major - Art, English, History, Geography, Home Economics, Industrial Arts, Mathematics, Modern Languages, Music, Science

High School - Business Education
Industrial Education

When a student applies for admission to the program of Student Teaching he must have met these prerequisites:

1) Minimum grade point average of 2.5 for courses taken at Chicago Teachers College South;

2) not on scholastic probation;

3) proficiency in:

a) English,

b) mathematics,

c) speech;

4) successful completion of background in general education;

5) evidence of successful completion of professional courses in the following areas:

a) philosophy and organization of American education;

b) psychology:

(1) educational,

(2) adolescent or child;

c) principles of teaching;

d) methods of teaching

(1) arithmetic,

(2) language arts,

(3) science or social studies;

e) fulfillment of major field requirements.

Before the student teacher is assigned to his cooperating school he attends orientation meetings where he is alerted to his duties. He is asked to view his life within the cooperating school in terms of:

1) selection of teaching areas;

2) observation;

3) responsibilities to be assumed;

4) desired outcomes of the program;

5) his role as a teacher;

6) relationships to various facets of the school such as:

a) to the principal,

b) to the staff,

c) to parents,

d) to pupils.

During the orientation meetings he learns that the principal is the educational leader and responsible head of the school through whom all important details must clear. These are:

1) selection of the classrooms in which he will teach;

2) selection of the subjects which he will teach;

3) selection of the teachers with whom he will work;

4) selection of the pupils with whom he will work;

5) assignment to extra-curricular activities;

6) approval of semester's overview, units, and lesson plans.

The student teacher becomes aware of his responsibilities within the school such as:

1) to observe the pupils with whom he will work;

2) to analyze pertinent data concerning them;

3) to study the suggested learnings desirable for pupils at this particular developmental level;

4) to prepare (after consultation with the cooperating teacher) overviews of the semester's work in both subject fields in which he plans to teach;

5) to assemble various teaching aids such as:

   a) text books,

   b) work books,

   c) other audio-visual aids;

6) to observe skills of expert teachers;

7) to participate in many classroom activities of the cooperating teacher by:

   a) taking attendance,

   b) conducting Pledge to the Flag,

   c) directing the National Anthem,

   d) dismissing pupils for recess,

   e) supervising the recess period,

   f) conducting fire drills,

   g) developing assembly programs,

   h) accompanying cooperating teacher on field trips,

   i) requisitioning supplies,

   j) sitting in on selected parent-teacher conferences,

   k) evaluating pupils' progress, which must be reported at regular intervals in the form of the official report card,

   l) participating in P.T.A. meetings on occasion.

The student teacher is expected to learn how to develop:

1) classroom management,

2) control,

3) techniques and devices,

4) variety of methods and approaches,

5) ability to understand and organize basic curriculum concepts,

6) ability to interpret and apply an educational philosophy,

7) sensitivities,

8) knowledge of subject matter,

9) readiness,

10) ability to plan,

11) ability to identify and apply various theories of learning,

12) ability to select adequate devices of evaluation,

13) ability to collect and interpret data,

14) ability to keep records,

15) ability to carry out administrative policies,

16) personal social adjustment,

17) appreciations,

18) social attitudes,

19) effective ways of thinking,

20) ability to teach.

It is desirable that the student teacher has the opportunity to teach at two grade levels as widely separated as possible for the purpose of giving him varied experiences. If he is an upper grade teaching major he will teach in his subject field at

two different upper grade levels. If he is an intermediate-upper grade student teacher he will teach two different subject fields for which he has had his courses in teaching methods and at as wide a range of grade levels as it is possible for the cooperating school to provide.

This study was made during the semester dating from February through June, 1962. It includes a group of student teachers who did their student teaching in grades three through eight for one semester, either as upper grade teaching majors or as intermediate-upper grade students.

The purpose of the research is to appraise the performance of a selected group of student teachers in off-campus Chicago Public Elementary Schools; to determine the degree of relationship between entering scores and success in student teaching; to appraise objectives of the student teaching program; and to improve two-way communication between the cooperating school and the college.

The instrument used to evaluate the performance of this selected group of student teachers is a descriptive rating scale.[12] It was designed and produced by the writer in April, 1962. Request for continued use of this rating scale was made by the Department of Student Teaching at Chicago Teachers College South first in the summer of 1962 and again in September, 1962, and each time the writer granted this permission to the department.

---

[12]See Appendix II for Rating Scale for Student Teachers.

Three different types of raters--(1) the cooperating teachers, (2) the college counselors, and (3) the student teachers themselves--rated the same group of selected student teachers.

The study includes scores made at the time of entrance into Chicago Teachers College South on American Council on Education Psychological Examination (ACE), and at a later date of entrance scores made on School and College Ability Test (SCAT), scores on the Cooperative English Test, and scores on a mathematics placement test. Cumulative grade point averages at the beginning of twenty weeks of student teaching represent additional data for the purpose of comparison.

Research concentrates on that phase of the student teaching program which provides laboratory experiences in off-campus Chicago Public Elementary Schools for students who are preparing to teach in grades three through eight or in an upper grade subject matter field in grades seven through nine. Throughout the discussion the former will be referred to as intermediate-upper grade student teachers, and the latter as upper grade teaching majors in art, English, history, geography, home economics, mathematics, music, or science, depending on the field of specialization.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

A search of the literature revealed several studies in the area of student teaching. As the investigator narrowed the field to what has been written about appraising performance of student teachers she was confronted with a variety of emphases and viewpoints.

Review of the literature concerning evaluation of student teachers presents a variety of opinions. According to Michaelis:

> For many years student teaching has been considered to be the most worthwhile requirement in the teacher-education program. Its development as a laboratory phase of teacher education has been closely related to the normal-school movement over the past century and to the establishment of departments of education in universities and liberal-arts colleges during the past sixty years. Student teaching was viewed at first as an opportunity for students to pick up a few patterns of teaching; now it is recommended that student teaching should provide opportunities to develop a high level of competence in all phases of the teacher's work.
>
> The general status of critical, evaluative research on student teaching is poor. This is due to a lack of research interest in this area until recently and also to the difficulties in doing conclusive research in such a diverse and uncontrollable field of activity.[1]

The more one reads what the specialists have to say the more apparent it becomes that:

> The predictability of teacher effectiveness undoubtedly is affected by the multidimensionality of the criterion.

---

[1]John U. Michaelis, "Teacher Education--Student Teaching and Internship," Encyclopedia of Educational Research (New York, 1960), pp. 1473-1474.

> There is accumulating evidence that prediction can be accomplished with better than chance results for specified dimensions or components of the criterion. On the other hand, the prediction of over-all teacher effectiveness is possible only to the extent that some general agreement can be reached regarding the dimensions comprising over-all effectiveness (involving, of course, acceptance of a common set of educational values) and how they should be combined to form a composite.[2]

There is indication of growing interest in measurement and prediction of teacher competence. The investigator viewed the total problem as one that is developmental.

In their discussion of measurement and prediction of teacher efficiency Barr and Jones have this to say:

> Interest in the measurement and prediction of teaching efficiency has continued, and with increased sophistication. Gradually investigators are coming to see the subject as one of great complexity with many ramifications. There seems to have been some tendency to concentrate upon aspects of the subject instead of continued attention to the totality of teaching efficiency. There has also been considerable attention during this period to the theoretical orientation of research in this field. The vocabulary and design of research have been brought more generally into agreement with those of psychological research. (P. 256.)
>
> . . . . . .
>
> A number of investigators studied combinations of factors. Shea[3] studied the predictive value of combinations of standardized tests such as the National Teacher Examination, the American Council on Education Psychological Examination, the Cooperative English Examination, the Cooperative General Culture Test, and the cooperative contemporary Affairs Test. None of the correlations was high; the highest was .44 for the National Teacher Examination, which agrees with earlier findings. (P. 258.)
>
> . . . . . .

---

[2]David G. Ryans, "Prediction of Teacher Effectiveness," Encyclopedia of Educational Research (New York, 1960), p. 1490.

[3]Joseph A. Shea, "The Predictive Value of Various Combinations of Standardized Tests and Subtests for Prognosis of Teaching Efficiency," Educational Research Monographs, XIX, No. 5 (Washington, D.C., 1955).

> In summary one might say then that: (a) interest in the measurement and prediction of teacher efficiency has continued; (b) a variety of new approaches have been employed; (c) studies of the measurement and prediction of teacher efficiency are becoming more sophisticated; and (d) while progress has been made, most of the studies are exploratory in character.[4]

Detailed studies made by authorities in the field point to the need for analysis. In any program of student teaching the role of the student teacher is mirrored in multiple relationships. He is expected to find the proper point of distance within the framework of many interlocking relationships.

The theory that consideration of measurement and prediction of teacher efficiency need to be fitted into some simple pattern seems to be supported by the following statement:

> From the number of papers published during the last three years, it appears that interest in the measurement and prediction of teacher efficiency has continued and possibly has increased. Besides the many research studies reported in the literature, there are many critical papers assessing what has been done and suggesting new approaches. Levin, for example, found three sources of inconclusiveness in research on teacher competence: (a) poor questions, that is, questions that cannot be answered; (b) indefinite meanings for competence; and (c) lack of a conceptual framework or theory guiding the research.[5]

Anderson and Hunka employ the techniques of multivariate statistical analysis. Concerning teacher evaluation, they have this to say:

---

[4]Arvil S. Barr and Robert E. Jones, "The Measurement and Prediction of Teacher Efficiency," Review of Educational Research, XXVIII, No. 3 (June, 1958), pp. 256, 258, 261.

[5]Arvil S. Barr, David E. Eustice, and Edward J. Noe, "The Measurement and Prediction of Teacher Efficiency," Review of Educational Research, XXV, No. 3 (June, 1955), p. 261.

Summaries are available of conventional research into the evaluation and prediction of teaching proficiency using predictor and various sorts of criterion variables (Sandiford, Cameron, Conway and Long, 1937; Barr, 1945, 1948, 1952, 1953, 1955, 1958, 1961; Domas and Tiedeman, 1950; Watters, 1954; Castetter, Standlee and Fattu, 1954; Morsh and Wilder, 1954; Tomlinson, 1955a, 1955b; Evans, 1959; and Howsam, 1960). This type of research has reached a dead-end (Turner and Fattu, 1960, Preface) because negligible relationships exist within and among the various criteria of teaching proficiency, the ultimate criterion of pupil growth along desired dimensions, the immediate criterion of practice teaching marks, and the intermediate criterion of principal's or superintendent's ratings (Thorndike, 1959, pp. 121-124). Barr (1961) provides a cogent summary.

"There is plenty of evidence to indicate that different practitioners observing the same teacher teach, or studying data about her, may arrive at very different evaluations of her; this observation is equally true of the evaluation experts; starting with different approaches, and using different data-gathering devices, they, too, arrive at very different evaluations" (pp. 150-151).

And Barr (1958) has drawn the following conclusion, exact but melancholy for all involved in professional teacher-education.

"The simple fact of the matter is that, after 40 years of research on teacher effectiveness during which a vast number of studies have been carried out, one can point to few outcomes that a superintendent of schools can safely employ in hiring a teacher or granting him tenure, that an agency can employ in certifying teachers or that a teacher education faculty can employ in planning or improving teacher education programs" (p. 657).[6]

From the foregoing statements certain implications offered assistance to the investigator. At this point there was an awareness of what relationships are considered negligible, the broad spectrum of multidimensionality encompassing the complexity of success in teaching, and finally the human factor, all of which helped to determine what direction should be taken to explore fur-

---

[6]C. C. Anderson and S. M. Hunka, "Teacher Evaluation: Some Problems and a Proposal," Harvard Educational Review, Winter, 1963, pp. 74-75.

ther the problem of evaluating performance of student teachers.

Authors of two unpublished dissertations, Clausen and Dieterle, reflect to some degree the thinking of Anderson and Hunka. Clausen points out:

> If we look at student teaching as a learning experience, we must remember some of the basic principles governing a learning process. Only one of these is the principle of readiness, and you need to be able to apply the principle to yourself. You are a unique individual and will move into a situation where there is an element of comfort and a chance of success. Your cooperating teacher and your supervisor can help you here, but as the learner, you need to assess where you might step in and take some initiative for your own learning. As you begin to discover that you have more at your command than you ever imagined, you'll feel comfortable in moving into a variety of activities with children.[7]

A student teaching handbook resulted from the findings of Clausen's study. He divided the handbook into four sections. They are described as follows:

> Section I deals with student teacher-child relationships and emphasizes ways of establishing relationships so that children's respect is obtained and control of the classroom situation is possible.
>
> Section II deals with student teacher-cooperating teacher relationships and focuses on individual differences in teachers and implications of these differences for such problems as student participation in the program and student responsibility for establishing a good working relationship with a teacher.
>
> Section III is concerned with student teacher-college supervisor relationships and centers almost completely on the role of the supervisor in the program, emphasizing again the differences in supervisors and implications of these differences for the student teacher's experience.
>
> Section IV deals with the student's general feelings of adequacy and inadequacy concerning the background of prepa-

---

[7]Robert W. Clausen, "Development of a Handbook for Use with Beginning Student Teachers at Queens College," unpublished doctoral project, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1959, p. 121.

ration for student teaching. This section emphasizes the learning potential of student teaching experiences, suggests some ways in which students can use what they know with children while they are increasing their subject matter background and learning new ways of planning for and with children.

The handbook attempts to help students see that many of their concerns are shared by other students, and an effort has been made to encourage the student teacher to assume much responsibility for the kind of experience he will have.[8]

The purpose of Clausen's study was:

. . . to prepare a handbook which might be used with beginning student teachers in elementary education at Queens College to help them in getting a good start in student teaching.

. . . . . .

Students who are about to begin student teaching frequently have some insecurity about starting classroom work. The exact cause of concern may vary within individuals. This study has grown from one possible cause--students' lack of enough orientation to student teaching.

Orientation, as it is used in this study, refers to the process of helping the teacher education student develop a realistic overview of student teaching so that vague ideas he may have about the task and himself in relation to it begin to take shape. In providing this help, the orientation process must realize several purposes. These include:

1) Helping the learner to develop a mental set and outlook about student teaching,

2) Guiding the learner to look at his past experience in its relationship to new learning,

3) Aiding the learner to share his expectations of the experiences he will have,

4) Helping the learner to see himself as a person of worth who will bring valuable background to his experiences,

5) Helping the learner to become aware of resources he may call upon to help him.

Because each learner is unique, individuals need specific help, but the professional responsibilities of all student teachers and the common characteristics of all learners make it possible to plan useful orientation experiences for groups.[9]

---

[8] Ibid., pp. 83-84.

[9] Ibid., Preface, pp. ii-iii.

The author emphasizes the need for a positive self-concept for success, and for a feeling of adequacy.

Dieterle made a study of the problems encountered by a group of student teachers in off-campus schools. The purpose of the Dieterle study was:

> . . . to investigate the kinds of problems faced by a selected group of student teachers during their semester of student teaching in off-campus Chicago Public Elementary Schools and to present the various approaches used to solve these problems as worked out by the student teacher.[10]

She makes the following recommendations:

1. The pre-service teacher education curriculum should be organized so that student teachers have opportunities to have direct contact with children in numerous school situations during their four years of college.
2. Student teachers need to be given more opportunities for observing, planning for, and working with small groups of children outside the classroom and with two or three subgroups within the classroom.
3. Student teachers need more experience observing, planning for, and working with above average and below average children in a variety of classroom situations and subject areas.
4. Student teachers need opportunities to observe and work with teachers who are highly skilled in handling children with behavior and emotional problems. Student teachers need to gain an understanding of the individual child and the ways and means available for helping him achieve within his limits.
5. Student teachers need more experiences in performing the various classroom activities included as part of the teacher's responsibilities.
6. Cooperating teachers should be aware of the areas presenting greatest difficulty to student teachers and should be helped to select appropriate learning experiences that will be most beneficial to the student teacher.
7. Areas presenting greatest difficulty should be given special attention during the seminar sessions and in

---

[10] Louise E. Dieterle, "An Analysis and Treatment of the Problems Faced by the Student Teachers in Off-Campus Elementary Schools," unpublished doctoral dissertation, Loyola University, Chicago, 1961, p. 1.

individual counseling sessions.

8. During the semester, seminar discussions should be devoted to problem situations. Discussions based upon the student teachers' immediate and far-reaching problems should help them identify the real sources of the problems, note various relationships and implications, and evaluate the approaches and methods applicable to the problem in terms of the individual situation.[11]

Munson did a study comparing interest and attitude patterns of three selected groups of teacher candidates. He chose:

Two hundred nineteen students drawn from four colleges located in southeastern Minnesota:

Winona State College - state college

St. Mary's College - liberal arts college for men under private control and affiliated with the Roman Catholic Church

The College of St. Theresa - liberal arts college for women under private control and affiliated with the Roman Catholic Church

Macalester College - co-educational liberal arts college affiliated with the Presbyterian Church.[12]

The purpose of Munson's study was:

. . . to compare the interests and attitudes of groups of candidates preparing for three specific areas of teaching. The following hypotheses served as a guide to the study:

1. Elementary teacher candidates and secondary social studies candidates do not differ significantly in interests and attitudes as measured by selected standardized instruments.

2. Elementary teacher candidates do differ significantly from secondary science teacher candidates in their interests and attitudes as measured by selected standardized instruments.

3. People who choose elementary education and people who choose secondary social studies education generally are of a type which can be described as "socially oriented." Their interests and attitudes are centered in people and as a re-

---

[11] Ibid., p. 246-247.

[12] Howard R. Munson, "Comparison of Interest and Attitude Patterns of Three Selected Groups of Teacher Candidates," unpublished doctoral project, State College of Washington, 1959, p. 18.

sult they tend to choose socially oriented courses in preference to science training.

4. People who choose secondary science education generally are of a type which can be described as "science oriented." Their interests and attitudes are science centered with the result that they pursue related specialized training in preference to the social sciences.

The sample population of 112 elementary teacher candidates, 51 secondary social studies teacher candidates, and 56 secondary science teachers was selected from four private and public colleges.[13]

The following conclusions were reached by Munson:

1. With respect to interests and attitudes, each of the three groups of teacher candidates may be regarded as distinct and different.

2. The elementary teacher candidates and the social studies teacher candidates appeared to be more similar in interests and attitudes than did the elementary and science or the social studies and science candidates.

3. The selection of teaching area appeared to be consistent with dominant interests and values.

4. Scoring high in any one area of interests did not seem to preclude the possibility of scoring high in any other area of interests.

5. Elementary teacher candidates appeared to lack interests in science and science-related activities.

6. A "social orientation" appeared to be somewhat characteristic of all three groups.[14]

A wide range of factors involved in evaluation of student teachers confronts the researcher as he continues to review the literature. Another study made by Stevens[15] points to the need for improvement of apprcaches to supervision. Her purpose was:

. . . to point the way toward improving the insights and ac-

---

[13] Ibid., pp. 94-95.

[14] Ibid., p. 96.

[15] Lillian L. Stevens, "A Study of Certain Aspects of Elementary Student Teaching Experiences and Supervision in the Program of Teacher Education at the City College of the City of New York," unpublished doctoral dissertaion, New York University, 1958.

tivities of those engaged in the supervision of student teaching at the elementary level at the City College of New York.[16]

Out of 104 student teachers in the class of 1954 at the City College, 80 student teachers evaluated themselves. There were 72 evaluations returned by the supervisors.

Stevens chose the abbreviated form of the California Statement of Teaching Competence to be the measuring instrument used in her study. She found:

> . . . strong support in the related literature for integrating student teaching with the totality of the life of the school. Life in school includes all activities of children and youth in the school: assembly programs, student councils, school newspaper, school bank, store, and activities involving parents and staff.[17]

Her study included competences rated by the students and supervisors. Each group checked the abbreviated form of the California Statement of Teaching Competence. The symbols used on the Instructor's Evaluation Report were:

5 - highly competent, efficient, very successful

4 - competent

3 - satisfactory

2 - slightly effective

1 - showed recognition of the elements of the situation but was not effective or did nothing

0 - a situation calling for the competence occurred but the student did not recognize or use it

NR - not relevant, no situation calling for the competence occurred[18]

---

[16] Ibid., p. 1.

[17] Ibid., p. 22.

[18] Ibid.

Stevens discovered that in 1953 the ratings by the student teachers were higher than the ratings they received by their supervisors. However, in 1954 she found greater agreement between the two classes of raters.

Troisi[19] conducted a study in which he asked a group of juniors to list the goals they hoped to reach during their student teaching experience. He describes his procedure in the following way:

> This original rating scale for student-teaching objectives was developed by asking ninety-two juniors at the State University Teachers College of Plattsburgh to list what they hoped to gain from their student teaching experience. From their lists a rank order compilation was made.[20]

The author reworded each objective in the rating scale and designed an instrument called the Student-Teaching Achievement Scale. He also used the Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory, Form A, by Cook, Leeds, and Callis,[21] to measure attitudes.

Troisi drew these conclusions:

> The investigation lent support to the hypothesis that the student-teaching experience will increase an individual's score on a Rating Scale for Student-Teaching Objectives. In addition, the students became more selective in their post-student-teaching response to the Rating Scale.
> Evidence was also provided that an individual's rating of student-teaching objectives is not related to his atti-

---

[19]Nicholas Francis Troisi, "The Effect of Student-Teaching upon Student Teachers' Objectives and Their Relation to Achievement and Attitudes toward Children," unpublished doctoral dissertation, The Pennsylvania State University, 1959.

[20]Ibid., p. 42.

[21]Walter W. Cook, Carroll H. Leeds, and Robert Callis, Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory Manual (New York: The Psychological Corporation), p. 10.

tude toward children. This study shows that attitudes toward children and acceptance of objectives for student-teaching are relatively independent measures.

The investigation did not support the hypothesis that a significant relationship exists between the value ascribed to student-teaching objectives by an individual and the achievement of these objectives.

Finally, since the post-student-teaching MTAI scores went up for the group studied, it was concluded that student-teaching should be considered as guided training instead of actual teaching experience. It must be remembered that, according to Cook's original validation, training tends to improve MTAI scores while teaching experience tends to lower scores.[22]

Another study concerning the evaluation of student teachers in business training was made by Prickett.[23] He formulated fourteen basic principles after making a "comprehensive study, analysis, and interpretation of the literature,"[24] His purpose was:

> . . . to develop evaluative criteria useful in determining the extent to which the student teaching phase of business teacher preparation is effective.[25]

He refers to seven major aspects of student teaching which he approaches in terms of seven evaluative schedules. Each schedule consists of guiding principles, explanations of rating scales, and specific criteria. He lists these seven schedules as:

I. Objectives of Student Teaching

II. Organization and Administration of Student Teaching

III. Selection of Student Teaching Stations

---

[22]Troisi, op. cit., p. 79.

[23]Loy Elvin Prickett, "Evaluation of the Student Teaching Phase of Business Teacher Preparation," unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Oklahoma, 1959.

[24]Ibid., p. 14.

[25]Ibid., p. 143.

IV. Selection and Orientation of Student Teachers

V. Content of Student Teaching

VI. Supervision of Student Teaching

VII. Evaluation of Student Teachers[26]

These schedules utilize a progressive scale in terms of the following headings:

0 - Item is not present in student teaching program in business education

N - No opinion or no basis for judgment

1 - All or nearly all aspects unsatisfactory

2 - More aspects unsatisfactory than satisfactory

3 - More aspects satisfactory than unsatisfactory

4 - Most aspects satisfactory

5 - Nearly all or all aspects satisfactory[27]

According to Tyler[28] "the process of evaluation begins with the objectives of the educational program." The process of evaluating the student teacher is a complex one. Criteria for an evaluation instrument are validity, reliability, and objectivity. Performance in student teaching is not measured by paper-and-pencil tests. The Thirty-Ninth Yearbook[29] (1960) of the Association for Student Teaching is devoted to the task of evaluating student

---

[26] Ibid., p. 145. [27] Ibid., p. 171.

[28] Ralph W. Tyler, Basic Principles of Curriculum and Instruction, Syllabus Division, the University of Chicago Press, (Chicago, 1950).

[29] Association for Student Teaching, Evaluating Student Teaching, Thirty-Ninth Yearbook, 1960 (Cedar Falls, Iowa: Iowa State Teachers College, 1960).

teaching. Some broad principles are presented by Boykin. They are:

1. The evaluation of student teaching must be based upon and function within a democratic philosophy of education.
2. The evaluation of student teaching should be made within a behavioral frame of reference.
3. In evaluating student teaching the objectives should be defined and stated in terms of the kinds of behavior expected to be realized.
4. The methods, procedures, and techniques used in appraising the work of the student teacher should be sufficiently diagnostic to enable the student teacher to identify the various stages of growth and progress involved in learning to teach.
5. Evaluation of student teaching should be conceived as an integral part of all learning, to be engaged in cooperatively by the student teacher, the supervising teacher, and the pupils.
6. The evaluation of student teaching should lead to a better understanding of growth and development and its relationship to developmental tasks and learning.
7. The evaluation of the student teacher's performance should lead to a more realistic understanding and acceptance of "self" and to the development of a positive approach to teaching, learning, and living.
8. The evaluation of the student teacher can be educative only to the extent that it reconstructs the group experiences which the student teacher brings with him to the student teaching situation.
9. The evaluation of student teaching is broader than measurement and requires the use of both quantitative and qualitative data.
10. The mere description of the characteristics of a "good teacher" is insufficient for evaluating teaching competencies needed in a democratic social order.
11. The evaluation of student teaching is comprehensive, continuous, and leads to improvement in the total program of teacher education.[30]

A word of praise must be given to the Ohio Teaching Record developed at Ohio State University in 1939. Beecher has this to say:

There is no question about the Ohio Teaching Record being a major contribution to educational thinking in this field

---

[30] Ibid., pp. 9-22.

> of teaching efficiency and self-evaluation. That it does not solve the problem of obtaining objective measurements of this efficiency in no way discounts the extent to which it serves its intended purpose. Perhaps its most significant effect has been to guide thinking away from measurement, in its former narrow sense, to evaluation in its currently accepted meaning as intimately associated with learning and growth of the individual teacher.[31]

As the development of evaluation instruments is traced it is important to note that:

> Instruments used for evaluation purposes vary in kind and extent of use. Such instruments as rating scales, diaries, logs, records of scholastic achievement, personal data records, anecdotal records, observation forms, and questionnaires reportedly yield evaluative data. How should these data be interpreted and appraised? Theoretically, personal interviews, individual and group conferences, and seminars provide means for evaluating, but evidence is not available from high quality research to show what values are derived from these procedures.[32]

In the literature reviewed the writer did not find anyone setting forth the objectives of a specific program of student teaching according to the Tyler rationale. However, there is indication from the various studies that the task of pulling together the multiple facets of a student teaching program is Gargantuan. It includes what goes on in the practice school off-campus, as well as in the seminars and counseling program at the college or university.

This study is different from those described in the following ways: (1) the writer designed and produced the rating scale

---

[31]Dwight E. Beecher, The Evaluation of Teaching (Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1945), p. 22.

[32]Lois C. Blair, "A Supervising Teacher Looks at the Functions of Evaluation in Student Teaching," Thirty-Ninth Yearbook, 1960, Association for Student Teaching.

based on a structural program of student teaching and used it to evaluate the performance of a selected group of students; (2) three different types of raters--(a) the cooperating teachers, (b) the college counselors, and (c) the student teachers themselves--rated the same group; (3) scores on entrance examinations, ACE or SCAT, the Cooperative English Test, and on a mathematics placement test, as well as cumulative grade point averages and final grades in student teaching represent additional data; (4) the writer synthesized into a two-dimensional chart fifteen objectives of the student teaching program at Chicago Teachers College South.

In the program of student teaching at Chicago Teachers College South the role of the student teacher is mirrored in multiple relationships. Study of the two-dimensional chart suggests the multidimensionality of the objectives.[33] This program includes what goes on in the off-campus cooperating schools, as well as in the seminars and counseling program at the college.

---

[33]See Appendix I for Two-Dimensional Chart.

CHAPTER III

METHODS OF PROCEDURE AND SOURCES OF DATA

The purpose of this study is to appraise the performance of a selected group of student teachers in off-campus Chicago Public Elementary Schools assigned to do their student teaching in grades 3 through 8 for one semester dating from February through June, 1962; to determine the degree of relationship between entering scores and success in student teaching; to appraise objectives of the student teaching program; and to improve two-way communication between the cooperating schools and the college.

The principal method used for collecting evaluative data is a descriptive rating scale. Patterns of treatment follow the designs described in Lindquist.[1] The causal-comparative method of research is used in this investigation. This method is defined thus:

> The causal-comparative method of research seeks to establish causal relationships by comparing the circumstances associated with observed effects and by noting the factors present in those instances in which a given effect occurs or does not occur.[2]

The research involves ninety-nine student teachers assigned to forty-nine off-campus Chicago Public Elementary Schools.

---

[1] E. F. Lindquist, Design and Analysis of Experiments in Psychology and Education (New York, 1953), pp. 1-304.

[2] Carter V. Good, A. S. Barr, and Douglas E. Scates, The Methodology of Educational Research (New York, 1941), p. 533.

Each student teacher was rated a total of forty times; twenty times by cooperating teachers, ten times by counselors, and ten times by himself. The sample of ninety-nine students received approximately 1980 ratings from cooperating teachers, 990 ratings from the counselors, and 990 ratings from the student teachers themselves, bringing the total number of ratings to approximately 3960 item responses.

The instrument used in this study was designed by the writer and completed in April, 1962. It consists of ten broad areas to be rated in terms of three levels of performance which are designated as Excellent, Satisfactory, and Unsatisfactory. Levels of performance for each broad area are spelled out concisely and specifically. The areas included in the rating scale are the following:

1. Classroom Management
2. Discipline
3. Motivation
4. Curriculum
5. Personal Social Adjustment
6. Planning
7. Procedures
8. Teaching
9. Records
10. Responsibility

At the top of the first page of the rating scale the following information appears:

Your cooperation in completing a copy of the attached evaluating form for each student teacher is greatly appreciated.

Directions:

1. Each broad area to be rated includes three levels of performance: Excellent - (E); Satisfactory - (S); Unsatisfactory - (U).

2. A brief descriptive statement is included for each level of performance for each item.

3. Please read through the list, item by item, recording your rating for each by marking an "X" in the appropriate space in the right-hand column.

4. Each cooperating teacher please rate each individual student independently.

5. Please return to the Department of Student Teaching by June 8, 1962.[3]

Stapled to the rating form was a half-sheet giving identifying information about the name of the student, grade, subject area, name of the cooperating school, date, name of the cooperating teacher, and name or signature of the principal.

These were then mailed with a cover letter to the cooperating schools with a self-addressed, stamped envelope enclosed for the return of the descriptive rating scale.[4]

Two counselors as well as the writer constituted the three raters from the Department of Student Teaching, who rated the students in their respective seminars.

The student teachers themselves composed the third group of raters. In addition to checking the descriptive rating scales

---

[3]See Appendix II for Rating Scale for Student Teachers.

[4]See Appendix III for cover letter sent to principals of cooperating schools.

they also filled out a Personal Data Sheet.[5]

To facilitate collating and analyzing data the rating scale was produced in three different colors: white was used by the cooperating teachers, yellow by the counselors of the Student Teaching Department, and pink by the student teachers.

On the right of each item is a space for the rater to place an "X" in the appropriate space for E (Excellent), S (Satisfactory), or U (Unsatisfactory).

Many factors were considered before the final product was decided upon. The writer and the Advisory Board agreed that the instrument should be designed to measure ten broad areas in terms of three levels of performance and this should not be in excess of two pages. These ratings were intended to be gross discriminations of the performance of student teachers selected for this study. A look at the multidimensionality of the objectives of the student teaching program made it necessary to design a functional instrument with a clear, concise, comprehensive, and yet simple approach.

The selected group of student teachers consisted of twenty-two male students and seventy-seven female students. The range in ages was from twenty to forty-one, with the greatest number in the age group from twenty to twenty-two. Forty-six, or 46.46 per cent, of the group fell in the age range of twenty to twenty-two; twenty-six, or 26.26 per cent, were in the age range of twenty-three to

---

[5]See Appendix IV for Personal Data Sheet filled in by student teachers.

twenty-eight; sixteen, or 16.16 per cent, were between the ages of twenty-nine and thirty-one; and eleven, or 11.11 per cent, were between thirty-two and forty-one. The total picture of this distribution is shown in Table I.

TABLE I

AGE DISTRIBUTION OF NINETY-NINE STUDENT TEACHERS

Ages	Number of Students		
	Male	Female	Total
20-22	4	42	46
23-25	5	9	14
26-28	6	6	12
29-31	7	9	16
32-34	..	3	3
35-37	..	1	1
38-40	..	6	6
41-43	..	1	1

Educational backgrounds of the student teachers are shown in Table II. In this sample forty-eight students were transfer

TABLE II

EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUNDS OF THE STUDENT TEACHERS

Elementary		High School		College	
Kind	No.	Kind	No.	Kind	No.
Chgo. Parochial	31	Chgo. Parochial	27	Transfer	48
Chgo. Public	61	Chgo. Public	67	4-Year CTC	51
Ill. Suburban	1	Ill. Suburban	2		
Outside Illinois	6	Outside Illinois	3		

students and fifty-one were four year Chicago Teachers College stu-

dents. The forty-eight transfer students were twenty-nine who transferred from public junior colleges and nineteen from private colleges and private and state universities.

Seventy-seven students were enrolled as intermediate-upper grade student teachers and twenty-two as upper grade teaching majors. Sixty-two of the intermediate-upper grade group were "regular three through eight," eleven were physical education students, and four were library science. Twenty-two upper grade teaching majors consisted of three specialists in English, five in mathematics, four in social studies, two in science, seven in art, and one in home arts (see Table III).

TABLE III

ENROLLMENT IN UNDERGRADUATE TEACHER TRAINING PROGRAM

Grades 3-8		Upper Grade Teaching Major	
Kind	No.	Kind	No.
Regular	62	English	3
Physical Education	11	Mathematics	5
Library Science	4	Social Studies	4
		Science	2
		Art	7
		Home Arts	1
TOTALS	77		22

The Office of Examinations of Chicago Teachers College South has compiled statistical information in unpublished reports

on a semester basis. The writer had access to these reports as well as to data in the files. General information on interpretation of test results may be found at the beginning of each report. Prior to September, 1960 the test results should be interpreted in this way:

> For each of these examinations (Mathematics excepted) the percentile information is given. For each student a local percentile is given which shows how the student compares to others in the February class. For freshmen, a national percentile is also given which is in terms of a liberal arts group. As you know, a percentile is the given point on a 100 point scale which shows the student's place in a given group. The first student on the list is at the 37th percentile nationally on the Quantitative aspect of the American Council on Education--Psychological Test. This means she has done better than 37 per cent of the group and not so well as 63 per cent of the group.
>
> The figure in the column titled Mathematics is the percentage of problems correct. There are 74 problems in the Mathematics test.[6]

The report of September, 1960 gives this general information on the interpretation of test results:

> The available test information on freshmen and students with advanced standing admitted to Chicago Teachers College in September, 1960, will be found on the following pages.
> . . . . . .
>
> The scores of this test are presented in "bands" of percentiles which suggest the range in which the "true" score would fall. These "bands" thus keep us aware of the standard error contained in all test scores.
>
> These bands are quite useful not only because they suggest the fact that no test gives a "true" score and that every measurement contains a "standard error" but they also allow us to compare scores of students more intelligently. We all know that if two students achieve scores that differ slightly from each other, there may actually be no real difference in the performance of these two students. There are statistical techniques, however, that allow us to esti-

[6] R. B. Kirk, "Guidance Test Results" (unpublished report, Office of Examinations, Chicago Teachers College, February, 1958), Preface.

> mate the chances that a true difference exists, but we find that most people do not take time to estimate the odds and often conclude that one student is superior to another on the basis of test scores when, in fact, a true difference cannot be demonstrated. In presenting our scores in "bands" we have done the work for you.[7]

Available test information on freshmen admitted to Chicago Teachers College South shows that there are scores on a psychological examination and tests in English amd mathematics. Prior to February, 1960 the American Council on Education--Psychological Examination (ACE) was used exclusively. Beginning September, 1960 the School and College Ability Test (SCAT) was administered exclusively.

During the changeover in February, 1960 from the American Council on Education--Psychological Examination (ACE) to the School and College Ability Test (SCAT), the report on Guidance Test Results for February, 1960[8] presents scores for both ACE and SCAT.

Table IV presents the ACE scores for seventy-eight student teachers. The highest national percentile was ninety-seven and the lowest was four. There were no scores recorded for seven students due to changes in testing program and personnel. The remaining fourteen students have SCAT scores. They were transfer students, as indicated in Table V.

---

[7] T. J. Stolarz, "Guidance Test Results" (unpublished report, Office of Examinations, Chicago Teachers College, September, 1960), Preface, p. i.

[8] Ibid.

TABLE IV

ACE SCORES FOR SEVENTY-EIGHT STUDENT TEACHERS

National Percentile Scores	Number of Student Teachers
0-5	1
6-10	2
11-15	2
16-20	7
21-25	4
26-30	2
31-35	7
36-40	4
41-45	4
46-50	4
51-55	7
56-60	2
61-65	3
66-70	5
71-75	5
76-80	4
81-85	5
86-90	5
91-95	3
96-	2
	78[a]

[a]99 students participated in the entire study, but ACE scores were available for only 78. Due to changes in testing program and personnel, 7 students have no ACE scores recorded. 14 transfer students have SCAT bands which may be found in the following table.

Analysis of the data used in this study shows that there has been consistent use through 1960 of the Cooperative English Test, which reports scores in two sections as shown in Table VI.

TABLE V

SCAT SCORES FOR FOURTEEN TRANSFER STUDENTS

Percentile Bands	Year	Number of Students
97-99	9/60	1
93-96	9/60	1
92-94	2/61	1
89-93	9/60	1
87-92	2/61	1
84-89	9/60	2
80-87	9/60	1
68-80	9/60	1
62-74	9/60	2
48-62	9/60	1
42-55	9/60	1
20-28	9/60	1

Table VI shows that the highest national percentile in the Reading Test Total was ninety-eight and the lowest was six; the highest national percentile in Mechanics of Expression was ninety-six and the lowest was one.

In past years local percentiles were also calculated and entered for each student. This practice was discontinued this year.[9]

The Mathematics placement test consisted of 74 problems in each report of Guidance Test Results. See Table VII for local percentile scores.

The Undergraduate Catalog for 1961-63 explains cumulative grade point averages (G.P.A.) in the following way:

---

[9] Ibid., Preface, p. ii.

TABLE VI

COOPERATIVE ENGLISH TEST SCORES FOR EIGHTY-THREE STUDENT TEACHERS

National Percentile Scores	Number of Students	
	Reading Test Total	Mechanics of Expression
0-5	0	6
6-10	3	10
11-15	3	6
16-20	7	1
21-25	2	2
26-30	8	8
31-35	0	2
36-40	8	2
41-45	4	2
46-50	4	5
51-55	9	6
56-60	8	5
61-65	1	6
66-70	3	1
71-75	7	4
76-80	2	8
81-85	9	3
86-90	3	2
91-95	2	3
96-	1	1
Totals	83[a]	83[a]

[a]99 students participated in the entire study, but Cooperative English Test scores were available for only 83. Due to changes in testing program and personnel, 16 students have no scores recorded.

Unit of Credit

The unit of credit is the credit hour. A credit hour consists of the equivalent of one fifty-minute lecture or discussion period, or two laboratory periods, per week for twenty weeks.

Marking System

Letter grades are given; their values in grade points are:

Letter Grade	Grade Points Per Credit Hour
A	6.0
B	4.0
C	2.0
D	0.0
F (failure)	-2.0

Given in lieu of letter grades under certain circumstances are: Withdrew, Withdrew/Passing, Withdrew/Failing, and Deferred Credit.[10]

TABLE VII

MATHEMATICS SCORES FOR EIGHTY STUDENT TEACHERS

Local Percentile Scores	Number of Student Teachers	Local Percentile Scores	Number of Student Teachers
0-5	0	51-55	10
6-10	0	56-60	4
11-15	0	61-65	4
16-20	3	66-70	5
21-25	1	71-75	6
26-30	4	76-80	2
31-35	9	81-85	4
36-40	7	86-90	2
41-45	5	91-95	3
46-50	8	96-	3
		Total	80[a]

[a]99 students participated in the entire study, but Mathematics scores were available for only 80; 19 have no Mathematics scores recorded. There were 74 problems in this test.

In the case of Education 223, Elementary Student Teaching, six hours of credit is given. Therefore, if a student teacher re-

[10]Chicago Teachers College Bulletin, General Announcements, Undergraduate Catalogue, 1961-1963 (Chicago, 1961), p. 30.

ceived a grade of "B" he would earn four grade points for each hour of credit. The formula for determining the number of grade points earned in this particular course is:

$$\text{Ed. 223 El.} = \frac{\text{Credit Hrs.}}{6} \times \frac{\text{Grade}}{\text{B (4)}} = \frac{\text{Grade Points}}{24.0}$$

To determine his cumulative grade point average, the student totals the number of grade points earned (Total One); totals the number of credit hours earned (Total Two); divides Total One by Total Two, to arrive at his cumulative grade point average (G.P.A.).

$$\begin{matrix}\text{Total One} \\ \text{(Total Grade Points}\end{matrix} \div \begin{matrix}\text{Total Two} \\ \text{(Total Credit Hours}\end{matrix} = \begin{matrix}\text{Grade Point Average} \\ \text{(G.P.A.).}\end{matrix}$$

The range of cumulative grade point averages (G.P.A.'s) used in this study is from 2.5 to 5.8, and the median GPA for this sample of 99 student teachers at the time of beginning student teaching is 3.8 (see Table VIII).

TABLE VIII

RANGE IN GRADE POINT AVERAGES

Cumulative Grade Point Averages	Number of Student Teachers	Cumulative Grade Point Averages	Number of Student Teachers
2.5	12	4.2	1
2.6	2	4.3	1
2.7	4	4.4	4
2.8	1	4.5	4
2.9	5	4.6	0
3.0	5	4.7	1
3.1	2	4.8	3
3.2	3	4.9	2
3.3	1	5.0	1
3.4	1	5.1	1
3.5	6	5.2	3
3.6	0	5.3	3
3.7	6	5.4	0
3.8	7	5.5	1
3.9	5	5.6	1
4.0	11	5.7	0
4.1	1	5.8	1

Table IX shows the distribution of grade point averages.

TABLE IX

CUMULATIVE GRADE POINT AVERAGE DISTRIBUTION

Cumulative Grade Point Averages	Number of Student Teachers
2.5-2.99	24
3.0-3.99	36
4.0-4.99	28
5.0-5.99	11

Final grades which the students received upon completion of student teaching are used in this study. See Chapter V, Tables XLII, XLIII, and XLIX.

Students at Chicago Teachers College South who are in their graduating semester have the opportunity to take for the first time the Certification Examination in Grades 3-8 for elementary teachers in Chicago Public Schools. Some students took advantage of this opportunity and their success or failure is indicated in this study. The students themselves shared the results with their counselors, and the counselors reported the results to the writer.

Of ninety-nine student teachers, sixty-five were eligible and made the choice to take the Certification Examination for Elementary Teachers, Grades 3-8. Of the sixty-five who took it for the first time, fifty-nine were successful in both the written and the oral parts. Ninety-one per cent passed. One student passed the written but failed the oral part. Five students failed the

written part. These results are shown in the following table.

TABLE X

RESULTS OF CERTIFICATION EXAMINATION TAKEN BY SIXTY-FIVE STUDENT TEACHERS FOR ELEMENTARY TEACHER CERTIFICATE GRADES 3-8

Passed Examination		Failed Examination	
Successful in Written and Oral Parts	Successful in Written Part Only	Failed Oral Part	Failed Written Part
59	1	1	5

This study was made during the semester dating from February through June, 1962. It consists of a group of ninety-nine student teachers assigned to forty-nine off-campus Chicago Public Elementary Schools who did their student teaching in grades three through eight for one semester, either as upper grade teaching majors or as intermediate-upper grade students.

One hundred four students were included in the program at the start of the semester dating from February through June, 1962. Four students withdrew failing from the program and one was a deferred credit student (held over from the previous semester) who terminated work in April. This provided ninety-nine cases for the study who were followed throughout the term of the research.

CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS OF ITEM RESPONSES TO THE DESCRIPTIVE RATING SCALE

The previous chapters have described the problem of investigation, outlined the structured program of student teaching at Chicago Teachers College South, reviewed the literature in the field, and presented an overview of methods of procedure and sources of data. This chapter deals with tabulation, categorization, comparison, analysis, and synthesis of item responses to the descriptive rating scale.

Data for this study were collected during the semester February through June, 1962. The sample for this study was tailor-made with respect to the fact that it was confined to student teachers assigned to forty-nine off-campus Chicago Public Elementary Schools who did their student teaching in grades three through eight for one semester, either as upper grade teaching majors or as intermediate-upper grade students. The original number of students who enrolled for this particular semester was one hundred and four, but four students withdrew failing from the program and one was a hold-over from the previous semester who is referred to as a deferred credit student and who terminated her student teaching in April of 1962. A total of ninety-nine students continued throughout the semester's program and are included in the study.

Tabulations of responses to ten rating areas appearing on the evaluation instrument fall into four categories of raters. Since each student teacher was assigned to teach at two different grade levels, there are two groups of cooperating teachers who participated as raters. The teachers who rated students at their lower grade level experience or in such specialization fields as physical education and library science are classified as Group A, cooperating teachers. Teachers who rated students at their higher level experience are classified as Group B, cooperating teachers; Group D is made up of the three college counselors from the Department of Student Teaching; and the ninety-nine student teachers themselves compose Group E. In each instance of rating, the same group of ninety-nine students was rated on the same evaluation instrument previously described in Chapter III.

GROUP A, COOPERATING TEACHERS

The rating of excellent made by Group A, cooperating teachers, reveals that it was given the greatest number of times in the area of records, including seventy-six students. The least number of times the rating of excellent was given was to forty-eight students in the area of teaching. The complete detail of the number of ratings given for each area is shown in Table XI.

TABLE XI

ANALYSIS OF RESPONSES MADE BY GROUP A, COOPERATING TEACHERS WHO RATED 99 STUDENT TEACHERS IN TERMS OF THE EVALUATION INSTRUMENT

Rating Areas Stated in Descending Order of Excellent	Number of Students Rated Excellent	Number of Students Rated Satisfactory	Number of Students Rated Unsatisfactory	No Response Given	Total Ratings by Areas
Records	76	21	1	1	98
Curriculum	75	21	2	1	98
Responsibility	74	24	1	0	99
Motivation	73	24	2	0	99
Personal Social Adjustment	70	28	1	0	99
Planning	67	31	1	0	99
Procedures	63	34	2	0	99
Classroom Management	61	37	1	0	99
Discipline	52	46	1	0	99
Teaching	48	49	1	1	98
Totals	659	315	13	3	987

Rating areas stated in descending order of satisfactory are shown in Table XII. The rating of satisfactory was given the greatest number of times to forty-nine students in the area of teaching. The least number of times the rating of satisfactory was given was to twenty-one students in the areas of records and curriculum.

Table XIII shows the descending order of areas in which students were rated unsatisfactory. Curriculum, motivation, and procedures show tabulations of two students rated unsatisfactory in each of these areas. The areas of records, responsibility, personal social adjustment, planning, classroom management, discipline, and teaching have one student rated unsatisfactory in each instance.

In Table XIV the responses made by Group A, cooperating teachers are indicated by levels of excellent, satisfactory, and unsatisfactory, and the number of students at each level is shown. Analysis of responses made by Group A, cooperating teachers showing levels of performance in per cent are presented in Table XV. The breakdown by levels showing percentage of total for each of the ten rating areas reveals that in the area of records 77.6 per cent of the students rated were excellent, 21.4 per cent were satisfactory, and 1.0 per cent were unsatisfactory. In curriculum 76.5 per cent were excellent, 21.4 per cent were satisfactory, and 2.0 per cent were unsatisfactory. In responsibility 74.7 per cent were excellent, 24.2 per cent were satisfactory, and 1.0 per cent were unsatisfactory. In motivation 73.7 per cent were excellent,

TABLE XII

ANALYSIS OF RESPONSES MADE BY GROUP A, COOPERATING TEACHERS SHOWING DESCENDING ORDER OF SATISFACTORY RATINGS

Rated Areas Stated in Descending Order of Satisfactory	Number of Students Rated Satisfactory	Number of Students Rated Excellent	Number of Students Rated Unsatisfactory	No Response Given	Total Ratings by Areas
Teaching	49	48	1	1	98
Discipline	46	52	1	0	99
Classroom Management	37	61	1	0	99
Procedures	34	63	2	0	99
Planning	31	67	1	0	99
Personal Social Adjustment	28	70	1	0	99
Responsibility	24	74	1	0	99
Motivation	24	73	2	0	99
Records	21	76	1	1	98
Curriculum	21	75	2	1	98
Totals	315	659	13	3	987

TABLE XIII

ANALYSIS OF RESPONSES MADE BY GROUP A, COOPERATING TEACHERS SHOWING DESCENDING ORDER OF UNSATISFACTORY RATINGS

Rating Areas Stated in Descending Order of Unsatisfactory	Number of Students Rated Unsatisfactory	Number of Students Rated Excellent	Number of Students Rated Satisfactory	No Response Given	Total Ratings by Areas
Curriculum	2	75	21	1	98
Motivation	2	73	24	0	99
Procedures	2	63	34	0	99
Records	1	76	21	1	98
Responsibility	1	74	24	0	99
Personal Social Adjustment	1	70	28	0	99
Planning	1	67	31	0	99
Classroom Management	1	61	37	0	99
Discipline	1	52	46	0	99
Teaching	1	48	49	1	98
Totals	13	659	315	3	987

24.2 per cent were satisfactory, and 2.0 per cent were unsatisfactory. In personal social adjustment 70.7 per cent were excellent, 28.3 per cent were satisfactory, and 1.0 per cent were unsatisfactory. In planning 67.7 per cent were excellent, 31.3 per cent were satisfactory, and 1.0 per cent were unsatisfactory. In procedures 63.6 per cent were excellent, 34.3 per cent were satisfactory, and 2.0 per cent were unsatisfactory. In classroom management 61.6 per cent were excellent, 37.4 per cent were satisfactory, and 1.0 per cent were unsatisfactory. In teaching 49.0 per cent were excellent, 50.0 per cent were satisfactory, and 1.0 per cent were unsatisfactory. In all ten areas the range in excellent performance stated in per cent was from 49.0 in teaching to 77.6 in records. The range in satisfactory performance was from 21.4 per cent in both records and curriculum to 50.0 per cent in teaching. The range in unsatisfactory performance was from 2.0 per cent in motivation, curriculum, and procedures to 1.0 per cent in classroom management, discipline, personal social adjustment, planning, teaching, records, and responsibility.

GROUP B, COOPERATING TEACHERS

Table XVI shows the rating areas in descending order of the level of excellent resulting from tabulation of ratings made by Group B, cooperating teachers. These responses represent ratings of student teachers in their higher grade level experience. The rating of excellent was given the greatest number of times to seventy-one student teachers in the area of curriculum. The

TABLE XIV

ANALYSIS OF RESPONSES MADE BY GROUP A, COOPERATING TEACHERS SHOWING NUMBER OF STUDENTS BY LEVELS INDICATED ON RATING SCALE

Levels	Classroom Management	Discipline	Motivation	Curriculum	Personal Social Adjustment	Planning	Procedure	Teaching	Records	Responsibility	Total Number
L_1 (Number of Total)	61	52	73	75	70	67	63	48	70	48	659
L_2 (Number of Total)	37	46	24	21	28	31	34	49	21	24	315
L_3 (Number of Total)	1	1	2	2	1	1	2	1	1	1	13
Number of Total	99	99	99	98	99	99	99	98	98	99	987
Number of No Response	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	3

Code: L_1 = Number of students rated excellent

L_2 = Number of students rated satisfactory

L_3 = Number of students rated unsatisfactory

TABLE XV

ANALYSIS OF RESPONSES MADE BY GROUP A, COOPERATING TEACHERS SHOWING LEVELS OF PERFORMANCE IN PER CENT

Levels	Classroom Management	Discipline	Motivation	Curriculum	Personal Social Adjustment	Planning	Procedures	Teaching	Records	Responsibility
L_1 (Percentage of Total)	61.6	52.5	73.7	76.5	70.7	67.7	63.6	49.0	77.6	74.7
L_2 (Percentage of Total)	37.4	46.5	24.2	21.4	28.3	31.3	34.3	50.0	21.4	24.2
L_3 (Percentage of Total)	1.0	1.0	2.0	2.0	1.0	1.0	2.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
Percentage of Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Code: L_1 = Percentage of Students Rated Excellent
L_2 = Percentage of Students Rated Satisfactory
L_3 = Percentage of Students Rated Unsatisfactory

least number of times the rating of excellent was given was to forty-three students in the area of discipline.

Table XVII shows the rating areas in descending order of satisfactory resulting from tabulation of ratings made by Group A, cooperating teachers. Students received the highest satisfactory rating in the area of discipline and the lowest in the area of curriculum. Table XVIII reveals that Group A, cooperating teachers gave the highest number of three unsatisfactory ratings in personal social adjustment, two in motivation, one unsatisfactory rating each in responsibility, planning, procedures, teaching, discipline, and no unsatisfactory ratings in curriculum, records, and classroom management.

In Table XIX the responses made by Group B, cooperating teachers are indicated by levels of excellent, satisfactory, and unsatisfactory and the number of students at each level is shown. Analysis of responses made by Group B, cooperating teachers showing levels of performance in per cent are shown in Table XX. Breakdown by levels showing percentage of the total for each of the ten rating areas reveals that in the area of curriculum 73.2 per cent of the students rated were excellent, 26.8 per cent were satisfactory, and 2.1 per cent were unsatisfactory. In records 69.1 per cent were excellent, 30.9 per cent were satisfactory, and 0.0 per cent was unsatisfactory. In personal social adjustment 68.0 per cent were excellent, 28.9 per cent were satisfactory, and 3.1 per cent were unsatisfactory. In motivation 67.0 per cent were excellent, 30.9 per cent were satisfactory, and 2.1 per cent

TABLE XVI

ANALYSIS OF RESPONSES MADE BY GROUP B, COOPERATING TEACHERS WHO RATED 99 STUDENT TEACHERS IN TERMS OF THE EVALUATION INSTRUMENT

Rates Areas Stated in Descending Order of Excellent	Number of Students Rated Excellent	Number of Students Rated Satisfactory	Number of Students Rated Unsatisfactory	No Response Given	Total Ratings by Areas
Curriculum	71	26	0	2	97
Records	67	30	0	2	97
Personal Social Adjustment	66	28	3	2	97
Motivation	65	30	2	2	97
Responsibility	61	35	1	2	97
Planning	58	38	1	2	97
Calssroom Management	58	39	0	2	97
Procedures	55	41	1	2	97
Teaching	46	50	1	2	97
Discipline	43	52	1	3	96
Totals	590	369	10	21	969

TABLE XVII

ANALYSIS OF RESPONSES MADE BY GROUP B, COOPERATING TEACHERS SHOWING DESCENDING ORDER OF SATISFACTORY RATINGS

Rating Areas Stated in Descending Order of Satisfactory	Number of Students Rated Satisfactory	Number of Students Rated Excellent	Number of Students Rated Unsatisfactory	No Response Given	Total Ratings by Areas
Discipline	52	43	1	3	96
Teaching	50	46	1	2	97
Procedures	41	55	1	2	97
Classroom Management	39	58	1	2	97
Planning	38	58	1	2	97
Responsibility	35	61	1	2	97
Records	30	67	0	2	97
Motivation	30	65	2	2	97
Personal Social Adjustment	28	66	3	2	97
Curriculum	26	71	0	2	97
Totals	369	590	10	21	969

TABLE XVIII

ANALYSIS OF RESPONSES MADE BY GROUP B, COOPERATING TEACHERS SHOWING DESCENDING ORDER OF UNSATISFACTORY RATINGS

Rating Areas Stated in Descending Order of Unsatisfactory	Number of Students Rated Unsatisfactory	Number of Students Rated Excellent	Number of Students Rated Satisfactory	No Response Given	Total Ratings by Areas
Personal Social Adjustment	3	66	28	2	97
Motivation	2	65	30	2	97
Responsibility	1	61	35	2	97
Planning	1	58	38	2	97
Procedures	1	55	41	2	97
Teaching	1	46	50	2	97
Discipline	1	43	52	3	96
Curriculum	0	71	26	2	97
Records	0	67	30	2	97
Classroom Management	0	58	39	2	97
Totals	10	590	369	21	969

TABLE XIX

ANALYSIS OF RESPONSES MADE BY GROUP B, COOPERATING TEACHERS SHOWING NUMBER OF STUDENTS BY LEVELS INDICATED ON RATING SCALE

Levels	Classroom Management	Discipline	Motivation	Curriculum	Personal Social Adjustment	Planning	Procedures	Teaching	Records	Responsi-bility	Total Number
L_1 (Number of Total)	58	43	65	71	66	58	55	46	67	61	590
L_2 (Number of Total)	39	52	30	26	28	38	41	50	30	35	369
L_3 (Number of Total)	0	1	2	0	3	1	1	1	0	1	10
Number of Total	97	97	97	97	97	97	97	97	97	97	969
Number of No Response	2	3	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	21

Code: L_1 = Number of students rated excellent

L_2 = Number of students rated satisfactory

L_3 = Number of students rated unsatisfactory

TABLE XX

ANALYSIS OF RESPONSES MADE BY GROUP B, COOPERATING TEACHERS SHOWING LEVELS OF PERFORMANCE IN PER CENT

Levels	Classroom Management	Discipline	Motivation	Curriculum	Personal Social Adjustment	Planning	Procedures	Teaching	Records	Responsibility
L_1 (Percentage of Total)	59.8	44.8	67.0	73.2	68.0	59.8	56.7	47.4	69.1	62.9
L_2 (Percentage of Total)	40.2	54.2	30.9	26.8	28.9	39.2	42.3	51.6	30.9	36.1
L_3 (Percentage of Total)	0.0	1.0	2.1	0.0	3.1	1.0	1.0	1.0	0.0	1.0
Percentage of Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Code: L_1 = Percentage of students rated excellent
L_2 = Percentage of students rated satisfactory
L_3 = Percentage of students rated unsatisfactory

were unsatisfactory. In responsibility 62.9 per cent were excellent, 36.1 per cent were satisfactory, and 1.0 per cent were unsatisfactory. In planning 59.8 per cent were excellent, 39.2 per cent were satisfactory, and 1.0 per cent were unsatisfactory. In classroom management 59.8 per cent were excellent, 40.2 per cent were satisfactory, and 0.0 per cent was unsatisfactory. In procedures 56.7 per cent were excellent, 42.3 per cent were satisfactory, and 1.0 per cent were unsatisfactory. In teaching 47.4 per cent were excellent, 51.6 per cent were satisfactory, and 1.0 per cent were unsatisfactory. In discipline 44.8 per cent were excellent, 54.2 per cent were satisfactory, and 1.0 per cent were unsatisfactory. In all ten areas the range in excellent performance stated in per cent was from 44.8 in discipline to 73.2 in curriculum. The range in satisfactory performance was from 26.8 per cent in curriculum to 54.2 per cent in discipline. The range in unsatisfactory performance was from 3.1 per cent in personal social adjustment to 0.0 per cent in classroom management, curriculum, and records. Tables XXXVI, XXXVII, and XXXVIII show differences in ratings between Group A, and Group B, cooperating teachers.

COMBINED RESPONSES OF GROUP A, AND GROUP B, COOPERATING TEACHERS

Combined responses made by Group A, and Group B, cooperating teachers may be found in Tables XXI, XXII, XXIII, XXIV, and XXV. Table XXI lists the descending order of rating areas in terms of excellent in this way: one hundred forty-six students were rated excellent in the area of curriculum, one hundred forty-

TABLE XXI

ANALYSIS OF COMBINED RESPONSES MADE BY GROUP A, AND GROUP B, COOPERATING TEACHERS WHO RATED 99 STUDENT TEACHERS IN TERMS OF THE EVALUATION INSTRUMENT

Rating Areas Stated in Descending Order of Excellent	Number of Students Rated Excellent	Number of Students Rated Satisfactory	Number of Students Rated Unsatisfactory	No Response Given	Total Ratings by Areas
Curriculum	146	47	2	3	195
Records	143	51	1	3	195
Motivation	138	54	4	2	196
Personal Social Adjustment	136	56	4	2	196
Responsibility	135	59	2	2	196
Planning	125	69	2	2	196
Classroom Management	119	76	1	2	196
Procedures	118	75	3	2	196
Discipline	95	98	2	3	195
Teaching	94	99	2	3	195
Totals	1249	684	23	24	1956

three were rated in the area of records, one hundred thirty-eight were rated excellent in motivation, one hundred thirty-six were rated in personal social adjustment, thirty-five were rated in responsibility, one hundred twenty-five were rated in planning, one hundred nineteen were rated in classroom management, one hundred eighteen were rated in procedures, ninety-five were rated in discipline, and ninety-four were rated in teaching.

Combined responses of Group A, and Group B, in descending order are listed in Table XXII showing that satisfactory ratings fall into the following sequence: ninety-nine students were rated satisfactory in teaching, ninety-eight in discipline, seventy-six in classroom management, seventy-five in procedures, sixty-nine in planning, fifty-nine in responsibility, fifty-six in personal social adjustment, fifty-four in motivation, fifty-one in records, and forty-seven in curriculum.

Listed in descending order of unsatisfactory are the combined ratings of Group A, and Group B, cooperating teachers in Table XXIII. They line up in the following way: four students were rated unsatisfactory in motivation and personal social adjustment; three in the area of procedures; two students were rated unsatisfactory in each of the areas of curriculum, responsibility, planning, discipline, and teaching; and one student in each of the areas of records and classroom management.

In Table XXIV the combined responses made by Group A, and Group B, cooperating teachers are indicated by levels of excellent, satisfactory, and unsatisfactory, and the number of ratings

TABLE XXII

ANALYSIS OF COMBINED RESPONSES MADE BY GROUP A, AND GROUP B, COOPERATING TEACHERS SHOWING DESCENDING ORDER OF SATISFACTORY RATINGS

Rating Areas Stated in Descending Order of Satisfactory	Number of Students Rated Satisfactory	Number of Students Rated Excellent	Number of Students Rated Unsatisfactory	No Response Given	Total Ratings by Areas
Teaching	99	94	2	3	195
Discipline	98	95	2	3	195
Classroom Management	76	119	1	2	196
Procedures	75	118	3	2	196
Planning	69	125	2	2	196
Responsibility	59	135	2	2	196
Personal Social Adjustment	56	136	4	2	196
Motivation	54	138	4	2	196
Records	51	143	1	3	195
Curriculum	47	146	2	3	195
Totals	684	1249	23	24	1956

TABLE XXIII

ANALYSIS OF COMBINED RESPONSES MADE BY GROUP A, AND GROUP B, COOPERATING TEACHERS SHOWING DESCENDING ORDER OF UNSATISFACTORY RATINGS

Rating Areas Stated in Descending Order of Unsatisfactory	Number of Students Rated Unsatisfactory	Number of Students Rated Excellent	Number of Students Rated Satisfactory	No Response Given	Total Ratings by Areas
Motivation	4	138	54	2	196
Personal Social Adjustment	4	136	56	2	196
Procedures	3	118	75	2	196
Curriculum	2	146	47	3	195
Responsibility	2	135	59	2	196
Planning	2	125	69	2	196
Discipline	2	95	98	3	195
Teaching	2	94	99	3	195
Records	1	143	51	3	195
Classroom Management	1	119	76	2	196
Totals	23	1249	684	24	1956

TABLE XXIV

ANALYSIS OF COMBINED RESPONSES MADE BY GROUP A, AND GROUP B, COOPERATING TEACHERS SHOWING NUMBER OF RATINGS BY LEVELS INDICATED ON EVALUATION INSTRUMENT

Levels	Classroom Management	Discipline	Motivation	Curriculum	Personal Social Adjustment	Planning	Procedures	Teaching	Records	Responsibility	Total Number
L_1 (Number of Total)	119	95	138	146	136	125	118	94	143	135	1249
L_2 (Number of Total)	76	98	54	47	56	69	75	99	51	59	684
L_3 (Number of Total)	1	2	4	2	4	2	3	2	1	2	23
Number of Total Responses	196	195	196	195	196	196	196	195	195	196	1956
Number of No Response	2	3	2	3	2	2	2	3	3	2	24

Code: L_1 = Number of students rated excellent
L_2 = Number of students rated satisfactory
L_3 = Number of students rated unsatisfactory

at each level is shown. In Table XXV analysis of combined responses made by Group A, and Group B, cooperating teachers shows levels of performance in per cent. Breakdown by levels showing percentage of the total for each of the ten rating areas reveals that in the area of curriculum 74.9 per cent of the students were rated excellent, 24.1 per cent were satisfactory, and 1.0 per cent were unsatisfactory. In records, there were 73.3 per cent of the students rated excellent, 26.2 per cent rated satisfactory, and 0.5 per cent unsatisfactory. In motivation there were 70.4 per cent rated excellent, 27.6 per cent satisfactory, and 2.0 per cent unsatisfactory. In personal social adjustment there were 69.4 per cent rated excellent, 28.6 per cent satisfactory, and 2.0 per cent unsatisfactory. In responsibility there were 68.9 per cent rated excellent, 30.1 per cent satisfactory, and 1.0 per cent unsatisfactory. In planning there were 63.8 per cent rated excellent, 35.2 per cent satisfactory, and 1.0 per cent unsatisfactory. In classroom management there were 60.7 per cent rated excellent, 38.8 per cent satisfactory, and 0.5 per cent unsatisfactory. In procedures there were 60.2 per cent rated excellent, 38.3 per cent satisfactory, and 1.5 per cent rated excellent.

In discipline there were 48.7 per cent rated excellent, 50.3 per cent satisfactory, and 1.0 per cent unsatisfactory. In teaching there were 48.2 per cent rated excellent, 50.8 per cent satisfactory, and 1.0 per cent unsatisfactory.

TABLE XXV

ANALYSIS OF RESPONSES MADE BY GROUP A, AND GROUP B, COOPERATING TEACHERS SHOWING LEVELS OF PERFORMANCE IN PER CENT

Levels	Classroom Management	Discipline	Motivation	Curriculum	Personal Social Adjustment	Planning	Procedures	Teaching	Records	Responsibility
L_1 (Percentage of Total)	60.7	48.7	70.4	74.9	69.4	63.8	60.2	48.2	73.3	68.9
L_2 (Percentage of Total)	38.8	50.3	27.6	24.1	28.6	35.2	38.3	50.8	26.2	30.1
L_3 (Percentage of Total)	.5	1.0	2.0	1.0	2.0	1.0	1.5	1.0	.5	1.0
Percentage of Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Code: L_1 = Percentage of students rated excellent
L_2 = Percentage of students rated satisfactory
L_3 = Percentage of students rated unsatisfactory

RESPONSES OF GROUP D, COLLEGE COUNSELORS

The responses made by the college counselors are a composite rating of the total performance of each student at both grade levels. There were three counselors who rated ninety-nine student teachers. The first thirty-four students were rated by counselor X; students thirty-five through sixty-six were rated by counselor Y; and students sixty-seven through ninety-nine were rated by counselor Z. Table XXVI shows the rating areas in descending order of the level of excellent. The counselors gave students the highest rating in the area of records and the lowest in the area of discipline. Seventy-one students were rated excellent in records. Seventy students were rated excellent in the area of curriculum; sixty-five students were rated excellent in responsibility; forty-six were rated excellent in personal social adjustment; forty-three were rated excellent in motivation and forty-three were rated excellent in planning; forty-two were rated excellent in procedures; thirty-three were rated excellent in classroom management; twenty-seven were rated excellent in teaching; and twenty-four were rated excellent in teaching.

Rating areas stated in descending order of satisfactory are shown in Table XXVII. The rating of satisfactory was given the greatest number of times to seventy-four students in the area of discipline. The least number of times the rating of satisfactory was given was to twenty-six students in the area of records.

Table XXVIII shows the descending order of areas in which

TABLE XXVI

ANALYSIS OF RESPONSES MADE BY GROUP D, COUNSELORS WHO RATED 99 STUDENT TEACHERS IN TERMS OF THE EVALUATION INSTRUMENT

Rating Areas Stated in Descending Order of Excellent	Number of Students Rated Excellent	Number of Students Rated Satisfactory	Number of Students Rated Unsatisfactory	No Response Given	Total Ratings by Areas
Records	71	26	2	0	99
Curriculum	70	29	0	0	99
Responsibility	65	33	1	0	99
Personal Social Adjustment	46	45	8	0	99
Motivation	43	54	2	0	99
Planning	43	54	2	0	99
Procedures	42	56	1	0	99
Classroom Management	33	64	2	0	99
Teaching	27	70	2	0	99
Discipline	24	74	1	0	99
Totals	464	505	21	0	990

TABLE XXVII

ANALYSIS OF RESPONSES MADE BY GROUP D, COUNSELORS SHOWING DESCENDING ORDER OF SATISFACTORY RATINGS

Rating Areas Stated in Descending Order of Satisfactory	Number of Students Rated Satisfactory	Number of Students Rated Excellent	Number of Students Rated Unsatisfactory	No Response Given	Total Ratings by Areas
Discipline	74	24	1	0	99
Teaching	70	27	2	0	99
Classroom Management	64	33	2	0	99
Procedures	56	42	1	0	99
Planning	54	43	2	0	99
Motivation	54	43	2	0	99
Personal Social Adjustment	45	46	8	0	99
Responsibility	33	65	1	0	99
Curriculum	29	70	0	0	99
Records	26	71	2	0	99
Totals	505	464	21	0	990

TABLE XXVIII

ANALYSIS OF RESPONSES MADE BY GROUP D, COUNSELORS WHO RATED 99 STUDENT TEACHERS SHOWING DESCENDING ORDER OF UNSATISFACTORY RATINGS

Rating Areas Stated in Descending Order of Unsatisfactory	Number of Students Rated Unsatisfactory	Number of Students Rated Excellent	Number of Students Rated Satisfactory	No Response Given	Total Ratings by Areas
Personal Social Adjustment	8	46	45	0	99
Records	2	71	26	0	99
Motivation	2	43	54	0	99
Planning	2	43	54	0	99
Classroom Management	2	33	64	0	99
Teaching	2	27	70	0	99
Responsibility	1	65	33	0	99
Procedures	1	42	56	0	99
Discipline	1	24	74	0	99
Curriculum	0	70	29	0	99
Totals	21	464	505	0	990

students were rated unsatisfactory. The counselors rated eight students unsatisfactory in the area of personal social adjustment. Records, motivation, planning, classroom management, and teaching show tabulations of two students rated unsatisfactory in each of these areas. The areas of responsibility, procedures, and discipline reveal one student rated unsatisfactory in each item.

In Table XXIX the responses made by Group D, counselors are indicated by levels of excellent, satisfactory, and unsatisfactory, and the number of students at each level is shown. Analysis of responses made by the counselors showing levels of the student teachers' performance in per cent are presented in Table XXX. The breakdown by levels showing percentage of the total for each of the ten rating areas reveals that in the area of records 71.7 per cent of the students rated were excellent, 26.3 per cent were satisfactory, and 2.0 per cent were unsatisfactory. In curriculum 70.7 per cent were excellent, 29.3 per cent were satisfactory, and 0.0 per cent was unsatisfactory. In responsibility 65.7 per cent were excellent, 33.3 per cent were satisfactory, and 1.0 per cent were unsatisfactory. In personal social adjustment 46.5 per cent were excellent, 45.5 per cent were satisfactory, and 8.0 per cent were unsatisfactory. In motivation 43.4 per cent were excellent, 54.4 per cent were satisfactory, and 2.0 per cent were unsatisfactory. In planning 43.4 per cent were excellent, 54.5 per cent were satisfactory, and 2.0 per cent were unsatisfactory. In procedures 42.4 per cent were excellent, 56.6 per cent were satisfactory, and 1.0 per cent were unsatisfactory. In classroom manage-

TABLE XXIX

ANALYSIS OF RESPONSES MADE BY GROUP D, COUNSELORS SHOWING NUMBER OF STUDENTS BY LEVELS INDICATED ON RATING SCALE

Levels	Classroom Management	Discipline	Motivation	Curriculum	Personal Social Adjustment	Planning	Procedures	Teaching	Records	Responsibility	Total Number
L_1 (Number of Total)	33	24	43	70	46	43	42	27	71	65	464
L_2 (Number of Total)	64	74	54	29	45	54	56	70	26	33	505
L_3 (Number of Total)	2	1	2	0	8	2	1	2	2	1	21
Number of Total	99	99	99	99	99	99	99	99	99	99	990
Number of No Response	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Code: L_1 = Number of students rated excellent

L_2 = Number of students rated satisfactory

L_3 = Number of students rated unsatisfactory

TABLE XXX

ANALYSIS OF RESPONSES MADE BY GROUP D, COUNSELORS SHOWING LEVELS OF PERFORMANCE IN PER CENT

Levels	Classroom Management	Discipline	Motivation	Curriculum	Personal Social Adjustment	Planning	Procedures	Teaching	Records	Responsibility
L_1 (Percentage of Total)	33.3	24.2	43.4	70.7	46.5	43.4	42.4	27.3	71.7	65.7
L_2 (Percentage of Total)	64.6	74.7	54.5	29.3	45.5	54.5	56.6	70.7	26.3	33.3
L_3 (Percentage of Total)	2.0	1.0	2.0	0.0	8.0	2.0	1.0	2.0	2.0	1.0
Percentage of Total	99.9	99.9	99.9	100.0	100.0	99.9	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Code: L_1 = Percentage of students rated excellent
L_2 = Percentage of students rated satisfactory
L_3 = Percentage of students rated unsatisfactory

ment 33.3 per cent were excellent, 64.6 per cent were satisfactory, and 2.0 per cent were unsatisfactory. In teaching 27.3 per cent were excellent, 70.7 per cent were satisfactory, and 2.0 per cent were unsatisfactory. In discipline 24.2 per cent were excellent, 74.7 per cent were satisfactory, and 1.0 per cent were unsatisfactory.

RESPONSES OF GROUP E, 99 STUDENT TEACHERS

In the sample of ninety-nine student teachers each had the opportunity of rating himself. Each student teacher's response expressed a total evaluation of his performance in both grade levels. Table XXXI shows the rating areas in descending order of the level of excellent. They gave themselves the highest rating in the area of responsibility and discipline the lowest.

Rating areas stated in descending order of satisfactory are shown in Table XXXII. The rating of satisfactory was given the greatest number of times by fifty-eight students who rated themselves in the area of discipline. The least number of times the rating of satisfactory was given was by sixteen students who rated themselves in the area of personal social adjustment.

Table XXXIII shows the descending order of areas in which students were rated unsatisfactory. Two student teachers rated themselves unsatisfactory, one each in the areas of personal social adjustment and planning.

In Table XXXIV responses made by Group E, student teachers are indicated by levels of excellent, satisfactory, and unsatis-

TABLE XXXI

ANALYSIS OF RESPONSES MADE BY GROUP E, 99 STUDENT TEACHERS WHO RATED THEMSELVES IN TERMS OF THE EVALUATION INSTRUMENT

Rating Areas Stated in Descending Order of Excellent	Number of Students Rated Excellent	Number of Students Rated Satisfactory	Number of Students Rated Unsatisfactory	No Response Given	Total Ratings by Areas
Responsibility	85	14	0	0	99
Personal Social Adjustment	82	16	1	0	99
Curriculum	69	30	0	0	99
Records	68	31	0	0	99
Motivation	64	35	0	0	99
Procedures	52	47	0	0	99
Planning	52	46	1	0	99
Classroom Management	48	51	0	0	99
Teaching	43	55	0	1	98
Discipline	41	58	0	0	99
Totals	604	383	2	1	989

TABLE XXXII

ANALYSIS OF RESPONSES MADE BY GROUP E, STUDENT TEACHERS SHOWING DESCENDING ORDER OF SATISFACTORY RATINGS

Rating Areas Stated in Descending Order of Satisfactory	Number of Students Rated Satisfactory	Number of Students Rated Excellent	Number of Students Rated Unsatisfactory	No Response Given	Total Ratings by Areas
Discipline	58	41	0	0	99
Teaching	55	43	0	1	98
Classroom Management	51	48	0	0	99
Procedures	47	52	0	0	99
Planning	46	52	1	0	99
Motivation	35	64	0	0	99
Records	31	68	0	0	99
Curriculum	30	69	0	0	99
Personal Social Adjustment	16	82	1	0	99
Responsibility	14	85	0	0	99
Totals	383	604	2	1	989

TABLE XXXIII

ANALYSIS OF RESPONSES MADE BY GROUP E, STUDENT TEACHERS SHOWING DESCENDING ORDER OF UNSATISFACTORY RATINGS

Rating Areas Stated in Descending Order of Unsatisfactory	Number of Students Rated Unsatisfactory	Number of Students Rated Excellent	Number of Students Rated Satisfactory	No Response Given	Total Ratings by Areas
Personal Social Adjustment	1	82	16	0	99
Planning	1	52	46	0	99
Responsibility	0	85	14	0	99
Curriculum	0	69	30	0	99
Records	0	68	31	0	99
Motivation	0	64	35	0	99
Procedures	0	52	47	0	99
Classroom Management	0	48	51	0	99
Teaching	0	43	55	1	98
Discipline	0	41	58	0	99
Totals	2	604	383	1	989

TABLE XXXIV

ANALYSIS OF RESPONSES MADE BY GROUP E, 99 STUDENT TEACHERS WHO RATED THEMSELVES SHOWING NUMBER OF STUDENTS BY LEVELS INDICATED ON RATING SCALE

Levels	Classroom Management	Discipline	Motivation	Curriculum	Personal Social Adjustment	Planning	Procedures	Teaching	Records	Responsibility	Total Number
L_1 (Number of Total)	48	41	64	69	82	52	52	43	68	85	604
L_2 (Number of Total)	51	58	35	30	16	46	47	55	31	14	383
L_3 (Number of Total)	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	2
Number of Total	99	99	99	99	99	99	99	98	99	99	989
Number of No Response	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1

Code: L_1 = Percentage of students rated excellent

L_2 = Percentage of students rated satisfactory

L_3 = Percentage of students rated unsatisfactory

factory, and the number of students at each level is shown. Analysis of responses made by the student teachers showing their own levels of performance in per cent are presented in Table XXXV. The breakdown by levels showing percentage of the total for each of the ten rating areas reveals that in the area of responsibility 85.9 per cent of the student teachers rated themselves excellent, 14.1 per cent rated satisfactory, and 0.0 per cent rated unsatisfactory. In personal social adjustment 82.8 per cent rated excellent, 16.2 per cent rated satisfactory, and 1.0 per cent rated unsatisfactory. In curriculum 69.7 per cent rated excellent, 30.3 per cent rated satisfactory, and 0.0 per cent rated unsatisfactory. In records 68.7 per cent were excellent, 31.3 per cent were satisfactory, and 0.0 per cent was unsatisfactory. In motivation 64.6 per cent were excellent, 35.4 per cent were satisfactory, and 0.0 per cent was unsatisfactory. In procedures 52.5 per cent were excellent, 47.5 per cent were satisfactory, and 0.0 per cent was unsatisfactory. In planning 52.5 per cent were excellent, 46.5 per cent were satisfactory, and 1.0 per cent were unsatisfactory. In classroom management 48.5 per cent were excellent, 51.5 per cent were satisfactory, and 0.0 per cent was unsatisfactory. In teaching 43.9 per cent were excellent, 56.1 per cent were satisfactory, and 0.0 per cent was unsatisfactory. In discipline 41.4 per cent were excellent, 58.6 per cent were satisfactory, and 0.0 per cent was unsatisfactory.

Contrasts and comparisons of responses made by the different groups of raters may be seen in Tables XXXVI, XXXVIII, XXXVIII

TABLE XXXV

ANALYSIS OF RESPONSES MADE BY GROUP E, STUDENT TEACHERS WHO RATED THEMSELVES SHOWING LEVELS OF PERFORMANCE IN PER CENT

Levels	Classroom Management	Discipline	Motivation	Curriculum	Personal Social Adjustment	Planning	Procedures	Teaching	Records	Responsibility
L_1 (Percentage of Total)	48.5	41.4	64.6	69.7	82.8	52.5	52.5	43.9	68.7	85.9
L_2 (Percentage of Total)	51.5	58.6	35.4	30.3	16.2	46.5	47.5	56.1	31.3	14.1
L_3 (Percentage of Total)	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.0	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Percentage of Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Code: L_1 = Percentage of students rated excellent
L_2 = Percentage of students rated satisfactory
L_3 = Percentage of students rated unsatisfactory

TABLE XXXVI

SUMMARY OF RESPONSES MADE BY GROUP A, GROUP B, GROUP D, AND GROUP E, SHOWING NUMBER OF STUDENTS AND PER CENT IN TERMS OF PERFORMANCE AT THE LEVEL OF EXCELLENT (L_1)

Rating Area	Group A Cooperating Teachers		Group B Cooperating Teachers		Difference Between A and B		Group D Counselors		Group E Student Teachers		Difference Between D and E	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Classroom Management	61	61.6	58	59.8	3	1.8	33	33.3	48	48.5	-15	-15.2
Discipline	52	52.5	43	44.8	9	7.7	24	24.2	41	41.4	-17	-17.2
Motivation	73	73.7	65	67.0	8	6.7	43	43.4	64	64.6	-21	-21.2
Curriculum	75	76.5	71	73.2	4	3.3	70	70.7	69	69.7	1	1.0
Personal Social Adjustment	70	70.7	66	68.0	4	2.7	46	46.5	82	82.8	-36	-36.3
Planning	67	67.7	58	59.8	9	7.9	43	43.4	52	52.5	-9	-9.1
Procedures	63	63.6	55	56.7	8	6.9	42	42.4	52	52.5	-9	-9.1
Teaching	48	49.0	46	47.4	2	1.6	27	27.3	43	43.9	-16	-16.6
Records	76	77.6	67	69.1	9	8.5	71	71.7	68	68.7	3	3.0
Responsibility	74	74.7	61	62.9	13	11.8	65	65.7	85	85.9	-20	-20.2

TABLE XXXVII

SUMMARY OF RESPONSES MADE BY GROUP A, GROUP B, GROUP D, AND GROUP E, SHOWING NUMBER OF STUDENTS AND PER CENT IN TERMS OF PERFORMANCE AT THE LEVEL OF SATISFACTORY (L_2)

Rating Area	Group A Cooperating Teachers		Group B Cooperating Teachers		Difference Between A and B		Group D Counselors		Group E Student Teachers		Difference Between D and E	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Classroom Management	37	37.4	39	40.2	-2	-2.8	64	64.6	51	51.5	13	13.1
Discipline	46	46.5	52	54.2	-6	-7.7	74	74.7	58	58.6	16	16.1
Motivation	24	24.2	30	30.9	-6	-6.7	54	54.5	35	35.4	19	19.1
Curriculum	21	21.4	26	26.8	-5	-5.4	29	29.3	30	30.3	-1	-1.0
Personal Social Adjustment	28	28.3	28	28.9	0	-.6	45	45.5	16	16.2	29	29.3
Planning	31	31.3	38	39.2	-7	-7.9	54	54.5	46	46.5	8	8.0
Procedures	34	34.3	41	42.3	-7	-8.0	56	56.6	47	47.5	9	9.1
Teaching	49	50.0	50	51.6	-1	-1.6	70	70.7	55	56.1	15	14.6
Records	21	21.4	30	30.9	-9	-9.5	26	26.3	31	31.3	-5	-5.0
Responsibility	24	24.2	35	36.1	-11	-11.9	33	33.3	14	14.1	-19	-19.2

TABLE XXXVIII

SUMMARY OF RESPONSES MADE BY GROUP A, GROUP B, GROUP D, AND GROUP E, SHOWING NUMBER OF STUDENTS AND PER CENT IN TERMS OF PERFORMANCE AT LEVEL OF UNSATISFACTORY (L_3)

Rating Area	Group A Cooperating Teachers		Group B Cooperating Teachers		Difference Between A and B		Group D Counselors		Group E Student Teachers		Difference Between D and E	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Classroom Management	1	1.0	0	0.0	1	1.0	2	2.0	0	0.0	2	2.0
Discipline	1	1.0	1	1.0	0	0.0	1	1.0	0	0.0	1	1.0
Motivation	2	2.0	2	2.1	0	-0.1	2	2.0	0	0.0	2	2.0
Curriculum	2	2.0	0	0.0	2	2.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Personal Social Adjustment	1	1.0	3	3.1	-2	-2.1	8	8.0	1	1.0	7	7.0
Planning	1	1.0	1	1.0	0	0.0	2	2.0	1	1.0	1	1.0
Procedures	2	2.0	1	1.0	1	1.0	1	1.0	0	0.0	1	1.0
Teaching	1	1.0	1	1.0	0	0.0	2	2.0	0	0.0	2	2.0
Records	1	1.0	0	0.0	1	1.0	2	2.0	0	0.0	2	2.0
Responsibility	1	1.0	1	1.0	0	0.0	1	1.0	0	0.0	1	1.0

TABLE XXXIX

SUMMARY OF DIFFERENCES BETWEEN GROUPS SHOWING NUMBER OF STUDENTS AND PER CENT IN TERMS OF PERFORMANCE AT THE LEVEL OF EXCELLENT (L_1)

Rating Area	Differences Between A and D		Difference Between A and E		Difference Between B and D		Difference Between B and E	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Classroom Management	28	28.3	13	13.1	25	26.5	10	11.3
Discipline	28	28.3	11	11.1	19	20.6	11	11.1
Motivation	30	30.3	9	9.1	22	23.6	9	9.1
Curriculum	5	5.8	6	6.8	1	2.5	-12	-12.1
Personal Social Adjustment	24	24.2	-12	-12.1	20	21.5	-12	12.1
Planning	24	24.3	15	15.2	15	16.4	15	15.2
Procedures	21	21.2	11	11.1	13	14.3	11	11.1
Teaching	21	21.7	5	5.1	19	20.1	5	5.1
Records	5	5.9	5	5.9	-4	-2.6	8	8.9
Responsibility	9	9.0	8	8.9	-4	-2.8	-11	-11.2

TABLE XL

SUMMARY OF DIFFERENCES BETWEEN GROUPS SHOWING NUMBER OF STUDENTS AND PER CENT IN TERMS OF PERFORMANCE AT THE LEVEL OF SATISFACTORY (L_2)

Rating Area	Difference Between A and D		Difference Between A and E		Difference Between B and D		Difference Between B and E	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Classroom Management	-27	-27.2	-14	-14.1	-25	-24.4	-12	-11.3
Discipline	-32	-28.2	-12	-12.1	-28	-28.2	-6	-4.4
Motivation	-30	-30.3	-11	-11.2	-24	-23.6	-5	-4.5
Curriculum	-8	-7.9	-9	-8.9	-3	-2.5	-4	-3.5
Personal Social Adjustment	-17	-17.2	12	12.1	-17	-16.6	12	12.7
Planning	-23	-23.2	-15	-15.2	-23	-23.2	-8	-7.3
Procedures	-22	-22.3	-13	-13.2	-15	-14.3	-6	-5.2
Teaching	-21	-20.7	-6	-6.1	-20	-19.1	-5	-4.5
Records	-5	-4.9	-10	-9.9	4	4.6	4	4.6
Responsibility	-9	-9.1	-10	-10.1	2	2.8	21	22.0

TABLE XLI

SUMMARY OF DIFFERENCES BETWEEN GROUPS SHOWING NUMBER OF STUDENTS AND PER CENT IN TERMS OF PERFORMANCE AT THE LEVEL OF UNSATISFACTORY (L_3)

Rating Area	Difference Between A and D		Difference Between A and E		Difference Between B and D		Difference Between B and E	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Classroom Management	-1	-1.0	1	1.0	-2	-2.0	0	0.0
Discipline	0	0.0	1	1.0	0	0.0	1	1.0
Motivation	0	0.0	2	2.0	0	0.0	2	2.1
Curriculum	2	2.0	2	2.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Personal Social Adjustment	-7	-7.0	0	0.0	-5	-4.9	2	2.1
Planning	-1	-1.0	0	0.0	-1	-1.0	0	0.0
Procedures	1	1.0	2	2.0	0	0.0	1	1.0
Teaching	-1	-1.0	1	1.0	-1	-1.0	1	1.0
Records	-1	-1.0	1	1.0	-2	-2.0	0	0.0
Responsibility	0	0.0	1	1.0	0	0.0	1	1.0

XXXIX, XL, and XLI. Since this rating scale was designed to show tabulations of responses to ten rating areas in one of three levels of performance, no scores were intended in the use of this evaluation instrument. Analysis of variance in this case is presented in terms of differences in numbers of students and in percentage of the total which represent the responses of the different raters.

CHAPTER V

ANALYSIS OF PERFORMANCE

Analysis of performance of ninety-nine student teachers assigned to forty-nine off-campus Chicago Public Elementary Schools who did their student teaching in grades three through eight for one semester, either as upper grade teaching majors or as intermediate-upper grade students, reveals various kinds of information. As previously indicated in Chapter III, Table X, sixty-five student teachers were eligible and made the choice to take the Certification Examination for Elementary Teachers, Grades 3-8 during the last semester prior to graduation in June 1962. Of the sixty-five who took it, fifty-nine were successful in both the written and oral parts. One student passed the written but failed the oral. Five students failed the written part. According to the Circular of Information:

> A candidate to be successful in the written examination must attain an average of not less than 80 with a mark of not less than 75 in the major subject and no minor mark below 50.
>
> Only those candidates who are successful in the written part of the examination will be called for the non-written part of the examination. In the non-written part of the examination further consideration will be given to the candidate's character, scholarship and general fitness for the certificate.
>
> To be successful in the non-written examination, the candidate must receive a grade of not less than 80.
>
> The candidate's final grade on the examination as a whole will be the average of the non-written grade and the grade in the written part of the examination, each to be of equal weight. A candidate must receive a final grade on the examination as a whole of not less than 80 to be considered suc-

cessful in the examination as a whole.[1]

Results of students who were successful in both the written and oral parts of the Certification Examination are shown in Table XLII. The range in the total grade was from 90 to 81. One student received a total grade of 90, four students received 89, four students received 88, eight students received 87, seven received 86, seven received 85, 13 received 84, six received 83, three received 82, and three received 81. See Table XLV.

Results of students who were unsuccessful in either the written or oral part of the Certification Examination are shown in Table XLIII. In addition, Tables XLII and XLIII give such information as ACE, SCAT, English and mathematics scores, grade point averages, final grades, age, sex, transfer or four-year status for each student.

Table XLIV shows the distribution of total grades for fifty-nine students who were successful in both the written and oral parts of the Certification Examination.

The mean for this group is 84.86, the median 83.6, and the mode is 84. The standard deviation is 2.33.

Of the group of fifty-nine students who passed the Certification Examination, fifty had ACE national percentile scores. Using the Spearman Rank Difference Method of Correlation, the final grades in the certification examination for each of fifty students

---

[1] Circular of Information, Board of Examiners, Board of Education, Chicago Public Schools, City of Chicago, January, 1960, pp. 31-32.

TABLE

SUCCESSFUL RESULTS OF CERTIFICATION
TEACHERS, GRADES 3-8, TAKEN BY

Student No.	Written Part*	Oral Part*	Total Grade	Transfer	4-Yr. CTC	ACE Nat'l %ile	ACE Local %ile
45	95	85	90		x	86	96
41	96	82	89	x			
3	94	83	89	x		42	
82	92	85	89		x	96	99
52	91	87	89		x	66	86
46	92	84	88	x		75	88
40	91	84	88		x	81	93
39	91	85	88	x		92	
15	88	88	88	x		78	89
77	92	82	87	x		80	86
13	91	83	87	x		40	
80	91	83	87		x	53	70
73	90	84	87		x	64	82
30	89	85	87		x	52	68
28	89	85	87		x	56	74
68	89	85	87	x			
95	86	87	87		x	13	7
97	91	82	86	x		87	
5	90	82	86	x		97	99
7	90	81	86		x	67	80
85	89	83	86		x	62	81
54	88	83	86	x		49	
83	87	84	86		x	85	95
37	86	86	86		x	36	48
16	86	84	85	x		57	
49	86	83	85		x	78	93
34	88	81	85		x	88	96
33	87	83	85	x		71	78
23	85	84	85		x	31	39
8	85	84	85	x			
19	83	85	85		x	21	24
35	88	80	84		x	56	74
69	88	80	84		x	53	70
81	88	80	84	x			

XLII

EXAMINATION FOR ELEMENTARY
FIFTY-NINE STUDENT TEACHERS

SCAT Nat. Band	Read. Nat. %ile	Mech. Nat. %ile	Math Local %ile	G.P.A.	Final Grade Student Teaching	Final Grade Semi-nar	Sex	Age
	83	89	74	5.3	A		F	21
	91	54		5.2	A	B	F	31
				4.5	B		F	27
	98	72	39	4.0	B		F	20
	72	51	32	4.4	A	A	F	21
	85	60	34	3.3	C	C	F	22
	90	79	91	5.8	A	A	F	37
	83	84	91	4.2	C		F	21
	85	55	72	4.0	A		F	21
	87	76	39	4.8	B	A	F	26
	83	91	42	3.8	A	A	F	25
	64	95		4.0	C	B	F	22
	56	64	60	3.5	C	B	F	21
	80	55	37	4.4	A		M	21
	42	79	51	3.8	A	A	F	20
87-92	52			3.5	C	B	M	27
	10	8	47	3.5	C		F	22
				3.9	B	B	F	22
	93	51	76	5.3	B		F	22
	49	64	96	4.4	C	B	F	21
	49	47	53	3.2	B	C	F	22
89-93	49	82	68	4.9	B	B	F	40
	72	79		3.9	B		F	21
			42	4.3	A	A	F	30
48-62	38	47	32	4.0	B	A	F	21
	52	76	54	3.6	B	B	F	21
	52	43	61	3.7	B	B	F	21
	72	30	47	4.4	B	A	F	40
	30	30	51	3.9	A	A	F	21
	38	10	45	3.5	B	A	F	41
	20	17	18	3.5	A		F	21
	72	34	80	4.0	B		F	22
	72	38	60	3.2	B	B	F	21
93-96	60	38	91	4.8	B		M	25

TABLE XLII

Student No.	Written Part*	Oral Part*	Total Grade	Transfer	4-Yr. CTC	ACE Nat'l %ile	ACE Local %ile
70	87	81	84		x	85	95
48	86	82	84	x		35	34
90	86	82	84	x			
78	86	81	84	x			
62	86	81	84	x			
36	86	81	84	x			
1	85	83	84		x	36	48
31	84	84	84	x		74	87
71	84	83	84	x			
79	83	85	84		x	32	41
98	84	82	83		x	32	41
55	84	81	83		x	37	51
25	84	82	83		x	19	
88	83	83	83		x	69	89
32	82	86	83	x		94	97
86	82	84	83		x	27	33
53	84	80	82		x	53	70
9	84	80	82	x		20	
20	83	81	82		x	42	56
60	81	82	82		x	42	56
74	81	82	82	x		48	74
72	81	82	82		x	72	90
91	82	80	81		x	25	30
2	82	80	81	x		30	
99	80	82	81		x	16	17

(Continued)

SCAT Nat. Band	Read. Nat. %ile	Mech. Nat. %ile	Math Local %ile	G.P.A.	Final Grade Student Teaching	Final Grade Semi-nar	Sex	Age
	49	72	53	3.8	B		F	21
	27	14	96	3.7	C	C	M	28
	75	95	68	2.5	B		F	23
68-80	34	96	91	5.1	B	C	F	21
62-74	56	10	64	3.9	B	C	F	21
80-87	68	60	81	5.4	C	C	F	31
	27	23	49	3.5	B	A	F	21
	52	14	49	3.5	B	B	F	21
	23	34	50	3.4	B	A	F	23
	52	30	27	3.2	B	A	F	30
	60	68	55	2.8	B	B	F	22
				4.0	A	A	F	21
				3.1	B		F	22
	38	30		2.5	A		F	23
74-84	85	14	69	2.5	B	B	M	23
	20	47	72	3.5	B	C	F	21
	38	60	27	3.0	A	A	F	21
	38	64	39	2.5	C	A	M	30
	14	8	32	3.2	B	B	F	21
	27	7	28	2.9	B		F	21
	38	4	55	3.7	C	A	F	24
	52	64	82	2.5	C		F	22
	12	1	62	2.8	B	B	F	22
				3.8	C	A	M	28
	17	30	37	3.0	B		F	21

TABLE

FAILURE RESULTS OF CERTIFICATION TEACHERS, GRADES 3 - 8, TAKEN

Student No.	Written Part*	Oral Part*	Total Grade	Transfer	4-Yr. CTC	ACE Nat'l %ile	ACE Local %ile
18	90	76	Failed	x		87	95
38	79	None	Failed		x	9	1
66	76	None	Failed		x	24	
50	69	None	Failed		x	19	26
22	69	None	Failed	x		20	
24	59	None	Failed	x		4	1

*Must have a score of 80 in each part, oral and written.

XLIII

EXAMINATION FOR ELEMENTARY
BY SIX STUDENT TEACHERS

SCAT Nat. Band	Read. Nat. %ile	Mech. Nat. %ile	Math Local %ile	G.P.A.	Final Grade Student Teaching	Final Grade Semi-nar	Sex	Age
	23	23	82	4.0	B	B	M	27
	27		46	3.0	A	A	F	21
	17	2	20	2.6	B		F	22
	10	1	34	2.5	B		M	23
	20	7	23	2.6	B		F	29
14-20	20	3	16	2.7	D	B	F	30

were paired with the ACE national percentile scores which each student received at the time of entrance into Chicago Teachers College South. See Table XXXV. Using the Spearman formula, the Coefficient of Correlation, rho (ρ), equals +.38. This indicates

TABLE XLIV

DISTRIBUTION OF TOTAL GRADES FOR FIFTY-NINE STUDENTS WHO WERE SUCCESSFUL IN THE CERTIFICATION EXAMINATION

Total Grades	Mid-Points (Total Grades)	f	x'	fx'	fx'^{2}	cf
89.5-90.5	90	1	6	6	36	59
88.5-89.5	89	4	5	20	100	58
87.5-88.5	88	4	4	16	64	54
86.5-87.5	87	8	3	24	82	50
85.5-86.5	86	7	2	14	28	42
84.5-85.5	85	7	1	7	7	35
83.5-84.5	84	13	0	0	0	28
82.5-83.5	83	6	-1	-6	6	15
81.5-82.5	82	6	-2	-12	24	9
80.5-81.5	81	3	-3	-9	27	3
N = 59				$\Sigma fx' = 60$	$\Sigma fx'^2 = 374$	

a positive correlation which is low between total grades received on the certification examination and the ACE national percentile scores at the time of entrance into college. It is of interest to note that two students with ACE scores as low as sixteen and twenty received a total grade of eighty-one and eighty-two respectively on the certification examination. On the other hand, one student with an ACE score of 87 failed the oral part of the certification examination and five students with ACE scores of twenty-four, twenty, nineteen, nine, and four respectively failed the written.

TABLE XLV

SPEARMAN RANK DIFFERENCE METHOD OF CORRELATION BETWEEN CERTIFICATION TOTAL GRADES AND ACE SCORES FOR FIFTY STUDENT TEACHERS

Student No.	Certification	Math	Rx	Ry	D	D^2
45	90	86	1.0	7.0	-6.0	36.00
3	89	42	3.0	34.0	-31.0	961.00
82	89	96	3.0	2.0	1.0	1.00
52	89	66	3.0	21.0	-18.0	324.00
46	88	75	6.5	14.0	-7.5	56.25
40	88	81	6.5	10.0	-3.5	12.25
39	88	92	6.5	4.0	2.5	6.25
15	88	78	6.5	12.5	6.0	36.00
77	87	80	12.0	11.0	1.0	1.00
13	87	40	12.0	36.0	-24.0	576.00
80	87	53	12.0	27.5	-15.5	240.25
73	87	64	12.0	22.0	-20.0	400.00
30	87	52	12.0	29.0	-17.0	289.00
28	87	56	12.0	25.5	-13.5	182.25
95	87	13	12.0	50.0	-38.0	1444.00
97	86	87	19.0	6.0	13.0	169.00
5	86	97	19.0	1.0	18.0	324.00
7	86	67	19.0	19.0	0	0
85	86	62	19.0	23.0	-4.0	16.00
54	86	49	19.0	31.0	-12.0	144.00
83	86	85	19.0	8.5	10.5	110.25
37	86	36	19.0	38.5	-19.5	380.25
16	85	57	25.5	24.0	1.5	2.25
49	85	78	25.5	12.5	13.0	169.00
34	85	88	25.5	5.0	20.5	420.25
33	85	71	25.5	17.0	8.5	72.25
23	85	31	25.5	42.0	-16.5	272.25
19	85	21	25.5	46.0	-20.5	420.25
35	84	56	32.0	25.5	6.5	42.25
69	84	53	32.0	27.5	4.5	20.25
70	84	85	32.0	8.5	23.5	552.25
48	84	35	32.0	40.0	-8.0	64.00
1	84	36	32.0	38.5	-6.5	42.24
31	84	74	32.0	15.0	17.0	289.00
79	84	32	32.0	41.0	-9.0	81.00

TABLE XLV (Cont'd)

Student No.	Certification	Math	Rx	Ry	D	D^2
98	83	66	38.5	20.0	18.5	342.25
55	83	37	38.5	37.0	1.5	225.00
25	83	19	38.5	48.0	-9.5	90.25
88	83	69	38.5	18.0	20.0	420.25
32	83	94	38.5	3.0	35.5	1260.25
86	83	27	38.5	44.0	-5.5	30.25
53	82	50	44.5	30.0	14.5	210.25
9	82	20	44.5	47.0	-2.5	625.00
20	82	42	44.5	34.0	10.5	110.25
60	82	42	44.5	34.0	10.5	110.25
74	82	48	44.5	32.0	12.5	156.25
72	82	72	44.5	16.0	28.5	812.25
91	81	25	49.0	45.0	4.0	16.00
2	81	30	49.0	43.0	6.0	36.00
99	81	16	49.0	49.0	0	0

N = 50 $\qquad \Sigma d^2 = 12600.5$

$$\rho = 1 - \frac{6\Sigma(D^2)}{N(N^2-1)}$$

$$= 1 - \frac{75603}{50(2500-1)}$$

$$= 1 - \frac{75603}{50(2449)}$$

$$= 1 - \frac{75603}{122450}$$

$$= 1 - .62$$

$\rho = .38$ (positive low correlation; definite but small)

Comparison of cumulative grade point averages at the beginning of the semester of student teaching with ACE scores for seventy-eight student teachers at the time of entrance into Chicago Teachers College South is shown in a scattergram. See Table XLVI. Computation of the Pearson product-moment coefficient of correlation reveals that r = +.04. This shows a very low positive correlation.

An r of +.58 showing moderate, substantial, positive relationship was found in running a correlation between reading test scores for fifty-two student teachers at the time of entrance into Chicago Teachers College South and their total grades on the certification examination. See Table XLVII.

Of the fifty-nine student teachers who were successful in the certification examination, forty-nine had mathematics scores. Table XLVIII shows the relationship between total grades received on the certification examination and the mathematics scores for forty-nine students at the time of entrance into Chicago Teachers College South. Using the Spearman Rank Difference Method of Correlation, the two sets of scores were paired and ranked. The coefficient of correlation, rho (ρ), equals +.134, which indicates a very low positive correlation.

Twenty-six were transfer students and thirty-three were four-year Chicago Teachers College South students of the fifty-nine students who passed successfully the certification examination. Of the six failures, three were transfer students and three were four-year Chicago Teachers College South students. Of the

TABLE XLVI

SCATTERGRAM SHOWING CUMULATIVE GRADE POINT AVERAGES AT THE BEGINNING OF STUDENT TEACHING

SCATTERGRAM SHOWING ACE SCORES FOR SEVENTY-EIGHT STUDENT TEACHERS AT TIME OF ENTRANCE INTO CTC SOUTH

	2.5-2.99	3.0-3.49	3.5-3.99	4.0-4.49	4.5-4.99	5.0-5.49	5.5-5.99	fy	dy	fydy	fyd^2y	dx	
96-				1		1		2	10	20	200	4	40
91-95	1			2				3	9	27	243	0	0
86-90			2	1		2		5	8	40	320	7	56
81-85			2		2		1	5	7	35	245	8	56
76-80			1	1	1		1	4	6	24	144	7	42
71-75	1	1	2	1				5	5	25	125	-2	-10
66-70	2		1	2				5	4	20	80	-2	-8
61-65		2	1					3	3	9	27	-2	-6
56-60	1		1	2				4	2	8	16	0	0
51-55		2		3				5	1	5	5	1	1
46-50	3		1		1			5	0	0	0	-4	0
41-45	1	1			1			3	-1	-3	3	-1	1
36-40			2	3				5	-2	-10	20	3	-6
31-35	1	2	2			1		6	-3	-18	54	-1	-3
26-30			2					2	-4	-8	32	0	0
21-25	2	1	1					4	-5	-20	100	-5	25
16-20	3	2	1	1				7	-6	-42	252	-7	42
11-15			1	1				2	-7	-14	98	1	7
6-10	1	1						2	-8	-16	128	-3	24
0-5	1							1	-9	-9	81	-2	18
fx	17	12	20	18	5	4	2	78		73	2173	2	279
dx	-2	-1	0	1	2	3	4	N		$\Sigma fydy$		Σfdy	
$fxdx_x$	-34	-12	0	18	10	12	8	$2\Sigma fdx$			$\Sigma fydy^2y$		
fd^2x	68	12	0	18	20	36	32	186	Σfdx^2				

TABLE XLVI (Cont'd)

Computation of Pearson Product-Moment Correlation:

$$\frac{\Sigma x'}{N} = \frac{2}{78} = .025$$

$$\left(\frac{\Sigma x'}{N}\right)^2 = (.025)^2 = .000625$$

$$\frac{\Sigma x'^2}{N} = \frac{186}{78} = 2.38$$

$$\frac{\Sigma y'}{N} = \frac{73}{78} = .9358$$

$$\frac{\Sigma y'^2}{N} = (.9358)^2 = .8767$$

$$\frac{\Sigma y'^2}{N} = \frac{2173}{78} = 27.85$$

$$\frac{\Sigma x'y'}{N} = \frac{279}{78} = .354$$

$$\sigma x = \sqrt{\frac{\Sigma x'^2}{N} - \left(\frac{\Sigma x'}{N}\right)^2} = \sqrt{2.38 - .0062} = \sqrt{2.37} = 1.53$$

$$\sigma y = \sqrt{\frac{\Sigma y'^2}{N} - \left(\frac{\Sigma y'}{N}\right)^2} = \sqrt{27.85 - .8767} = \sqrt{26.974} = 5.19$$

$$r = \frac{\frac{\Sigma x'y'}{N} - \left(\frac{\Sigma x'}{N}\right)\left(\frac{\Sigma y'}{N}\right)}{\sigma x \quad X \quad \sigma y} = \frac{.354 - (.025)(.9358)}{1.53 \times 5.19} = \frac{.354 - .023}{7.94} =$$

$$\frac{.331}{7.94}$$

r = .04 (very low positive correlation)

TABLE XLVII

SCATTERGRAM SHOWING CERTIFICATION TOTAL GRADES FOR FIFTY-TWO STUDENT TEACHERS

SCATTERGRAM SHOWING READING SCORES FOR FIFTY-TWO STUDENT TEACHERS AT TIME OF ENTRANCE INTO CTC SOUTH

	90	89	88	87	86	85	84	83	82	81	fy	dy	fydy	fyd^2y	dx	dxdy
96-		1									1	9	9	81	-4	-36
91-95		1			1						2	8	16	128	-5	-40
86-90			1	1				1			3	7	21	147	-3	-21
81-85	1		3	1				1			6	6	36	216	-14	-84
76-80				1							1	5	5	25	-2	-10
71-75		1			1	1	3				6	4	24	96	-2	-8
66-70							1				1	3	3	9	1	3
61-65				1							1	2	2	4	-2	-4
56-60				1			2	1			4	1	4	4	2	2
51-55				1		2	2		1		6	0	0	0	3	0
46-50					3		1				4	-1	-4	4	-2	2
41-45				1							1	-2	-2	4	-2	4
36-40					1	1		1	3		6	-3	-18	54	10	-30
31-35							1				1	-4	-4	16	1	4
26-30						1	2		1		4	-5	-20	100	5	-25
21-25							1				1	-6	-6	36	1	-6
16-20								1		1	2	-7	-14	98	6	-42
11-15										1	1	-8	-8	64	4	-32
6-10				1							1	-9	-9	81	-2	-18
fx	1	3	4	8	6	5	13	5	5	2	52		35	1167	-5	-341
dx	-5	-4	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3	4	N		$\Sigma fydy$	Σfyd^2y	Σfdx	
$fxdx_x^1$	-5	-12	-12	-16	-6	0	13	10	15	8						
fd^2x	25	48	36	32	6	0	13	20	45	32	$-5\Sigma dx$					
											257					
											Σfdx^2					

TABLE XLVII (Cont'd)

Computation of Pearson Product-Moment Correlation:

$$\frac{\Sigma x'}{N} = \frac{-5}{52} = -.096$$

$$\left(\frac{\Sigma x'}{N}\right)^2 = (-.96)^2 = .009216$$

$$\frac{\Sigma x'^2}{N} = \frac{257}{52} = 4.94$$

$$\frac{\Sigma y'}{N} = \frac{35}{52} = .673$$

$$\left(\frac{\Sigma y'}{N}\right)^2 = (.673)^2 = .452929$$

$$\frac{\Sigma y'^2}{N} = \frac{1167}{52} = 22.44$$

$$\frac{\Sigma x'y'}{N} = \frac{-341}{52} = 6.56$$

$$\sigma x = \sqrt{\frac{\Sigma x'^2}{N} - \left(\frac{\Sigma x'}{N}\right)^2} = \sqrt{4.94 - (.0092)} = \sqrt{4.94} = 2.22$$

$$\sigma y = \sqrt{\frac{\Sigma y'^2}{N} - \left(\frac{\Sigma y'}{N}\right)^2} = \sqrt{22.44 - .4529} = \sqrt{21.987} = 4.68+$$

$$r = \frac{\frac{\Sigma x'y'}{N} - \left(\frac{\Sigma x'}{N}\right)\left(\frac{\Sigma y'}{N}\right)}{\sigma x \times \sigma y} = \frac{6.56 - (-.096)(.673)}{2.22 \times 4.68+} = \frac{5.98}{10.39}$$

$$r = .575$$

$$r = .58 \text{ (moderate, substantial relationship)}$$

TABLE XLVIII

SPEARMAN RANK DIFFERENCE METHOD OF CORRELATION BETWEEN CERTIFICATION TOTAL GRADES AND MATH SCORES FOR FORTY-NINE STUDENT TEACHERS

Student No.	Certification	Math	Rx	Ry	D	D^2
45	90	74	1.0	11.0	-10.0	100.00
82	89	39	2.5	38.0	-35.5	1260.25
52	89	32	2.5	44.0	-41.5	1722.25
40	88	91	5.5	4.5	1.0	1.00
39	88	91	5.5	4.5	1.0	1.00
15	88	72	5.5	12.5	-7.0	49.00
46	88	34	5.5	42.0	-36.5	1332.25
77	87	39	10.5	38.0	-27.5	756.25
13	87	42	10.5	35.5	-25.0	625.00
73	87	60	10.5	20.5	-10.0	100.00
30	87	37	10.5	40.5	-30.0	900.00
28	87	51	10.5	27.5	-17.0	289.00
95	87	47	10.5	32.5	-22.0	484.00
5	86	76	16.0	10.0	6.0	36.00
7	86	96	16.0	1.5	14.5	210.25
85	86	53	16.0	24.5	-8.5	72.25
54	86	68	16.0	15.5	.5	.25
37	86	42	16.0	35.5	-19.5	380.25
33	85	47	22.0	32.5	-10.5	110.25
16	85	32	22.0	44.0	-22.0	484.00
23	85	51	22.0	27.5	-5.5	30.25
34	85	61	22.0	19.0	3.0	9.00
49	85	54	22.0	23.0	-1.0	1.00
8	85	45	22.0	34.0	-12.0	144.00
19	85	18	22.0	49.0	-27.0	729.00
35	84	80	32.0	9.0	23.0	529.00
69	84	60	32.0	20.5	11.5	132.25
70	84	53	32.0	24.5	7.5	56.25
81	84	91	32.0	4.5	27.5	756.25
48	84	96	32.0	1.5	30.5	930.25
1	84	49	32.0	30.5	1.5	2.25
31	84	49	32.0	30.5	1.5	2.25
62	84	64	32.0	17.0	15.0	225.00
78	84	91	32.0	4.5	27.5	756.25
36	84	81	32.0	8.0	24.0	576.00

TABLE XLVIII (Cont'd)

Student No.	Certification	Math	Rx	Ry	D	D^2
90	84	68	32.0	15.5	16.5	275.56
71	84	50	32.0	29.0	3.0	9.00
79	84	27	32.0	47.5	-15.5	240.25
32	83	69	40.0	14.0	26.0	676.00
98	83	52	40.0	26.0	14.0	196.00
86	83	72	40.0	12.5	27.5	756.25
53	82	27	44.5	47.5	-3.0	9.00
9	82	39	44.5	38.0	6.5	42.25
20	82	32	44.5	44.0	.5	.25
60	82	28	44.5	46.0	1.5	2.25
74	82	55	44.5	22.0	22.5	560.25
72	82	82	44.5	7.0	37.5	1406.25
91	81	62	48.5	18.0	30.5	930.25
99	81	37	48.5	40.5	8.0	64.00

N = 49 Σd^2 = 18949.32

$$\rho = 1 - \frac{6\ (D^2)}{N(N^2-1)}$$

$$= 1 - \frac{113695.92}{49(2401-1)}$$

$$= 1 - \frac{113695.92}{117600}$$

$$= 1 - .966$$

ρ = .134 (low positive relationship)

total sample of ninety-nine student teachers, forty-eight were transfer students and fifty-one were four-year Chicago Teachers College South students. See Chapter III, Table II.

The wide range of achievement scores for ninety-nine student teachers is indicated in Tables XLII, XLIII, and XLIX. Study of these tables gives a picture of each student listed by number. In the case of physical education and upper grade teaching majors, only one final grade for both student teaching and seminar is recorded. These students received six hours credit and a composite grade. Intermediate-upper grade students received six hours credit for student teaching and three hours credit for seminar and therefore two separate grades are recorded. Of the twenty students who received a final grade of "A" in student teaching twelve received a composite mark for student teaching and seminar and eight received a separate mark for student teaching. Of the fifty-nine students who received a final grade of "B" in student teaching, seventeen received a composite mark for student teaching and seminar and forty-two received a separate mark for student teaching. Of the eighteen students who received a final grade of "C" in student teaching, three received a composite mark for student teaching and seminar and fifteen received a separate mark for student teaching. Of the two students who received a final grade of "D" in student teaching, one received a composite mark for student teaching and seminar and one received a separate mark for student teaching. Final grades in seminar for sixty-six students were distributed as follows: twenty-seven students received "A,"

TABLE XLIX

FINAL GRADES AND OTHER DATA FOR THIRTY-FOUR STUDENT TEACHERS WHO DID NOT TAKE THE CERTIFICATION EXAMINATION

Student No.	Age	Sex	Transfer	4-Year CTCS	ACE Nat'l %ile	ACE Local %ile	SCAT Nat'l Band	Read. Nat'l %ile	Mech. Nat'l %ile	Math. Local %ile	G.P.A.	Final Grade Stud. Tch'g	Final Grade Seminar
57	21	M		x	20	21		10	10	64	4.3	A	
4	21	F		x	76	92		38	84	85	5.5	A	
14	22	F	x		84	89	37-48	42	56	50	4.8	A	
63	22	F	x					56	14	35	4.7	A	A
75	25	F	x				92-94				5.6	A	A
58	21	F		x	65	84		30	37	58	3.2	B	
42	26	M		x	59						2.5	B	
76	25	M		x	46						2.5	B	
44	22	F		x	88	93		56	47	53	5.3	B	
21	22	F		x	22	26		30	30	35	3.0	B	
56	25	M	x					30	56	62	2.6	B	
10	21	F		x	93	97		52	64	89	4.0	B	
43	38	F	x				97-99	81	91	88	5.0	B	A
11	22	F		x	20	31		6	30	43	2.5	B	A
12	21	F	x		33	38		56	14	32	3.0	B	A
17	24	F	x		85	93		52	43	57	4.5	B	A
26	40	F	x		35	35			1	26	5.2	B	A
29	28	M	x		49						2.9	B	A
92	39	F	x				84-89	68	79		5.0	B	B
84	22	F		x	39	53		56	64	42	4.0	B	B
65	28	F	x				62-74	56	14	35	2.9	B	B
61	24	F	x				84-89	81	72	69	4.9	B	B
27	29	M	x		51	56	32-42		10	37	4.0	B	B
47	34	F	x				42-55	81	79		4.0	B	B
59	23	F		x	34	58		17	1	19	2.9	B	C
94	22	F	x		46		24-32	68	14	74	2.9	B	C
87	23	F	x		71	84		78	96		3.8	B	C
64	38	F	x		7						2.5	B	C
96	29	M		x	68	88		49	30	74	3.5	C	B
89	29	M		x	12						4.0	C	C
51	34	F		x	16						4.0	C	C
67	29	M		x			20-28	87	6	51	3.7	C	C
93	31	M	x			6			7		2.5	C	C
6	30	M	x			17		44	10	32	2.5	D	

twenty-four received "B," and fifteen students received "C."

As previously stated in Chapter III, the range of cumulative grade point averages (G.P.A.'s) used in this study is from 2.5 to 5.8, and the median G.P.A. for this sample is 3.8. See Table VIII. The range in mathematics scores is from 16 to 96, and the median score is 54.0. Scores on the Cooperative English Test range from 6 to 98 and the median score is 53.6 in the reading section; in the mechanics of expression the range is from 1 to 96 and the median score is 51.7. The range in ACE scores is from 4 to 97 and the median score is 51.9.

Out of sixty-five students who took the certification examination, fifty-nine were successful and six failed. Ninety-one per cent passed this examination. Searching for causal comparisons, the writer found no high, positive correlation between scores made on tests at the time of entrance into Chicago Teachers College South and grades made on the certification examination or between scores made on tests at the time of entrance into Chicago Teachers College South and grade point averages (G.P.A.'s) at the beginning of student teaching. There is substantial evidence indicating such a high percentage of successful grades on the certification examination may be accounted for in the following ways:

(1) the excellence of the over-all teacher preparation program offered by all departments at Chicago Teachers College South,

(2) the structured program of the Department of Student Teaching at Chicago Teachers College South, making it

possible for the counselors to implement an itinerant program in off-campus Chicago Public Elementary Schools,

(3) team effort on the part of the cooperating schools and the counselors in providing varied learning experiences for student teachers,

(4) warm acceptance of student teachers and the program of student teaching by the principals and the cooperating teachers, thereby creating a professional climate in which student teachers are helped to make the transition from student to teacher.

CHAPTER VI

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

SUMMARY

This study encompasses a fourfold purpose which is (1) to appraise the performance of a selected group of student teachers in off-campus Chicago Public Elementary Schools; (2) to determine the degree of relationship between entering scores and success in student teaching; (3) to appraise objectives of the student teaching program; and (4) to improve two-way communication between the cooperating schools and the college. It focuses on the culminating semester of the organizational pattern of the program of student teaching as offered prior to the changeover to trimester organization which took place in September, 1962 by Chicago Teachers College South.

Chicago Teachers College South, located in the heart of Englewood on twenty acres of land at 6800 Stewart Avenue, is an educational landmark on Chicago's south side. Its bilateral origin stems from two sources, one of which started in the city of Chicago in 1855 and the other in the County of Cook in 1867. The establishment of county normal schools was authorized by the General Assembly of Illinois in the session of 1869. In this year the Cook County Normal School was founded, having the distinction of being the first such institution in the country.

A single purpose, degree granting, coeducational institution, legally authorized to train teachers, it is characterized by the dimensions of stability, flexibility, and challenge. Its early history discloses the fact that this institution took its place as one of the pioneer teacher training institutions west of the Alleghenies which contributed to educational progress in the State of Illinois as well as in the city of Chicago.

Some contradictions which teacher education must face up to may be described as:

(1) universality versus excellence

(2) equality of educational opportunity versus students' abilities

(3) slums versus suburbs

(4) Jeffersonian principle versus selectivity

(5) mobility versus stability

(6) individual differences versus group cohesion

(7) rate of speed of change in the constituency of society versus rate of speed of change in pedagogical tasks.

Objectives for the student teaching program at Chicago Teachers College South are included in an unpublished study made by the writer in January, 1962. Student behaviors are described in terms of the rationale of Ralph W. Tyler.[1] Since the multiple relationships of the program present a very lengthy list of the

---

[1]Tyler, op. cit.

content aspect, a two-dimensional chart listing these in detail may be found in the appendix.[2]

The behavioral aspect of objectives for the student teaching program are:

1) Ability to satisfy basic human needs
2) Development of sensitivities
3) Ability to interpret and apply an educational philosophy
4) Ability to identify and apply various theories of learning
5) Ability to understand and organize basic curriculum concepts
6) Ability to select adequate devices of evaluation
7) Ability to collect and interpret data and/or keep records
8) Development of personal social adjustment
9) Development of appreciations
10) Ability to demonstrate readiness
11) Ability to carry out administrative policies
12) Development of social attitudes
13) Ability to plan
14) Development of effective ways of thinking
15) Development of teaching ability.

The Department of Student Teaching is staffed by college

---

[2]See Appendix I for Two-Dimensional Chart stating objectives.

teachers who are called counselors and assume four distinct roles, those of coordinator, supervisor, counselor, and evaluator.

This study was made during the semester dating from February through June, 1962. It includes a group of student teachers who did their student teaching in grades three through eight for one semester, either as upper grade teaching majors or as intermediate-upper grade students.

The method used to evaluate the performance of this selected group of student teachers is a descriptive rating scale.[3] It was designed by the writer and completed in April, 1962. Request for continued use of this rating scale was made by the Department of Student Teaching at Chicago Teachers College South first in the summer of 1962 and again in September, 1962, and each time the writer granted this permission to the department. The format took the shape of a list consisting of ten broad areas to be rated in terms of three levels of performance which are designated as Excellent, Satisfactory, and Unsatisfactory. Each of these levels of performance for each broad area is spelled out concisely and specifically. Three different types of raters--(1) the cooperating teachers, (2) the college counselors, and (3) the student teachers themselves--rated the same group of selected student teachers.

The study includes scores made at the time of entrance into Chicago Teachers College South on American Council on Education

---

[3]See Appendix II, op. cit.

Psychological Examination (ACE), and at a later date of entrance scores made on School and College Ability Test (SCAT), scores on the Cooperative Eanglish Test, and scores on a mathematics placement test. Cumulative grade point averages at the beginning of twenty-weeks of student teaching represent additional data for the purpose of comparison. Final grades which the students received upon completion of student teaching are used in this study. In addition the final results on the Certification Examination for Elementary Teachers, Grades 3-8 in Chicago Public Elementary Schools are included for sixty-five student teachers.

Review of the literature concerning evaluation of student teachers presents a variety of opinions. Increased sophistication characterizes interest in measurement and appraisal of teacher efficiency. From the studies mentioned in Chapter II, the writer gained insights into the broad spectrum of multidimensionality encompassing the complexity of success in teaching, relationships which are considered negligible, and finally the human factor, all of which helped to determine what direction should be taken to explore further the problem of evaluating performance of student teachers. The investigator did not find anyone setting forth the objectives of a specific program of student teaching according to the Tyler rationale.

Study of the two-dimensional chart reveals the complexity and multiplicity of the objectives for the program of student teaching. The fact that they gave a systematic background to the program and direction to construction of the evaluation instrument

proves their value in the high success of the student teachers.

The multidimensionality of objectives made it necessary to condense them into a precise instrument for use in the research. The fact that students attained the grades they did in these terms and also of the total number of sixty-five student teachers who took the certification examination for the first time there was ninety-one per cent success proves conclusively high attainment of objectives.

The causal-comparative method of research is used in this investigation. A look at the multidimensionality of the objectives of the student teaching program at Chicago Teachers College South made it necessary to design a functional instrument with a clear, concise, comprehensive and yet simple approach. The writer knows that her rating scale is not a perfect instrument but it is an instrument which made it possible to improve two-way communication between the cooperating schools and the college by spelling out in descriptive language at three levels of performance the meaning of expectancy in behavior of student teachers in ten broad areas. The responses made on this descriptive rating scale were intended to be distinct discriminations of performance of student teachers selected for this study. Further uses of this instrument were suggested for the on-going program in student teaching. One, which came from the cooperating teachers, was a request to have in their hands a copy of the instrument which they could use in two-way conferences with the student teachers at the beginning of student teaching. The other came from the student teachers them-

selves, asking for familiarity with the instrument at the beginning of student teaching. The writer believes that quantitative measurements and qualitative factors suggest the use of complementary dimensions in evaluation of on-going programs. In this respect the instrument has made a contribution by making it possible to move in the direction of assessing qualitative factors which have a direct bearing on the pursuit of excellence in teacher training.

Chapter IV spells out in detail tabulation, categorization, comparison, analysis, and synthesis of item responses to the instrument. Data for this study were collected during the semester dating from February through June of 1962. The research involves ninety-nine student teachers assigned to forty-nine off-campus Chicago Public Elementary Schools. Each student teacher was rated a total of forty times: twenty times by cooperating teachers, ten times by counselors, and ten times by himself. The sample of ninety-nine students received approximately 1980 ratings from cooperating teachers, 990 ratings from counselors, and 990 ratings from the student teachers themselves, bringing the total number of ratings to approximately 3960 item responses. Rating areas stated in descending order of excellence are shown in the various tables throughout Chapter IV. Contrasts and comparisons made by the different groups of raters may be seen in Tables XXXVI, XXXVII, and XXXVIII. Since this rating scale was designed to show tabulations of responses to ten rating areas in one of three levels of performance, no scores were intended in the use of

this evaluation instrument. Analysis of variance in this case is presented in terms of differences in numbers of students and in percentage of the total which represent the responses of the different raters.

One hundred four students entered the student teaching program for the semester dating from February through June, 1962. Four students withdrew failing from the program and one was a deferred credit student (held over from the previous semester) who terminated her work in April, 1962. This provided ninety-nine cases included and followed throughout the period of the study. The selected group of student teachers consisted of twenty-two male students and seventy-seven female students. The range in age was from twenty to forty-one. Forty-six, or 46.46 per cent, of the group fell in the age range of twenty to twenty-two, twenty-six, or 26.26 per cent, were in the age range of twenty-three to twenty-eight; sixteen, or 16.16 per cent, were between the ages of twenty-nine and thirty-one; and eleven, or 11.11 per cent, were between thirty-two and forty-one. Their educational backgrounds show that fifty-one students of the ninety-nine were four-year Chicago Teachers College students. Of the forty-eight transfer students, twenty-nine transferred from public colleges and nineteen from private colleges as well as private and state universities. Sixty-one attended Chicago Public Elementary Schools, thirty-one Chicago Parochial Schools, one an Illinois suburban elementary school, and six attended elementary schools outside the state of Illinois. Sixty-nine attended Chicago Public High

Schools, twenty-seven Chicago Parochial High Schools, two Illinois suburban high schools, and three attended high schools outside the state of Illinois. Seventy-nine students were enrolled as intermediate-upper grade student teachers and twenty as upper grade teaching majors. Sixty-seven of the intermediate-upper grade student teachers were "regular three through eight," eight were physical education students, and four were in library science. The twenty upper grade teaching majors consisted of three specialists in English, four in mathematics, four in social studies, two in science, six in art, and one in home economics.

Of ninety-nine student teachers, sixty-five were eligible and made the choice to take for the first time the Certification Examination for Elementary Teachers, Grade 3-8. Of the sixty-five who took it, fifty-nine were successful in both the written and oral parts. One student passed the written but failed the oral part. Five students failed the written part. This represents ninety-one per cent success on the first attempt. Chapter V shows the search for reasons to explain this high per cent of success in terms of the wide range of age, wide range in choice of the undergraduate teacher training program, and wide range in scores made at the time of entrance into Chicago Teachers College South. Correlations which were run to show the relationship existing between scores made by students at the time of entering the college and those made on the certification examination or the cumulative grade point averages at the beginning of student teaching indicate positive correlation but nothing that may be described as very

high or high marked relationship. The positive correlations which were found range from low to moderate relationship. With these factors then indicating no very high relationship and in view of evidence presented, the high percentage of success on the certification examination is accounted for by the excellence of the teacher training program going on in all departments at Chicago Teachers College South, by the value of the structured program of the Department of Student Teaching which makes it possible for the counselors to implement an itinerant program (encompassing a choice of undergraduate teacher training programs such as intermediate-upper grade student teachers and teaching majors) in off-campus elementary schools, by the team effort on the part of the cooperating schools and the college, and the warm reception of student teachers by principals and cooperating teachers of the cooperating schools.

CONCLUSIONS

According to Tyler, "The process of evaluation begins with the objectives of the educational program."[1] The writer selected three of the fifteen behavioral aspect objectives shown in the two-dimensional chart (see Appendix I)[2] to demonstrate how these objectives are followed through in seminar. These three objectives are: (1) development of sensitivities, (2) ability to interpret and apply an educational philosophy, (3) ability to understand and apply basic curriculum concepts.

The objectives, learning experiences, materials, and teaching procedures are described in the following way:

OBJECTIVES	LEARNING EXPERIENCES	MATERIALS	TEACHING PROCEDURES
Ability to understand & organize basic curriculum concepts	PANEL Presentations in a variety of subject areas	Guide Sheet: "Conducting Panel Discussions" Teaching Guides & Supplements for Subject areas Books & periodicals Films & filmstrips Recordings Models, mock-ups, & specimens Children's work	Discussing Subject Areas Studying Teaching Guides & Supplements Discussing basic mechanics of conducting panels Ques. & Answer period Selecting subject areas Volunteering for chosen subject area panels Buzz sessions Mock panel Electing coordinator of panels Structuring individual panels Giving initial help where needed Discussing on-going procedures Organizing guide sheets Presenting panels Evaluating panels
Ability to interpret & apply an educational philosophy			

[1] Ralph W. Tyler, op. cit., p. 71.

[2] See Appendix I, op. cit.

OBJECTIVES	LEARNING EXPERIENCES	MATERIALS	TEACHING PROCEDURES
Development of sensitivities Ability to interpret & apply an educational philosophy	COMMUNITY Study	Guide Sheet: "Introductory Information Concerning Each Practice Teaching Class" Records at local school Data on children in two classes in which the student teacher will do his student teaching	Discussing basic information necessary to making a study of the community Emphasizing the importance of first-hand observation Explaining relationships to planning, grouping, and instruction Gathering data about: Socio-economic status Special characteristics, if any Community resources, such as libraries, museums, industrial plants, etc. Types of dwellings Recreation facilities Distribution of abilities of individuals in class, such as: Power Line Reading Grade Level Arithmetic Grade Level Experiential background Social maturity levels Considering effect upon general objectives
Ability to interpret & apply an educational philosophy	FIELD Trips	Guide Sheets: "Field Trips" "Legal Aspects" "Trips with Children"	Preparation Excursion Evaluation Professional implications

Through day by day experience as well as subject area panels presented in seminars, through field trips, and community studies, they come to see that the broad fields type of curriculum organization provides an effective kind of organization. Through this type of organization they are provided the opportunity to

help children to see the relationships among the contents of various subjects and also to teach for correlation of reading, writing, speaking, and listening.

Through careful study of and growing familiarity with the study guides and their supplements the student teachers learn to look for and recognize the organizing threads which may start in kindergarten and carry through the grades. As the students develop, they become sensitive to the difference between quantitative measurement and qualitative evaluation. They learn how to build on skills previously learned as well as the levels of ascendency.

At Chicago Teachers College South the program of student teaching which includes seminars is one which is on-going and developmental. While it is characterized by a structural aspect it also has the mark of flexibility. Proof of this is shown in this study, in which forty-nine elementary off-campus cooperating schools participated in training and rating ninety-nine student teachers placed in varied learning experiences.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The writer presents the following recommendations:

1. It is the opinion of the writer that this particular study opens the way for further research in bringing to attention the complementary dimensions of quantitative measurements and qualitative factors in the evaluation of student teachers.

2. In the pursuit of excellence in teacher training there is need for comparison of objectives of student teaching programs in terms of the behavioral view of goals for student teachers showing their relationships to the content aspect.

3. Studies of other student teaching programs made on a regional basis might reveal emphases different from those found in this study.

4. Studies made of the contradictions which teacher training must face might contribute to a better understanding of the broad spectrum of multidimensionality. These contradictions may be described as:

a) universality versus excellence

b) equality of educational opportunity versus students' abilities

c) slums versus suburbs

d) Jeffersonian principle versus selectivity

e) mobility versus stability

f) individual differences versus group cohesion

g) rate of speed of change in the constituency of society

versus rate of speed of change in pedagogical tasks.

5. There is need for more research in the areas of what is good teaching and what makes a good teacher.

6. Further research to determine whether the progress in skills of teaching which have quantitative measurements have outstripped progress in skills of teaching which are characterized by qualitative expressions might bring into focus some answers needed in teacher training.

7. Studies of the size and composition of the professional staff in cooperating schools on a regional basis might prove helpful.

American education today is faced with numerous and complex problems. Among questions uppermost in the minds of many and often asked are: What is good teaching? What makes a good teacher? This is no time to evade such considerations or to settle for mediocrity because of lack of information. Pursuit of excellence in terms of teacher preparation means continuous planning, implementation of plans, appraisal and reappraisal of results. Quantitative measurements and qualitative factors suggest the use of complementary dimensions in evaluation of on-going programs of teacher training.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

I. PRIMARY SOURCES

A. Dissertations

Clausen, Robert W. "Development of a Handbook for Use with Beginning Student Teachers at Queens College." Unpublished doctoral project, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1959.

Dieterle, Louise E. "An Analysis and Treatment of the Problems Faced by the Student Teachers in Off-Campus Elementary Schools." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Loyola University, Chicago, 1961.

Munson, Howard R. "Comparison of Interest and Attitude Patterns of Three Selected Groups of Teacher Candidates." Unpublished doctoral project, State College of Washington, 1959.

Prickett, Loy Elvin. "Evaluation of the Student Teaching Phase of Business Teacher Preparation." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Oklahoma, 1959.

Stevens, Lillian L. "A Study of Certain Aspects of Elementary Student Teaching Experiences and Supervision in the Program of Teacher Education at the City College of the City of New York." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, New York University, 1958.

Troisi, Nicholas Francis. "The Effect of Student-Teaching upon Student Teachers' Objectives and Their Relation to Achievement and Attitudes toward Children." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The Pennsylvania State University, 1959.

B. Article

Tierney, Marie. "Our Student Teaching Program," Chicago Schools Journal, XXXV (May-June, 1953), 203-208.

C. Reports

Kirk, R. B. "Guidance Test Results." Unpublished report, Office of Examinations, Chicago Teachers College, February, 1958).

Stolarz, Theodore J. "Guidance Test Results." Unpublished report, Office of Examinations, Chicago Teachers College, February, 1960.

II. SECONDARY SOURCES

A. Books

Beecher, Dwight E. The Evaluation of Teaching. Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1945.

Blair, Lois C. "A Supervising Teacher Looks at the Functions of Evaluation in Student Teaching," Thirty-Ninth Yearbook, 1960, Association for Student Teaching. Cedar Falls, Iowa: Iowa State Teachers College, 1960.

Chicago Teachers College, Announcements, 1949-1951. Chicago, 1949.

Chicago Teachers College Bulletin, General Announcements, Undergraduate Catalogue, 1961-1963. Chicago, 1961.

Chicago Teachers College South, Report on the Teacher Education Programs. Chicago, Illinois, 1962.

Good, Carter V., A. S. Barr, and Douglas E. Scates. The Methodology of Educational Research. New York, 1941.

Lindquist, E. F. Design and Analysis of Experiments in Psychology and Education. New York, 1953.

Michaelis, John U. "Teacher Education--Student Teaching and Internship," Encyclopedia of Educational Research. New York, 1960.

Ryans, David G. "Prediction of Teacher Effectiveness," Encyclopedia of Educational Research. New York, 1960.

Tyler, Ralph W. Basic Principles of Curriculum and Instruction. Chicago: Syllabus Division, the University of Chicago Press, 1950.

B. Articles

Anderson, C. C., and S. M. Hunka. "Teacher Evaluation: Some Problems and a Proposal," Harvard Educational Review, Winter, 1963, 74-75.

Barr, Arvil S., David E. Eustice, and Edward J. Noe. "The Measurement and Prediction of Teacher Efficiency," Review of Educational Research, XXV, No. 3 (June, 1955), 261.

Barr, Arvil S., and Robert E. Jones. "The Measurement and Prediction of Teacher Efficiency," Review of Educational Research, XXV, No. 3 (June, 1958), 256, 258, 261.

APPENDIX I

TWO-DIMENSIONAL CHART STATING OBJECTIVES FOR STUDENT TEACHING PROGRAM, CHICAGO TEACHERS COLLEGE SOUTH

TWO-DIMENSIONAL CHART STATING OBJECTIVES FOR
STUDENT TEACHING PROGRAM
CHICAGO TEACHERS COLLEGE, SOUTH
6800 STEWART AVENUE
CHICAGO 21, ILLINOIS

BEHAVIORAL ASPECT of the OBJECTIVES

CONTENT ASPECT AND/OR LIFE OF THE OBJECTIVES	1. Ability to satisfy basic human needs	2. Development of sensitivities	3. Ability to interpret & apply an educational philosophy	4. Ability to identify & apply various theories of learning	5. Ability to understand & organize basic curriculum concepts	6. Ability to select adequate devices of evaluation	7. Ability to collect & interpret data, and/or keep records	8. Development of personal social adjustment	9. Development of appreciations	10. Ability to demonstrate readiness	11. Ability to carry out Administrative Policies	12. Development of social attitudes	13. Ability to plan	14. Development of effective ways of thinking	15. Development of teaching ability
A. Student Teacher															
1. Appearance	x	x	x	x		x		x	x	x					x
2. Health	x	x	x	x		x	x	x	x	x					x
a. Physical															
b. Mental															
3. Intelligence	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x			x	x	x
4. Human Relations	x	x	x	x	x	x		x	x	x		x		x	x
5. Responsibilities	x	x	x	x		x		x	x	x	x			x	x
6. Common Sense	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x			x	x
7. Citizenship	x	x	x	x		x		x	x	x		x		x	x
8. Speech Patterns	x	x	x	x		x	x	x	x	x				x	x
9. Knowledge	x	x	x	x	x	x		x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
10. Attitudes	x	x	x	x		x		x	x	x	x	x		x	x
11. Maturation	x	x	x	x		x	x	x	x	x		x	x	x	x
12. Rapport	x	x	x	x		x		x	x	x	x	x		x	x
13. Desires	x	x	x	x		x		x	x	x		x		x	x
14. Qualities	x	x	x	x		x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
a. Industry															
b. Motivation															
c. Cooperation															
d. Judgment															
e. Balance															
f. Reliability															
g. Dedication															
h. Sincerity															
i. Adaptability															
j. Performance															
k. Interests															
l. Punctuality															
m. Creativity															
B. Children															
1. Basic Needs	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
2. Child Development	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x		x	x	x
3. Learning Activities	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x		x	x	x
4. Motivation	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x			x	x	x
5. Individual Differences	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
6. Work Habits	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x		x	x	x
7. Study Skills	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x		x	x	x
8. Group Dynamics	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
9. Experiential Background	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x		x	x	x	x
10. Interests	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x		x	x	x	x
C. Tools of Teaching															
1. Unit of Learning	x	x	x	x	x	x	x		x	x	x		x	x	x
2. Daily Lesson Plans	x	x	x	x	x	x	x		x	x	x		x	x	x
3. Daily Log			x		x	x	x		x	x	x		x	x	x
4. Class Data	x		x		x	x	x		x	x	x		x	x	x
5. Community Study	x	x	x		x	x	x		x	x	x	x	x	x	x
6. Overview			x		x	x		x	x	x	x		x	x	x
7. Curriculum Guides			x			x			x	x	x		x	x	x
8. Materials of Instruction			x	x	x	x			x	x	x		x	x	x
9. Classroom Management			x	x	x	x		x	x	x	x		x	x	x
10. Classroom Control			x	x	x	x		x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
11. Classroom Climate	x		x	x	x	x		x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
12. Evaluation Criteria		x	x	x	x			x	x	x	x		x	x	x
13. Records			x		x	x	x		x	x	x		x	x	x
14. Knowledge of Subjectmatter			x	x	x	x			x	x	x		x	x	x
D. School															
1. General Policies and Practices		x	x			x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
2. Philosophy	x	x	x		x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
3. Psychology of Learning			x	x	x	x	x		x	x	x		x	x	x
4. Daily Routines		x	x			x	x	x	x	x	x		x	x	x
5. Interlocking Relationships	x	x	x		x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
E. Community															
1. Constituency	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
2. History			x	x	x	x	x		x	x		x	x	x	x
3. Customs		x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x		x	x	x	x
4. Resources			x	x	x	x		x	x	x		x	x	x	x
5. Values		x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
F. Professional Image															
1. Status	x	x	x			x		x	x	x		x		x	x
2. Ideals	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x		x	x	x	x
3. Development	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x

M.M.F. 11-25-61

APPENDIX II

DESCRIPTIVE RATING SCALE

PROBLEM CHECK LIST FOR STUDENT TEACHERS

DEPARTMENT OF STUDENT TEACHING
CHICAGO TEACHERS COLLEGE, SOUTH
6800 S. STEWART AVENUE
CHICAGO 21, ILLINOIS

____M ____F

NAME _____
Last First Middle

GRADE _____ SUBJECT AREA _____

GRADE _____ SUBJECT AREA _____

SCHOOL _____ DATE _____

COOPERATING TEACHER _____

_____

PRINCIPAL _____

RATING SCALE FOR STUDENT TEACHERS

Your cooperation in completing a copy of the attached evaluating form for each student teacher is greatly appreciated.

Directions:

1. Each broad area to be rated includes three levels of performance, Excellent - (E); Satisfactory - (S); Unsatisfactory - (U).
2. A brief descriptive statement is included for each level of performance for each item.
3. Please read through the list, item by item, recording your rating for each by marking an X in the appropriate space in the right-hand column.
4. Each cooperating teacher please rate each individual student independently.
5. Please return to the Department of Student Teaching by June 8, 1962.

	EXCELLENT	SATISFACTORY	UNSATISFACTORY	E S U
Classroom Management	Careful organization of daily routines. Children know and follow through with minimum loss of time. Work habits of children carefully guided.	Some organization of daily routines. Some lesson time is lost. Some effort to improve children's work habits.	Lacks organization of daily routines. Much of lesson time is lost. Little effort to improve poor work habits of children.	( ) ( ) ( )
Discipline	Readily gets children's attention. Has influence. Orderly behavior of children in atmosphere of freedom.	Usually gets children's attention. Some influence. Evidence of working at control.	Seldom gets children's attention. Little influence. Little evidence of working at control.	E S U ( ) ( ) ( )
Motivation	Plans learning exercises wisely. Bulletin boards are functional. Emergence of insights. Guided by children's interests & needs as well as predetermined objectives.	Sometimes learning exercises are planned wisely. Sometimes bulletin boards are functional. Some push but not enough for purposive learning. Some insights.	Learning exercises lack planning and often meaningless. Bulletin boards rarely functional. Children do not care very much. Few insights. Learning largely a matter of routine memorization.	E S U ( ) ( ) ( )
Curriculum	Careful reference to & makes maximum use of Study Guides & Supplements. Understands child development.	Refers to Study Guides & Supplements but makes only moderate use. Some understanding of child development.	Rarely refers to Study Guides & Supplements. Has little understanding of child development.	E S U ( ) ( ) ( )
Personal Social Adjustment	Emerges as a real person. Not poured into a mould. Balance. Poise. Dependability. Initiative. Industry.	Some originality but not enough.	Little originality	E S U ( ) ( ) ( )

	EXCELLENT	SATISFACTORY	UNSATISFACTORY	E S U
Planning	Well organized. Units & plans carefully structured. Always submits on time. Provides for individual differences, total group & sub-groups. Considers experiential background.	Some organization. Usually careful structuring of units & plans. Nearly always submits on time. Usually provides for individual differences, total & sub-groups. Usually considers experiential background.	Lacks organization Careless about structuring of units & plans. Rarely submits on time. Unaware of individual & group differences. Shows little evidence of improvement from one set of unit & plans to the next. Ignores experiential background.	( ) ( ) ( )
Procedures	Subject matter is correct. Uses a variety of activities & instructional materials. Alert to objectives, quality instruction, pupil response. Confers with cooperating teacher & counselor. Uses daily log to improve teaching.	Subject matter is correct. Some variety of activities & instructional materials. Uses good objectives, good instruction to get pupil response. Nearly always confers with cooperating teacher and counselor. Some reference to daily log to improve teaching.	Subject matter often is erroneous. Lacks variety in activities & instructional materials. Makes little use of class and community data. Rarely confers with cooperating teacher and counselor. Does not keep daily log.	E S U ( ) ( ) ( )
Teaching	Well prepared in subject matter & gets it across. Keeps lesson moving. Excellent speech patterns. Good approach to motor skills, memorizing, reinforcing, recall, problem solving, appreciations.	Prepared in subject matter but needs help in getting it across. Sometimes lesson lags. Acceptable speech patterns. Usually good approach to motor skills, memorizing, recall, problem solving, appreciations.	Poorly or inadequately prepared in subject matter. Needs constant supervision. Careless, indifferent. Lacks sense of timing. Poor speech patterns. Little discernment of use of appropriate learning experiences.	E S U ( ) ( ) ( )
Records	Effective system of recording grades. Records kept in ink, accurately, legibly. Uses a variety of methods. Does careful recording.	Usually keeps effective system of grades. Records are in ink, accurate & legible.	No system for recording grades. Does not keep accurate, legible records in ink.	E S U ( ) ( ) ( )
Responsibility	Carries out administrative policies. Volunteers for extra duties. Works well independently.	Carries out administrative policies. Accepts but does not volunteer for duties.	Indifferent to authority. Neglects duties. Has to be followed up on most things.	E S U ( ) ( ) ( )

APPENDIX III

COVER LETTER

APPENDIX III

CHICAGO TEACHERS COLLEGE SOUTH
6800 STEWART AVENUE
CHICAGO 21, ILLINOIS

DEPARTMENT OF STUDENT TEACHING

To the Principals of Cooperating Schools:

Enclosed are the evaluation forms for the student teachers in your school. Please return them by Friday, June 8, 1962; a self-addressed envelope is enclosed for your convenience.

We would appreciate having your cooperating teachers fill in the problem check list as well as the usual student teaching evaluation form. It is our hope that the problem check list will be helpful at this time.

Thank you for your continued cooperation.

Marie Tierney, Chairman
Department of Student Teaching

May 1, 1962

APPENDIX IV

PERSONAL DATA SHEET

PERSONAL DATA SHEET

Cumulative Grade Point Average _____

Name _____
Last First Middle or Maiden

Address _____ Telephone _____

Date of Birth _____ Age _____
Year Month Day Years Months Days

Place of Birth _____
City State Country

Anticipated Date of Graduation _____
Month Day Year

Status

1. Transfer Student _____ _____ _____
(Check) Name of Institution Entered C.T.C. Year Month

If a transfer student list names of all colleges attended prior to C.T.C. Include dates.

_____

_____

2. 4 Year C.T.C. _____ 3. Grades 3-8 _____
(Check) (Check)

4. Upper Grade Subject Specialist _____ _____
(Check) (List Teaching Major)

5. Home Arts _____ Home Mechanics _____ Industrial Arts _____
(Check) (Check) (Check)

6. Library Science (_____ 7. Physical Education _____
(Check) (Check)

Elementary School (s) Attended _____
Name (S) City, State (Country)

High School (s) Attended _____
Name (S) City, State (Country)

Cumulative Grade point Average _____

Approval Sheet

The dissertation submitted by Marie M. Foote has been read and approved by five members of the Department of Education.

The final copies have been examined by the director of the dissertation and the signature which appears below verifies the fact that any necessary changes have been incorporated, and that the dissertation is now given final approval with reference to content, form, and mechanical accuracy.

The dissertation is therefore accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Degree of Doctor of Education.

Date

Signature of Adviser