To the Graduate Council:

I am submitting herewith a dissertation written by George D. Spivey, entitled "The Subject Area Specialist Approach Versus the Generalist Approach in the Supervision of Student Teaching." I recommend that it be accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Education, with a major in Curriculum and Instruction.

Edward S. Christenbury
Edward S. Christenbury,
Major Professor

We have read this dissertation
and recommend its acceptance:

A. Paul Nichols

Earl R. Danner

Schuyler W. Huck

Accepted for the Council:

Hilton A. Smith
Vice Chancellor
Graduate Studies and Research

THE SUBJECT AREA SPECIALIST APPROACH VERSUS THE GENERALIST APPROACH IN THE SUPERVISION OF STUDENT TEACHING

A Dissertation

Presented for the

Doctor of Education

Degree

The University of Tennessee

George D. Spivey

June 1974

Copyright by George D. Spivey 1974
All Rights Reserved

1146814

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The writer wishes to express his appreciation to many individuals who gave assistance and encouragement in helping to make this study possible.

A special word of appreciation is extended to the doctoral committee of Drs. E. S. Christenbury, Schuyler W. Huck, Earl M. Ramer, and A. Paul Wishart for their interest and guidance.

The writer is most grateful to Dr. E. S. Christenbury who has not only served as committee chairman, but has provided encouragement, suggestions and assistance throughout the doctoral program and the writing of this dissertation.

The interest, suggestions and assistance given by Dr. William Butefish and his staff of student teacher coordinators at the University of Tennessee have been most gratefully appreciated.

The writer wishes to express gratitude to Dr. Charles Henderson of the University of Florida, Dr. Bert Webb of Memphis State University and Dr. Robert Eaker of Middle Tennessee State University for their interest and assistance extended in the study.

A very special "thanks" is expressed to many student teachers, faculty members and public school teachers for their help in conducting the study.

The writer is most grateful to Miss Helen Smithson who untiringly helped to type this document.

Words are so inadequate in expressing the writer's appreciation to his mother, Mrs. Katherine B. Spivey, Sr. (deceased) and his wife's mother, Mrs. Emma G. Cameron who assisted in so many ways to make this study possible.

Finally, personal affection and a deep appreciation are expressed to my wife, Rosemary, and my three children, Cameron, Cathy and Christy, who helped to make this study worthwhile.

ABSTRACT

The major purpose of this study was to determine if a significant difference existed with respect to the effectiveness of two different approaches to the supervision of student teaching--the Subject Area Specialist Approach and the Generalist Approach.

Data used in the study were obtained from 45 student teachers supervised by the Subject Area Specialist Approach and 45 student teachers supervised by the Generalist Approach in two institutions of higher education in the southeastern area of the United States. The two groups of student teachers were randomly selected from five subject areas: (1) English, (2) Foreign Language, (3) Mathematics, (4) Science, and (5) Social Studies. These student teachers responded to the ANSTE (Assessment of Needs in the Student Teaching Experience) questionnaire and the MTAI (Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory) at the beginning and end of the spring quarter, 1973. The ANSTE questionnaire was developed and validated by the investigator. This instrument consisted of 79 items in seven basic areas of the student teaching experience. The three scales in the ANSTE questionnaire were: (1) Scale I, a scale designed to measure the perceived needs of the student teacher at the beginning of the student teaching

experience, (2) Scale II, a scale designed to measure the amount of supervision given by the college coordinator, and (3) Scale III, a scale designed to measure the degree to which the supervision of the college coordinator helped the student teacher to meet his/her needs during the student teaching experience. The MTAI instrument which is widely used for measuring the attitudes of teachers was used: (a) to determine if a significant difference existed between the responses of the two groups of student teachers in respect to teacher-pupil relations at the beginning of the quarter, and (b) to determine if a significant difference existed between the change scores of the two groups of student teachers in respect to attitudes toward teacher-pupil relations.

An independent samples t-test was used in attempting to determine if a significant difference existed between the responses of the two groups of student teachers as measured by the three scales of the ANSTE questionnaire. A correlated samples t-test was used in attempting to determine if a significant difference existed between the responses of the two groups of student teachers to the MTAI measuring instrument at the beginning of the student teaching experience and the change scores of the student teachers at the end of the student teaching experience.

When the data obtained from the responses of the two groups of student teachers were analyzed, the following conclusions seemed warranted:

Perceived needs of student teachers. There was no significant difference between the perceived needs of the student teachers supervised by the Generalist Approach and the perceived needs of student teachers supervised by the Subject Area Specialist Approach at the beginning of the student teaching experience.

Amount of supervision given. The Generalist Approach provided significantly more supervision to student teachers than did the Subject Area Specialist Approach in the student teaching experience.

Amount of supervision related to subject content. There was no significant difference between the responses of student teachers supervised by the Generalist Approach and student teachers supervised by the Subject Area Specialist Approach in respect to the degree to which supervision was given in helping the student teachers to meet their needs in the area of subject content during the student teaching experience.

Comparison of results in meeting needs. The college coordinator in the Generalist Approach helped student teachers to meet their needs to a significantly greater

degree than did the college coordinator using the Subject Area Specialist Approach during the student teaching experience.

Attitudes of student teachers. There was no significant difference between the attitudes of student teachers supervised by the Generalist Approach and attitudes of student teachers supervised by the Subject Area Specialist Approach toward teacher-pupil relations at the beginning of the student teaching experience.

Change scores in attitudes. There was no significant difference between the change scores of the attitudes of student teachers supervised by the Generalist Approach and attitudes of student teachers supervised by the Subject Area Specialist Approach toward teacher-pupil relations at the close of the student teaching experience.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER		PAGE
I.	INTRODUCTION	1
	Statement of the Problem	2
	Rationale for the Study	3
	Significance of the Study	8
	Hypotheses	9
	Assumptions	10
	Limitations of the Study	11
	Definition of Terms	13
	Organization of the Study	16
II.	REVIEW OF THE RELATED RESEARCH	17
	Review of Literature and Studies Relating to the Development of the Supervision of Student Teachers	17
	Supervision prior to the 1800's	18
	Supervision in the normal school	18
	Supervision in the laboratory school	19
	College controlled public school type of supervision	22
	Professional type of supervision	26
	Review of Literature and Studies Relating to Two Widely Used Types of Supervision of Student Teachers--The Subject Area Specialist Approach and the Generalist Approach	31

CHAPTER PAGE

The subject area specialist approach to supervision 32

The generalist approach to supervision . . 33

Studies relating to the two types of supervision 34

Review of Literature and Studies Relating to the Use of the Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory in Student Teaching Programs . . 43

Studies showing a positive attitude change of student teachers during the student teaching experience as measured by the MTAI 44

Studies showing a negative attitude change of student teachers during the student teaching experience as measured by the MTAI 47

Studies showing no attitude change of student teachers during the student teaching experience as measured by the MTAI 50

Summary 51

III. PROCEDURES 53

Justification, Development and Validation of the Assessment Instrument 53

CHAPTER PAGE

Selection of the Population 60

Procedure for Administering the ANSTE Assessment Instrument 62

Use and Validity of the Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory 64

Procedure for Administering the MTAI Instrument 70

Statistical Treatment of the Data 72

Summary 73

IV. PRESENTATION AND INTERPRETATION OF THE DATA . 74

Presentation and Interpretation of the Data Relating to the Five Hypotheses 74

Summary 86

V. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS . . 89

Summary 89

Purpose 89

Population 90

Instruments 91

Procedures 91

Findings 93

Conclusions 95

Recommendations 97

BIBLIOGRAPHY 99

CHAPTER PAGE

APPENDICES 107

APPENDIX A 108

APPENDIX B 141

APPENDIX C 147

APPENDIX D 152

VITA 166

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE		PAGE
I.	Distribution of Student Teachers in Five Subject Areas	63
II.	Student Teacher's Assessment of Needs in the Student Teaching Experience Form A - Scale I	76
III.	Student Teacher's Assessment of Needs in the Student Teaching Experience Form B - Scale II	79
IV.	Student Teacher's Assessment of Needs in the Student Teaching Experience Form B - Scale III	82
V.	A Comparison of Student Teachers' Attitudes in Group I with Student Teachers' Attitudes in Group II as Measured by the Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory Form A	84
VI.	A Comparison of Change Scores of Student Teachers' Attitudes in Group I with Change Scores of Student Teachers' Attitudes in Group II as Measured by the Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory Form A	87

TABLE PAGE

VII. Personal Data of Student Teacher Population of the Study 144

VIII. Pre- and Post-Test Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory Scores for Each Member of Group I 148

IX. Pre- and Post-Test Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory Scores for Each Member of Group II 150

X. Perceived Needs of Student Teachers at the Beginning of the Student Teaching Experience Form A - Scale I 153

XI. The Means of Responses of Student Teachers in Five Subject Areas as Measured by Scale I of the ANSTE 154

XII. Analysis of Variance on Scores on Student Teachers' Rating Scale of Perceived Needs at the Beginning of the Student Teaching Experience 155

XIII. Student Teachers' Assessment of the Amount of Supervision Given by the College Coordinator Form B - Scale II 156

TABLE PAGE

XIV. The Means of Responses of Student Teachers in Five Subject Areas as Measured by Scale II of the ANSTE 157

XV. Analysis of Variance on Scores on Student Teachers' Rating Scale of the Amount of Supervision Given by the College Coordinator 158

XVI. Degree to Which the Supervision of the College Coordinator Helped Student Teachers Meet Their Needs During the Student Teaching Experience Form B - Scale III 159

XVII. The Means of Responses of Student Teachers in Five Subject Areas as Measured by Scale III of the ANSTE 160

XVIII. Analysis of Variance on Scores on Student Teachers' Rating Scale of the Degree to Which the Supervision of the College Coordinator Helped Student Teachers Meet Their Needs During the Student Teaching Experience 161

XIX. The Means of Responses of Student Teachers in Two Groups as Measured by the Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory Form A 162

TABLE PAGE

XX. Analysis of Variance on Scores of Student Teachers' Responses to the Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory 163

XXI. The Means of Change Scores of Two Groups of Student Teachers as Measured by the Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory Form A 164

XXII. Analysis of Variance on Scores of the Change of Student Teachers' Attitudes as Measured by the Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory 165

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Education in the United States has faced considerable criticism during the last decade. Criticisms have been wielded, beginning in pre-kindergarten and continuing through colleges and universities. Teacher Education Programs, like other phases of education, have been undergoing evaluation and change.

The present focus on the specific competencies to be developed by student teachers has increased the need for evaluating current student teaching programs. The need to determine the effectiveness of various types of supervision in developing student teacher competencies raises a number of important questions. How effective is the supervision of student teachers in current student teaching programs in helping them to meet the needs of their pupils? Is it feasible to shelve one approach to the supervision of student teaching and implement another without attempting to carefully weigh the results of research? Should not studies be conducted to determine if a particular type of supervision of student teachers is more adequately meeting the needs of student teachers? What change is needed and justifiable in a projected program in the supervision of student teaching?

Until the effectiveness of specific types of supervision of the student teaching experience can be determined, broad improvements cannot be wisely implemented.

Numerous educational leaders and writers in the field of teacher education support the proposition that the effectiveness of student teaching programs should be determined through adequate research and evaluation. There is agreement that change should be made in order to meet the needs of pupils more effectively. Most effective methods in the supervision of the student teaching experience have yet to be determined.[1]

Therefore, it seemed essential that an effort be made to determine the effectiveness of some of the types of supervision used in the student teaching experience.

I. STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

In this study an effort was made to determine if a significant difference existed with respect to the effectiveness of two different approaches to the supervision of student teaching--the Subject Area Specialist Approach and the Generalist Approach.

---

[1]B. Othanel Smith, ed., The American Educational Research Association, Research in Teacher Education, A Symposium (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1971), p. 1.

II. RATIONALE FOR THE STUDY

During the last decade teacher education programs have been undergoing increasingly close scrutiny as to purpose and effectiveness. There is agreement among educational writers that the student teaching experience remains as one of the most important phases of a teacher education program. Although most educators agree that change is eminent in student teaching programs, they have differing views as to the most effective mode of supervising student teaching programs.

Othanel Smith, in the introduction to Research in Teacher Education, A Symposium, stated that, "one thousand higher level institutions are producing 200,000 beginning teachers per year." He emphasized the need to conduct research on the education of teachers in order to improve the programs of teacher preparation in educational institutions. He further stated that the problem that confronts those who are interested and concerned with research on teacher education is the

> . . . quest for more dependable knowledge of teaching behavior--its elements and their influence on pupil learning. But even if there were an abundance of such knowledge, there would still be the problem of training teachers to use it in their practice and of inducing institutional changes that incorporate these training procedures into preparatory programs--

> a task comparable to rebuilding vehicles while they are in motion.[2]

Conant maintained that one of the most important parts of training teachers is the practice (student) teaching experience. He called it "the one indisputably essential element in professional education."[3] His recommendation was that teacher competence should determine certification.[4] Rivlin was supportive of Conant's view that student teaching is one of the most important parts of training teachers. He stated:

> Student teaching is the most valuable part of preparation for teaching. Nevertheless, student training, as it is generally conducted, is far from adequate for the preparation and training of today's teachers; and it needs far more than patchwork changes to make it adequate. There is just too big a gap between the limited experience and responsibility of the student teacher and the full responsibility of a classroom teacher which they are expected to assume immediately upon graduation from a teacher training program.[5]

Although student teaching has been considered as essential to adequate teacher education programs, Smith

---

[2] Ibid., p. 1.

[3] James B. Conant, The Education of American Teachers (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1963), p. 142.

[4] Ibid., p. 58.

[5] Harry N. Rivlin, "A New Pattern for Urban Teacher Education," The Journal of Teacher Education, vol. 17 (Summer, 1966), p. 177.

stated that the concern of how skills of teaching are to be developed has long confronted those in teacher education. Current student teaching programs are based on the assumption and supposition that after observing and studying the performance of the supervising teacher and practicing under his supervision, the student teacher is expected to acquire the necessary skills for effective classroom teaching. He further stated that this procedure of developing teaching skills has long been criticized during the past quarter of a century, but "no thorough evaluation of the system of practice [student] teaching has been made."[6]

Various factors have added to the need to re-examine the effectiveness of student teaching programs. Factors such as technological advances, scientific achievements, sociological changes, and the unveiling of new knowledge in the different areas of learning have added to the present milieu to which educators are directing their attention regarding student teaching programs.[7]

Lindley J. Stiles, in the preface to the book, Education and the New Teacher, maintained that the world

---

[6]Smith, op. cit., p. 2.

[7]James C. Stone, Breakthrough in Teacher Education (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1968), pp. 1-10.

of the new teacher is drastically different from the world that we have known. Stiles wrote:

> The world of the new teacher of the 1970's is drastically different from the world familiar to most of us who have helped to educate them. Teachers for this decade will deal with problems unfamiliar to their mentors and, indeed, to thousands of established members of the profession operating outside areas of tension and conflict. The social revolution which has overtaken so many urban communities has affected curriculum, school organization, community relations--the very nature of the teaching-learning process itself. Thus, as decentralization, community control, identification, and diversification of roles, and greater accountability increase, old ground rules become obsolete.[8]

Combs supported the re-examination of the effectiveness of student teaching programs when he stated:

> The product of all of this kind of effort and discussion has been bitterly disappointing. For the most part it has resulted in little more than a reshuffling of the same old courses, a heavier load of content for teacher education students, and some changes in procedures for the certification and licensing of teachers. This is not enough.
>
> Teacher education needs more than a tinkering job. What is called for is a re-examination of the problem in light of our changing social needs on one hand, and our understandings about human behavior and learning on the other.[9]

---

[8] B. J. Chandler, Daniel Powell, and William R. Hazard, Education and the New Teacher (New York: Dodd, Mead and Company, 1971), p. vii.

[9] E. Brooks Smith (ed.), Partnerships in Teacher Education (Washington, D. C.: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1969), p. 10.

Although considerable research on teacher education has been conducted, Smith pointed out that "we keep asking ourselves how much dependable knowledge do we have with which to build more effective programs of teacher education?"[10]

In an effort to obtain the dependable knowledge essential in building an effective student teaching program, it became necessary at first to evaluate existing student teaching programs. Herbert Schueler's view was that, "A teacher education program is, and must be, judged by the performance of its product."[11]

Charles Silberman has leveled strong criticism at the quality of supervision which student teachers have been receiving under traditional student teaching programs. He asserted that student teachers have received limited feedback as to the quality of their performance in the student teaching experience. He described the type of supervision which is given as sporadic and perfunctory in nature. He attributed this to insufficiently trained supervisors.[12]

---

[10] *Ibid*.

[11] Herbert Schueler, "Making Teacher Education Meaningful in Urban Settings," *Improving Education in U.S.*, Stanley Elam, ed. (Wauwatosa, Wisconsin: Phi Delta Kappa, Inc., 1967), pp. 79-90.

[12] Charles E. Silberman, *Crisis in the Classroom* (New York: Random House, 1970).

Since there was agreement among educational writers that the student teaching experience was a vital part in the teacher education program, that the need for change was eminent, and that the quality of the supervision must be improved, there was the need to determine the effectiveness of current approaches to the supervision of student teaching.

III. SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY

The purpose of this study was to gather data to permit a comparative study to be made between the effectiveness of two different approaches to the supervision of student teachers.

Due to the lack in research of an extensive evaluation of current student teaching programs, it was the intent in this study to conduct research in an effort to answer numerous important questions. Schwartz, in presenting a proposal to the faculty at Portland State University in Portland, Oregon, introduced two important questions: (1) To what extent could the generalist deal competently with content problems at the secondary level in the varied subject matter? and (2) To what extent could the generalist deal competently with the teaching skills central to effective teaching in any discipline? Schwartz further stated that no data were available in educational research literature

to serve as a guideline in answering these questions. Therefore, feedback was needed from student teachers regarding the degree to which they received help needed in their content area from the generalist supervisor.[13]

Other questions of importance to be answered were: (1) How extensively would supervision be given in the Subject Area Specialist Approach as compared with the Generalist Approach? and (2) How effectively would the needs of student teachers be met in each of the two approaches to the supervision of student teachers?

An effort was made in this study to determine strengths and weaknesses of these two types of supervision of student teachers. If the effectiveness of a certain type of supervision were to be judged by the performance of its product, it was necessary to determine its effectiveness through research.

IV. HYPOTHESES

The following null hypotheses were tested in this study:

---

[13]Carol A. Schwartz, "The Effect of a Cluster Plan on Secondary Student Teachers," The Journal of Teacher Education, vol. 22 (Fall, 1971), pp. 348-349.

H_1: There is no significant difference between the perceived needs of student teachers supervised by two types of supervision--the Subject Area Specialist Approach and the Generalist Approach.

H_2: There is no significant difference between the assessed amount of supervision given to student teachers in two types of supervision--the Subject Area Specialist Approach and the Generalist Approach.

H_3: There is no significant difference between the degree to which student teachers perceive that their needs are met in the two types of supervision--the Subject Area Specialist Approach and the Generalist Approach.

H_4: There is no significant difference between the attitudes of student teachers in Group I and Group II with respect to teacher-pupil relations at the beginning of the student teaching experience.

H_5: There is no significant difference between the change scores of attitudes of student teachers in Group I and Group II with respect to teacher-pupil relations at the end of the student teaching experience.

V. ASSUMPTIONS

The following assumptions were made in the study:

(1) It was possible to measure the effectiveness of certain phases of student teaching without a detailed study

of every factor involved in the student teaching program.

(2) The measuring instruments were properly developed and selected for the study.

(3) The individuals selected to collect data were adequately trained to use the measuring instruments in obtaining the needed data for the study.

(4) The institutions from which student teachers were randomly selected for the study adequately represented the two different approaches to the supervision of student teachers.

(5) The data were collected at a time commensurate in both systems to allow a comparison to be made between the effectiveness of each of the two types of supervision of student teachers.

(6) The attitudes in one group or system were equated with those of the second group or system by the use of a sufficiently large sample in the five selected subject areas.

(7) The input and/or the influence of the supervising teachers in Group I and Group II was commensurate in the study.

VI. LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

(1) The population of this study was limited to randomly sampled student teachers from each of five

subject areas: (1) English, (2) Mathematics, (3) Social Studies, (4) Science, and (5) Foreign Languages.

(2) The student teachers were selected from the Spring Quarter group in the Secondary Education Department of two institutions of higher education in the southeastern region of the United States.

(3) Forty-five student teachers enrolled in their student teaching experience under the supervision of college coordinators using the Subject Area Specialist Approach to the supervision of student teaching were used in the study.

(4) Forty-five student teachers enrolled in their student teaching experience under the supervision of college coordinators using the Generalist Approach to the supervision of student teaching were used in the study.

(5) The college coordinators used in this study as Subject Area Specialists and Generalists were selected upon the recommendation of the Directors of Student Teaching as being experienced and qualified in their roles as college coordinators. No further attempt was made to establish the competence of the coordinators, nor was any attempt made to equate the supervisory competence of the Subject Area Specialists and the Generalists.

VII. DEFINITION OF TERMS

Student Teaching. A period of guided teaching under the supervision of a supervising (directing) teacher in the public schools and a college coordinator (supervisor). The college student assumes increasing responsibilities for directing the learning activities of a group or groups of students for a number of consecutive weeks.[14]

College Coordinator. A regular member of the college of education who has as his/her responsibility the supervision of a group of student teachers for one or more quarters during a school year.

Generalist. A college coordinator (supervisor) who is a specialist in the art of teaching and works in the area of curriculum and instruction. He/she may be a specialist in one or more subject areas and concentrates upon the total development of student teachers. The generalist usually supervises 15 to 20 student teachers in a variety of disciplines and grade levels as opposed to a specialist who supervises six to 10 student teachers within his discipline or special area of preparation. The generalist supervises student teachers who are usually assigned to schools in a limited geographic location referred to as

---

[14]Leonard O. Andrews, Student Teaching (New York: The Center for Applied Research in Education, Inc., 1964), p. 9.

a "center." Normally, provision is made for the generalist to meet regularly in seminars with the total group of student teachers.[15]

Subject Area Specialist. A college coordinator (supervisor) who has majored in a specific subject area. He/she is professionally prepared to supervise student teachers in a particular discipline such as mathematics, science, foreign language, social studies, or English. A subject area specialist usually supervises six to 10 student teachers in schools within a radius of 50 miles of the campus of the college or university and teaches one or two classes at the educational institution.[16]

Supervising (Directing) Teacher. A regular certified member of a school faculty in a public institution usually assigned the teaching responsibilities on either a grade level(s) or in a particular subject area. The supervising (directing) teacher assumes jointly the responsibility with the college supervisor for guiding the student teacher in teaching activities during a specified period of time.

---

[15]Carol A. Schwartz, "The Effect of a Cluster Plan on Secondary Student Teachers," The Journal of Teacher Education, vol. 22 (Fall, 1971), p. 348.

[16]Edward C. Merrill, Jr., Professional Student Teaching Programs (Danville, Illinois: The Interstate Printers and Publishers, Inc., 1967), p. 101.

Scale I. A form of measurement for identifying the degree to which needs were perceived by the student teacher, upon entering the student teaching experience. An example can be found in Appendix A.

Scale II. A form of measurement for identifying the degree to which supervision was provided by the college coordinator during the student teaching experience. An example can be found in Appendix A.

Scale III. A form of measurement for identifying the degree to which the supervision of the college coordinator helped to meet the needs of the student teacher during the student teaching experience. An example can be found in Appendix A.

Participation. A term used to refer to the gradual involvement of student teachers in instructional situations under the supervision of a college coordinator and supervising classroom teacher.

Seminars. A term referring to periodic meetings planned within a group of student teachers for the purpose of allowing discussion and evaluation of pertinent factors involved in their student teaching experience.

Group I. Group of student teachers referred to in this study who were supervised by Subject Area Specialists.

Group II. Group of student teachers referred to in this study who were supervised by Generalists.

VIII. ORGANIZATION OF THE STUDY

This study is reported in five chapters as follows:

Chapter I introduced the reader to the stated purpose of the study. The hypotheses are stated. The rationale, the significance of the study, the assumption, the limitations, the definition of terms, and the organization of the study are included.

Chapter II reviews the related research. The review of the literature includes readings and studies relative to the development of supervision, readings and studies relative to two types of supervision--the Subject Area Specialist Approach and the Generalist Approach--and the use of the MTAI in studies on student teaching.

Chapter III includes the procedures for developing and administering the research. In this chapter the following areas are considered: the construction and validation of the instruments, the activities and procedures, the sources of the data, and the treatment of the data.

Chapter IV includes a report of the data collected and an interpretation given with the use of appropriate tables.

Chapter V includes a summary, conclusions, and recommendations.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE RELATED RESEARCH

In this chapter literature was reviewed with consideration given primarily to three specific areas. The related literature and studies selected for review were: (1) A Review of Literature and Studies Relating to the Development of the Supervision of Student Teachers, (2) A Review of Literature and Studies Relating to Two Widely Used Types of Supervision of Student Teachers--The Subject Area Specialist Approach and the Generalist Approach, and (3) A Review of Literature and Studies Relating to the Use of the Minnesota Teacher's Attitude Inventory in Student Teaching Programs.

I. REVIEW OF LITERATURE AND STUDIES RELATING TO THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE SUPERVISION OF STUDENT TEACHERS

The research in this area was selected to show the development of the various types of supervision used in the supervising of student teachers. The improvements and changes relating to the supervision of student teachers paralleled quite closely the changes and growth relating to teacher education and certification.

Supervision Prior to the 1800's

Prior to the 1800's, the supervision of student teachers was very limited or non-existent. Teaching was fairly simple in that it dealt with subject content with little emphasis on the techniques of teaching and the individual needs of students.[1]

Supervision in the Normal School

In the earlier part of the nineteenth century, the training of teachers became one of the focal points in education.[2] With the establishment of the "normal" school in 1839, Harper pointed out that practice teaching became an integral part of the curriculum. This type of training allowed for personal supervision in that one of the distinctive characteristics of the normal school was that of its being a model and practice school for the training of teachers.[3]

---

[1]Carroll Atkinson and Eugene T. Maleska, The Story of Education (New York: Bantam Books, 1964), p. 380.

[2]L. Cremin, "Background of Teacher Education for U. S. Public Schools," The Education of Teachers in England, France, and the U. S. A., eds., C. A. Richardson, H. Brule, and H. Snyder (Paris: UNESCO, The United Nations, 1953), p. 229.

[3]C. Harper, A Century of Public Teacher Education (Washington, D. C.: American Association of Teachers Colleges, 1939), p. 118.

Differences of opinion developed as to the function of the normal school. Harper stated that the normal school should maintain the role of testing, demonstrating new and better techniques, and teaching materials, as well as making provisions for a direct learning laboratory for practice teachers.[4]

Supervision in the Laboratory School

As the normal schools gave way to teacher colleges with their development of four-year preparation programs, student teaching became an important part of the educational process in teacher preparation. Teacher colleges grew considerably in size, and state universities began teacher education programs. The laboratory school became very prominent in teacher education. Its main emphasis was that of providing a student teaching experience that allowed for carefully planned and controlled learning situations.[5]

One of the first educators who maintained that practice work in a laboratory setting was an essential part of teacher preparation was John Dewey. Dewey maintained that practice work provided a number of opportunities for the practice teacher to develop a better hold upon the educational significance of subject matter, and of the

---

[4] Ibid.

[5] William A. Bennie, Cooperation for Better Student Teaching (Minneapolis: Burgess Publishing Company, 1966), p. 4.

science, philosophy, and history of education.[6] The increased emphasis upon the development of teaching skills in actual classroom experiences required more supervision than had previously been given.

Andrews described the type of supervision given in the laboratory school as representing the first common pattern of supervision of student teachers. In this type of supervision "the director of student teaching made the placements, conducted weekly conferences, kept the records, observed very occasionally, helped with the problem cases, and transmitted the grades to the registrar." Andrews further stated that the director of student teaching carried only 10 percent of the total supervisory responsibilities. His load averaged 100 or more student teachers. The success, then, of this type of supervision depended mainly upon the competence of the laboratory school teacher.[7]

In 1914, a comprehensive study was made by Arthur R. Mead in which he made an investigation of a number of factors relating to the student teaching experience. The study was conducted by the use of a questionnaire. It was a study involving state universities and private

---

[6]John Dewey, "Relationship of Theory to Practice in Education," The Relation of Theory to Practice in Education, ed., A. C. Haines (Cedar Falls, Iowa: The Association for Student Teaching, 1962), pp. 21-23.

[7]L. O. Andrews, Student Teaching (New York: The Center for Applied Research in Education, Inc., 1964), pp. 53-54.

colleges in an effort to determine five specific factors in the area of practice teaching. Among the various factors considered were the ways of supervising student teachers.[8]

Mead found that a variety of types of supervision existed among educational institutions with teacher training programs. These kinds of supervision ranged from those having little supervision to those having close and careful supervision. Numerous other studies were made during this period which described the practice, organization and administration of student teaching programs.

In 1932, Marshall conducted a study in which she evaluated three types of student teaching--the one-term program, the extended program, and the practice period of 180 clock hours. Her conclusion was that the student teaching experience in which the student teacher experienced a number of hours of teaching extended over a number of weeks was more effective than concentrated effort in a brief period of time.[9] These three kinds of student

---

[8]Arthur R. Mead, Practice Teaching for Teachers in Secondary Schools, Bulletin No. 29 (Washington: U. S. Bureau of Education, Government Printing Office, 1917).

[9]Edna M. Marshall, Evaluation of Types of Student Teaching, Contributions to Education No. 488 (New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1932).

teaching programs varied as to the degree of supervision made available in the student teaching experience.

College Controlled Public School Type of Supervision

After the early part of the twentieth century, the type of supervision used in the supervision of student teachers was described by Andrews as a "college-controlled public school type." This type of supervision was developed in colleges using the public schools for the student teaching experience. The college supervisor's role involved a number of responsibilities. Whereas the laboratory school teacher had previously assumed 90 percent of the responsibility of the supervision, the college supervisor now assumed 90 percent of the responsibility of the supervision. His duties included:

(1) Conducting the campus seminar,
(2) Observing the student teacher each week followed by a personal conference,
(3) Checking all lesson plans,
(4) Being responsible for the over-all planning of instruction, and
(5) Giving the final grade.[10]

His full-time load averaged about 12 student teachers. The competence of the college supervisor was the key to the success of this plan of supervision.

---

[10]Andrews, op. cit., p. 54.

In 1948, the Flowers Report which was sponsored by the American Association of Teachers Colleges, influenced educational institutions to use the school and community setting for practice teaching. In 1945 the Committee on Students and Surveys of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education appointed a subcommittee to conduct a study relating to the professional education of student teachers. This subcommittee was made up of the following educators: Dr. John G. Flowers, Dr. Allen D. Patterson, and Dr. Florence B. Stratemeyer. Standards governing student teaching had not undergone revision in 25 years. Standard VI, "The Training Schools and Student Teaching," was in the opinion of the Standards Committee in great need of revision. As the study was undertaken in 1945, the Association for Student Teaching was invited to participate.[11]

The response to an extensive questionnaire which was sent to 182 member institutions of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education and to 50 selected liberal arts colleges provided the data and information for the study. One hundred fifty-seven member institutions and 23 liberal arts colleges responded. In addition to this

---

[11]John G. Flowers, School and Community Laboratory Experiences in Teacher Education (Oeonta, New York: American Association of Teachers Colleges, 1948), p. 261.

response, Dr. Margaret Lindsey visited 10 campuses of the participating institutions, conferences were held with representatives from 39 institutions and 32 consultants reviewed the findings of the committee.

Among the findings of this committee were six prevailing trends in the organization of student teaching. In Trend V: Supervising and Guiding the Student in Professional Laboratory Experiences, the committee reported that 33 institutions' made a practice of scheduling regular visits of college personnel to observe student teachers during the student teaching experience. Only 54 of 129 institutions stated that the supervision of the student teacher was the primary concern of professional personnel of teacher training institutions. Twenty-six institutions indicated that they felt that the supervision of student teachers was a joint responsibility.[12]

In 1948, at the meeting of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education in Atlantic City, Dr. Margaret Lindsey reported the major findings of the survey committee and made six recommendations. In these recommendations, one was related specifically to the supervision of student teaching. It was recommended that the instructional load of both the cooperating teacher and the college

---

[12] Ibid., pp. 201-248.

instructors be adjusted. Further study and research on off-campus practices was recommended.[13]

As the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education was concluding its study, the Association for Student Teaching began a study relating to off-campus trends and practices in student teaching. A committee composed of four members, Dr. Margaret Lindsey, Dr. Allen D. Patterson, Dr. Morton S. Malter, and Dr. Troy L. Stearns were appointed to conduct a pilot study on off-campus student teaching. This committee was to report to the Association at the national convention in Atlantic City in 1950.

This study approved by the Association for Student Teaching involved 80 colleges accredited by the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education. A questionnaire was employed for obtaining the derived information relating to off-campus student teaching. The number of the participants included in the study was increased from 80 colleges to 245 teacher education institutions. One hundred thirty-nine responded to the questionnaire. The

---

[13]Margaret Lindsey, Major Findings and Recommendations in the Study of Professional Laboratory Experiences (Oeonta: The American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1948), pp. 14-15.

final results were published in the thirtieth yearbook of the Association for Student Teaching in 1951.[14]

In the study, 10 prevailing trends were revealed. In Trend I, it was reported that off-campus student teaching was the culminating experience in teacher education programs.[15] In Trend X, it was reported that the regular duties of the director of student teaching included teaching both elementary and secondary classes, supervising student teachers on the elementary and secondary levels, and conducting seminars on both the elementary and secondary levels of instruction. Ninety-one of the 139 institutions reported that the director of student teachers was responsible for the supervision of student teachers.[16] Among the standards recommended, Dr. Horn suggested that "off-campus personnel should be specialists in their particular area of instruction."[17]

Professional Type of Supervision

During the last two decades numerous changes have occurred in student teaching. Bennie pointed out that

---

[14]The Association for Student Teaching, Off-Campus Student Teaching, Thirtieth Yearbook (Lock Haven: The Association for Student Teaching, 1951), pp. 40-41.

[15]Ibid., p. 49 [16]Ibid., pp. 63-65.

[17]Dwight K. Curtis and others, Achieving Quality in Off-Campus Professional Laboratory Experiences (Cedar Falls: The Association for Student Teaching, 1957), pp. v-vi.

the change from "practice teaching" to "student teaching" indicated a changed philosophy. The student teacher was now considered as being in a learning experience instead of practicing those things demonstrated in the laboratory experience. The prospective teacher candidate was encouraged to experiment, to probe, to inquire, and to learn for himself how theory previously studied applies to real pupils in actual classrooms.[18] This change in philosophy had also brought about change in supervision.

A third type of supervision as described by Andrews, was that of a "dual responsibility" or "professional type" of supervision. In this type of supervision the college supervisor worked primarily through the classroom teacher. The college supervisor carried from 20 percent to 40 percent of the responsibility of supervising the student teacher with the cooperating teacher carrying the remaining responsibility. This type of supervision was somewhere between the two previously mentioned patterns of supervision. The college coordinator observed the student teacher a few times, held follow-up conferences, conducted seminars and decided on the final grade. A reasonable load of student teachers for the college coordinator ranged between 20 and 35 student teachers. This depended on the geographical

---

[18]Bennie, op. cit., p. 2.

location as well as the experience and competence of the cooperating teachers.[19]

In 1952, Rucker surveyed 299 colleges in the United States in an effort to establish trends in student teaching from 1932 to 1952. He established six national trends. Among these six trends was the trend toward cooperation and democratic supervision of student teaching.[20]

In 1958, Koonts conducted a study of the development, organization, and administration of student teaching in South Carolina. In this study he states that 95.2 percent of the 21 educational institutions in South Carolina used part-time supervisors of student teaching. Nine colleges reported that the chairman of the education department had supervisory duties of student teachers; seven colleges reported the supervision of the student teachers by the chairman of elementary education; and five colleges reported supervision of the student teachers by the chairman of secondary education. These practices of supervising student teachers predominated in all types of institutions reporting in the study in South Carolina.[21]

---

[19]Andrews, op. cit., p. 55.

[20]Winfred Ray Rucker, "A Critical Analysis of Current Trends in Student Teaching" (unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, Harvard University, 1952), pp. 197-198.

[21]Jones Calvin Koonts, "Development, Organization, and Administration of Student Teaching in South Carolina" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Peabody College for Teachers, 1958), p. 284.

In the recommendations of the study, Koonts maintained that "the supervision of student teachers be shared by academic and professional personnel of the college." He further stated that "subject major advisors are better prepared to evaluate the student teachers on course matter than are professional personnel who should be specialists in method and procedure."[22] He further recommended that conferences with the student teacher and the evaluation of the student teacher's work be a cooperative endeavor of the student teacher, the cooperating teacher, and the college supervisor. The director of student teaching would also have a part in the final evaluation.[23] Although Koonts made these recommendations, he did not present any specific data supporting one method of supervision as more effective than other methods of supervision used.

John W. Michaelis, in his review of research on student teaching in 1960, maintained that the critical, evaluative research on student teaching is poor. He further stated that

> . . . available published literature is made up largely of articles based on opinion, descriptions of practice, recommendations of committees and commissions, surveys and related recommendations, and a few critical studies.[24]

---

[22] Ibid., p. 369. [23] Ibid., p. 370.

[24] John U. Michaelis, "Teacher Education-Student Teaching and Internship," Encyclopedia of Educational Research (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1960), pp. 1473-74.

Andrews supported Michaelis' view that critical and evaluative research on student teaching has had its limitations due to the emphasis placed on relationships and comparisons. He stated that the most inadequate techniques were used. Although a number of doctoral dissertations have been written in an effort to seek answers to practical problems, few dissertations have been reported extensively enough to have any great impact on shaping future student teaching programs. Andrews conducted a check on doctoral dissertations in an effort to identify those in the field of student teaching which had recommendations and suggestions other than local interest. There were 21 studies submitted in the two-year period of 1958-1960. In a survey of the Educational Index from July, 1959 through June, 1962, it was found that not one of those who had written his doctoral dissertation in the area of student teaching had published an indexed monograph or magazine article on the research conducted in his dissertation.[25]

In 1966 Cornett made a survey of research relative to the supervision of student teachers at the secondary level. Three questions were of primary importance:

(1) What research was done prior to 1950 pertaining to the supervision of student teachers?

---

[25]Andrews, op. cit., pp. 88-89.

(2) What is the present status (since 1950) of our knowledge regarding the supervision of student teachers at the secondary level?
(3) What trends can be predicted from the changes that occurred?[26]

In an overall interpretation of the findings, Cornett concluded that an excessive amount of poor supervision of student teachers by both the supervising teachers (college supervisors) and the cooperating teachers (classroom teachers) existed.[27]

II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE AND STUDIES RELATING TO TWO WIDELY USED TYPES OF SUPERVISION OF STUDENT TEACHERS--THE SUBJECT AREA SPECIALIST APPROACH AND THE GENERALIST APPROACH

The review of literature indicated that larger enrollments in educational institutions during the last two decades have necessitated a change from the close supervision in the laboratory school to a more realistic setting in the public school. Andrews stated that as this change occurred, the responsibilities of the college supervisor increased. No longer could the director of student

---

[26]Joe DeLayne Cornett, "A Survey of Research Relative to Supervision of Student Teachers at the Secondary Level" (unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, University of Arkansas, 1966).

[27]Ibid.

teaching supervise the increasing number of student teachers, but other kinds of supervision were sought.[28]

The Subject Area Specialist Approach to Supervision

One of the approaches that has been used in numerous institutions in meeting the supervisory needs of student teachers has been the subject area specialist approach. Subject area professors have been assigned the responsibility of supervising six to ten student teachers while teaching one or two classes on the college campus. The number of classes assigned to the subject area specialist supervisors has depended on a number of factors. In some situations the student teachers have been assigned to public schools a number of miles apart due to the lack of courses in certain subject areas. The diverse placement of the student teachers under one supervisor has required additional time in travel, thus limiting the number and length of visits made by the college supervisor, and increasing the cost of the supervisory program.

Merrill referred to the subject area specialist as a "professional specialist." He pointed out that a "professional specialist" was a professor who had made an in depth study of a particular discipline--English, history, music, or some other subject. He had conducted research

---

[28] Ibid., pp. 43-54.

and written in his subject area field of concentration. He viewed himself as a professional educator and was interested in his particular subject as it was being taught.[29]

The Generalist Approach to Supervision

A second approach to the supervisory needs of student teachers has been that of the generalist approach. Schwartz defined the role of a generalist as a "person who supervised in a variety of disciplines as opposed to that of a specialist, one who supervised only within his discipline or special area of preparation."[30]

Merrill pointed out that some generalists were specialists in a certain subject area, but within that field concentrated upon the total educational development of the student teacher. Some professionals have had a preparation of a more general description. Merrill further stated that they have studied curriculum or curriculum foundations in depth and have specialized in either the elementary or secondary grades.[31]

---

[29]Edward C. Merrill, Jr., Professional Student Teaching Programs (Danville, Illinois: The Interstate Printers and Publishers, Inc., 1967), p. 101.

[30]Carol A. Schwartz, "The Effect of a Cluster Plan on Secondary Student Teachers," The Journal of Teacher Education, vol. 22 (Fall, 1971), p. 348.

[31]Merrill, op. cit., pp. 100-101.

Studies Relating to the Two Types of Supervision

Among the numerous issues in the student teaching experience which were revealed in the literature was the question--What specific kind of supervision should be used? Andrews asked, "Should the colleges assign their supervisory staff to work as general or special area supervisors?"[32]

The issue, as Andrews pointed out, is one of whether faculty members should be prepared as general college supervisors in any subject area or grade level; or whether they should be assigned as a specialist to supervise student teachers in a single subject field or narrow range of fields; or, whether general supervisors should be assigned to a group of student teachers from a few related subject fields with subject area specialists serving as consultants.[33]

Since the purpose of this study was to determine the effectiveness of two specific types of supervision, the following studies were considered as they concentrated on the "subject area specialist approach" and the "generalist approach."

In 1972, Crocker examined the role elements of a full time college supervisor in a newly formed off-campus setting. He considered the following nine facets of the

---

[32]Andrews, op. cit., p. 87. [33]Ibid.

college supervising role: supervision, seminars, in-service activities, a field experience, pre-service center, service to the college, administrative duties and responsibilities, time and motion, the supervision as a generalist, and the role of the college in developing pre-service field centers.[34]

Crocker's conclusion was that the "center approach" was considered superior to the former "transient" approach. He stated that the areas of great improvement were a higher frequency of visits, improved communications, availability of the supervisor, usefulness of his presence and reduced travel time. Crocker concluded that a process oriented "generalist" supervision was more useful to both the school district and the college than a higher number of individual "subject area" supervisors. There were six conditions stated as necessary for a successful field oriented supervisory role:

(1) A small geographic area in which supervision takes place.
(2) Few or no campus duties.
(3) An assignment of no more than twenty student teachers.
(4) A supporting organization such as the center idea.
(5) Accessibility to subject matter people at the college.

---

[34]Walter Adams Crocker, Jr., "The College Supervisor of Student Teachers, K-12 in a Field Oriented Setting: A Developmental Study" (unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, Wayne State University, 1972).

(6) Opportunity to discuss the role with other supervisors on a regular basis.[35]

In the final 12 recommendations, two specific recommendations were of importance to this study:

(7) Further studies of the efficacy of a K-12 generalist supervision should be encouraged.
(12) A follow-up study of center development student teachers should be undertaken.[36]

In 1972 an experimental program in French Education was conducted at the University of Wisconsin. In this study Knop stated that numerous factors had demanded that alternatives be sought in the supervision of student teachers. The first factor that demanded an alternative was an increase in French Education at the University of Wisconsin. A second factor was the lack of foreign language programs in all secondary schools in a close proximity of the educational institution. This meant that students must be placed 75 to 100 miles from campus. Knop stated that the practice in the college of education had been one of the methods professor and/or assistants making three visits per student teacher during his/her seven weeks of teaching. These visits included lengthy discussions with the student teacher regarding the class observed. Other problems or questions were also answered at this time.[37]

---

[35] Ibid. [36] Ibid

[37] Constance K. Knop, "Alternatives in Student Teacher Supervision and Evaluation," The French Review, vol. 46 (December, 1972), p. 354.

Knop further pointed out that

> . . . problems in the budget, distance in travel and time limitations created the need for seeking alternatives for the third visit to classrooms. It was felt that two visits should be made: one near the beginning of the student teaching experience to offer suggestions and guidance and one near the end of the student teaching experience to evaluate progress and achievement.[38]

Five alternatives were provided as a replacement for the third visit. The first alternative was to set up several Saturday meetings during the student teaching experience for all student teachers in the program, no matter how far they were placed from campus. The second alternative was that of the cooperating teacher's writing up in detail three observations of their student teachers' classes. These observations were to be done during the time that the college supervisor was not visiting. The third alternative was that of the student teacher's making a video tape or tape recording of a class and submitting it with a written evaluation of teaching in the class and the work up to that point, and turning it into the college supervisor. The fourth alternative was that of the student teachers' making up an evaluation form on their teaching to submit to their pupils at the end of the seven weeks of teaching. The student teachers were encouraged to ask specific questions about their teaching, give their pupils a check list to

---

[38] Ibid., p. 355.

complete, and leave spaces for their special comments. The fifth alternative was that of having student teachers make up one last self-evaluation, two weeks after their teaching ended. Included in this evaluation was the evaluation of their pupils, the evaluation of their cooperating teacher, the achievements made, insights developed, and their own personal feeling of accomplishments.[39]

The results of this experimental program were: (1) that more feedback was given to student teachers concerning their work, (2) that student teachers received weekly guidance from some type of communication, and (3) that more information was available to the college coordinator for the final evaluation. Finally, Knop stated that student teachers became more involved in self-evaluation, constructive self-criticism and independent self-improvement in working out means of improving their teaching.[40]

In 1969, Schwartz stated that a proposal for developing a new program for the supervision of student teachers was presented to the faculty at Portland State University in Portland, Oregon. In the proposal, the role of the university supervisor was that of a generalist. The generalist in this context was one who supervised in a variety of disciplines as opposed to the specialist who supervised

---

[39] Ibid., pp. 355-358. [40] Ibid., p. 359.

within his own discipline or his special area of preparation.[41]

In the fall term of 1969, seven student teachers were selected at random from a total pool of secondary student teachers at Portland State University to participate in the "cluster plan" at Reynolds High School in the northeast Portland metropolitan area. The traditional plan of placement was used in placing the seven student teachers. Six of these student teachers continued throughout the program. Two student teachers were in social studies; two, English; one, business education; and one, speech and drama. These six student teachers taught in the same school under the supervision of one college supervisor. The supervisor focused attention on helping the student teachers develop effective teaching skills and viewed the classroom supervising teacher's role as that of a subject matter specialist. Many seminars were held in the school instead of on campus.[42]

A control group of 25 student teachers was selected at random from the same pool of student teachers as those who had been selected for the "cluster" plan. The student teachers in the control group were assigned to six college supervisors. Each college supervisor was a subject area

---

[41]Schwartz, op. cit., p. 348. [42]Ibid., pp. 348-349.

specialist in the subject area in which he supervised the student teachers. Two supervisors had additional student teachers outside their area of specialization, who were not included in the study. In the traditional program at Portland State University, the subject area specialist's supervisory load ranged from 8 to 16 student teachers per quarter and were assigned to a number of public schools in the area. Under the traditional placement of student teachers, the average number of schools visited was four and this required considerable time in traveling. In addition to the supervisory load, the college supervisor taught one or two classes on campus. The majority of seminars for the control group was similar to seminars of the traditional program and were held on the university campus.

The measurement instrument used in the study at Portland State University was a two-part attitudinal questionnaire. Part I was administered after a month of the term had passed and again during the last week of the term. Part II was administered during the last week of the term.

The results of the research showed no significant difference between student teachers supervised by a generalist as compared to student teachers supervised by a subject area specialist as to: (1) the help received from the college supervisor with the subject matter taught, and (2) the help received in the area of teaching skills relating

to different disciplines. Data suggested that the student teachers at the secondary level felt that having a generalist was as satisfactory as having a specialist.[43]

In 1968, an effort was made by Barnett to determine the status and practices of supervisors of secondary student teachers in Texas colleges and universities. He compared these practices with those recommended by national authorities in the field of student teacher supervision. Among the practices considered were: (1) practices of supervisors of all-day student teachers with those of part-time student teachers, and (2) practices of general supervisors with those of special supervisors.

A questionnaire was constructed and sent to 371 supervisors of secondary student teachers in Texas. Ninety-one percent of these supervisors responded.[44] As a result of the findings, some of Barnett's conclusions were: (1) that little coordination existed between directors of student teachers and the individual supervisors, and (2) it appeared that the majority of the college supervisors in Texas were not adequately prepared professionally for the position of college supervision.

---

[43] Ibid., p. 355.

[44] John B. Barnett, "A Study of the Texas Supervisor of Secondary Student Teachers" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, North Texas State University, 1968).

In the recommendations made, some of the suggestions were: (1) more initial conferences of college supervisors, the supervising teacher, and the student teacher, and (2) carefully structured meetings for the supervisory staff.[45]

In 1963-64, at Indiana State College, Indiana, Pennsylvania, Stapleton made an investigation to determine whether a change in the measured performance of student teachers might result in the pattern of college supervisor activities. An experimental group was exposed to an intensified program of college supervision which involved at least six visits, team conferences were held between the student teacher, supervising teacher and college supervisor. This group of student teachers were required to keep a log, seating charts, write a report of co-curricular activity involvement, prepare a case study, and attend a Saturday campus meeting. A check list of important items was used during all of the conferences.[46]

The control group of student teachers were visited by the college supervisor three times. Conferences were

---

[45] Ibid.

[46] Martin Luther Stapleton, "An Evaluation of Two Programs of Student Teacher Supervision by College Supervisors" (unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, The Pennsylvania State University, Pennsylvania, Indiana, 1965).

of a professional nature and a check list was not used. No additional requirements were made of the control group.

Stapleton stated that

> . . . statistical tests demonstrated significant differences between the measured performance of the more intensively supervised experimental group and the control group on both the Revised Indiana and the Cornell scales.[47]

He further stated that no evidence was shown that academic averages might be used to predict measured performance in student teaching.

III. REVIEW OF LITERATURE AND STUDIES RELATING TO THE USE OF THE MINNESOTA TEACHER ATTITUDE INVENTORY IN STUDENT TEACHING PROGRAMS

In a careful review of the literature and studies it was found that numerous studies have been conducted using the Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory[48] as a measurement to determine the change in attitude of student teachers during the student teaching experience. The findings of the research were grouped in three categories: (1) studies showing a positive attitude change in student

---

[47] Ibid.

[48] Walter W. Cook, Carroll H. Leeds, and Robert Callis, Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory (New York: The Psychological Corporation, 1951).

teachers during the student teaching experience, (2) studies showing a negative attitude change in the student teachers during the student teaching experience, and (3) studies showing no significant attitude change among student teachers during the student teaching experience.

Studies Showing a Positive Attitude Change of Student Teachers During the Student Teaching Experience as Measured by the MTAI

Among the studies relating to a positive attitude change of student teachers under various kinds of supervision, Rawlins, Richardson, Troisi, Sandgreen and Schmidt, and Christenbury found a significant positive attitude change in student teachers during the student teaching experience.

In 1970, at the University of Tennessee, Rawlins conducted a study of prospective teachers' problem perception compared with problems encountered and attitude changes occurring during student teaching. The Problem Instrument and the MTAI were administered to 135 elementary and secondary student teachers enrolled in the regular student teaching program at the University of Tennessee during the fall quarter of 1969, and to 103 students enrolled in one of the three core professional education courses during the summer of 1969.

The student teachers were supervised in teaching centers by coordinators described as generalists, and did not include student teachers in the areas of Home Economics, Agriculture, and Industrial Arts.

The findings of Rawlins' study showed a statistically significant positive increase in the attitudes of student teachers toward teaching and working with young people as a result of the student teaching experience.[49]

In 1969, at Northern Illinois University, Richardson conducted a study in which he used the MTAI and the Self-Assessment of Relative Strengths in Teaching to determine the effect of student teachers' being exposed to an "Individual Progression Approach" to the supervision of student teachers. He stated that the results as measured by the MTAI, showed that there was a statistically significant change in the attitudes of student teachers toward teaching after participating in the "Individual Progression Program."[50]

---

[49]George Mimms Rawlins, III, "A Study of Prospective Teachers' Perceptions Compared with Problems Encountered and Attitude Changes Occurring During Student Teaching" (unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, University of Tennessee, 1970).

[50]Richardson, op. cit.

In 1959, Troisi made a study to determine the effect of student teaching upon student teachers' objectives and their relation to achievement and attitudes toward children. Among the three instruments used in this study at the State University of New York Teachers Colleges at Fredonia, Oneonta, and Plattsburgh in the fall semester of 1956-57, the MTAI was used to measure attitudes toward children's behavior. It was found that the student teaching experience increased the student teachers' MTAI scores. There was a significant positive difference between the pre-test and post-test scores of the main study group of 180 participants.[51]

In 1956, Sandgren and Schmidt administered the MTAI to 393 seniors at Midwestern State Teachers College at the beginning and again at the end of the student teaching experience. This study was designed to answer the question--"Does Practice Teaching Change Attitudes Toward Teaching?" In the results of the study as measured by the MTAI, it was found that the increase in scores as shown by the difference between the pre-test scores and the post-test scores was statistically significant.[52]

---

[51]Nicholas Franis Troisi, "The Effect of Student-Teaching Upon Student Teachers' Objectives and Their Relation to Achievement and Attitudes Toward Children" (unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, The Pennsylvania State University, 1959).

[52]Duane L. Sandgren and Louis G. Schmidt, "Does Practice Teaching Change Attitudes Toward Teaching?" Journal of Educational Research, vol. 49 (May, 1956), pp. 637-680.

In 1950, in one of the earlier studies conducted, Christenbury found a significant positive change in the attitudes of student teachers in both the "off-campus" and the "on-campus" student teachers as measured by the MTAI.[53]

Studies Showing a Negative Attitude Change of Student Teachers During the Student Teaching Experience as Measured by the MTAI.

Among the studies relating to a negative attitude change of student teachers under various kinds of supervision, Dutton, McCullough, Osmon, and Dunham found a significant negative change of attitudes ot student teachers during the student teaching experience.

In 1962, Dutton conducted a study to determine the attitude change of elementary school student teachers during the student teaching experience, and to study the effects of anxiety upon the performance of student teachers. The MTAI was administered to 91 elementary school student teachers enrolled in the University of California, at Los Angeles. They taught one-half day, five days each week during one semester. The results of the study revealed

---

[53]Edward S. Christenbury, "An Appraisal of the Student Teaching Program of the University of Tennessee" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Georgia, 1950).

that significant changes occurred in a negative direction toward children as measured by the MTAI (total score) during the student teaching experience.[54]

In 1961, McCullough made a study involving two selected groups of student teachers at North Texas State College, in which he compared the change of attitude of student teachers toward youth. The first group of student teachers were placed in public secondary schools for full-time participation in student teaching during the first nine weeks. These student teachers returned to campus for the last nine weeks for professional education courses. The second group of student teachers took accelerated professional education courses during the first nine weeks of the semester and were placed in public secondary schools for a full-time participation in student teaching during the last nine weeks.[55]

McCullough found that the mean MTAI score of both groups of student teachers changed in a positive direction during the time of their enrollment in professional

---

[54]Wilbur H. Dutton, "Attitude Change of Elementary School Student Teachers and Anxiety," The Journal of Educational Research, vol. 55 (May, 1962).

[55]Henry Elmer McCullough, Jr., "Comparison of the Change in Attitudes Toward Youth of Two Selected Groups of Student Teachers" (unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, North Texas State College, 1961).

education courses and in a negative direction during their period of student teaching.[56]

In 1959, at the University of Indiana, Osmon administered the MTAI to 222 secondary student teachers during the second semester of the 1956-57 academic year. Osmon was conducting a study on associative factors in changes of student teachers' attitudes during student teaching. By means of the t-test statistic, he found the mean MTAI scores of all of the student teachers to show a loss in mean MTAI points at less than the one percent level of significance during the student teaching experience.[57]

In 1955, at the University of Indiana, Dunham conducted a study in which attitudes of student teachers, college supervisors, and supervising teachers toward youth were considered. The MTAI was administered to 15 college supervisors, 140 secondary school supervising teachers, and 150 student teachers of Indiana University. Fisher's "t" was used as the statistical test of significance. Dunham found that during the on-campus experience of professional education, a change in a positive direction

---

[56] Ibid.

[57] Robert Vance Osmon, "Associative Factors in Changes of Student Teachers' Attitudes During Student Teaching" (unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, Indiana University, 1959).

was effected, whereas during the student teaching experience, a change in a negative direction was effected in the attitude of student teachers.[58]

Studies Showing No Attitude Change of Student Teachers During the Student Teaching Experience as Measured by the MTAI

Among the studies relating to significant attitude changes of student teachers under various kinds of supervision, Campbell,[59] Ragsdale,[60] Scott and Brinkley,[61] Sanford,[62] and Loy[63] found no significant change of attitudes

---

[58]Darrell Robert Dunham, "Attitudes of Student Teachers, College Supervisors and Supervising Teachers Toward Youth" (unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, Indiana University, 1958).

[59]Donald E. Campbell, "Dimensional Attitude Changes of Student Teachers," The Journal of Educational Research, vol. 61 (December, 1967).

[60]Elva Mae Ragsdale, "Attitude Changes of Elementary Student Teachers and the Changes in Their Classroom Behavior During Student Teaching" (unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, Ball State University, 1967).

[61]Owen Scott and Sterling G. Brinkley, "Attitude Changes of Student Teachers and the Validity of the Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory," Journal of Educational Psychology, vol. 51 (April, 1960), 76-81.

[62]Alpheus Sanford, "The Practice Teaching Experience and Its Effect on Cadet Teacher Attitudes Toward Pupils" (unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, Boston University School of Education, 1959).

[63]Hubert M. Loy, "Changes of Students During Student Teaching in Attitudes Toward Teaching and Pupils and in the Constructive Use of Principles of Behavior" (unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, University of Maryland, 1955).

of student teachers during the student teaching experience, as measured by the MTAI.

IV. SUMMARY

This chapter presented a review of literature and studies relating to: (a) the development of the supervision of student teachers, (b) two widely used types of supervision of student teachers--the Subject Area Specialist Approach and the Generalist Approach, and (c) the use of the Minnesota Teachers' Attitude Inventory in student teaching programs. The findings in the studies were inconclusive in respect to which type of supervision was the most effective in supervising student teachers.

Three specific patterns of supervision which have been used in the student teaching experience were identified. These three patterns were: (a) the laboratory type of supervision, (b) the college controlled public school type of supervision, and (c) the professional or dual type of supervision.

Various studies in the related research were experimental programs conducted to examine the role elements of a full-time college supervisor or generalist. The data revealed that student teachers felt having a generalist was as satisfactory as having a specialist. However, these studies were limited in scope. Emphasis was not

placed on the degree to which the college coordinator provided supervision in helping the student teacher to meet his/her specific needs during the student teaching experience.

A review of the studies using the MTAI revealed three categories of attitudes of student teachers toward teacher-pupil relations. These three categories were: (a) a positive attitude change toward teacher-pupil relations, (b) a negative attitude change toward teacher-pupil relations, and (c) no attitude change toward teacher-pupil relations.

CHAPTER III

PROCEDURES

In Chapter III the research design is described and the procedures which are used in conducting the research for this study are outlined. Consideration is first given to the justification, development and validation of an instrument which was used for measuring the effectiveness of the two specific approaches to the supervision of student teaching during the student teaching experience.

After the justification, development and validation of the instrument, the procedure for selecting the population of the study and the administering of the ANSTE (Assessment of Needs in the Student Teaching Experience) instrument are explained. Next, attention is given to the use and validity of the MTAI (Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory) instrument and the procedure used in administering it. Finally, the collection of the data and the statistical treatment of the data are described in this chapter.

I. JUSTIFICATION, DEVELOPMENT AND VALIDATION OF THE ASSESSMENT INSTRUMENT

A search of the literature and a review of evaluation instruments failed to provide adequate measurement for

determining the effectiveness of different types of supervision which were used during the student teaching experience. ACT Scores (American College Test Scores), SAT Scores (Scholastic Aptitude Test Scores), and GPA Scores (Grade Point Average Scores) did not provide sufficient data for adequately determining and establishing the student teachers' level of performance in teaching or their specific needs at the point of entering the student teaching experience. Therefore, it seemed advisable that an instrument be developed that would restrict the data to the supervision being given during the student teaching experience and not involve an evaluation of a total teacher education program.

An instrument was needed which would yield a qualitative measure as well as a quantitative measure of the degree to which a specific type of supervision given by the college coordinator would help the student teacher to meet his/her needs during the student teaching experience.

In developing an instrument for measuring the effectiveness of the two specific types of supervision given by the college coordinator, which were a part of this study, three important factors had to be considered. These factors were: (1) the establishment of the needs of the student teacher as he/she entered the student teaching experience, (2) the degree to which participants perceived

that supervision was given by the college supervisor during the student teaching experience, and (3) the degree to which supervision given by the college supervisor during the student teaching experience helped the student teacher to meet his/her needs.

In the fall, winter, and spring quarters of 1972-73, an assessment instrument (shown in Appendix A) which met these three criteria was developed and validated for the purpose of measuring the effectiveness of the two different approaches to the supervision of student teachers being considered in this study.

Numerous variables were encountered in designing and developing an instrument which would through its measurement show the effectiveness of a specific approach to the supervision of student teachers during the student teaching experience.

Specific variables which could have an effect upon the findings of the study were: (1) the proactive learning experienced in courses taken prior to student teaching in the areas of Social Foundations, Educational Psychology and Methods Courses, (2) the extent of student aids' laboratory experiences prior to the student teaching experience, (3) the extent of guidance and help given by the supervising teacher (directing teacher) during the student teaching experience, (4) the influence of the student teacher's previously developed self-concept, (5) the influence of the

student teacher's previously developed rapport with others and (6) the influence of the student teacher's previously developed self-motivation.

In the initial stage of developing an instrument for the study, numerous resources were used. After making a thorough research of student teaching handbooks used in other institutions of higher education, making a comprehensive search in related literature, interacting with 25 faculty members who were well acquainted with the supervision of student teachers, interacting with 50 student teachers involved in the student teaching experience, interacting with 20 supervising teachers and four principals participating in a student teacher program, the writer developed Form A and Form B of the ANSTE (Assessment of Needs in the Student Teaching Experience) questionnaire.

Seven areas of the student teaching experience were considered in the development of the measurement instrument. These seven areas were: (1) Orientation, (2) Personal Needs, (3) Initial Observation and Participation, (4) Teaching Role, (5) Analysis of Teaching Skills, (6) Relinquishing of Teaching Role, and (7) Evaluation of the Student Teaching Experience. In Appendix A, these seven areas are shown as they were considered in the development of the questionnaire.

After the design for the questionnaire was conceived, a questionnaire containing 77 items was developed. For the purpose of validating the questionnaire, copies were sent to institutions which used the Subject Area Specialist Approach. In each institution, a faculty member familiar with the student teaching program was asked to administer five sets of the two questionnaires (the ANSTE, Form A and Form B) to student teachers in their student teaching program and three copies of ANSTE (Form B) to college coordinators (supervisors) who were subject area specialists. A letter, as shown in Appendix A, was sent to the faculty member, who administered the ANSTE questionnaire to the student teachers and the faculty members in his institution of higher education. This letter contained the necessary instruction for administering the ANSTE questionnaire. It was requested that in the number of the five student teachers selected to respond to the questionnaire, one student teacher be selected from each of the following areas: Language Arts, Mathematics, Science, and Social Studies. As shown in Appendix A, a letter was attached to each questionnaire explaining to the participant the reason for asking their assistance in responding to the questionnaire. Each individual responding to the questionnaire was asked to make comments regarding clarification, rewording of questions, and suggestions either above or

beside the items being considered. This procedure was duplicated with student teachers and faculty members in an institution which used the Generalist Approach.

After the questionnaires had been administered and returned to the writer, the final forms of the ANSTE, Form A and Form B, were developed. Appendix A shows Form A and Form B of the ANSTE questionnaire.

Form A and Form B of the ANSTE were then administered to 15 student teachers during the fall and winter quarters, 1973, in an effort to further check the clarity of the questions after deletions, revisions, and additions had been made in the development of the ANSTE questionnaire. The final revision of the ANSTE questionnaire, as shown in Appendix A, contained 79 items, which were listed under the seven subheadings outlined in the design of the questionnaire.

Form A of the ANSTE questionnaire, as shown in Appendix A, was developed to assess the needs of student teachers in each of the two types of supervision given by the college coordinator. Scale I on Form A of the ANSTE questionnaire was designed to measure the degree to which the student teachers perceived that they needed supervision to be given by the college supervisor as they began the student teaching experience. Student teachers were asked to respond to the questionnaire by selecting one of five

choices in Scale I for each of the 79 items. The five choices on Scale I represented the degree to which student teachers perceived that they needed supervision to be given by the college coordinator (supervisor). These choices were as follows: (1) Need Exceptional Amount, (2) Need More than Average Amount, (3) Need Little, (4) Don't Need Any, and (5) Not Applicable.

Form B of the ANSTE Questionnaire, as shown in Appendix A, was developed to measure the degree to which it was perceived by the student teacher that the college coordinator (supervisor) gave supervision in the seven different areas of the student teaching experience. Scale II on Form B consisted of five choices. As the student teachers indicated their judgment with respect to the degree to which they perceived that supervision was given by the college coordinator (supervisor), they selected one of the following: (1) Exceptional Amount Given, (2) More than Average Given, (3) Little Given, (4) None Given, and (5) Not Applicable. Also, on Form B there was Scale III. Scale III was designed to measure the degree to which student teachers perceived that the supervision of the college coordinator had helped to meet their needs in the student teaching experience. As the student teachers responded indicating the degree to which they perceived that the supervision of the college coordinator had helped

to meet their needs in the student teaching experience, they selected one of the following: (1) Too Much Given, (2) Adequate Amount Given, (3) Not Enough Given, (4) None Given When Needed, and (5) Not Applicable.

II. SELECTION OF THE POPULATION

In an effort to determine the effectiveness of the two different approaches to the supervision of student teachers, as used by college coordinators, two institutions in the southeastern area of the United States were selected for the study. One of these institutions used the Subject Area Specialist Approach to the supervision of student teachers during the student teaching experience; the second, the Generalist Approach. Each of these educational institutions had a total student population of 20,000 or more, and had used their type of supervision for at least 10 years.

As shown in Appendix B, information was gathered in an effort to compare the environmental backgrounds of student teachers selected from both educational institutions. A questionnaire of 14 questions was prepared in order to obtain important information concerning the environmental background of all of the participants in the study. In addition to the 14 questions administered to all of the participants, information was sought from two professors who had taught on the faculty of both educational

institutions. After examining the information obtained from the student teachers' responses to the questionnaire and the information from the two faculty members, it was assumed that the population, which was selected from the two educational institutions had similar backgrounds. Therefore, no appreciable effect should be had upon the study in respect to the background of the student teachers in the two groups.

The population of this study was 90 student teachers who were enrolled for the student teaching experience during the spring quarter, 1973. Forty-five of the student teachers were randomly selected from an institution using the Subject Area Specialist Approach to the supervision of student teachers. These student teachers had been assigned by the director of student teaching to one of three secondary schools within a 15 mile radius of the university campus. They were enrolled at the university for the student teaching experience in one of the five following subject areas: English, Foreign Language, Mathematics, Science, and Social Studies.

The remaining 45 student teachers were randomly selected from another institution which used the Generalist Approach to the supervision of student teachers. These student teachers were assigned by the director of student teaching to centers consisting of 15 to 25 student teachers. Each

center in this group was established in a school system within a 30 mile radius of the university campus and supervised by the college supervisor known as a generalist. The student teachers in each center were enrolled at the university for the student teaching experience in one of the five following areas: English, Foreign Language, Mathematics, Science, and Social Studies. In Table I the distribution of the student teachers in the five subject areas in the two educational institutions selected for the study are shown.

III. PROCEDURE FOR ADMINISTERING THE ANSTE ASSESSMENT INSTRUMENT

During the first two weeks of the spring quarter, 1973, Form A of the ANSTE questionnaire was administered to 45 student teachers enrolled in the selected educational institution using the Subject Area Specialist Approach. As shown in Appendix A, instructions were given to the student teachers as Form A of the ANSTE questionnaire was administered. This same procedure was used in administering Form A of the ANSTE questionnaire to the group of student teachers who were supervised by the Generalist Approach.

Form B of the ANSTE questionnaire was administered during the last six to eight days of the student teaching experience of the spring quarter, 1973, to all of the

TABLE I

DISTRIBUTION OF STUDENT TEACHERS IN FIVE SUBJECT AREAS

	English	Foreign Language	Mathematics	Science	Social Studies	Total
Institution 1[a]	10	5	13	10	7	45
Institution 2[b]	13	5	7	10	10	45
Totals	23	10	20	20	17	90

[a]Institution using Subject Area Specialist Approach.

[b]Institution using Generalist Approach.

participants in the study. As shown in Appendix A, instructions were given to the student teachers as Form B of the ANSTE questionnaire was administered. Special attention was given to the fact that two scales were to be completed on Form B, whereas on Form A of the ANSTE questionnaire there was only one scale to be completed. It was explained to the participants in this study that Scale II on Form B of the ANSTE questionnaire was developed for measuring the degree to which supervision was given to the student teachers by the college coordinator (supervisor). It was pointed out to the participants that Scale III on Form B of the ANSTE questionnaire was developed for measuring the degree to which the supervision of the college coordinator (supervisor) helped to meet their needs during the student teaching experience.

IV. USE AND VALIDITY OF THE MINNESOTA TEACHER ATTITUDE INVENTORY

One of the more widely used instruments for the measurement of teacher attitudes is the MTAI (Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory). Prior to the publication of the MTAI in 1951, there had been very little accomplished in developing a predictive instrument to be used in predicting the probable relationship between a prospective teacher and individual pupils. By 1963, the MTAI was used in more than 50 research studies which were reported

in the literature.[1] The MTAI was a beginning effort to meet the need of such a predictive instrument.

The MTAI was developed at the University of Minnesota by Carroll H. Leeds, Robert Callis, and Walter W. Cook. Investigations, which were carried on over a 10 year period by these three men, indicated

> . . . that the attitudes of teachers toward children and school work can be measured with high reliability and that they are significantly correlated with the teacher-pupil relations found in the teacher's classroom.[2]

The MTAI was designed to

> . . . measure those attitudes of a teacher which predict how well he will get along with pupils in interpersonal relationships, and indirectly how well satisfied he will be with teaching as a vocation.[3]

In designing an instrument with an attitude scale which would predict the type of teacher-pupil relations that would be maintained in the classroom, it became necessary to define the extremes of the scale. At one end of the scale were desirable teacher-pupil relations and at the other extreme were undesirable teacher-pupil relations.[4]

---

[1] J. W. Getzels and P. W. Jackson, "Attitudes--The Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory," Handbook of Research on Teaching (Chicago: Rand McNally and Company, 1963), p. 509.

[2] Walter W. Cook, Carroll H. Leeds, and Robert Callis, Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory Manual (New York: The Psychological Corporation, 1951), p. 3.

[3] Ibid. [4] Ibid.

Certain assumptions were made in the development of the measurement scale of the MTAI. One of the assumptions was that a teacher who ranked at the high end of the scale should be able to maintain a state of harmonious relations with his pupils characterized by mutual affection and sympathetic understanding. As a result of this type of relationship, the pupils should like the teacher and enjoy their school work. Likewise, the teacher should like the children and enjoy teaching.[5]

The teacher and the pupil work together in a social atmosphere of cooperative endeavor, maintaining a high degree of interest and developing a feeling of security as a result of a permissive atmosphere of freedom to think, act, and speak one's mind with mutual respect for the feelings, rights, and abilities of others. Inadequacies and shortcomings in both the teacher and pupils are admitted openly to be overcome. Situations requiring disciplinary action should rarely exist.[6]

At the other extreme of the scale is the teacher who attempts to dominate the classroom activities. This type of teacher may be successful as he rules with an iron hand, but his success is usually a result of having created an atmosphere of tension, fear, and submission; or

---

[5] Ibid. [6] Ibid.

he may be unsuccessful as a result, and nervous, fearful and distraught in a classroom characterized by frustration, restlessness, inattention, lack of respect, and numerous disciplinary problems. In either of these two cases, both the teacher and pupils dislike school work. In this type of setting, there is mutual distrust and hostility. Inadequacies and shortcomings are hidden by both teacher and pupils. Emphasis is placed upon the correctness of the position taken by the teacher on classroom matters, the subject matter to be covered rather than what the student needs, feels, knows and can do.[7]

In the original Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory there were 378 items on each of the two forms as constructed by Leeds. Two hundred teachers were selected from 70 schools in three states. One hundred of these teachers who responded were considered to maintain "good" pupil-teacher relations and 100 of these teachers who responded were considered to maintain "poor" pupil-teacher relations. In the selection of the 200 teachers, the judgment was made by their administrators as to whether they maintained "good" or "poor" pupil-teacher relations. All of the 200 teachers selected were asked to complete both forms of the Teacher-Pupil Inventory.[8]

---

[7] Ibid.

[8] Robert V. Osmon, "Associative Factors in Changes of Student Teachers' Attitudes During Student Teaching" (unpublished Doctoral dissertation, Indiana University, 1959), p. 34.

The first experimental form of the Teacher-Pupil Inventory was constructed from the responses of the 200 teachers. These responses were analyzed and 164 test items from the original reservoir of 756 items were selected. The form was then referred to as Form X-164. The three criteria which were employed in the selection of the items were

(1) Is the item adequate in differentiating the two groups of teachers?
(2) Is the item unambiguous in meaning?
(3) Does the content of the item duplicate that of another item?
(4) Is the response pattern logical and easy to interpret?[9]

The mean scores of the group consisting of 100 teachers judged to have "good" teacher-pupil relations was found to be 131.0. The mean score for the group consisting of 100 teachers judged to have "poor" teacher-pupil relations was a minus 32.0.[10]

The next step was to validate the instrument. Form X-164 was administered to 100 randomly sampled teachers of grades four to six inclusive from several locations. Their scores were correlated with three outside criteria of teacher-pupil rapport. These three criteria were: (1) the rating of the teachers by their pupils, (2) the

---

[9]Cook, Leeds, and Callis, op. cit., p. 11.

[10]Osmon, op. cit., p. 35.

rating of the teachers by their principals, and (3) the rating of the teachers by a specialist in the area of teaching effectiveness. The correlations between the criterion ratings of the pupils, principals, and specialist and inventory scores were .45, .43, and .49. All of these correlations are significant at the 1 percent level of confidence. When the scores of these three criteria were combined, with equal weight given to each of the three criteria by the use of a standard score procedure, the correlation with the teachers' scores on the Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory, Form X-164, was a validity coefficient of .60. The single criteria which had the highest relationship with the MTAI was the rating by the expert. The correlation was .49. The next highest was the pupil's rating, .45, and the lowest was the principals' rating, .43.[11]

Based on these and numerous other correlations, the Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory has been accepted as a valid instrument for predicting the ability of classroom teachers to develop and maintain harmonious relationships with their pupils. The final revision, Form A, consists of 150 attitude statements, and are categorized into the following five areas: (1) Moral Status, (2) Discipline, (3) Principles of Child Development and Behavior, (4) Principles of

---

[11]Cook, Leeds, and Callis, op. cit., p. 11.

Education, and (5) Personal Reactions of the Teacher. The items in the inventory are not limited to only one of the five areas, but may include more than one of the five areas.[12]

V. PROCEDURE FOR ADMINISTERING THE MTAI INSTRUMENT

During the first two weeks of the spring quarter, 1973, Form A of the MTAI was administered to 45 student teachers enrolled in the selected institution using the Subject Area Specialist Approach to the supervision of student teachers. The Instructions for Administering the MTAI, as outlined on page five in the MTAI Manual, were followed by the examiner in administering the questionnaire as a pre-test.[13]

The MTAI was administered after the participants had completed their response to the ANSTE questionnaire which required approximately 35 minutes. The same procedure, as was used in administering Form A of the MTAI to the group of student teachers who were being supervised by the Subject Area Specialist Approach to the supervision of student teachers, was used with the student teachers being supervised by the Generalist Approach to the supervision of student teachers.

---

[12] Ibid., p. 10. [13] Ibid., p. 5.

During the last six to eight days of the student teaching experience of the spring quarter, 1973, Form A of the MTAI was administered to all of the participants in both of the groups in the study as a post-test.

The time required for administering the MTAI at one sitting ranged from 20 to 30 minutes. Specific instructions as listed in the manual were given each time the MTAI was administered.

The cooperation of the Director of Student Teaching in each of the two institutions in this study proved to be extremely beneficial. A letter was provided by each of the directors as the examiner traveled to the schools and centers to administer the two measuring instruments. The administrators of the schools in which the student teachers were assigned for the student teaching experience were very helpful in arranging the physical setting for the administering of the questionnaires at the beginning and end of the spring quarter, 1973. With the approval of college coordinators, time was allowed in the various schools and centers for the administering of the two questionnaires at the beginning and end of the quarter.

The examiner used the instructions as shown in the MTAI Manual in administering the MTAI. Each participant at both the pre-test sitting and the post-test sitting was given the ANSTE questionnaire to complete first. Next, the

MTAI questionnaire was administered. Upon the completion of the two questionnaires, each one was carefully checked by the investigator in an effort to make sure that the student teachers had responded to every item.

VI. STATISTICAL TREATMENT OF THE DATA

The data for this study were collected and submitted to the University of Tennessee Computing Center for processing. The computing center staff was responsible for the data card punching, programming and machine operation. The MTAI was obtained from and graded by the Tennessee State Testing Bureau. The responses of the participants in this study to Form A and Form B of the ANSTE questionnaire were both scored and tabulated by the investigator. Each response was carefully checked by a second scorer. The MTAI scores of the participants of the study, as shown in Appendix C, were tabulated for the University of Tennessee Computing Center by the investigator.

The correlated samples t-test was used in testing the hypotheses concerning attitude changes as measured by the pre-test and the post-test of the MTAI. The t-test statistic was used to determine if significant difference existed between the mean pre-test and the mean post-test attitude scores of the two groups of student teachers.

An independent samples t-test was used in testing the hypotheses that no significant difference existed

between the mean of responses to the pre-test of the ANSTE questionnaire of the two groups of student teachers and the mean of responses to the post-test of the ANSTE questionnaire of the two groups of student teachers.

In the analysis of the data obtained from the pre-tests and post-tests of the ANSTE and MTAI questionnaires, the acceptance or rejection of the null hypotheses was determined at the .01 level of confidence.

VII. SUMMARY

In this chapter the research design was described and the procedures which were used in the study were outlined. The development, validation and administration of the ANSTE and MTAI measuring instruments were explained. The five subject areas which were used in the study were presented and the selection of the population was described. Finally, the method for the collection of data, the statistical treatment and analysis of the data were presented.

CHAPTER IV

PRESENTATION AND INTERPRETATION OF THE DATA

The purpose of this chapter is to present the data gathered from the response of 90 student teachers. The major purpose of this study was to determine if a significant difference existed between the effectiveness of two types of supervision as perceived by student teachers.

I. PRESENTATION AND INTERPRETATION OF THE DATA RELATING TO THE FIVE HYPOTHESES

In the following sections of this chapter, the data were reported under the five stated null hypotheses:

HYPOTHESIS ONE: There is no significant difference between the perceived needs of student teachers supervised by the two types of supervision--the Subject Area Specialist Approach and the Generalist Approach.

In an effort to test Hypothesis One, Form A of the ANSTE was administered to 45 student teachers in each of the two types of supervision. Form A was administered to Group I and Group II for the purpose of determining if a significant difference existed between the perceived needs of these two groups of student teachers at the beginning of the student teaching experience.

There was found to be no significant difference between the responses of the student teachers in Group I and Group II in respect to their perceived needs at the beginning of the student teaching experience. As shown in Table II, the t-value for Scale I was 1.86 and indicated no significant difference at the .01 level of confidence. Therefore, the null Hypothesis One was accepted.

Although a significant difference did not exist between the total responses of each of the two groups of student teachers in respect to their perception of needs, a significant difference did exist between the responses of the two groups of student teachers in the area--Orientation. As shown in Table X (Appendix D), the t-value for this area was 3.03 and indicated that a significant difference existed at the .01 level of confidence. The student teachers in Group I perceived that their needs were greater than did the student teachers in Group II perceive theirs to be at the beginning of the student teaching experience in the area of Orientation.

The t-test statistic for each of the remaining six areas of Form A of the ANSTE questionnaire indicated no significant difference between the responses of the two groups at the .01 level of confidence. The t-value for each of the six areas was as follows: 1.77 for the area of Personal Needs, 1.29 for the area of Initial

TABLE II

STUDENT TEACHER'S ASSESSMENT OF NEEDS IN THE STUDENT TEACHING EXPERIENCE FORM A - SCALE I

Group	Number of Cases	Mean	Standard Deviation	t-Value
I[a]	45	228.96	30.87	1.86 (ns)
II[b]	45	211.91	53.08	

[a]Student teachers supervised by the Subject Area Specialist Approach.

[b]Student teachers supervised by the Generalist Approach.

Observation and Participation, 1.36 for the area of Teaching Role, 0.98 for the area of Analysis of Teaching Skills, 0.60 for the area of Relinquishing of Teaching Role, and 1.59 for the area of Evaluation Procedure of the Student Teaching Experience.

In Tables XI and XII (Appendix D), the description of the population and the ANOVA Table for the five subject areas are shown. The F ratio from an analysis of variance test of the differences among the mean scores of the five subject areas was 0.27. Therefore, the F ratio was not significant at the .05 level of confidence.

HYPOTHESIS TWO: There is no significant difference between the assessed amount of supervision given to student teachers in two types of supervision--the Subject Area Specialist Approach and the Generalist Approach.

Scale II on Form B of the ANSTE measuring instrument was administered to Group I and to Group II of student teachers for the purpose of determining if a significant difference did exist between the responses of the two groups with respect to the degree to which Group I and Group II of the student teachers perceived that supervision was given by the college coordinator during the student teaching experience.

It was found that a significant difference existed between the responses of Group I and Group II in respect to the degree to which they perceived that supervision was given by the college coordinator during the student teaching experience. The t-value, as shown for Scale II in Table III, was 6.40 and indicated that Group II perceived that a greater degree of supervision was given by the Generalist Approach than Group I perceived was given by the Subject Area Specialist Approach. Therefore, the null Hypothesis Two was rejected.

Although a significant difference existed between the total responses of the two groups of student teachers on Scale II of Form B of the ANSTE questionnaire, the t-value for the area--Relinquishing of Teacher Role--was 2.56 and indicated a lack of significance between the responses of the two groups at the .01 level of confidence. As shown in Table XIII (Appendix D), this area was the only area of the seven areas on the ANSTE questionnaire in which a significant difference was not shown between the responses of the two groups of student teachers.

The t-value for the six areas, in which a significant difference was shown between the responses of the two groups of student teachers, was as follows: 6.98 for the area of Orientation, 5.78 for the area of Personal Needs, 5.14 for the area of Initial Observation and Participation, 4.80 for

TABLE III

STUDENT TEACHER'S ASSESSMENT OF NEEDS IN THE STUDENT TEACHING EXPERIENCE FORM B - SCALE II

Group	Number of Cases	Mean	Standard Deviation	t-Value
I[a]	45	233.89	44.08	6.40*
II[b]	45	179.11	36.85	

*$p < .01$.

[a]Student teachers supervised by the Subject Area Specialist Approach.

[b]Student teachers supervised by the Generalist Approach.

the area of Teaching Role, 7.26 for the area of Analysis of Teaching Skills, and 7.00 for the area of Evaluation Procedures of the Student Teaching Experience.

In Tables XIV and XV (Appendix D), the description of the populations and the ANOVA Table for the five subject areas are shown. The F ratio from an analysis of variance test of the differences among the mean scores of the five subject areas was 0.57. Therefore, the F ratio was not significant at the .05 level of confidence.

HYPOTHESIS THREE: There is no significant difference between the degree to which student teachers perceive that their needs are met in the two types of supervision--the Subject Area Specialist Approach and the Generalist Approach.

Scale III on Form B of the ANSTE measuring instrument was administered at the close of the student teaching experience to Group I and to Group II of student teachers. This scale was administered for the purpose of determining if a significant difference existed between the responses of the two groups in respect to the degree to which they perceived that their needs were met by the supervision of the college coordinator.

It was found that a significant difference existed between the total responses of Group I and Group II on

Scale III of Form B of the ANSTE questionnaire. The t-value, as shown for Scale III in Table IV, was 2.98. It was shown that Group II's response to Scale III indicated that their perceived needs were met by the Generalist Approach to a greater degree than Group I indicated that their perceived needs were met by the Subject Area Specialist Approach.

Since a significant difference was shown between the responses of the two groups of student teachers on Scale III, at the .01 level of confidence, the null Hypothesis Three was rejected.

Although a significant difference existed between the total responses of Group I and Group II of student teachers on Scale III, a significant difference did not exist between the responses of these two groups in three areas--Initial Observation and Participation, Teaching Role and Relinquishing of Teacher Role.

As shown in Table XVI (Appendix D), the t-statistic for each of these three areas was: 2.30 for the area of Initial Observation and Participation, 1.91 for the area of Teaching Role, and -1.31 for the area of Relinquishing of Teacher Role.

The t-value for each of the four areas, on Scale III of Form B of the ANSTE, in which a significant difference was shown between the responses of student teachers in Group I and Group II were: 2.91 for the area of Orientation,

TABLE IV

STUDENT TEACHER'S ASSESSMENT OF NEEDS IN THE STUDENT TEACHING EXPERIENCE FORM B - SCALE III

Group	Number of Cases	Mean	Standard Deviation	t-Value
I[a]	45	195.93	28.25	
				2.98*
II[b]	45	180.96	18.42	

*$p < .01$.

[a]Student teachers supervised by the Subject Area Specialist Approach.

[b]Student teachers supervised by the Generalist Approach.

2.96 for the area of Personal Needs, 3.82 for the area of Analysis of Teaching Skills, and 3.58 for the area of Evaluation Procedure of the Student Teaching Experience.

In Tables XVII and XVIII (Appendix D), the description of the population and the ANOVA Table for the five subject areas are shown. The F ratio from an analysis of variance test of the difference among the mean scores of the five subject areas was 0.67. Therefore, the F ratio was not significant at the .05 level of confidence.

HYPOTHESIS FOUR: There is no significant difference between the attitudes of student teachers in Group I and Group II with respect to teacher-pupil relations at the beginning of the student teaching experience.

Form A of the MTAI questionnaire was administered to the student teachers in Group I and Group II at the beginning of the student teaching experience. The MTAI was administered to the two groups of student teachers to determine if a significant difference existed between the responses of the two groups with respect to teacher-pupil relations.

There was found to be no significant difference between the responses of student teachers in Group I and Group II on Form A of the MTAI. As shown in Table V, the t-value was -0.68 and indicated that the attitudes of student teachers in Group I toward teacher-pupil relations

TABLE V

A COMPARISON OF STUDENT TEACHERS' ATTITUDES IN GROUP I WITH STUDENT TEACHERS' ATTITUDES IN GROUP II AS MEASURED BY THE MINNESOTA TEACHER ATTITUDE INVENTORY FORM A

Group	Number of Cases	Mean	Standard Deviation	t-Value
I[a]	45	24.69	40.57	-0.68 (ns)
II[b]	45	30.00	33.58	

[a]Student teachers supervised by the Subject Area Specialist Approach.

[b]Student teachers supervised by the Generalist Approach.

were not significantly different from the attitudes of student teachers in Group II toward teacher-pupil relations at the beginning of the student teaching experience. Therefore, the null Hypothesis Four was accepted.

In Tables XIX and XX (Appendix D), the description of the population and ANOVA Table for the two groups of student teachers are shown. The F ratio from an analysis of variance test of the difference among the mean scores of the two groups of student teachers was 0.46. Therefore, the F ratio was not significant at the .05 level of confidence.

HYPOTHESIS FIVE: There is no significant difference between the change scores of attitudes of student teachers in Group I and Group II with respect to teacher-pupil relations at the end of the student teaching experience.

Form A of the MTAI questionnaire was administered to the two groups of student teachers at the close of the student teaching experience. The purpose of administering the MTAI as a post-test was to determine to what degree change had taken place in the attitudes of the two groups of student teachers toward teacher-pupil relations. The next step was to compare the change of attitudes of Group I toward teacher-pupil relations with the change of attitudes of Group II toward teacher-pupil relations.

There was found to be no significant difference between the degree to which the change of attitudes occurred in the two groups as based on their response to Form A of the MTAI questionnaire. As shown in Table VI, the t-value was 1.06 and indicated that the change of attitudes of student teachers in Group I toward teacher-pupil relations was not significantly different from the attitudes of student teachers in Group II toward teacher-pupil relations at the end of the student teaching experience. Therefore, the null Hypothesis Five was accepted.

In Tables XXI and XXII (Appendix D), the description of the population and the ANOVA Table for the two groups of student teachers are shown. The F ratio from an analysis of variance test of the difference among the mean scores of the two groups of student teachers was 1.13. Therefore, the F ratio was not significant at the .05 level of confidence.

II. SUMMARY

The purpose of this chapter was to present data gathered from the responses of 90 student teachers randomly selected from five subject areas. Forty-five of the student teachers were supervised by the Subject Area Specialist Approach and 45 of the student teachers were supervised by the Generalist Approach.

TABLE VI

A COMPARISON OF CHANGE SCORES OF STUDENT TEACHERS' ATTITUDES IN GROUP I WITH CHANGE SCORES OF STUDENT TEACHERS' ATTITUDES IN GROUP II AS MEASURED BY THE MINNESOTA TEACHER ATTITUDE INVENTORY FORM A

Group	Number of Cases	Mean	Standard Deviation	t-Value
I[a]	45	8.78	24.13	1.06 (ns)
II[b]	45	2.76	29.36	

[a]Student teachers supervised by the Subject Area Spedialist Approach.

[b]Student teachers supervised by the Generalist Approach.

The presentation and interpretation of the data were given. Hypotheses One, Four and Five were accepted. Hypotheses Two and Three were rejected.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This final chapter has been devoted to a summary of the study, a list of conclusions based upon the findings in the study and recommendations formulated as a result of the study.

I. SUMMARY

Purpose

The purpose of this study was to compare the effectiveness of two different approaches to the supervision of student teachers during the student teaching experience. First, an establishment of the perceived needs of both groups of student teachers was determined through the response of the student teachers to Scale I of the ANSTE questionnaire at the beginning of the spring quarter, 1973. Secondly, the degree to which participants perceived that supervision was given by the college coordinator during the student teaching experience was determined by the response of the student teachers to Scale II of the ANSTE questionnaire at the close of the spring quarter, 1973. Thirdly, the degree to which student teachers perceived that supervision given by the college coordinator had helped them meet their needs was determined by the

response of student teachers to Scale III of the ANSTE questionnaire at the end of the spring quarter, 1973. Finally, the study attempted to determine with the use of the MTAI if a significant difference existed between the following: (a) the attitudes of the two groups of student teachers in respect to pupil-teacher relations as they entered the student teaching experience, and (b) the change of attitudes of the two groups of student teachers in respect to pupil-teacher relations as they completed the student teaching experience.

Population

The total population of this study was 90 student teachers who were enrolled for student teaching at their respective educational institutions during the spring quarter, 1973. Forty-five student teachers were enrolled in an educational institution which used the Subject Area Specialist Approach to the supervision of student teachers. The remaining 45 student teachers were enrolled in an educational institution which used the Generalist Approach to the supervision of student teachers. Student teachers were randomly selected from those enrolled in five subject areas: English, Foreign Language, Mathematics, Science and Social Studies.

Instruments

The instruments which were used in this study were the ANSTE and the MTAI. The ANSTE was an instrument which was developed and validated by the investigator to measure the assessment of needs in the student teaching experience (See Appendix A). After a careful review of the literature and evaluation instruments had been made, this instrument was developed to restrict the data to the supervision of student teachers instead of involving the evaluation of the total teacher education program. The MTAI has been widely used in measuring teacher attitudes in respect to teacher-pupil relations. It was developed by Cook, Callis and Leeds and published in 1951.[1]

Procedures

A pilot study was conducted with 15 student teachers during the fall and winter quarter, 1973. Form A and Form B of the ANSTE questionnaire were validated prior to the pilot study. These two forms were administered to 10 student teachers who were enrolled in an institution using the Subject Area Specialist Approach and to 10 student teachers who were enrolled in an institution using the Generalist Approach. In addition to the response of student teachers

---

[1]Walter W. Cook, Carroll H. Leeds, and Robert Callis, Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory (New York: The Psychological Corporation, 1951).

who were supervised by each type of supervision, a copy of the ANSTE (Form B) was administered to faculty members. Three faculty members who were experienced in the field of student teaching, in each of the two types of supervision, responded to the ANSTE (Form B) questionnaire.

An independent samples t-test was used: (1) to determine if a significant difference existed between the mean of the responses of Group I to the pre-test of the ANSTE questionnaire and the mean of responses of Group II to the pre-test of the ANSTE questionnaire; and (2) to determine if a significant difference existed between the mean of the responses of Group I to the post-test of the ANSTE questionnaire and the mean of responses of Group II to the post-test of the ANSTE questionnaire on the two separate scales (Scales II and III) of Form B.

A correlated-samples t-test was used: (1) to determine if a significant difference existed between the mean of responses of Group I to the pre-test of attitudes and the mean of responses of Group II to the pre-test of attitudes as measured by Form A of the MTAI; and (2) to determine if a significant difference existed between the mean of the change scores of attitudes of Group I and the mean of the change scores of attitudes of Group II as measured by Form A of the MTAI.

Findings

The hypotheses and findings of the study were as follows:

HYPOTHESIS ONE: There is no significant difference between the perceived needs of student teachers supervised by two types of supervision--the Subject Area Specialist Approach and the Generalist Approach.

It was found that a significant difference did not exist between the total perceived needs of the student teachers in each of the two types of supervision--the Subject Area Specialist Approach and the Generalist Approach--at the beginning of the student teaching experience. Therefore, Hypothesis One was accepted.

HYPOTHESIS TWO: There is no significant difference between the assessed amount of supervision given to student teachers in two types of supervision--the Subject Area Specialist Approach and the Generalist Approach.

It was found that a significant difference existed between the total responses of the student teachers in Group I and Group II with respect to the degree to which supervision was given by the college coordinator. Student teachers in Group II perceived that a greater amount of supervision was given by the college coordinator in the Generalist Approach than student teachers in Group I

perceived that supervision by the college coordinator was given in the Subject Area Specialist Approach. Therefore, Hypothesis Two was rejected.

HYPOTHESIS THREE: There is no significant difference between the degree to which student teachers perceive that their needs are met in the two types of supervision--Subject Area Specialist Approach and the Generalist Approach.

It was found that a significant difference existed between the total responses of the student teachers in Group I and Group II in respect to the degree to which they perceived that the supervision of the college coordinator helped them to meet their needs in the student teaching experience. Student teachers in Group II perceived that the supervision given by the college coordinator in the Generalist Approach helped them to meet their needs to a greater degree than student teachers in Group I perceived that the supervision given by the college coordinator in the Subject Area Specialist Approach helped them to meet their needs. Therefore, Hypothesis Three was rejected.

HYPOTHESIS FOUR: There is no significant difference between the attitudes of student teachers in Group I and Group II with respect to teacher-pupil relations at the beginning of the student teaching experience.

It was found that a significant difference did not exist between the total responses of the student teachers

in Group I and Group II in respect to their attitudes toward teacher-pupil relations at the beginning of the student teaching experience. Therefore, Hypothesis Four was accepted.

HYPOTHESIS FIVE: There is no significant difference between the change scores of attitudes of student teachers in Group I and Group II with respect to teacher-pupil relations at the end of the student teaching experience.

It was found that a significant difference did not exist between the total responses of the student teachers in Group I and Group II in respect to the change scores of attitudes toward teacher-pupil relations at the end of the student teaching experience. Therefore, Hypothesis Five was accepted.

II. CONCLUSIONS

From this investigation, the following conclusions were reached:

Perceived needs of student teachers. There was no significant difference between the perceived needs of the student teachers supervised by the Generalist Approach and the perceived needs of student teachers supervised by the Subject Area Specialist Approach at the beginning of the student teaching experience.

Amount of supervision given. The Generalist Approach provided significantly more supervision to student teachers than did the Subject Area Specialist Approach in the student teaching experience.

Amount of supervision related to subject content. There was no significant difference between the responses of student teachers supervised by the Generalist Approach and student teachers supervised by the Subject Area Specialist Approach in respect to the degree to which supervision was given in helping the student teachers to meet their needs in the area of subject content during the student teaching experience.

Comparison of results in meeting needs. The college coordinator in the Generalist Approach helped student teachers to meet their needs to a significantly greater degree than did the college coordinator using the Subject Area Specialist Approach during the student teaching experience.

Attitudes of student teachers. There was no significant difference between the attitudes of student teachers supervised by the Generalist Approach and attitudes of student teachers supervised by the Subject Area Specialist Approach toward teacher-pupil relations at the beginning of the student teaching experience.

Change scores in attitudes. There was no significant difference between the change scores of the attitudes of student teachers supervised by the Generalist Approach and attitudes of student teachers supervised by the Subject Area Specialist Approach toward teacher-pupil relations at the close of the student teaching experience.

III. RECOMMENDATIONS

As a result of the findings obtained in this study, the following recommendations were made:

1. A study should be made in a larger geographical area, perhaps at the national level, to determine if a significant difference exists between these two types of supervision.

2. A study should be made to determine the correlation between the college coordinator's responses and the student teachers' responses with respect to: (a) the needs of the student teacher at the beginning of the student teaching experience, (b) the amount of supervision given by the college coordinator, and (c) the degree to which supervision of the college coordinator helped the student teacher to meet his/her needs.

3. Studies should be made to determine the effectiveness of supervision in subject areas not included in this study such as Agriculture, Home Economics, Industrial Education, and Special Education.

4. Efforts should be made to compare the effectiveness of these two types of supervision with other types of supervision (field service educator, intern, etc.) used in the student teaching experience.

5. The results of Form A of the ANSTE questionnaire should be used in the placement of student teachers in the student teaching experience.

6. A follow-up of this study should be made in an effort to determine the cost factor as related to the effectiveness of specific types of supervision.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Alexander, William (ed.). The High School of the Future. Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Company, 1969.

American Educational Research Association. "Report of the Committee on the Criteria of Teacher Effectiveness," Review of Educational Research, 22:238-61, June, 1962.

Andrews, Leonard O. Student Teaching. New York: The Center for Applied Research in Education, Inc., 1964.

Association for Student Teaching. Off-Campus Student Teaching, The Thirtieth Yearbook. Lockhaven: The Association Press, 1951.

Atkinson, Carroll, and Eugene T. Maleska. The Story of Education. New York: Bantam Books, 1964.

Barnett, John B. "A Study of the Texas Supervisor of Secondary Student Teachers." Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, North Texas State University, 1968.

Bellack, Arno. The Language of the Classroom: Meanings Communicated in High School Teaching. New York: U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 1964.

Bennie, William A. Cooperation for Better Student Teaching. Minneapolis: Burgess Publishing Company, 1966.

Bosley, Howard E. Teacher Education in Transition, An Experiment in Change. Baltimore: Multi-State Education Project, May, 1969.

Brown, Bob Burton. The Experimental Mind in Education. New York: Harper and Row, 1968.

_____, Richard L. Ober, and R. Soar. The Florida Taxonomy of Cognitive Behavior. Gainesville: The University of Florida, 1967.

Campbell, Donald E. "Dimensional Attitude Changes of Student Teachers," Journal of Educational Research, 61:160-62, December, 1967.

Chandler, B. J., Daniel Powell, and William R. Hazard. Education and the New Teacher. New York: Dodd, Mead and Company, 1971.

Christenbury, Edward S. "An Appraisal of the Student Teaching Program of The University of Tennessee." Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, University of Georgia, 1950.

Cogan, Morris L. Clinical Supervision. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1973.

Conant, James B. The Education of American Teachers. New York: McGraw Hill Book Company, 1963.

Cook, Walter W., Carroll H. Leeds, and Robert Callis. Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory. New York: The Psychological Corporation, 1951.

_____. Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory Manual. New York: The Psychological Corporation, 1951.

Cornett, Joe DeLayne. "A Survey of Research Relative to Supervision of Student Teachers at the Secondary Level." Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, University of Arkansas, 1966.

Cosper, Cecil. Student-Teaching Theory and Practices. New York: Greenwich Book Publishers, Inc., 1965.

Cremin, L. "Background of Teacher Education for U. S. Public Schools," The Education of Teachers in England, France, and the U.S.A. Paris: UNESCO, The United Nations, 1953.

Crocker, Walter Adams, Jr. "The College Supervisor of Student Teachers, K-12 in a Field Oriented Setting: A Developmental Study." Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, Wayne State University, 1972.

Cunningham, Glennis. Multidimensionality: Implications for Preparation of Teachers. Minneapolis: AFRA, 1970.

Curtis, Dwight K., and others. Achieving Quality in Off-Campus Professional Laboratory Experiences. Cedar Falls, Iowa: The Association for Student Teaching, 1957.

Davies, Don. Teacher Education and the Public Schools, The Fortieth Yearbook of The Association for Student Teaching. Dubuque, Iowa: William C. Brown Company, Inc., 1961.

Dewey, John. "Relationship of Theory to Practice in Education," The Relation of Theory to Practice in Education. Cedar Falls, Iowa: The Association for Student Teaching, 1962.

Dickson, George. "International Teacher Education Research: A New Frame of Reference for Teacher Education Reform," The Journal of Teacher Education, 17:277, Fall, 1967.

Dunham, Darrell R. "Attitudes of Student Teachers, College Supervisors, and Supervising Teachers Toward Youth." Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, Indiana University, 1958.

Dutton, Wilbur H. "Attitude Changes of Elementary School Student Teachers and Anxiety," The Journal of Educational Research, 55:380-82, May, 1962.

Edelfelt, R. (ed.). Innovative Programs in Student Teaching. Baltimore, Maryland: Maryland State Department of Education, 1968.

Flanders, Ned A. Teacher Influence--Pupil Attitudes and Achievement. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Office of Education, 1960.

Flowers, John G. School and Community Laboratory Experiences in Teacher Education. Oneonta, New York: American Association of Teachers Colleges, 1948.

Gage, N. L. (ed.). Handbook of Research on Teaching. Chicago: Rand McNally and Company, 1964.

Getzels, J. W., and P. W. Jackson. "Attitudes--The Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory," Handbook of Research on Teaching. Chicago: Rand McNally and Company, 1963.

Goldhammer, Robert. Clinical Supervision. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1969.

Good, Carter V. (ed.). Dictionary of Education. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1959.

Goodlad, John. "Learning and Teaching in the Future," National Education Association Journal, 57:49-51, February, 1968.

Harper, C. A Century of Public Teacher Education. Washington, D. C.: American Association of Teachers Colleges, 1939.

IOTA, The Committee on IOTA. Measuring Teacher Competence: Research Backgrounds and Current Practices. Burlingame: The California Teachers Association, 1967.

Johnson, James A. A National Survey of Student Teaching Programs. Baltimore: Multi-State Teacher Education Project, 1968.

Kelly, Donald Edward. An Assessment of the Effects of Two Experimental Arrangements on the Classroom Behavior of Student Teachers as Measured by IOTA. Tempe, Arizona: Arizona State University, 1970.

Klopf, Gordon. "Conviction and Vision in Teacher Education," The Journal of Teacher Education, 17:4, Spring, 1966.

Knop, Constance K. "Alternatives in Student Teacher Supervision and Evaluation," The French Review, 46:354, December, 1972.

Koonts, Jones Calvin. "Development, Organization, and Administration of Student Teaching in South Carolina." Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, George Peabody College for Teachers, 1958.

Lindsay, Margaret. Major Findings and Recommendations in the Study of Professional Laboratory Experiences. Oeonta, New York: The American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1948.

Loy, Hubert M. "Changes of Students During Student Teaching in Attitudes Toward Teaching and Pupils and in the Constructive Use of Principles of Behavior." Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, University of Maryland, 1955.

McCullough, Henry E. "Comparison of the Changes in Attitudes Toward Youth of Two Selected Groups of Student Teachers." Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, North Texas State College, 1961.

Mager, Robert F. Preparing Instructional Objectives. Palo Alto, California: Fearson Publishers, 1962.

Malikail, Joseph S. "Supervision of Student Teaching," Education, 91:163-5, November, 1970.

Marshall, Edna M. Evaluation of Types of Student Teaching, Contributions to Education, No. 488. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1932.

Mead, Arthur R. Practice Teaching for Teachers in Secondary Schools, Bulletin No. 29. Washington: U. S. Bureau of Education, Government Printing Office, 1917.

Merrill, Edward C., and Betty Schuchman. Professional Student Teaching Programs. 2nd ed. Danville, Illinois: Interstate Printers and Publishers, 1973.

Michaelis, John U. "Teacher Education--Student Teaching and Internships," Encyclopedia of Educational Research. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1960.

Monson, Jay A., and Aldon M. Bebb. "New Roles for the Supervision of Student Teaching," Educational Leadership, 28:44-7, October, 1970.

Mooney, Edward S. An Analysis of the Supervision of Student Teaching, Contributions to Education, No. 711. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1937.

Neal, Charles D., Gordon K. Butts, and J. D. Clemmons. The Student Teacher at Work. 2nd ed. Minneapolis: Burgess Publishing Company, 1971.

Ober, Richard L. The Reciprocal Category System. Tampa: R. L. Ober, 1969.

Osmon, Robert V. "Associative Factors in Changes of Student Teachers' Attitudes During Student Teaching." Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, Indiana University, 1959.

Pfeiffer, Robert T. (ed.). The College Supervisor: Conflict and Challenge. Forty-third Yearbook of the Association for Student Teaching. Dubuque, Iowa: William C. Brown Company, Inc., 1964.

Popham, W. James, and T. R. Husek. "Implications of Criterion Referenced Measurement," Journal of Educational Measurement, 61:6, Spring, 1969.

Ragsdale, Elva Mae. "Attitude Changes of Elementary Student Teachers and the Changes in Their Classroom Behavior During Student Teaching." Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, Ball State University, 1967.

Rawlins, George Mimms, III. "A Study of Prospective Teachers' Perceptions Compared with Problems Encountered and Attitude Changes Occurring During Student Teaching." Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, University of Tennessee, 1970.

Rivlin, Harry N. "A New Pattern for Urban Teacher Education," The Journal of Teacher Education, 17:177, Summer, 1966.

Rucker, Winfred Ray. "A Critical Analysis of Current Trends in Student Teaching." Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, Harvard University, 1952.

Samford, Alpheus. "The Practice Teaching Experience and Its Effect on Cadet Teacher Attitudes Toward Pupils." Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, Boston University School of Education, 1959.

Sandgren, Duane L., and Louis G. Schmidt. "Does Practice Teaching Change Attitudes Toward Teaching?" Journal of Educational Research, 49:673-80, May, 1956.

Schueler, Herbert. "Making Teacher Education Meaningful in Urban Settings," Improving Education in U. S., Phi Delta Kappa, Inc., 1967.

Schwartz, Carol A. "The Effect of a Cluster Plan on Secondary Student Teachers," The Journal of Teacher Education, 22:348, Fall, 1971.

Scott, Owen, and Sterling G. Brinkley. "Attitude Changes of Student Teachers and the Validity of the Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory," Journal of Educational Psychology, 51:76-81, April, 1960.

Silberman, Charles E. Crisis in the Classroom. New York: Random House, 1970.

Shane, Harold. "Future Shock and the Curriculum," Phi Delta Kappan, 49:67-70, October, 1967.

Smith, B. Othanel (ed.). Research in Teacher Education, A Symposium. Englewood Cliffs: The American Educational Research Association, 1971.

Smith, E. Brooks (ed.). Partnerships in Teacher Education. Washington, D. C.: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1969.

Stapleton, Martin Luther. "An Evaluation of Two Programs of Student Teacher Supervision by College Supervisors." Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, The Pennsylvania State University, 1965.

Stone, James C. Breakthrough in Teacher Education. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1968.

Stradley, William E. Supervising Student Teachers. Danville, Illinois: The Interstate Printers and Publishers, Inc., 1968.

Strebel, Ralph F. The Nature of the Supervision of Student Teaching, Contributions to Education, No. 655. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1935.

Troisi, Nicholas F. "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.

Trump, J. Lloyd. "The Education of a Professional Teacher," Phi Delta Kappan, 46:49, June, 1964.

Wiles, Kimball. "The Teacher Education We Need," The Journal of Teacher Education, 17:266-67, Summer, 1966.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

A DESCRIPTION OF THE ANSTE QUESTIONNAIRE

An Outlined Description of an Instrument Designed to: (1) Measure the student teacher's needs at the beginning of the student teaching experience; (2) Measure the degree to which supervision was given by the college coordinator during the student teaching experience; and (3) Measure the degree to which the supervision of the college coordinator helped the student teacher to meet his/her need during the student teaching experience.

Student Teaching Experience

I. Orientation to Student Teaching Program
(Policies, Housing, School, Community, Faculty)

II. Personal Needs of Student Teacher
(Counseling Student Teacher)
- A. Attitude toward self (self-concept)
- B. Attitude toward others (teachers and pupils)
- C. Attitude toward teaching.

III. Initial Observation and Participation (Induction to Teaching Role)
- A. Routine duties of teacher
- B. Scheduling of classes to be taught
- C. Acquainting self with the characteristics and needs of students
- D. Becoming acquainted with textbooks, curriculum guides and materials.

IV. Teaching Role
- A. Preparation (Overall planning-unit planning)
- B. Introduction (Introduction, instructions, assignments)
- C. Communication (Clarity, tone, and variety of voice, mannerisms, presenting materials on level of understanding of learners)
- D. Conceptualization (Understanding skill to be developed)
- E. Concentration (Selection of subject content)
- F. Classroom Management
  - (1) Planning (Daily lesson plans)
    - (a) Time
    - (b) Space
    - (c) Materials

(2) Organizational pattern
(3) Activities
    (a) Selection
    (b) Pacing
(4) Interactions
    (a) Teacher-pupil
    (b) Pupil-pupil
    (c) Pupil-media
    (d) Teacher-teacher
(5) Motivation
(6) Discipline
(7) Evaluation of pupil's progress

V. Analysis of Teaching Skills
   A. Self analysis of progress and development of teaching skills (Diary)
   B. Analysis of teaching skills and problems on Group Level (Seminars)
   C. Analysis of teaching skills using observational instruments and equipment
      (1) Video-tape recorder (Verbal, Non-verbal, and Cognitive Behaviors)
      (2) Audio (Tape recorder for analyzing verbal behavior)
      (3) Observational instruments (Flander's Interaction Analysis, Mork's Classroom Verbal Reaction Behavior Log, etc.)
          (a) Supervising teacher
          (b) Other student teachers
          (c) Teachers in other subject areas

VI. Returning the Teaching Responsibilities to the Supervising Teacher

VII. Evaluation of the Student Teaching Experience

LETTER SEEKING RESPONSES FOR VALIDATION OF
THE ANSTE QUESTIONNAIRE

1611 Laurel Avenue SW
Knoxville, Tennessee 37916
January 11, 1973

Dear

I am writing to ask your assistance in validating two questionnaires which I plan to use in conducting a study, "A Comparative Study of the 'Subject Area Specialist Approach' and the 'Generalist Approach' to the Supervision of Student Teaching as Measured by the ANSTE and the ACCS." These two questionnaires are the ANSTE (Assessment of Needs in the Student Teaching Experience) and the ACCS (Analysis of the College Coordinator's Supervision).

I have enclosed five sets of these two questionnaires, the ANSTE and the ACCS, to be administered to student teachers now enrolled in student teaching. I am requesting that one student teacher be selected from each of these four subject areas--Mathematics, Social Studies, Language Arts, and Science. The fifth student teacher responding to the questionnaire may be selected from any one of these four subject areas.

Also enclosed are three copies of the ACCS questionnaire to be completed by College Coordinators or faculty members who are experienced in coordinating student teachers.

Please note that the three questionnaires being administered contain the same questions, but differ either in the rating scale being used or the group responding to the questionnaire.

Each individual responding to the questionnaire is asked to make comments regarding clarification and suggestions either above or beside the item being considered.

Please return all of the copies in order that I might properly validate the questionnaire. Also, I ask that no duplications be made at this time. Upon request, copies of this instrument will be sent to your office at the completion of this study.

I appreciate your willingness to cooperate in the validation of this questionnaire.

Sincerely,

George D. Spivey

George D. Spivey

LETTER OF INSTRUCTION ACCOMPANYING THE ANSTE QUESTIONNAIRE

Dear Participant:

I am requesting your assistance in helping to validate the attached questionnaire to be used in a study relating to the supervision of student teachers. You will find the necessary instructions at the top of page one and the rating scale in the upper right hand corner of each page.

Please make any additional comments regarding points of clarification, rewording of questions, and suggestions either above or beside the item being considered that you might feel necessary.

I appreciate your willingness to cooperate in the validation of this questionnaire.

Sincerely,

George D. Spivey

George D. Spivey

INSTRUCTIONS FOR ADMINISTERING THE ANSTE QUESTIONNAIRE

(1) Ask participants to check their copy of the ANSTE Questionnaire for the correct number of pages and make available to all participants a number two pencil. Make sure the correct Form is being administered.

(2) Make any necessary corrections on the Questionnaire clear before having the group begin to respond to the questionnaire.

(3) Explain that the time necessary to take the ANSTE Questionnaire ranges from 35 to 40 minutes. There is no set time limit.

(4) Read the instructions orally to the entire group before having participants begin to respond (Instructions on the front of the Questionnaire).

(5) Ask the participants not to deliberate on any one question too long. Each participant is asked to give his first response.

(6) Ask the participants to respond to all of the items on the ANSTE Questionnaire as though the supervision in developing these skills is the responsibility of the college coordinator.

(7) Ask the participants to check all of the seven pages of the ANSTE Questionnaire after responding to the 79 items in order to check:
   (a) That no item has two spaces for one item marked;
   (b) That no item is omitted.

STUDENT TEACHER'S ASSESSMENT OF NEEDS IN THE STUDENT TEACHING EXPERIENCE

FORM A

Instructions: Rate your needs as to the following items using Scale I. Mark the part of the scale that best represents the way you perceive your personal needs in the student teaching experience. The results of this study will not be used as a part of your evaluation. Please respond as objectively as possible.

The following response indicates my anticipated need for help from the college coordinator (supervisor) to:

Scale I
Degree of Perceived Needs

	1 Need Exceptional Amount	2 Need More than Average	3 Need Little	4 Don't Need Any	5 Not Anticipated
Orientation:					
1) Become acquainted with the nature of the community, school and faculty.					
2) Become acquainted with the cooperating (supervising) teacher prior to the student teaching experience					
3) Acquire a list of available housing					
4) Become aware of the policies and regulations of the College or University regarding the student teaching experience.					
5) Understand the policies of the assigned school.					

Scale I

Degree of Perceived Needs

	1 Need Exceptional Amount	2 Need More than Average	3 Need Little	4 Don't Need Any	5 Not Applicable
6					
7					
8					
9					
10					
11					
12					

Orientation (continued)

6) Identify the goals in the student teaching program with the cooperative teacher and principal.
7) Understand the role of the college coordinator.
8) Understand the role of the cooperating teacher.
9) Become familiar with the evaluation procedure to be used by the college coordinator.
10) Become familiar with the evaluation procedure to be used by the cooperating teacher.
11) Become acquainted with the school plant and facilities.
12) Become acquainted with the cumulative records and counseling services.

Personal Needs:

13) Establish trust with the college coordinator.
14) Establish trust with the cooperating teacher.
15) Establish trust with the principal.
16) Build self-confidence.
17) Develop rapport with pupils.
18) Use a sense of humor in relating to others.
19) Develop a flexibility in meeting new situations.
20) Develop ways in approaching problems that do not fit the specific style or mold of someone else.
21) Develop meaningful teaching priorities.
22) Understand the use of interpersonal relationships (Teacher-pupil and Teacher-teacher).

Scale I
Degree of Perceived Needs

	1 Need Exceptional Amount	2 Need More than Average	3 Need Little	4 Don't Need Any	5 Not Applicable
13					
14					
15					
16					
17					
18					
19					
20					
21					
22					

Scale I
Degree of Perceived Needs

	1 Need Exceptional Amount	2 Need More than Average	3 Need Little	4 Don't Need Any	5 Not Applicable
23					
24					
25					
26					
27					
28					
29					

Personal Needs (continued)

23) Arrange conferences with the cooperating teacher for better communication.
24) Arrange informal conferences with the University coordinator.
25) Evaluate oneself as a teacher.

Initial Observation and Participation:

26) Become acquainted with the routine duties of the cooperating teacher.
27) Become familiar with the daily schedule of the grade level to be taught.
28) Develop with the cooperating teacher a schedule of the classes to be taught.
29) Become familiar with ways to prepare the environmental setting for effective learning (Learning centers, bulletin boards, etc.).

Initial Observation and Participation (continued)

30) Learn to identify certain kinds of student problems (Discipline, learning disabilities, etc.).
31) Learn to work with certain kinds of student problems.
32) Become familiar with the individual needs of all students.
33) Develop skill in managing the class for short periods of time.
34) Become familiar with the textbooks, curriculum guides and materials being used.
35) Identify specific things to consider when making observations of the cooperating teacher.
36) Become involved in a variety of classroom activities to prepare for assuming actual teaching responsibilities.

Scale I
Degree of Perceived Needs

	1 Need Exceptional Amount	2 Need More than Average	3 Need Little	4 Don't Need Any	5 Not Applicable
30					
31					
32					
33					
34					
35					
36					

Initial Observation and Participation (continued)

37) Become involved in the extra-curricular activities of the school as they relate to the teacher's role.

Teaching Role:

38) Plan units in the subject area to be taught.
39) Formulate specific objectives in planning daily lesson plans.
40) Use a variety of activities within the process of repetition in teaching.
41) Develop the skill of identifying student needs by the use of pre-test covering the exact material to be taught.
42) Become skillful in giving instructions and directions.

Scale I
Degree of Perceived Needs

	1 Need Exceptional Amount	2 Need More than Average	3 Need Little	4 Don't Need Any	5 Not Applicable
37					
38					
39					
40					
41					
42					

Scale I

Degree of Perceived Needs

Teaching Role (continued)

	1 Need Exceptional Amount	2 Need More than Average	3 Need Little	4 Don't Need Any	5 Not Applicable
43) Develop a type of communication which is natural and clearly understood.					
44) Present material on the level of understanding of the learners.					
45) Understand the specific skills to be developed and taught to the learner.					
46) Develop a workable understanding of the subject content.					
47) Become aware of the steps involved in the process of learning (Sequential steps in a specific subject area).					
48) Plan so as to utilize time in order to accomplish the objectives.					
49) Plan so as to utilize space in order to accomplish the objectives.					

Teaching Role (continued)

50) Plan so as to utilize materials in order to accomplish the objectives.
51) Become skillful in grouping for a short period of time in order to have certain kinds of activities (Math drills, project planning).
52) Individualize classroom work (Individualized assignments).
53) Plan the use of audio-visual aids for learning.
54) Vary the types of classroom activities to avoid monotony in the classroom.
55) To learn to use the different techniques of questioning.
56) Plan for teacher-pupil interaction.
57) Plan for pupil-pupil interaction.
58) Plan for pupil-media interaction.

Scale I
Degree of Perceived Needs

	1 Need Exceptional Amount	2 Need More than Average	3 Need Little	4 Don't Need Any	5 Not Applicable
50					
51					
52					
53					
54					
55					
56					
57					
58					

Teaching Role (continued)

59) Plan for teacher-teacher interaction.
60) Develop personal style of teaching through the student teaching experience (Trying and adapting innovative ideas, methods and techniques to classroom management).
61) Become acquainted with ways in which pupils are reinforced in the classroom.
62) Use outside resources to enhance classroom learning.
63) Develop different approaches to discipline.
64) Become skillful in planning a number of ways to evaluate pupil's work.
65) Become skillful in varying classroom arrangement as classroom activities vary.

Scale I
Degree of Perceived Needs

	1	2	3	4	5
	Need Exceptional Amount	Need More than Average	Need Little	Don't Need Any	Not Applicable
59					
60					
61					
62					
63					
64					
65					

Scale I

Degree of Perceived Needs

	1 Need Exceptional Amount	2 Need More than Average	3 Need Little	4 Don't Need Any	5 Not Applicable
66) Use the log (diary) as a medium to reveal progress and development of teaching skills. 66					
67) Use seminars as a medium of interaction with other student teachers and college coordinators with respect to similar problems and needs. 67					
68) Learn the use of one or more observational instruments in the analysis of teaching (Flanders Interaction Analysis, Mork's VRBL) 68					
69) Understand the use of verbal behavior in the classroom. 69					
70) Understand the use of non-verbal behavior in the classroom. 70					
71) Learn how to gauge the difference in student's abilities as to cognitive learning (Gifted, slow, etc.). 71					

Analysis of Teaching Skills:

Scale I
Degree of Perceived Needs

	1	2	3	4	5
	Need Exceptional Amount	Need More than Average	Need Little	Don't Need Any	Not Applicable
72					
73					
74					

Analysis of Teaching Skills (continued)

72) Develop an understanding of the whole teaching program in the school by visiting other classes in different subject areas.

Relinquishing of Teaching Role:

73) Plan for the orderly return of the responsibilities of teaching to the cooperating teacher.

74) Develop ways in which to use the time at the close of the teaching experience most profitably.

Scale I
Degree of Perceived Needs

	1 Need Exceptional Amount	2 Need More than Average	3 Need Little	4 Don't Need Any	5 Not Applicable
Evaluation Procedure of the Student Teaching Experience:					
75) Become acquainted with strengths in the student teaching experience. 75					
76) Identify characteristics which add to the professional image of teaching. 76					
77) Develop an understanding with the cooperating teacher of the overall accomplishments achieved during the teaching experience. 77					
78) Develop an understanding with the college coordinator of the overall accomplishments achieved during the teaching experience. 78					
79) Develop the skills to evaluate oneself as a teacher. 79					

STUDENT TEACHER'S ASSESSMENT OF NEEDS IN
THE STUDENT TEACHING EXPERIENCE

FORM B

Instructions: Rate your needs as to the following items using Scale II. Mark the part of the scale that best represents the degree to which the supervision of the college coordinator (supervisor) helped you to meet your personal needs in the student teaching experience. The results of this study will not be used as a part of your evaluation. Please respond as objectively as possible. (Your personal identity will not be revealed.)

The following response indicates the degree to which the supervision of the college coordinator (supervisor) was given in helping me to meet my need to:

Orientation:

1) Become acquainted with the nature of the community, school and faculty.
2) Become acquainted with the cooperating (supervising) teacher prior to the student teaching experience.

	Scale II Degree of Supervision Given					Scale III Degree to Which Supervision Met Need				
	1 Exceptional Amount Given	2 More Than Average Given	3 Little Given	4 None Given	5 Not Applicable	1 Too Much Given	2 Adequate Amount Given	3 Not Enough Given	4 None Given When Needed	5 Not Applicable
1										
2										

Orientation (continued)

3) Acquire a list of available housing.
4) Become aware of the policies and regulations of the College or University regarding the student teaching experience.
5) Understand the policies of the assigned school.
6) Identify the goals in the student teaching program with the cooperative teacher and principal.
7) Understand the role of the college coordinator.
8) Understand the role of the cooperating teacher.

	Scale II Degree of Supervision Given					Scale III Degree to Which Supervision Met Need				
	1 Exceptional Amount Given	2 More Than Average Given	3 Little Given	4 None Given	5 Not Applicable	1 Too Much Given	2 Adequate Amount Given	3 Not Enough Given	4 None Given When Needed	5 Not Applicable
3										
4										
5										
6										
7										
8										

Orientation (continued)

9) Become familiar with the evaluation procedure to be used by the college coordinator.
10) Become familiar with the evaluation procedure to be used by the cooperating teacher.
11) Become acquainted with the school plant and facilities
12) Become acquainted with the cumulative records and counseling services.

Personal Needs:

13) Establish trust with the college coordinator.

	Scale II Degree of Supervision Given					Scale III Degree to Which Supervision Met Need				
	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
	Exceptional Amount Given	More Than Average Given	Little Given	None Given	Not Applicable	Too Much Given	Adequate Amount Given	Not Enough Given	None Given When Needed	Not Applicable
9										
10										
11										
12										
13										

	Scale II Degree of Supervision Given					Scale III Degree to Which Supervision Met Need				
	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
	Exceptional Amount Given	More Than Average Given	Little Given	None Given	Not Applicable	Too Much Given	Adequate Amount Given	Not Enough Given	None Given When Needed	Not Applicable
Personal Needs (continued)										
14) Establish trust with the cooperating teacher.	14									
15) Establish trust with the principal.	15									
16) Build self-confidence.	16									
17) Develop rapport with pupils	17									
18) Use a sense of humor in relating to others.	18									
19) Develop a flexibility in meeting new situations.	19									
20) Develop ways in approaching problems that do not fit the specific style or mold of someone else.	20									
21) Develop meaningful teaching priorities.	21									
22) Understand the use of interpersonal relationships (Teacher-pupil and Teacher-teacher).	22									

		Scale II Degree of Supervision Given					Scale III Degree to Which Supervision Met Need				
		1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
		Exceptional Amount Given	More Than Average Given	Little Given	None Given	Not Applicable	Too Much Given	Adequate Amount Given	Not Enough Given	None Given When Needed	Not Applicable
Personal Needs (continued)											
23) Arrange conferences with the cooperating teacher for better communication.	23										
24) Arrange informal conferences with the University coordinator.	24										
25) Evaluate oneself as a teacher.	25										
Initial Observation and Participation:											
26) Become acquainted with the routine duties of the cooperating teacher.	26										
27) Become familiar with the daily schedule of the grade level to be taught.	27										
28) Develop with the cooperating teacher a schedule of the classes to be taught.	28										

Initial Observation and Participation (continued)

29) Become familiar with ways to prepare the environmental setting for effective learning (learning centers, bulletin boards, etc.).
30) Learn to identify certain kinds of student problems (discipline, learning disabilities, etc.).
31) Learn to work with certain kinds of student problems.
32) Become familiar with the individual needs of all students.
33) Develop skill in managing the class for short periods of time.

	Scale II Degree of Supervision Given					Scale III Degree to Which Supervision Met Need				
	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
	Exceptional Amount Given	More Than Average Given	Little Given	None Given	Not Applicable	Too Much Given	Adequate Amount Given	Not Enough Given	None Given When Needed	Not Applicable
29										
30										
31										
32										
33										

	Scale II Degree of Supervision Given					Scale III Degree to Which Supervision Met Need				
	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
	Exceptional Amount Given	More Than Average Given	Little Given	None Given	Not Applicable	Too Much Given	Adequate Amount Given	Not Enough Given	None Given When Needed	Not Applicable
Initial Observation and Participation (continued)										
34) Become familiar with the textbooks, curriculum guides and materials being used. 34										
35) Identify specific things to consider when making observations of the cooperating teacher. 35										
36) Become involved in a variety of classroom activities to prepare for assuming actual teaching responsibilities. 36										
37) Become involved in the extracurricular activities of the school as they relate to the teacher's role. 37										

Teaching Role:

38) Plan units in the subject area to be taught.
39) Formulate specific objectives in planning daily lesson plans
40) Use a variety of activities within the process of repetition in teaching.
41) Develop the skill of identifying student needs by the use of a pre-test covering the exact material to be taught.
42) Become skillful in giving instructions and directions.
43) Develop a type of communication which is natural and clearly understood.

	Scale II Degree of Supervision Given					Scale III Degree to Which Supervision Met Need				
	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
	Exceptional Amount Given	More Than Average Given	Little Given	None Given	Not Applicable	Too Much Given	Adequate Amount Given	Not Enough Given	None Given When Needed	Not Applicable
38										
39										
40										
41										
42										
43										

	Scale II Degree of Supervision Given					Scale III Degree to Which Supervision Met Need				
	1 Exceptional Amount Given	2 More Than Average Given	3 Little Given	4 None Given	5 Not Applicable	1 Too Much Given	2 Adequate Amount Given	3 Not Enough Given	4 None Given When Needed	5 Not Applicable
Teaching Role (continued)										
44) Present material on the level of understanding of the learners.	44									
45) Understand the specific skills to be developed and taught to the learner.	45									
46) Develop a workable understanding of the subject content.	46									
47) Become aware of the steps involved in the process of learning (Sequential steps in a specific subject area).	47									
48) Plan so as to utilize time in order to accomplish the objectives.	48									
49) Plan so as to utilize space in order to accomplish the objectives.	49									

Teaching Role (continued)

50) Plan so as to utilize materials in order to accomplish the objectives.
51) Become skillful in grouping for a short period of time in order to have certain kinds of activities (Math drills, project planning).
52) Individualize classroom work (Individualized assignments).
53) Plan the use of audio-visual aids for learning.
54) Vary the types of classroom activities to avoid monotony in the classroom
55) To learn to use the different techniques of questioning.
56) Plan for teacher-pupil interaction.

	Scale II Degree of Supervision Given					Scale III Degree to Which Supervision Met Need				
	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
	Exceptional Amount Given	More Than Average Given	Little Given	None Given	Not Applicable	Too Much Given	Adequate Amount Given	Not Enough Given	None Given When Needed	Not Applicable
50										
51										
52										
53										
54										
55										
56										

Teaching Role (continued)

57) Plan for pupil-pupil interaction.
58) Plan for pupil-media interaction.
59) Plan for teacher-teacher interaction.
60) Develop personal style of teaching through the student teaching experience (Trying and adapting innovative ideas, methods and techniques to classroom management).
61) Become acquainted with ways in which pupils are reinforced in the classroom.
62) Use outside resources to enhance classroom learning.

	Scale II Degree of Supervision Given					Scale III Degree to Which Supervision Met Need				
	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
	Exceptional Amount Given	More Than Average Given	Little Given	None Given	Not Applicable	Too Much Given	Adequate Amount Given	Not Enough Given	None Given When Needed	Not Applicable
57										
58										
59										
60										
61										
62										

Teaching Role (continued)

63) Develop different approaches to discipline.

64) Become skillful in planning a number of ways to evaluate pupil's work.

65) Become skillful in varying classroom arrangement as classroom activities vary.

Analysis of Teaching Skills:

66) Use the log (diary) as a medium to reveal progress and development of teaching skills.

67) Use seminars as a medium of interaction with other student teachers and college coordinators with respect to similar problems and needs.

	Scale II Degree of Supervision Given					Scale III Degree to Which Supervision Met Need				
	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
	Exceptional Amount Given	More Than Average Given	Little Given	None Given	Not Applicable	Too Much Given	Adequate Amount Given	Not Enough Given	None Given When Needed	Not Applicable
63										
64										
65										
66										
67										

Analysis of Teaching Skills
(continued)

68) Learn the use of one or more observational instruments in the analysis of teaching (Flanders Interaction Analysis, Mork's VRBL)

69) Understand the use of verbal behavior in the classroom.

70) Understand the use of non-verbal behavior in the classroom.

71) Learn how to gauge the difference in student's abilities as to cognitive learning (Gifted, slow, etc.).

	Scale II Degree of Supervision Given					Scale III Degree to Which Supervision Met Need				
	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
	Exceptional Amount Given	More Than Average Given	Little Given	None Given	Not Applicable	Too Much Given	Adequate Amount Given	Not Enough Given	None Given When Needed	Not Applicable
68										
69										
70										
71										

Analysis of Teaching Skills
(continued)

72) Develop an understanding of the whole teaching program in the school by visiting other classes in different subject areas.

73) Plan for the orderly return of the responsibilities of teaching to the cooperating teacher.

74) Develop ways in which to use the time at the close of the teaching experience most profitably.

	Scale II Degree of Supervision Given					Scale III Degree to Which Supervision Met Need				
	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
	Exceptional Amount Given	More Than Average Given	Little Given	None Given	Not Applicable	Too Much Given	Adequate Amount Given	Not Enough Given	None Given When Needed	Not Applicable
72										
73										
74										

	Scale II Degree of Supervision Given					Scale III Degree to Which Supervision Met Need				
	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
	Exceptional Amount Given	More Than Average Given	Little Given	None Given	Not Applicable	Too Much Given	Adequate Amount Given	Not Enough Given	None Given When Needed	Not Applicable
75										
76										
77										
78										
79										

Evaluation Procedure of the Student Teaching Experience:

75) Become acquainted with strengths in the student teaching experience.

76) Identify characteristics which add to the professional image of teaching.

77) Develop an understanding with the cooperating teacher of the overall accomplishments achieved during the teaching experience.

78) Develop an understanding with the college coordinator of the overall accomplishments achieved during the teaching experience.

79) Develop the skills to evaluate oneself as a teacher.

APPENDIX B

PERSONAL DATA FORM

Please complete the following questions for justifying the population and geographical location for the study.

(1) Name_____

(2) Sex: Male_____, Female_____

(3) Age_____
(years)

(4) Are you a transfer student? Yes_____ No_____
If the answer is yes, give the name of the institution previously attended._____
Location_____

(5) Give the name of the elementary school attended (If more than one, list the one elementary school which you feel has had the most influence on your work on the elementary level)._____
Location of elementary school:_____
(City) (State)

(6) Give the name of the high school attended (If more than one, list the one high school which you feel has had the most influence on your work on the secondary level).
_____
Location of high school:_____
(City) (State)

(7) Give the approximate size of enrollment of the high school attended.
(a) Below 500_____ (c) 1000-1500_____
(b) 500-1000 _____ (d) 1500 plus_____

(8) State the occupation of the father (If retired, state the occupation prior to retirement).
_____

(9) Give the level of father's education.
(a) 4 years college plus___ (d) High School ___
(b) 4 years college ___ (e) Junior High School ___
(c) 2-3 years college ___ (f) Elementary School ___

(10) State the occupation of the mother (If retired, state the occupation prior to retirement).
_____

(11) Give the level of the mother's education.

(a) 4 years college plus	___	(d) High School	___
(b) 4 years college	___	(e) Junior High School	___
(c) 2-3 years college	___	(f) Elementary School	___

(12) Give the number of brothers in your family._____

(13) Give the number of sisters in your family._____

(14) Name the languages (other than English) spoken fluently in your home._____ _____ _____

TABLE VII

PERSONAL DATA OF STUDENT TEACHER POPULATION OF THE STUDY

	Institution 1[a]	Institution 2[b]
Age:		
21-23	38	39
24-30+	7	4
Sex:		
Male	10	18
Female	35	27
Transfers:		
No Transfer	23	27
Junior College	11	7
College in State	1	3
College Out-of-State	1	2
University	2	3
Overseas College	2	1
Elementary School:		
Florida	35	0
Tennessee	0	36
Northeast	2	3
South	1	2
West	1	2
North Central	4	0
South America	1	0
Germany	1	0
Secondary School:		
Florida	37	0
Tennessee	0	37
Northeast	1	2
South	2	2
West	1	2
North Central	3	0
South America	0	0
Germany	1	0
Size of Secondary School:		
500	5	5
500-1000	13	13
1000-1500	5	12
1500+	22	10

TABLE VII (continued)

	Institution 1[a]	Institution 2[b]
Father's Occupation:		
Professional	13	13
Army	4	2
Business Experience	16	6
Skilled	10	4
Employed	2	16
Deceased	1	1
Not Employed	0	1
Father's Education:		
Four Years of College +	7	8
Four Years of College	11	9
Two to Three Years of College	9	5
High School	12	16
Junior High School	4	2
Elementary School	2	3
Mother's Occupation:		
Housewife	21	20
Business Experience	3	1
Teacher	7	5
Professional	2	3
Secretarial	10	4
Employed	2	10
Mother's Education:		
Four Years of College +	4	4
Four Years of College	6	5
Two to Three Years of College	12	12
High School	17	16
Junior High School	5	6
Elementary School	1	0
Siblings:		
No Brothers	13	17
One Brother	15	18
Two Brothers	11	6
Three Brothers	6	2

TABLE VII (continued)

	Institution 1[a]	Institution 2[b]
Siblings: (continued)		
No Sisters	20	16
One Sister	16	14
Two Sisters	4	8
Three Sisters	2	4
Four Sisters	2	0
Five Sisters	1	1
Number of Foreign Languages Spoken Fluently in Home:		
None	37	38
One	7	5
Two	1	0

[a] $N = 45$

[b] $N = 43$

APPENDIX C

TABLE VIII

PRE- AND POST-TEST MINNESOTA TEACHER ATTITUDE INVENTORY SCORES FOR EACH MEMBER OF GROUP I

Student Teacher Number	Post-test	Pre-test	Difference
1	20	45	-25
2	52	53	- 1
3	77	51	+26
4	47	24	+23
5	78	71	+ 7
6	40	51	- 9
7	50	51	- 1
8	- 9	-14	+ 5
9	-15	- 1	-14
10	66	73	- 7
11	46	21	+25
12	23	30	- 7
13	36	21	+15
14	12	11	+ 1
15	2	29	-27
16	55	31	+24
17	19	-22	+41
18	22	47	-25
19	- 5	-12	+ 7
20	- 5	- 2	- 3
21	67	44	+23
22	-51	-63	+12
23	62	48	+14
24	-12	-49	+37
25	39	27	+12
26	85	73	+12
27	26	-42	+68
28	5	1	+ 4
29	11	25	-14
30	37	-26	+63
31	42	61	-19
32	84	94	-10
33	33	17	+16
34	67	58	+ 9
35	- 2	8	-10
36	50	55	- 5

TABLE VIII (continued)

Student Teacher Number	Post-test	Pre-test	Difference
37	48	6	+42
38	76	83	- 7
39	-45	-60	+15
40	63	65	- 2
41	15	-23	+38
42	88	97	- 9
43	51	62	-11
44	11	27	-16
45	43	-35	+78

N = 45

TABLE IX

PRE- AND POST-TEST MINNESOTA TEACHER ATTITUDE INVENTORY SCORES FOR EACH MEMBER OF GROUP II

Student Teacher Number	Post-test	Pre-test	Difference
1	12	- 8	+20
2	92	85	+ 7
3	2	24	-22
4	78	76	+ 2
5	55	62	- 7
6	82	81	+ 1
7	60	36	+24
8	43	-16	+59
9	62	22	+40
10	-26	- 4	-22
11	- 3	-50	+47
12	75	84	- 9
13	10	47	-37
14	51	57	- 6
15	56	- 3	+59
16	40	44	- 4
17	64	46	+18
18	43	41	+ 2
19	-60	-35	-25
20	0	43	-43
21	26	2	+24
22	68	67	+ 1
23	28	33	- 5
24	- 8	33	-41
25	-25	9	-34
26	13	10	+ 3
27	92	0	+92
28	-13	- 1	-12
29	36	39	- 3
30	16	33	-17
31	56	44	+12
32	8	7	+ 1
33	-20	5	-25
34	16	6	+10
35	9	0	+ 9
36	-24	-21	- 3

TABLE IX (continued)

Student Teacher Number	Post-test	Pre-test	Difference
37	28	77	-49
38	53	39	+14
39	41	0	+41
40	52	50	+ 2
41	35	79	-44
42	65	62	+ 3
43	94	73	+21
44	80	48	+32
45	12	24	-12

N = 45

APPENDIX D

TABLE X

PERCEIVED NEEDS OF STUDENT TEACHERS AT THE BEGINNING OF THE STUDENT TEACHING EXPERIENCE
FORM A - SCALE I

Variable	Group	Number of Cases	Mean	Standard Deviation	Standard Error	t-Value
Orientation	I[a]	45	36.20	5.37	0.80	3.03*
	II[b]	45	31.98	7.64	1.14	
Personal Needs	I	45	38.71	6.57	0.98	1.77 (ns)
	II	45	35.49	10.28	1.53	
Initial Observation and Participation	I	45	35.58	6.11	0.91	1.29 (ns)
	II	45	33.44	9.27	1.38	
Teaching Role	I	45	79.31	13.27	1.98	1.36 (ns)
	II	45	74.16	21.66	3.23	
Analysis of Teaching Skills	I	45	19.38	3.97	0.59	0.98 (ns)
	II	45	18.51	4.37	0.65	
Relinquishing of Teaching Role	I	45	6.02	1.22	0.18	0.60 (ns)
	II	45	5.82	1.90	0.28	
Evaluation Procedure of the Student Teaching Experience	I	45	13.76	3.16	0.48	1.59 (ns)
	II	45	12.51	4.15	0.62	

*$p < .01$.

[a]Institution using the Subject Area Specialist Approach.

[b]Institution using the Generalist Approach.

TABLE XI

THE MEANS OF RESPONSES OF STUDENT TEACHERS IN FIVE SUBJECT AREAS AS MEASURED BY SCALE I OF THE ANSTE

Variable	Mean	Standard Deviation	Number
For Entire Population	220.43	44.02	90
English	220.96	39.96	(23)
Foreign Language	224.00	42.94	(10)
Mathematics	212.30	56.58	(20)
Science	220.65	43.12	(20)
Social Studies	226.94	37.41	(17)

TABLE XII

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE ON SCORES ON STUDENT TEACHERS' RATING SCALE OF PERCEIVED NEEDS AT THE BEGINNING OF THE STUDENT TEACHING EXPERIENCE

Source of Variability	Degrees of Freedom	Sum of Squared Deviations	Mean Square	F Ratio
Between Groups	4	2176.56	544.14	0.27 (ns)
Within Groups	85	170262.43	2003.09	
Total	89	172438.99		

TABLE XIII

STUDENT TEACHERS' ASSESSMENT OF THE AMOUNT OF SUPERVISION GIVEN BY THE COLLEGE COORDINATOR FORM B - SCALE II

Variable	Group	Number of Cases	Mean	Standard Deviation	Standard Error	t-Value
Orientation	I[a]	45	37.64	6.44	0.96	6.98*
	II[b]	45	28.98	5.29	0.79	
Personal Needs	I	45	36.29	8.06	1.20	5.78*
	II	45	27.18	6.85	1.02	
Initial Observation and Participation	I	45	36.49	8.73	1.30	5.14*
	II	45	27.93	6.95	1.04	
Teaching Role	I	45	81.53	17.45	2.60	4.80*
	II	45	64.82	15.54	2.32	
Analysis of Teaching Skills	I	45	21.11	3.98	0.59	7.26*
	II	45	15.02	3.97	0.59	
Relinquishing of Teaching Role	I	45	6.87	1.42	0.21	2.56 (ns)
	II	45	5.96	1.92	0.29	
Evaluation Procedure of the Student Teaching Experience	I	45	13.96	3.28	0.49	7.00*
	II	45	9.22	3.13	0.47	

*$p < .01$.

[a]Institution using the Subject Area Specialist Approach.

[b]Institution using the Generalist Approach.

TABLE XIV

THE MEANS OF RESPONSES OF STUDENT TEACHERS IN FIVE SUBJECT AREAS AS MEASURED BY SCALE II OF THE ANSTE

Variable	Mean	Standard Deviation	Number
For Entire Population	206.50	48.89	(90)
English	219.04	56.48	(23)
Foreign Language	202.60	27.95	(10)
Mathematics	198.35	48.11	(20)
Science	206.60	46.18	(20)
Social Studies	201.29	53.33	(17)

TABLE XV

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE ON SCORES ON STUDENT TEACHERS' RATING SCALE OF THE AMOUNT OF SUPERVISION GIVEN BY THE COLLEGE COORDINATOR

Source of Variability	Degrees of Freedom	Sum of Squared Deviations	Mean Square	F Ratio
Between Groups	(4)	5559.63	1389.91	0.57 (ns)
Within Groups	(85)	207185.37	2437.47	
Total	(89)	212744.99		

TABLE XVI

DEGREE TO WHICH THE SUPERVISION OF THE COLLEGE COORDINATOR HELPED STUDENT TEACHERS MEET THEIR NEEDS DURING THE STUDENT TEACHING EXPERIENCE
FORM B - SCALE III

Variable	Group	Number of Cases	Mean	Standard Deviation	Standard Error	t-Value
Orientation	I[a]	45	31.64	5.03	0.75	2.91*
	II[b]	45	29.09	3.07	0.46	
Personal Needs	I	45	31.22	4.77	0.71	2.96*
	II	45	28.67	3.30	0.49	
Initial Observation and Participation	I	45	29.40	5.91	0.88	2.30 (ns)
	II	45	27.09	3.26	0.49	
Teaching Role	I	45	68.53	12.53	1.87	1.91 (ns)
	II	45	64.20	8.68	1.29	
Analysis of Teaching Skills	I	45	17.71	3.00	0.45	3.82*
	II	45	15.44	2.63	0.39	
Relinquishing of Teaching Role	I	45	5.40	1.66	0.25	-1.31 (ns)
	II	45	5.89	1.87	0.28	
Evaluation Procedure of the Student Teaching Experience	I	45	12.02	2.32	0.35	3.58*
	II	45	10.58	1.39	0.21	

*$p < .01$.

[a]Institution using the Subject Area Specialist Approach.

[b]Institution using the Generalist Approach.

TABLE XVII

THE MEANS OF RESPONSES OF STUDENT TEACHERS IN FIVE SUBJECT AREAS AS MEASURED BY SCALE III OF THE ANSTE

Variable	Mean	Standard Deviation	Number
For Entire Population	188.44	24.88	(90)
English	191.61	24.95	(23)
Foreign Language	185.90	17.95	(10)
Mathematics	182.65	16.27	(20)
Science	186.60	25.31	(20)
Social Studies	194.65	35.00	(17)

TABLE XVIII

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE ON SCORES ON STUDENT TEACHERS' RATING SCALE OF THE DEGREE TO WHICH THE SUPERVISION OF THE COLLEGE COORDINATOR HELPED STUDENT TEACHERS MEET THEIR NEEDS DURING THE STUDENT TEACHING EXPERIENCE

Source of Variability	Degrees of Freedom	Sum of Squared Deviations	Mean Square	F Ratio
Between Groups	(4)	1689.19	422.30	0.67 (ns)
Within Groups	(85)	53397.81	628.21	
Total	(89)	55087.00		

TABLE XIX

THE MEANS OF RESPONSES OF STUDENT TEACHERS IN TWO GROUPS AS MEASURED BY THE MINNESOTA TEACHER ATTITUDE INVENTORY FORM A

Variable	Mean	Standard Deviation	Number
For Entire Population	27.34	37.13	(90)
Group I[a]	24.69	40.57	(45)
Group II[b]	30.00	33.58	(45)

[a]Student teachers supervised by the Subject Area Specialist Approach.

[b]Student teachers supervised by the Generalist Approach.

TABLE XX

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE ON SCORES OF STUDENT TEACHERS' RESPONSES TO THE MINNESOTA TEACHER ATTITUDE INVENTORY

Source of Variability	Degrees of Freedom	Sum of Squared Deviations	Mean Square	F Ratio
Between Groups	(1)	623.81	634.81	0.35 (ns)
Within Groups	(88)	122037.61	1386.79	
Total	(89)	122672.42		

TABLE XXI

THE MEANS OF CHANGE SCORES OF TWO GROUPS OF STUDENT TEACHERS AS MEASURED BY THE MINNESOTA TEACHER ATTITUDE INVENTORY FORM A

Variable	Mean	Standard Deviation	Number
For Entire Population	5.77	26.89	(90)
Group I[a]	8.78	24.13	(45)
Group II[b]	2.76	29.36	(45)

[a]Student teachers supervised by the Subject Area Specialist Approach.

[b]Student teachers supervised by the Generalist Approach.

TABLE XXII

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE ON SCORES OF THE CHANGE OF STUDENT TEACHERS' ATTITUDES AS MEASURED BY THE MINNESOTA TEACHER ATTITUDE INVENTORY

Source of Variability	Degrees of Freedom	Sum of Squared Deviations	Mean Square	F Ratio
Between Groups	(1)	816.02	816.02	1.13 (ns)
Within Groups	(88)	63546.09	722.11	
Total	(89)	64362.10		

VITA

George D. Spivey was born in Goodlettsville, Tennessee, in 1935. He attended school at Joelton, Tennessee, through the junior year in high school, graduating from Goodlettsville High School in 1951. He received his B.A. degree with a major in Biology at David Lipscomb College in Nashville, Tennessee, in 1955.

After teaching five years on the junior high level in Springfield, Tennessee, and serving as an assistant principal during four of these five years, he accepted the principalship of Virginia Street Elementary School in Hopkinsville, Kentucky, for two years. In 1965, he returned to Springfield, Tennessee, as principal of Cheatham Park Elementary School after working in religious education in Clarksville, Tennessee, for two years. He served in this position for six years. He completed the requirements for the M.A. degree in Educational Administration at George Peabody for Teachers in 1958. The requirements for the Education Specialist degree were completed at George Peabody College in 1968 in the area of Educational Administration.

He entered the University of Tennessee in the doctoral program in 1970 with a major in Curriculum and

Instruction and minors in Educational Psychology and Higher Education. In 1972 and 1973, he served in the position of Student Teacher Coordinator at the University of Tennessee.

He is married to the former Rosemary Cameron of Nashville, Tennessee, and they have three children--George Cameron, Emma Catherine, and Elizabeth Christine.