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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION TO THE PROBLEM

The education of prospective elementary school teachers in this country usually includes a four year program of college or university preparation. As components of this program, pre-service teachers generally receive preparation in both the liberal arts and in professional education.

Typically, part of the course work devoted to professional education requires future teachers to spend some time in an actual classroom engaged in practice or student teaching. According to Johnson (1968, p. 9), who surveyed 1,110 institutions which educate future teachers, pre-service students enrolled in elementary education spend an average of 12.02 weeks engaged in student teaching.

Student teaching is an integral and valued component in the education of future elementary teachers. Conant (1963, p. 215), in his extensive study of teacher training institutions, recommended that all pre-service elementary teachers engage in practice teaching (student teaching) for at least eight weeks.

Other investigators agree that student teaching is an important and necessary experience for pre-service teachers. Filburn
(1968, p. 188) stated that student teaching is a "vital and dynamic" phase of any teacher education program. Campbell (1967, p. 160) reported that an analysis of the literature revealed that student teaching is a valuable experience. Denemark and Macdonald (1967, p. 238) and Andrews (1964a, p. 165) all claimed that even the severest critics of teacher education programs feel that student teaching is desirable. Dressel (1970, p. 163) reported that a student teaching program is the "single most crucial component" of a teacher education program.

Authorities in the field of teacher education agree that future teachers should engage in student teaching as a part of their professional development and training. What, then, should be the characteristics of such an experience?

Student teaching serves as a culminating experience or as a transition from one role to another. Yee (1967, p. 1) indicated that student teaching serves as the typical culminating experience. Iannoccone (1963, p. 73) felt that the experience may be viewed "as a critical stage of transition from the status of college student to the status of classroom teacher."

Another characteristic of such an experience is the practice required by the neophyte who is learning to teach. Tanruther (1968, p. v) felt that learning to teach required "practice with professional help." Shaplin (1961, pp. 34-38) not only justified
practice as part of the training of teachers, but he also mentioned specific recommendations of elements which should be encompassed by this practice phase.

Providing student teachers with supervision comprises still another characteristic of a student teaching experience. According to Malikail (1970, p. 163) and Krumbein (1965, p. 49) the practice phase should be supervised. Conant (1963, p. 215) recommended that supervision during practice teaching should be afforded by a cooperating teacher and a clinical professor.

Thus, student teaching is a vital and important part of teacher education which can be characterized as an experience which serves as a culminating activity, helps the student teacher make the transition from one role to another, furnishes practice for the novice, and provides professional supervision to the pre-service teacher.

Supervision of the student teacher may be performed by a variety of people. According to Brink (1945, p. 396) a student-teacher supervisory staff usually consists of a general director, a coordinator, university supervisors, and supervising teachers. Johnson's study (1968) also alluded to this kind of staff. Iannaccone and Button (1964, p. 41) mentioned a dyad composed of student teacher and cooperating teacher. Other investigators have referred to a triad consisting of the student teacher, cooperating
teacher, and college supervisor (Merrill, 1967, p. 61; Filburn 1968, p. 188; Lindsey, 1969, p. 257; Shapiro and Shapiro, 1971, p. 16).

Thus, several different teacher educators may be involved with the supervision of student teachers. However, a prominent and necessary figure in this relationship, according to Bennie (1964, p. 131), is the college supervisor. The present investigation was undertaken to study a specific aspect involved in the dyadic relationship between a student teacher and college supervisor.

In the student teacher-college supervisor relationship, the college supervisor's role is varied. Merrill (1967, pp. 135-136) stated that the college supervisor's role consists of eight duties, one of which is to conduct conferences with student teachers. Johnson (1967, pp. 72-77), Andrews (1964, pp. 64-67), and Jones (1970, pp. 433-435) all mentioned that conferring with student teachers is a part of the college supervisor's role. Although a college supervisor's responsibilities include many tasks, this investigation was limited to one of these tasks--conducting conferences with student teachers.

Conducting conferences with student teachers is an important supervisory function. Bennie (1964, pp. 131-132) conducted a survey among first year in-service teachers. From a list of seven supervisory techniques employed by college supervisors, the respondents ranked the holding of regular conferences first as being
most helpful. To determine the effectiveness of college supervisors, Edmund and Hemink (1958, pp. 57-58) asked former student teachers to indicate "In what ways could your college supervisor have helped you more?" "Give more time to conferences with student teachers" was ranked fourth out of sixteen categories.

Two other investigators asked former student teachers to evaluate specific student teaching programs. Lingren (1959, pp. 468-470) asked 140 student teachers at the University of Pittsburgh to evaluate that student teaching program. Ranked third as being a definite strength of the program was the holding of conferences with the supervising teacher, college supervisor, and/or the director of student teaching. Wilkinson (1958, pp. 363-364), in a survey of former student teachers at Hunter College, found that "individual conferences with college supervisors" was ranked second in terms of its value as a part of the student teaching program.

From the above discussion it may be concluded that former student teachers consider the student teacher-college supervisor conference to be important, and this supervisory function has been the object of several studies.

In two parallel descriptive studies (Brown, Cobban, and Waterman, 1965, pp. 38, 39, 163; Canfield, Low, and Mullin, 1965, pp. 80-81, 204-205) supervisory conferences between college
supervisors and student teachers were examined. In both studies student teachers were asked to analyze their verbal teaching behavior by using different approaches. Upon the completion of these analyses, the student teachers were asked to try to improve their verbal teaching behavior in subsequent teaching sessions. A general conclusion reached in both studies indicated that student teachers can analyze their verbal teaching behavior and make commitments to change that behavior in subsequent teaching sessions.

In another descriptive study, Brown and Hoffman (1966, pp. 78-103, 118) developed a promissory model to be used in analyzing and describing the verbal interaction between student teachers and college supervisors during supervisory conferences. The method developed was tested and found to be highly reliable in analyzing and describing verbal interaction.

Two investigators conducted studies which appear to be experimental in nature. Brown (1962, pp. 178-184) observed the teaching of a lesson by seventy-eight student teachers. After the observation, each subject was told that his lesson was a failure. When the students were observed teaching a second lesson, one half of them taught less effectively than they had taught during the first lesson. One fourth of the group was not affected, and one fourth of the group showed some improvement.
In the other experimental study, Acheson (1964, pp. 22-38) sought to determine if the behavior of intern teachers can be modified when they are given feedback about their teaching based on televised recordings. Two types of supervisory conferences were used: direct and indirect. In the direct conference the supervisor gave the student teacher specific suggestions on how to change his verbal teaching behavior; in the indirect conference the supervisor elicited from the student teacher suggestions for changing his verbal teaching behavior. Acheson concluded that the use of television recordings in both types of conferences increased the supervisor's ability to modify an intern's subsequent verbal teaching behavior.

From the above descriptions one can conclude that supervisory conferences between college supervisors and student teachers can be examined and subjected to analysis. While past analyses, according to Dussault (1970, p. 56), have consisted primarily of surveys, Brown and Hoffman (1969, p. 107) indicated that variations in conference styles present an interesting possibility for analysis. Meaningful results obtained from studies in which the type of conference is varied should aid college supervisors when they perform this important supervisory function. Improved conference procedures would be of direct benefit to student teachers, and because of increased effectiveness of the student teachers, indirectly
beneficial to elementary students. The paucity of experimental research in the area of student teacher-college supervisor conferences and the belief that information gained from such research would benefit supervisors, student teachers, and elementary school children provided the impetus for the present investigation.

**Statement of the Problem**

The general purpose of this study was to investigate what effects different styles of college supervisor-student teacher conferences would have upon the phenomena connected with the conference. The specific purposes of the study were to investigate the effect different conference types would have upon:

1. what was discussed during the conference,

2. the students' attitudes toward the concept "conference,"

3. the students' attitudes toward the concepts "teaching a mini lesson," "being video taped," "preparing the conference agenda," "items (statements) discussed during the conference," and "communication during the conference," and

4. the students' perceptions as to whether the conferences aided their personal and/or professional growth.

From the problem statement several hypotheses were generated.
Hypotheses

In the following hypotheses the independent variables are the types or styles of conferences—student-initiated, college supervisor-initiated, and joint-initiated. The four dependent variables are the phenomena associated with the conference: the nature of what is discussed during the conference, the students' attitudes toward each type of conference, the students' attitudes pertaining to five elements connected with the conference, and the students' perceptions of the conferences as an aid to their personal and/or professional growth.

$H_01$ - No significant differences exist between conference statements initiated by student teachers and conference statements initiated by college supervisors.

$H_02$ - No significant differences exist among the student-initiated, college supervisor-initiated, and joint-initiated conferences with respect to the students' attitudes toward the concept "conference."

$H_03$ - No significant differences exist among the student-initiated, college supervisor-initiated, and joint-initiated conferences with respect to the students' attitudes toward the following concepts: "teaching a mini lesson," "being video taped," "preparing
the conference agenda, "items (statements) discussed during the conference," and "communication during the conference."

$H_04$ - No significant difference exists among the student-initiated, college supervisor-initiated, and joint-initiated conferences with respect to the students' perceptions as to whether the conferences aided their personal and/or professional growth.

All hypotheses were tested at the .05 level of significance.

**Statement of Terms**

**College supervisor.**--A college supervisor is a university instructor within the department of elementary education at the University of Dayton who holds a professorial rank and is assigned, as part of his teaching load, the supervision of student teachers.

**Student teacher.**--Those students enrolled in the department of elementary education at the University of Dayton and who student taught during the second trimester of 1972-1973 under the auspices of that department.

**Conference.**--An individualized teaching session in which a student teacher and college supervisor participate together for the purpose of discussing the student's and/or supervisor's conference agenda.
**Student-initiated conference.** — An individualized teaching conference between a student teacher and college supervisor where the student teacher has the responsibility for initiating and discussing prepared statements (items) pertaining to his teaching.

**Supervisor-initiated conference.** — An individualized teaching conference between a student teacher and college supervisor where the college supervisor has the responsibility for initiating and discussing his prepared statements (items) pertaining to the student's teaching.

**Joint-initiated conference.** — A conference between a college supervisor and student teacher where the student teacher has partial responsibility for initiating and discussing prepared statements (items) pertaining to his teaching and where the college supervisor has partial responsibility for initiating and discussing his prepared statements (items) pertaining to his student's teaching.

**Mini lesson.** — A short (eight to twelve minutes) video taped lesson (partial or complete) taught to four, five, or six elementary-age children.

**Video taping.** — A process of recording on tape the audio and video images of the student teacher's mini lesson.

**Conference agenda.** — Statements prepared for discussion during the conference by either the student teacher, college supervisor, or both.
Communication during the conference. — The verbal communication used between the college supervisor and student teacher during the conference.

Attitude. — A person's intuitive or instinctive belief(s) toward a concept or idea. Attitudes can be measured through inferences made by assessing a person's non-verbal overt behavior using evaluative, bi-polar adjectives.

Overview of Design

The design used in this study was a modified post-test only control group design where random assignment was used to assign subjects to each of the three treatment groups.

Campbell and Stanley (1963, pp. 25-26) illustrated the post-test only control group design in the following manner:

\[ \begin{array}{ccc} R & X & 0_1 \\ R & & 0_2 \end{array} \]

R represents random assignment and X represents treatment. Since this study will involve three treatments instead of one with no control group, the above design was modified in the following manner:

---

1The use of a control group indicates that no treatment has been administered. Because some type of student teacher-college supervisor conference following a video taping session is normal procedure at the University of Dayton, it was impossible to establish a control group.
$R_1 \quad X_1 \quad 0_1$

$R_2 \quad X_2 \quad 0_2$

$R_3 \quad X_3 \quad 0_3$

$R_1$ represents random assignment of students to the student-initiated conference, $R_2$ random assignment of students to the supervisor-initiated conference, and $R_3$ random assignment of students to the joint-initiated conference.

This study consisted of three phases: the implementation of a pilot study to train the college supervisors and to refine the measuring instruments, the implementation of the study, and the administration of a post-test.

The subjects in the study (phase two) were thirty-six pre-service teachers who student taught under the auspices of the department of elementary education at the University of Dayton. Five supervisors who volunteered participated in phases one and two of the study.

**Assumptions and Limitations**

The following assumptions were made in this study.

1. The five college supervisors were adequately trained to participate in this study. The college supervisors were trained during phase one of the study.
2. The subjects in this study were able to correctly follow the procedures established in the study.

3. The instruments used for collecting data were both valid and reliable. (See Chapter III for a discussion of validity and reliability.)

4. The students used in this study were similar to other students enrolled in private co-educational teacher training institutions.

The following limitations are inherent in this study:

1. The study was confined to a small group of student teachers who possess unique characteristics. (See Appendix A for those characteristics.) Generalizing the results of this study is appropriate only to those populations who possess the same characteristics.

2. Although students were assigned to treatment groups in a random manner, student teachers were not assigned to supervisors randomly. Because of factors such as student or supervisor preference, school assignment request, age level request, et cetera, it was not possible to assign students to supervisors in a random manner.

3. Some student teachers had been video taped in the past and for some this was their first such experience. This could
have an effect on results pertaining to students' attitudes toward
the concept "being video taped."

4. Because some of the student teachers who participated
in this study received a different assignment during the second half
of the trimester, the study could not be extended any longer. Phase
two of this study was limited to six weeks. Perhaps this did not
permit enough time for the independent variable, conference type,
to be maximized.

5. The measuring instruments were administered to
most of the group at the same time. Two students were absent
from the testing because of personal reasons. Both were adminis-
tered the tests several days later.

6. Because some students finished their participation
in the experiment during the fifth week and others during the sixth
week, the time which elapsed between the final conference and the
administration of the tests was not the same for all students. This
may have resulted in some unforeseen advantage to those students
who finished their conferences during the last week of the experi-
ment.
Summary

In this chapter was presented the background of the problem, statement of the problem, hypotheses, definition of terms, overview of design, and assumptions and limitations of the study.

Chapter II contains a review of the related literature.

This chapter is divided into three sections.
CHAPTEE II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

The review of the related literature pertaining to the problem under investigation is presented in this chapter. This chapter is divided into three sections: (1) literature related to student teaching, (2) literature pertaining to video taping, and (3) literature related to the meaning and measurement of attitudes.

Literature Related to Student Teaching

This section presents a review of the literature referring to student teaching. This section contains seven sub-sections: (1) a brief history of student teaching, (2) the importance of student teaching, (3) purposes of student teaching, (4) personnel who supervise the student teacher, (5) role of the college supervisor, (6) student teacher-college supervisor conferences, and (7) needs and concerns of student teachers.

History of Student Teaching

During colonial times the apprenticeship system was used to induct novices into a profession or trade. This apprenticeship concept also applied to those persons who wanted to learn how to
teach (Merrill, 1967, p. 8; Bennie, 1972, p. 3). During the era of
the county normal schools (1820-1900), the apprenticeship principle
was gradually phased out and prospective teachers were required to
attend classes at the normal school. Elementary age children were
brought to the normal school to be observed, studied, and taught by
future teachers.

Around 1900, the normal schools began to adopt a four
year curriculum and to convert into teachers colleges. Between
1920 and 1940, student teaching was instituted and became a vital
and necessary part of teacher preparation (Merrill, 1967, pp. 9-10).

Watters and Halsted (1962, p. 31) stated that prior to the
middle thirties it was considered important for future teachers to
memorize the principles of teaching which were enumerated in pro-
fessional textbooks or in lectures. Little or no emphasis was placed
upon the observation or study of children by pre-service teachers.
Student teaching consisted of teaching one hour per day for a period
of several weeks in a laboratory school affiliated with a college or
university.

Off campus student teaching did not develop extensively
until the 1930's and 1940's. During those years the laboratory
schools began to disappear because teacher educators wished future
teachers to have realistic experiences and because enrollment in
teacher education increased (Smith, 1964, p. 167).
During the 1950's a new philosophy pertaining to the education of future teachers began to emerge. The elementary classroom was conceived as a laboratory where a prospective teacher was to be treated as a student of teaching who experiments, probes, and inquires. With proper guidance from supervisory personnel, the student teacher should gradually expand his areas of competence and develop into a novice teacher.

Since the student teacher was to be considered as a student of teaching, newer supervisory methods and techniques were introduced. Those who supervised student teachers no longer acted as judges but acted as teachers. As teachers they tried to provide the student teacher with the proper guidance needed for the study and change of teaching behavior (Bennie, 1972, pp. 4–6).

Today student teaching in a realistic setting is an integral component of the education of future elementary teachers. In a nationwide survey of teacher education programs, Johnson (1968, p. 32) found that pre-service teachers enrolled in elementary education spend an average of 12.02 weeks engaged in student teaching.

**Importance of Student Teaching**

As noted above, student teaching has gained stature and prominence through the years, and numerous researchers have attested to its value.
Quick (1964, p. 449) felt that observation of children and practice teaching are important. Dressel (1970, p. 163) claimed that student teaching is "of utmost significance to the pre-service training of teachers--if, in fact, not the single most crucial component of the entire program--..."

Conant (1963, p. 215) believed student teaching to be such an important component of teacher education that he specifically recommended that all future elementary teachers practice teach for at least eight weeks with the student teacher placed in full responsibility for three of the eight weeks.

Denemark and Macdonald (1967, p. 238) indicated that even though teacher education received its share of criticism, "... it is noteworthy that there seemed to be little disagreement about the desirability of classroom practice under supervision." Also, Andrews (1964a, p. 165) stated that even the "severest critics of teacher education" agree that student teaching is desirable.

Campbell (1967, p. 160), Kalikail (1970, p. 163), Merrill (1967, p. 130), and Krumbein (1965, p. 49) all proclaimed that student teaching is a necessary part of a pre-service teacher's training. Krumbein and Kalikail both stated that the experience is not only necessary but "essential."

From the above discussion it can be concluded that student teaching is recognized by teacher education authorities as being
a necessary and desirable experience. What, then, are the purposes of student teaching?

**Purposes of Student Teaching**

One purpose of a student teaching experience is to serve as a culminating experience in the education of a novice teacher (Yee, 1967, p. 1). Another closely related purpose for student teaching is that such an experience should help the neophyte make the transition from college student to beginning teacher. According to Iannaccone (1963, p. 73) one can view student teaching as being "a critical stage of transition from the status of college student to the status of classroom teacher."

Providing a student an opportunity to practice what he has learned is another aim for requiring a student to student teach. Tanruther (1968, p. v) stated that learning to teach requires "practice with professional help." Merrill (1967, p. 28) expressed the opinion that a student teacher should be permitted to demonstrate and improve "his resourcefulness as a teacher in a real school setting."

Shaplin (1961, pp. 34-38) not only declared that "the inclusion of practice as a part of the training of teachers" is justified but he listed what experiences should be afforded. These experiences are:
1. practice in the behavioral analysis of teaching and learning,

2. practice in establishing the pre-conditions of teaching--the essentials of classroom management, and

3. practice in the organization of instruction.

Still another purpose of a student teaching program is to provide a controlled setting, supervised by a professional teacher, in which the pre-service teacher learns to teach. Tanruther (1968, p. v), Malikail (1970, p. 163), Merrill (1967, p. 28), and Krumbein (1965, p. 49) stated that a student's practice teaching must be supervised. Conant (1963, p. 215) felt that such supervision is necessary and that this supervision should be provided by a co-operating teacher and clinical professor.

A student teaching program, then, should have the objectives of providing the pre-service teacher with an opportunity to make the transition from college student to classroom teacher, letting the experience function as a culminating one, and permitting the student a chance to learn while being supervised. With respect to the objective of supervised learning, various professional personnel are involved with the supervision of this learning experience.

**Personnel Who Supervise Student Teachers**

The supervision of a student teacher generally involves two professionals--an experienced classroom teacher and a university
professor. Merrill (1967, p. 61), Shapiro and Shapiro (1971, p. 16), Iannaccone and Button (1964, p. v), and Lindsey (1969, p. 257), all stated that the supervision of a student teacher is provided by a classroom teacher and university instructor. Conant (1963, p. 215) also remarked that this supervisory arrangement is agreeable to him but he referred to a university professor as a clinical professor.

Some authorities include additional personnel in the supervisory staff. In addition to naming a college supervisor and classroom teacher as responsible for the supervision of student teachers, Michaelis (1960, p. 1477) and Brink (1945, p. 396) mentioned the director of student teaching as part of the supervisory organization. Corrigan and Garland (1966, p. 13), when discussing supervision of student teachers, spoke of the supervisory staff as an "interaction system" which is composed of the college supervisor, supervising teacher, and school administrators.

It can be concluded that the college supervisor is a prominent member of the student-teacher supervisory staff. What duties are expected of him?

The Role of the College Supervisor

Smith (1964, p. 170) assigned two general roles to the college supervisor: the role of tutor and the role of objective counselor. Curtis (1964, p. 49) felt that a college supervisor
should meet with the student teacher individually and in seminar situations.

Tanruther (1968, pp. 53, 55) was more explicit when he described the role of the college supervisor. He stated that the college supervisor's role consists of consulting with the classroom teacher before the student teaching term begins, observing the student while he is teaching, holding individual conferences, and conducting group discussions or seminars with his student teachers.

Johnson (1967, pp. 72-77) agreed in part with Tanruther's role description. In addition to holding conferences with the student teacher and serving in a public relations capacity, Johnson mentioned that the college supervisor ought to place the student teacher in his teaching assignment and evaluate the performance of the student teacher.

Filburn (1968, pp. 189-190) and Neal, Kraft, and Kracht (1967, pp. 25-26) described what the college supervisor's role should be. Filburn mentioned five duties, one of which is "working" with the student teacher, while Neal, Kraft, and Kracht discussed eleven functions, one of which is "helping" the student teacher. Although these terms are undefined, it seems safe to assume that "helping" and "working" with student teachers implies conferring with them.
Four prominent authorities in the field of teacher education have described what college supervisors ought to do.

Stratemeyer and Lindsey (1958, pp. 95-96) and Stratemeyer (1964, pp. 161-162) assigned seven specific tasks for the college supervisor to perform. They indicated that the supervisor:

1. works with the coordinator of the student teaching program in placing the student teachers,

2. provides general guidance to a group of student teachers through the use of seminars,

3. provides specific guidance to the student teacher through observation of his teaching and conferences,

4. provides professional help to the classroom teachers through group meetings,

5. provides professional help to the classroom teachers on an individual basis,

6. cooperates with other college supervisors in studying how to improve the student teaching program, and

7. interprets the policies of the student teaching program to public school educators and the lay public.

Andrews (1964b, pp. 64-67) also reported that the college supervisor's role consists of seven duties. They are:

1. serves as liaison between the university and public school,

2. assigns the student teacher to his school,
3. confers with the classroom teacher,

4. supervises the student's teaching and conducts conferences with him,

5. evaluates the performance of his student teacher,

6. conducts in-service education for public school personnel, and

7. provides services to the college.

Merrill (1967, pp. 135-136) stated that a college supervisor should act as liaison between the public school and university, exercise leadership, select the supervising teachers and place the student teachers, conduct in-service education, hold conferences and seminars with the student teachers, visit and observe the student, and evaluate the student.

Thus the role of the college supervisor contains a variety of duties and the holding of conferences with student teachers seems to be mentioned consistently as an important supervisory function. In fact, Cumming (1970, p. 439) stated that in order for a college supervisor to do a successful job of supervising, he needs to "couple frequent visits with conferences" with his student teacher.

Student Teacher-College Supervisor Conferences

Supervisory conferences between a student teacher and college supervisor are perceived by student teachers to be an important supervisory function. In a study conducted at the University
of Pittsburgh (Lingren, 1959, pp. 468-470) 140 student teachers upon completion of their student teaching were asked to evaluate the university's student teaching program by listing the program's strengths and weaknesses. From the list of ten strong points of the program, having conferences with the cooperating teacher, college supervisor, and student teacher coordinators was listed third. From the list of eight weaknesses of the program, the quality of conferences was ranked fifth.

In another survey Wilkinson (1958, pp. 363-364) asked 122 former student teachers at Hunter College to indicate which items on an eighteen item questionnaire were of great value to the program and therefore should be continued. The sixty-seven former student teachers who responded to the questionnaire during the four year study ranked the items "individual conferences with the college supervisor with regard to observation of lessons" and "experience with children such as talking with them and observing their behavior or their play" second in importance and value.

To secure information concerning the effectiveness of the supervision of student teachers at an Eastern university, Edmund Hemink (1958, pp. 57-59) randomly selected twenty-two student teachers from a population of 160 students and asked the following questions.
1. In what ways have your college supervisors helped you the most?

2. In what ways could your college supervisors have helped you more?

In reply to the first question, the response "gave constructive suggestions" was ranked second. Ranked third was the comment "were frank and honest in their criticisms." Although these replies do not explicitly mention the word conference, one can infer from these statements that the supervisory function of conferring with student teachers is implied. In reply to the second question the response with respect to conferences was more definite and ranked fourth was the statement "give more time to conferences with student teachers."

In a more recent study (Bennie, 1964, pp. 131-133) questionnaires were sent to 223 first year teachers. On the questionnaire the respondents were asked to indicate which supervisory technique employed by college supervisors was helpful. Of the seven supervisory techniques (visiting the student, holding conferences, checking lesson plans, checking required notes, checking required reports, reading daily logs, and checking materials file) the holding of conferences was ranked first as being very helpful by the 171 students who returned the questionnaire.

Student teachers feel that an important supervisory technique is that of conferring with them on a periodic basis, and this supervisory function has been studied in the past.
In two parallel descriptive studies (Brown, Cobban, and Waterman, 1965, pp. 38, 39, 163; Canfield, Low, and Mullin, 1965, pp. 80–81, 204–205) the investigators were interested in having student teachers examine their verbal teaching behavior during supervisory conferences. In the first investigation student teachers studied verbal teaching behavior by using a system of behavioral analysis which used pedagogical moves. In the second study student teachers were aided during supervisory conferences to analyze their verbal teaching behavior by employing a list of selected learning principles. In both studies the student teachers decided how to improve their verbal teaching behavior in subsequent teaching sessions. The results in both studies indicated that student teachers are capable of studying their verbal behavior during supervisory conferences and implementing verbal behavioral changes in subsequent teaching sessions.

In another descriptive study, Brown and Hoffman (1966, pp. 78–103, 118) described how they developed a conceptual tool for analyzing and describing the verbal interaction between a college supervisor and student teacher during supervisory conferences. The tool, devised so that college supervisors could study their teaching during supervisory conferences, was tested on eighteen typescripts of supervisory conferences. An overall reliability of 92.8 percent was reported when using the conceptual model.
Two studies appear to be experimental in nature. In one study (Brown, 1962, pp. 178-184) seventy-eight student teachers were observed while teaching on two different occasions. After the student taught his first lesson, the investigators told each student that his lesson was a failure because the student teacher did not create a suitable learning environment and failed to live up to the standards expected of him.

During the second observed lesson the investigators scored the degree and direction of change in the student teacher's behavior. They found that one-half of the students taught less effectively, one-fourth of the students were not affected, and one-fourth of the students showed some improvement in teaching behavior.

Also, student teachers characterized as high neurotics showed the most deterioration of teaching while under stress whereas students labeled as low neurotics improved. The same finding was reported with respect to anxiety, that is, those students who were highly anxious performed worse than those who were characterized as less anxious. With respect to intelligence, those students with high intelligence declined in teaching effectiveness while those with the lowest intelligence improved in teaching effectiveness.

In another experimental study, Acheson (1964, pp. 22-38) sought to determine if the behavior of intern teachers can be modified when they are given feedback about their teaching based on televised
recordings and when they are subjected to different conference styles.

The two conference styles were labeled as direct and indirect. In the direct conference the college supervisor told the student teacher specific items he could employ to change his teaching behavior. In the indirect conference the college supervisor did not give any specific advice; instead, he elicited from the student ways that the student could use to change his teaching behavior. Acheson concluded that the use of televised recordings in both types of conferences aided the supervisor in helping the student-intern to modify his subsequent verbal teaching behavior.

Supervisory conferences between student teachers and college supervisors can be studied. In most of the studies the authors attempted to describe different phenomena which occur during a student teacher-college supervisor conference.

Some authorities have also discussed supervisory conferences, but their focus has been on setting up theoretical principles pertaining to conferences rather than upon studying what happens during a conference. A conference, according to Stratemeyer and Lindsey (1958, p. 396), is "a means of communication involving two or more persons for the purpose of serious conversation or discussion." Such serious conversation could be an individual or group conference (Stratemeyer and Lindsey, 1958, p. 17) and is usually
held after each visitation by the college supervisor (Smith, 1960, p. 19; Hilliard and Durrance, 1968, p. 17).

In order for a conference to be effective, certain guidelines are recommended. Stratemeyer and Lindsey (1958, pp. 407-415) believe that essentials for an effective conference include:

1. maintaining good human relations between the participants,

2. identifying the purpose for conferring,

3. varying the number, frequency, and length of conferences,

4. preparing for the conference, and

5. keeping a record of suggestions and agreements made during the conference.

Hilliard and Durrance (1968, p. 16) offer eight guidelines for holding effective conferences. Three suggestions which have a bearing upon the problem under investigation are:

1. the setting of the conference should be in a place where a minimum of interruption will occur,

2. the place of the conference and the time allotment should be planned in advance, and

3. those involved in the conference should accept the responsibility for bringing to the conference pertinent data and materials on the topics to be discussed.

Bebb, Low, and Waterman (1969, pp. 21-29) also suggested principles for holding effective conferences. They proposed
that when preparing for a conference one needs to gather data, study the data, develop the conference agenda, and record the conference plans.

Thus, if one wishes to hold an effective conference he must prepare for the conference, hold the conference in a place free from interruptions, identify the purpose of the conference, and finally maintain good human relations when conferring with the other party.

Needs and Concerns of Student Teachers

Up to this point nothing has been said about what researchers have discovered to be the needs and concerns of student teachers. It is necessary to examine this area because the needs and concerns of student teachers may comprise a portion of what is discussed during supervisory conferences.

In a study by Triplett (1967, p. 14), forty elementary student teachers were asked to rank order twenty-three items which they felt were their needs before and after student teaching. Items ranked one through five before student teaching were: planning for instruction, handling classroom control, evaluating pupil progress, identifying and planning for handicapped pupils, and constructing and evaluating teacher-made tests. Items ranked one through five after student teaching were: identifying and planning for handicapped pupils, identifying and planning for academically talented pupils, handling
classroom control, constructing and evaluating teacher-made tests, and reporting pupil progress.

In another study Erickson and Ruud (1967, pp. 733-734) asked forty home economic student teachers to express what concerns they had before they began their student teaching. The top five concerns reported were:

1. would I know enough to teach a unit,

2. how will I be evaluated,

3. what will the classroom teacher expect of me and what will she be like,

4. how will I handle problem situations and how will I handle the situations when my students try me out, and

5. what will my college supervisor be like?

In a study involving student teachers and classroom teacher supervisors, Heidelbach (1969, pp. 109-166) developed a model for analyzing and describing the verbal behavior of cooperating teachers when they engaged in conferences with their student teachers. In addition to describing a model for analyzing this behavior, Heidelbach reported that twenty separate topics were discussed during these conferences. Below are seven of the most frequently discussed topics. They are:

1. characteristics of children,

2. student teacher teaching behavior,
3. content,
4. co-operating teacher teaching behavior,
5. generalized teaching behavior,
6. instructional materials, and
7. the lesson.

Fuller (1969, pp. 210-213), in an extensive study pertaining to concerns of student teachers, arranged to have a counseling psychologist meet once a week with a group of six student teachers the first semester of the student teaching year. The college supervisor was not present during any of the sessions. During the second semester the same procedure was used except eight different student teachers and two counseling psychologists were involved.

At the end of the student teaching year the topics discussed by the student teachers were organized into topic areas. The seven topical areas were: (1) concerns pertaining to supervising teachers, pupils, parents, and school principals, (2) concerns referring to the school plant, rules, and policies, (3) concerns relating to subject matter and grading of pupils, (4) items concerning discipline, (5) matters pertaining to seminar, research project, and group members, (6) concerns referring to attitudes toward self, and (7) items relating to pupils, pupil learning, and methods.

During the first week the major topic discussed was the one pertaining to supervising teachers, parents, and school principals.
During the second week the main topic of conversation centered upon the school plant, rules, and policies. Subject matter and grading of pupils received the major focus during the third week. During weeks four, five, and six the student teachers spent a majority of the seminar talking about discipline. Pupils, pupil learning, and methods received the most attention during the seventh and eighth weeks. During the ninth week the subjects focused their attention on the same topic discussed during the third week—subject matter and grading of pupils. During the last two weeks the students spent a majority of their time discussing the same topic examined during the seventh and eighth weeks—pupils, pupil learning, and methods.

In the second part of this study, Fuller (1969, pp. 213–214) gathered data from twenty-nine student teachers every two weeks. These students were asked to write what they were concerned about with respect to their teaching. Responses were classified into the following categories.

1. Where do I stand? How adequate am I? How do others think I am doing?

2. Problem behavior of pupils. Class control. Why do they do that?

3. Are pupils learning? How does what I do affect their gain?

The results from this portion of the study indicated that the students were concerned with self adequacy and/or class control.
Based on the results of her study and an analysis of selected literature on student teachers' problems, Fuller (1969, pp. 218-221) conceptualized three developmental phases of concerns: a pre-teaching phase (category zero), early teaching phase (categories one through three), and a late teaching phase (categories four through six). A manual (Fuller and Case, 1970, pp. 1-18) was devised in which concerns pertaining to the pre-teaching phase were labeled concerns about self; those concerns relating to the early teaching phase were classified as concerns about self as teacher. The items referring to the late teaching phase are categorized as concerns about pupils. (See Appendix B for the seven categories with a description for each category.)

When gathering data about concerns, the person using the instrument is asked to write a response to the question, "When you think about your teaching, what are you concerned about?" (Fuller and Case, 1972, p. 2.) The person scoring the instrument reads the description matter and places parentheses around each statement which expresses a complete concern. The scorer then assigns one of the seven concern code numerals to each statement enclosed in parentheses. When all concern statements have been coded, a mean code score is computed by dividing the sum by the number of coded concerns. This score is referred to as the student's concern score. Such a score indicated where a person is placed on a continuum of
concern with self as teacher (one through three) to concern with pupils (four through six) (Fuller and Case, 1970, p. 5).

Concerns of student teachers can be depicted as developmental in nature. When a student teacher begins student teaching, his concerns are expressed as concerns about self as a teacher. As he gains more classroom experience, his concerns become concerns about his pupils. Finally, these concerns can be classified and a concern score computed.

In this section a review of related literature pertaining to student teaching was presented. Topics discussed in this portion of the chapter included a brief history of student teaching, importance of student teaching, purposes of student teaching, personnel responsible for supervising the student teacher, the role of the college supervisor, student teacher-college supervisor conferences, and needs and concerns of student teachers.

In the next section the use of the video tape recorder in teacher education is discussed.

Literature Pertaining to the Use of the Video Tape Recorder

The video tape recorder has been used in teacher education with both pre-student teachers and student teachers. With pre-student teachers video tape recordings can be used to take the place of personal visitations to elementary school classrooms by pre-student
teachers (Bower, 1970, p. 43; Cyphert and Andrews, 1967, p. 1067). Also the video tape recorder has been employed in methods classes to help pre-student teachers learn how to evaluate teaching behaviors (Legge and Asper, 1972, p. 363).

As stated before, this equipment has been used in the training of student teachers. Several authorities (Cyphert and Andrews, 1967, p. 1067; Biberstine, 1970, p. 217; Michel, 1965, pp. 30-32; Schueller and Gold, 1964, pp. 358-364; Bennie, 1972, p. 136) reported that the video tape recorder can be used to film the teaching performance of a student teacher.

In some instances the video tape recorder is used in connection with filming a specific teaching act. This training concept known as microteaching, is structured so that a trainee teaches a small group of children for a short period of time. The trainee practices a specific teaching behavior which is usually video taped. Following the short lesson, the trainee and supervisor critique the video taped lesson. After the critique the trainee re-teaches the same lesson to another small group of children. The teaching skill which the trainee practices is for the trainee's benefit, that is, student learning is incidental (Allen and Ryan, 1969, pp. 1-3; Allen, 1971, p. 35; Bennie, 1972, p. 127).

The use of the video tape recorder in teacher education has gained in popularity with teacher educators. Roush (1971, p. 849)
stated that the use of this equipment has almost become as popular as the use of other audio visual equipment. Johnson (1968, p. 53) in his national survey of teacher training institutions reported that forty-seven percent of the responding institutions stated that they used video taping equipment to some degree with student teachers.

The use of video taping equipment enables teacher educators to focus upon the general or specific teaching behaviors of student teachers. The brief review pertaining to the use of video taping equipment was presented to illustrate to the reader that the use of the video tape recorder in the training of teachers is an acceptable and realistic practice.

In the next section a discussion relating to the meaning and measurement of attitudes is presented.

**Literature Pertaining to the Meaning and Measuring of Attitudes**

What is meant by the word attitude? According to Allport (1935, p. 810) an attitude

... is a mental and neutral state of readiness, organized through experience, exerting a directive or dynamic influence upon the individual's response to all objects and situations with which it is related.

Green (1954), p. 335) offered another definition for the term. He stated:
Like many psychological variables, attitude is a hypothetical or latent variable rather than an observable variable. The concept of attitude does not refer to any one specific act or response or an individual, but it is an abstraction from a large number of related acts or responses.

Some authorities make a distinction between attitude and opinion. According to McNeman (1946, p. 289) an attitude "is an abstraction the existence of which is inferred either from nonverbal overt behavior, or from verbal or symbolic behavior." An opinion is defined "as the verbal expression of an attitude." Thurstone (1928, p. 531) stated that an attitude

... denotes the sum total of man's inclinations and feelings, prejudice or bias, preconceived notions, ideas, fears, threats, and convictions about any specific topic.

Osgood, Suci, and Tannenbaum (1957, p. 190) stated that an attitude is a learned process which is "potentially bi-polar, varies in its intensity, and mediates evaluative behavior." In terms of defining an attitude with respect to the semantic differential an attitude toward a concept is defined "as the projection of this point onto the evaluative dimension of that space."

An attitude, then, is a subjective abstraction which varies in intensity and mediates evaluative behavior.

Can an attitude be measured? Allport (1935, pp. 828-831) states that attitudes can be measured in three ways: (1) tabulating answers to a questionnaire, (2) using an a priori scale which is
devised on the basis of logical considerations, and (3) employing the
psycho-physical scale devised by Thurstone.

Dawes (1972, pp. 4-15) reported that attitudes can be
measured in two ways: representational and index measurement.
Representational measurement is similar to measuring attitudes by
using Thurstone's psycho-physical approach while index measurement
is comparable to measuring attitudes by using an a priori scale.

Likert (1932, pp. 44-53) also stated that attitudes can be
measured. He suggested that the questionnaire items be followed by
five possible responses ranging from strongly approve, approve,
undecided, disapprove, and strongly disapprove.

Thurstone (1928, pp. 531-532) reported that because an
opinion can be interpreted as a symbol of attitude, we use opinions
as the means to measure attitudes. Thurstone (1928, pp. 544-547)
also described how an attitude scale can be constructed. Because
the construction of his scale is an elaborate procedure, that process
will not be reported here.

Osgood, Suci, and Tannenbaum (1957, pp. 191-192) wrote
that an attitude can be measured by using an instrument called the
semantic differential. With the semantic differential an investigator
is able to measure dimensions of the semantic space postulated by
Osgood, Suci, and Tannenbaum (1957, p. 25). This space contains
many orthogonal dimensions or axes, but only those dimensions which can be identified can be used.

To identify these dimensions, studies which employed factor analyzing adjectives associated with concepts were done. As a result of these factor analysis studies, it was found that the semantic space is multidimensional. Such a space consisted of such dimensions as evaluative, potency, activity, stability, tautness, novelty, receptivity, aggressiveness, and an unassigned dimension. Although in every analysis more than three factors appeared, the dominant factors turned out to be evaluation, potency and activity (Osgood, Suci, and Tannenbaum, 1957, pp. 62-72).

Examples of evaluative bi-polar adjectives are: high-low, true-false. Examples of bi-polar potency adjectives are: hard-soft, strong-weak. Fast-slow and hot-cold are examples of bi-polar activity adjectives (Osgood, Suci, and Tannenbaum, 1957, pp. 54-55, 57).

Attitudes, then, can be measured and many different types of instruments have been developed to measure attitudes. Among such devices are those devised by Likert, Thurstone, and Osgood, Suci, and Tannenbaum.

In this chapter a review of the related literature pertaining to the problem under investigation was presented. From the review of the literature relating to student teaching one can conclude that:
1. student teaching is an integral component of a teacher education program,

2. authorities in the field of teacher education recognize that student teaching is an important part of a student's pre-service education,

3. the student teaching experience helps the novice to make the transition from the role of student to that of a beginning teacher, lets the experience function as a culminating activity, and permits the student teacher to learn to teach while being supervised,

4. the college supervisor is a prominent member of the student teacher supervisory staff,

5. conducting conferences with student teachers is an essential part of the college supervisors' duties,

6. student teachers feel that an important supervisory technique is that of conferring with them,

7. supervisory conferences can be studied,

8. the characteristics of a formal conference include preparing for the conference, holding the conference in a quiet place, and identifying the purpose for the conference, and

9. the needs and concerns of student teachers are developmental in nature.

From the brief review of the literature pertaining to video taping one can conclude that:

1. the use of the video tape recorder in the training of teachers is an acceptable practice.

From the review of the literature relating to the meaning and measurement of attitudes one can conclude that:
1. attitudes can be measured, and
2. the instrument called the semantic differential can be used to measure attitudes.

The conclusions reached from reviewing the literature related to student teaching provided the base for conceptualization of the problem under investigation—the effects of different styles of college supervisor–student teacher conferences upon selected phenomena associated with the conference. The conclusions reached from the review of the literature pertaining to video taping and the meaning and measurement of attitudes helped to guide the investigator in selecting some of the procedures employed in this study.

In Chapter III the procedures used in this study are discussed.
CHAPTER III

PROCEDURE

In this chapter the methodology employed in this investigation is described. This chapter is divided into seven parts. In part one the hypotheses are presented while described in part two is the selection and assignment of subjects. The administration of the independent variable is discussed in part three. In part four the control of the independent variable is described. The instruments administered to the subjects are discussed in part five. In part six the administration of the post-test is presented, and the last section contains a description of the statistical procedures utilized.

Hypotheses

Listed below are the four hypotheses tested in this study.

$H_{01}$ - No significant differences exist between conference statements initiated by student teachers and conference statements initiated by college supervisors.

$H_{02}$ - No significant differences exist among the student-initiated, college supervisor-initiated,
and joint-initiated conferences with respect to the students' attitude toward the concept "conference."

\( H_0^3 \) - No significant differences exist among the student-initiated, college supervisor-initiated, and joint-initiated conferences with respect to the students' attitudes toward each of the following concepts: "teaching a mini lesson," "being video taped," "preparing the conference agenda," "items (statements) discussed during the conference," and "communication during the conference."

\( H_0^4 \) - No significant differences exist among the student-initiated, college supervisor-initiated, and joint-initiated conferences with respect to the student's perceptions as to whether the conferences aided their personal and/or professional growth.

All hypotheses were tested at the .05 level of significance.

**Selection and Assignment of Subjects**

Thirty-six (thirty-three female and three male) student teachers\(^1\) participated in this investigation. All of the subjects were

\(^1\)See Appendix A for more complete demographic information pertaining to the student teachers.
engaged in student teaching under the auspices of the Department of Elementary Education at the University of Dayton during the second trimester of 1973 (January to April). Although the student teaching assignments (school location and age level of the children) varied among the student teachers, each participating student's individual assignment remained the same during the course of the investigation. (Three student teachers transferred schools before the investigation ended, and the data from their test results were not used. See Chapter IV for the explanation. )

Five out of eight college supervisors assigned to the Department of Elementary Education took part in this study. All of the college supervisors who volunteered to participate in the pilot and final studies held professorial rank. (See Appendix C for the rank and teaching load for each of the five supervisors. )

The student teachers who did their student teaching during the study were assigned to college supervisors during November, 1972. The number of student teachers assigned to each of the eight college supervisors was determined by such factors as the college supervisor's total teaching load, the college supervisor's preference of student teachers, the student teacher's preference of college supervisors, the location of the student teaching school, the student teacher's grade level preference, and the availability of transportation. Although the random assignment of student teachers to the
eight college supervisors was not possible, the thirty-six student
teachers who took part in the study were assigned to one of three
treatment groups (student-initiated, college supervisor-initiated, and
joint-initiated) in a random fashion. This procedure resulted in
having twelve students comprise each treatment group. (See Appen-
dix D for the number of student teachers assigned to each supervisor
and the type of conference in which each student participated.)

In summary, thirty-six student teachers and five college
supervisors took part in this investigation. All of the students were
assigned to one of the three treatment groups in a random fashion.

In the next section the treatment and control of the inde-
pendent variable are discussed.

Administration of the Independent Variable

In this study the independent (treatment) variable was con-
ference type. The treatment was administered according to the
procedure set forth below.

During each of the three rounds each student teacher par-
ticipated in a conference with his college supervisor. All conferences,
except two, were held on the same day the video taping was done. The
two conferences mentioned above were held the day following the
taping of the video lesson.
At the beginning of the conference the student teacher and college supervisor viewed the tape together. Immediately following this, the conference agenda was planned. In the case of a student-initiated conference, the student teacher prepared the agenda by listing four to six statements pertaining to his teaching. In the case of the supervisor-initiated conference the college supervisor prepared the agenda by listing four to six statements pertaining to the student's teaching. With respect to the joint-initiated conference both the college supervisor and student teacher prepared the agenda. In this case each person prepared the agenda by listing two or three items pertaining to the student's teaching. Both the student teacher and the college supervisor prepared their respective agendas separately.

Statements listed on the agenda could refer to the mini-taped video lesson or to any statement which had reference to the student's teaching. Statements were written on a form entitled the "supervisor's" or "student teacher's assessment form." When preparing the agenda, students were asked to respond to the statement "When I think about my teaching, I think about. . . ." Supervisors responded to the statement "When I think about your teaching, I think about. . . ." Responses to these statements comprised the agenda for the conference. (See Appendix E for these instruments.)
Immediately following the preparation of the agenda, statements from the prepared agenda were initiated. In the student-initiated conference the student teacher was responsible for initiating for discussion four to six of his statements. In the supervisor-initiated conference the supervisor was responsible for initiating for discussion four to six of his prepared statements. In the joint-initiated conference each participant was required to initiate for discussion two or three of his prepared statements. All conferences were audio taped.

With respect to the time length of each conference, guidelines presented to the supervisors stated that each conference should last between ten and twenty minutes. To insist that a conference last a definite period of time was not recommended to the supervisors because hurrying or prolonging a conference could hamper the flow of communication. (Data pertaining to the length of the conferences are reported in Chapter IV.)

The administration of the independent variable was accomplished by following the procedure described above. Following a standardized procedure was important for the proper functioning of the experiment. Equally important for a successful experiment was the control of the independent variable.

Described in the next part is the control of the independent variable.
Control of the Independent Variable

Controlling the independent variable was a crucial part of this study. To insure that the independent variable was maximized, the following procedure was used.

During the pilot study the five college supervisors were trained to follow a standard procedure when participating in each of the three conference types. At the end of the pilot study, a critique was held with all of the supervisors. As an outcome of this critique the procedures to be used in the forthcoming study were written. A set of standard procedures to be followed was given to each student and supervisor. (See Appendix F for these procedures.)

Criteria used to judge the suitability of the conferences were established and followed. These criteria included: determining if the student was subjected to the correct conference type, insuring that the proper person initiated for discussion the prepared statements, deciding if each student conferred with his college supervisor once during each round, determining if the student remained in the same assignment during the experiment, and deciding if each student participated in a total of three conferences.

To ensure that the effects of the independent variable were maximized, data from some conferences had to be discarded. The reasons why some data were not used are discussed in Chapter IV.
Controlling the independent variable, then, was a critical part of the experiment. This was accomplished during a pilot study by training the five college supervisors to follow a standard procedure while holding conferences.

Another component of the methodology of this study was the use and design of the measuring instruments. This topic is treated in the next section.

**Instruments Employed**

In this study three different measuring instruments were used; therefore, this section is divided into three parts. In part one the modified Fuller-Case instrument is explained. In part two the semantic differential is described. The single item questionnaire is explained in part three.

**The Modified Fuller-Case Instrument**

In order to gather data on what students and/or supervisors wished to discuss during the conferences (hypothesis one) a modified form of the Fuller-Case Teacher Concern Statement\(^2\) was used. The original Fuller-Case instrument (Fuller-Case, 1970, p. 2) asked respondents to answer the question "When you think about your

\(^2\)Fuller and Case do not state explicitly with whom (student teachers, classroom teachers, or both groups) this instrument can be used.
teaching, what are you concerned about?" Respondents are free to answer this open ended question in any manner they desire.

When the respondent's replies are analyzed, his answers are placed in one of seven categories. The seven categories are: zero - "non teaching concerns," one - "Where do I stand?" two - "How adequate am I?" three - "How do my pupils feel about me? What are pupils like?" four - "Are pupils learning what I'm teaching?" and six - "How can I improve myself as a teacher (and improve all that influences pupils?)."

The instrument was revised before, during, and after the pilot study (October-November, 1972).

Before the pilot study began, the investigator revised the directions on the instrument so that students listed two to six concerns associated with their teaching instead of responding to the open ended question "What you think about your teaching, what are you concerned about?" This revision was made so that it would be easier for those using the instrument to count the number of statements when preparing the conference agenda. This instrument was used when the student teacher prepared the agenda for the student-initiated conference or his portion of the joint-initiated conference.

The original Fuller-Case instrument was developed to be used by a teacher who reflected upon his teaching: it was not constructed to be employed by someone else who reflected upon that
person's teaching. Before the pilot study started, the investigator devised an instrument which was used by the college supervisor when he prepared the agenda for the supervisor-initiated conference or his part of the joint-initiated conference. When using this instrument, the college supervisor was asked to list two to six items in response to the statement "When I think about your teaching, I am concerned about. . . ."

During the pilot study these instruments were again revised. Because the word "concern" connoted negative aspects or problems associated with a student's teaching, the student teacher question was changed to "When I think about my teaching, I think about. . . ." The college supervisor statement was changed to "When I think about your teaching, I think about. . . ." Positive and/or negative points concerning a student's teaching could be written in response to these statements. It was discovered that both the student teachers and college supervisors were able to respond to the appropriate statement by listing the required number of items. (See Appendix E for the student teacher and college supervisor assessment instruments.)

One final revision was made after the completion of the pilot study. In the interest of clarity and/or brevity the descriptive names for three categories were changed. Category three, "How do pupils feel about me? What are pupils like?" was changed to "How do
I relate to my students?" Category four, "Are pupils learning what I'm teaching?" was revised to state "Are my students learning from me?" Category five, "Are pupils learning what they need?" was changed to "Are my pupils learning what they need?" Although these descriptive names were slightly altered, the types of statements classified in these categories followed the procedures and examples outlined by Fuller and Case (1970, pp. 3-18). (See Appendix B for the original and modified Fuller-Case Instruments.)

Thus, the Fuller-Case Teacher Concern Statement was modified. Modifications in the areas of directions, the instrument's use, and wording of statements and categories were made.

The scoring of each instrument was done in the manner suggested in the Fuller-Case manual (1970, p. 5). Each statement was coded with a numeral (zero through six) which represented one of seven categories.

The seven categories and the numeral assigned to each category were: "Non-teaching concerns" - zero, "Where do I stand?" - one, "How adequate am I?" - two, "How do I relate to my students?" - three, "Are my students learning from me?" - four, "Are my pupils learning what they need?" - five, and "How can I improve myself as a teacher (and improve all that influences pupils?)" - six.

To ensure complete accuracy in scoring, each item was scored independently by the investigator and his assistant.
investigator's score for a statement was different than his assistant's, the investigator decided what code numeral the statement received.

The student teacher's statement assessment score (STSAS) for each round (a two week period) was determined by summing all of the numerals associated with each statement and dividing that numeral by the total number of statements. The supervisor's statement assessment score (SSAS) for each student for each round was computed in the same manner.

A low STSAS (one, two or three) indicated that the student teacher was concerned about himself as a teacher, while a high STSAS (four, five or six) signified that the student teacher was concerned about his pupils. A low SSAS meant that the supervisor was concerned about his student teacher as a teacher while a high SSAS indicated that the supervisor was concerned about his student teacher's concerns about his pupils.

The final study (January–March, 1973) consisted of three rounds. At the end of the six week period, a final student teacher's statement assessment score was computed by summing all of the individual statement scores and dividing by the number of statements. This yielded a mean STSAS. The same procedure was followed to determine the mean SSAS.

In order for a measuring instrument to be useful it should be valid. A measuring device is said to be valid if it measures what

According to Anastasi (1968, p. 100) content validity involves "the systematic examination of the test content to determine whether it covers a representative sample of the behavior domain to be measured." Because this instrument was a modified version of the Fuller-Case instrument and because the instrument was subjected to a pilot study and refined, it was felt that content validity had been established. Helmstadter (1964, p. 89) feels that face validity—a type of content validity, has a place in testing. He states, "... in the original writing of items, face validity is about all there is upon which to rely."

Inter-observer reliability of the instrument was computed. The investigator's assistant was trained to code statements by affixing the proper numeral to the statements. Using Scott's Coefficient of Reliability (Scott, 1955, pp. 323-325; Flanders, 1967, pp. 158-166; Ober, Bentley, and Miller, 1971, pp. 80-85), the inter-observer reliability on the first training test was .77. The
inter-observer reliability on the second training test was 1.00. Both training tests were administered before the statements on the assessment forms were scored. A mean inter-observer reliability of .88 was obtained for both tests. Flanders (1967, p. 166) stated that a reasonable figure of inter-observer reliability is .85. Ober, Bentley, and Miller (1971, p. 85) reported that an inter-observer reliability of .70 is reasonable.

Semantic Differential

The semantic differential is a device which one can use to measure the meaning of concepts in a tri-dimensional semantic space composed of the evaluative, potency, and activity dimensions or to measure attitudes toward concepts. The instrument is composed of concepts and bi-polar adjectives placed on a seven point scale (Osgood, Suci, and Tannenbaum, 1957, pp. 71-72, 77-80, 191; Issac, 1972, p. 102). In this study the semantic differential was used to measure attitudes toward concepts.

When one designs an instrument to measure attitudes, Osgood, Suci, and Tannenbaum (1957, p. 191) recommended that the concepts should be related to the problems under investigation and that the scales consist of bi-polar adjectives which have high loadings on the evaluative dimension. Other scales, though, may also be used
if they are relevant to the concept being judged (Osgood, Suci, and Tannenbaum, 1957, p. 28).

When one scores the concepts to be rated, the numeral one is assigned to the unfavorable pole of the scale; the numeral seven is assigned to the favorable pole. All of the scales associated with the concept are summed. This summed rating represents a person's attitude score. If a subject's score falls near the favorable poles, his attitude is interpreted as favorable toward that concept. If his score lies near the unfavorable poles, his attitude is interpreted as unfavorable toward that concept (Osgood, Suci, and Tannenbaum, 1957, pp. 191-192).

During the pilot study the instrument was employed to measure the attitudes of the student teachers toward the concepts "conference" (hypothesis two), "video tape," "mini teaching," "conference preparation," "conference summary," "concerns discussed during the conference," and "communication during the conference." All of the concepts were related to the problem under investigation. The bi-polar adjectives which comprised the scales had high loadings on the evaluative dimension (Osgood, Suci, and Tannenbaum, 1957, pp. 37, 53-55).

At the completion of the pilot study two revisions pertaining to some of the concepts and scales of the semantic differential were made. The concepts "video tape," "mini teaching," "conference
preparation," "conference summary," and "concerns discussed
during the conference" were changed to "being video taped," "teaching
a mini lesson," "preparing the conference agenda," "summarizing
the conference," and "items (statements) discussed during the con-
ference," respectively. These revisions were made because it was
felt that each concept had to be described more fully in order to
avoid confusion.

The second revision consisted of eliminating some of the
pairs of bi-polar adjectives and adding other pairs. This was nec-
essary because some of the adjectives were relevant to the concepts
while others were not. For example, the bi-polar adjectives--tense,
relaxed and valuable, worthless--were added to many of the instru-
ments while the bi-polar adjectives--altruistic, egotistical and
harmonious, dissonant--were deleted from some of the measuring
devices. (See Appendix G for the original and revised semantic
differential instruments.)

Because bi-polar evaluative adjectives were taken from
the lists compiled by Osgood, Suci, and Tannenbaum and because the
instruments were revised, it is felt that the revised instrument dis-
played a reasonable degree of content (face) validity. Osgood, Suci,
and Tannenbaum (1957, pp. 192-193) stated that the "evaluative
dimension of the semantic differential displays reasonable face-
validity as a measure of attitude."
In addition to being valid, a measuring device should also exhibit some degree of reliability. Reliability is a numerical index which indicates an instrument's consistency (Anastasi, 1968, p. 71; Green, 1954, p. 338; Oppenheim, 1966, p. 69). Several types of reliability have been described. Green (1954, p. 338) identified two types: test-retest and parallel forms. Helmstadter (1964, pp. 63-66) recognized four kinds: test-retest, parallel form, split half, and Kuder-Richardson test. Ferguson (1966, p. 377) also listed four types of reliability: test-retest, parallel form, split half, and internal consistency method.

According to Ferguson (1966, pp. 377-378) the test-retest method of determining reliability is used when the same test can be administered on two different occasions. Parallel form is used when an equivalent form of the test is administered to the same group of subjects. When this method is used, the criteria of parallelism must be met. This criteria includes similarity in test content, type of item, and instructions for administering the test. The split half method is applicable when the test can be divided into two halves. This procedure of obtaining reliability should not be used with highly speeded test material. Internal consistency or the Kuder-Richardson method for obtaining reliability is used when dichotomous items are employed on the test.
In this study the test-retest method of determining reliability was used. According to Green (1964, p. 338), if the test-retest method of determining reliability is used, a correlation coefficient can be computed between the two sets of group scores. This score represents the reliability coefficient of the test.

Parallel forms could not be used because the test content on a second test could not be similar to content on the first test. Only a certain number of bi-polar adjectives was available. Because the test was to be completed at a fairly fast rate of speed, the split half method could not be used. The Kuder-Richardson formula was not used because the items could not be dichotomously scored.

The reliability was computed by using the Pearson Product-Moment Correlation (Glass and Stanley, 1970, p. 114; Best, 1959, p. 236). Ten individuals were given the same test six or eight days later. The coefficient of reliability for the five sub-tests\(^3\) were:

"teaching a mini lesson" - .80, "being video taped" - .96, "preparing the conference agenda" - .90, "items (statements) discussed during the conference" - .92, and "communication during the conference" - .96. The mean coefficient of reliability of the total sub-tests was .90. The coefficient of reliability for the test "conference" was .96. Both coefficients of reliability approach 1.00, which is considered to

\(^3\)The sub-test "summarizing the conference" was not used. See the next section for the explanation.
be an indication that a test is completely reliable (Young and Veldman, 1972, p. 432).

Construction of the Questionnaire

A two-question questionnaire was developed to measure students' perceptions as to whether they felt the conferences aided their personal and/or professional growth (hypothesis four).

During phase two of the study this instrument was developed. Below are the original questions.

Do you feel that the three audio taped conferences with your college supervisor were helpful? Answer this question by stating yes or no.

If you answered yes, please explain how you feel the conferences were helpful.

If you answered no, please explain why you feel the conferences were not helpful.

These questions were given to a panel of judges. The judges were asked if the question was clear and if they felt it would elicit the information the investigator wanted.

Based on their suggestions and comments the questions were re-written. Below are the re-written questions.

---

4 This panel consisted of five student teachers not involved in the study, one audio visual specialist, one assistant professor of elementary education, one dean of the school of education, two associate professors of secondary education, and one associate professor of physical education.
Do you feel that you learned about yourself and/or about teaching as a result of participating in the three audio taped conferences with your college supervisor? Please answer by stating yes or no.

If you answered yes to question one, please discuss what you feel you learned about yourself and/or what you learned about your teaching.

If you answered no to question one, please discuss why you feel you did not learn about yourself and/or learn about your teaching.

The responses to the yes-no question were scored by tabulating the number of students who answered yes and the number who answered no. The replies to the second question were scored in the manner suggested by Fuller and Case (1970, p. 5). Each statement was coded with a numeral (zero through six) which represented one of seven categories.

The seven categories and the numerals assigned to them were: "Non teaching concerns" - zero, "Where do I stand?" - one, "How adequate am I?" - two, "How do I relate to my students?" - three, "Are my students learning from me?" - four, "Are my pupils learning what they need?" - five, and "How can I improve myself as a teacher (and improve all that influences pupils?)" - six.

After all of the statements were coded with the proper numeral, the number of statements in each category was tabulated.

This tabulation consisted of combining into the proper category all of the statements from all of the students. Because the questionnaire
was given to a panel of judges and re-written based on their comments, the investigator believes the questionnaire to be valid; that is, content validity has been established.

To determine reliability, the test-retest procedure was used. Of the eleven individuals who re-took the test, eight answered the question. Seven of the eight respondents (87.5%) did not change their answer on the second administration of the question.

In this section the investigator described the three measuring instruments used in this study. It was pointed out that all of the instruments were revised or modified. It was also shown how acceptable levels of validity and reliability were established for each modified instrument.

In the next section the administration of the post-test is discussed.

**Administration of the Post-test**

The post-test was administered to the subjects during the final week of the experiment. The post-test consisted of three parts. Parts one and two consisted of concepts and scales comprising the evaluative dimension of the semantic differential. Part three was the two-question questionnaire discussed earlier in this chapter.
Analysis of the Data

A variety of statistical procedures was utilized to analyze the post-test results. The chi square test was used to analyze the data in connection with hypotheses one and four. A program entitled Stat 05 was used to compute the value of chi square.

With respect to hypotheses two and three, four different statistical procedures were employed. They were the one way analysis of variance for a one way completely randomized design, Stat 13; Kruskal-Wallis H-Test, TOH 51; mean, variance, and standard deviation, Stat 01; and the chi square goodness of fit test, Ferguson, 1966, pp. 195-200.

All of the above statistical programs, except the goodness of fit test, are computer programs on file at the University of Dayton, Dayton, Ohio. The programs were used in connection with a Univac Seven Computer. The goodness of fit test values were computed by using the calculator component of the computer.

In summary, the procedure used in implementing the investigation was described in this chapter. Topics treated included the presentation of the four hypotheses, selection and assignment of the subjects, the administration of the independent variable, a discussion of the instruments used, the administration of the post-test, and a discussion of the statistical procedures employed.

In Chapter IV the analysis of the data is described.
CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

In this chapter the results and discussions concerning the results are presented. This chapter is divided into three parts. Part one contains the results and a discussion pertaining to these results for the first hypothesis. In part two the results and a discussion pertaining to these results for hypotheses two and three are presented. Part three contains the results and a discussion pertaining to these results for the fourth hypothesis.

Listed below are the four hypotheses tested in this study.

$H_{o1}$ - No significant differences exist between conference statements initiated by student teachers and conference statements initiated by college supervisors.

$H_{o2}$ - No significant differences exist among the student-initiated, college supervisor-initiated, and joint-initiated conferences with respect to the students' attitude toward the concept "conference."

$H_{o3}$ - No significant differences exist among the student-initiated, college supervisor-initiated, and joint-initiated conferences with respect to the students'
attitudes toward each of the following concepts:
"teaching a mini lesson," "being video taped,"
"preparing the conference agenda," "items (state-
ments) discussed during the conference" and
"communication during the conference." 

H_0^4 - No significant differences exist among the student-
initiated, college supervisor-initiated, and joint-
initiated conferences with respect to the students' perceptions as to whether the conferences aided their personal and/or professional growth.

All hypotheses were tested at the .05 level of significance.

Statements Discussed

Results

The first hypothesis stated that no significant differences exist between statements initiated by student teachers and those initiated by college supervisors.

Thirty-six student teachers and five college supervisors participated in this study. Each student teacher was scheduled to be taped and confer with his college supervisor once every two weeks. Because the taping and conference schedules had to be changed due to unforeseen circumstances (unscheduled elementary and university holidays, supervisors' attendance at professional conferences, and
student teacher illness) it was not possible to follow the original schedule. If a student teacher was taped and conferred with his college supervisor once during each round (a two week period), his conference statements were used in the tabulation of data for this hypothesis. If a student teacher was taped and conferred with his college supervisor more than once during a round, this data were not used. Results from three conferences (one student-initiated, one joint-initiated, and one supervisor-initiated) were discarded in connection with hypothesis one because of this factor. Also, data from four other conferences (three supervisor-initiated and one joint-initiated) were not used because three student teachers transferred schools before the experiment was over and one student teacher was subjected to the wrong type of conference. Thus, at the end of the study data from seven conferences had to be discarded with respect to this hypothesis.

The data in connection with the first hypothesis are presented in Table 1. The frequency of statements initiated and discussed by each group for each category for each round is presented.

Below is the pertinent information which can be obtained by examining Table 1.

1. The student teachers initiated and discussed more statements (221) than did the college supervisors (194). (The number enclosed in the parenthesis indicates the frequency of statements in that category.)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Student Teachers</th>
<th>( \text{Totals} )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Non teaching concerns&quot; ((0))</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Round One (First two weeks)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Round Two (Second two weeks)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Round Three (Third two weeks)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Where do I stand?&quot; ((1))</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Round One (First two weeks)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Round Two (Second two weeks)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Round Three (Third two weeks)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;How adequate am I?&quot; ((2))</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Round One (First two weeks)</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Round Two (Second two weeks)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Round Three (Third two weeks)</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;How do I relate to my students?&quot; ((3))</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Round One (First two weeks)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Round Two (Second two weeks)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Round Three (Third two weeks)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Are my students learning from me?&quot; ((4))</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Round One (First two weeks)</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Round Two (Second two weeks)</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Round Three (Third two weeks)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Are my pupils learning what they need?&quot; ((5))</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Round One (First two weeks)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Round Two (Second two weeks)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Round Three (Third two weeks)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;How can I improve myself as a teacher?&quot; ((6))</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Round One (First two weeks)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Round Two (Second two weeks)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Round Three (Third two weeks)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( N = 29 \)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Round One (First two weeks)</th>
<th>Round Two (Second two weeks)</th>
<th>Round Three (Third two weeks)</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TABLE 1—Continued**
2. During each of the three rounds (a two week period) the student teachers initiated and discussed more statements (78, 71, 72), respectively, than did the college supervisors (64, 64, 66), respectively.

3. At the end of the six week study the responses were rank ordered according to group (student teacher and college supervisor). Presented below are these results.

**Student Teachers**

(1) "How adequate am I?" (92).
(2) "Are my students learning from me?" (87).
(3) "Are my pupils learning what they need?" (16).
(4) "How do I relate to my students?" (12).
(5) "How can I improve myself as a teacher?" (3).
(6) "Non teaching items" and "Where do I stand?" (3 each).

**College Supervisors**

(1) "Are my students learning from me?" (100).
(2) "How adequate am I?" (64).
(3) "Are my pupils learning what they need?" (12).
(4) "How can I improve myself as a teacher?" (8).
(5) "How do I relate to my students?" (7).
(6) "Non teaching items" (3).
(7) "Where do I stand?" (0).

4. During the first round the rank ordering of responses by the student teachers and college supervisors was tabulated. These results are presented below.

**Student Teachers**

(1) "How adequate am I?" (35).
(2) "Are my students learning from me?" (32).
(3) "Are my students learning what they need?" (5).
(4) "How do I relate to my students?" (4).
(5) "Non teaching items" and "How can I improve myself as a teacher?" (1 each).
(6) "Where do I stand?" (0).
College Supervisors

(1) "Are my students learning from me?" (33).
(2) "How adequate am I?" (23).
(3) "Are my pupils learning what they need?" (4).
(4) "How do I relate to my students?" (3).
(5) "How can I improve myself as a teacher?" (1).
(6) "Non teaching items" and "Where do I stand?" (0 each).

5. During the second round the rank ordering of responses by the student teachers and college supervisors was compiled. Presented below are these results.

Student Teachers

(1) "How adequate am I?" (30).
(2) "Are my students learning from me?" (25).
(3) "How do I relate to my students?" (6).
(4) "Are my pupils learning what they need?" (5).
(5) "How can I improve myself as a teacher?" (3).
(6) "Where do I stand?" (2).
(7) "Non teaching items" (0).

College Supervisors

(1) "Are my students learning from me?" (33).
(2) "How adequate am I?" (18).
(3) "Are my pupils learning what they need?" (5).
(4) "How can I improve myself as a teacher?" (4).
(5) "Non teaching items" and "How do I relate to my students?" (2 each).
(6) "Where do I stand?" (0).

6. During the third round the rank ordering of responses by the student teachers and college supervisors was compiled. Presented below are these results.

Student Teachers

(1) "Are my students learning from me?" (30).
(2) "How adequate am I?" (27).
(3) "Are my pupils learning what they need?" (6).
To determine statistically if the null hypothesis of no
difference could be rejected, the data were organized into a 2 x 7
contingency table and the value of chi square was computed. In
Table 2 is presented a 2 x 7 contingency table which contains the
observed and expected frequencies of statements initiated and dis-
cussed by each group for each category.

Information obtainable from Table 2 includes the following
results.

1. In four cells the expected frequencies are less than
five.

2. The value of chi square is not significant at the .05
level of significance, therefore the hypothesis of
no difference cannot be rejected.

Guilford (1965, pp. 241-242) suggested that when the ex-
pected frequencies in any cell(s) of a contingency table larger than
2 x 2 are less than five, one should combine these columns with
### TABLE 2

**OBSERVED AND EXPECTED VALUES OF STATEMENTS INITIATED AND DISCUSSED BY EACH GROUP FOR EACH CATEGORY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>&quot;Non teaching concerns&quot;</th>
<th>&quot;Where do I stand?&quot;</th>
<th>&quot;How adequate am I?&quot;</th>
<th>&quot;How do I relate to my students?&quot;</th>
<th>&quot;Are my students learning from me?&quot;</th>
<th>&quot;Are my pupils learning what they need?&quot;</th>
<th>&quot;How can I improve myself as a teacher?&quot;</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Group</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Teachers</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(3.20)</td>
<td>(1.60)</td>
<td>(83.07)</td>
<td>(10.12)</td>
<td>(99.58)</td>
<td>(14.91)</td>
<td>(8.52)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Supervisors</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2.80)</td>
<td>(1.40)</td>
<td>(72.92)</td>
<td>(8.88)</td>
<td>(87.42)</td>
<td>(13.09)</td>
<td>(7.48)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>415</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$x^2 = 9.10; \ df 6; \ ns.$

---

1 All values in this chapter have been rounded to the nearest hundredth.
other columns which have small expected frequencies. Table 3 contains a 2 x 5 contingency table in which the correction factor suggested by Guilford has been applied.

TABLE 3

CONTINGENCY TABLE EMPLOYING GUILFORD'S CORRECTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0 &amp; 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>92</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(83.07)</td>
<td>(13.31)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Supervisors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>64</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(72.93)</td>
<td>(11.69)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ x^2 = 6.24; \text{ df 4; ns.} \]

The following information can be obtained by examining Table 3.

1. All of the expected frequencies in each cell are greater than five.

2. The computed value of chi square is not significant at the .05 level.

Applying Guilford's correction to this data is a correct statistical procedure, but when columns are combined as shown in
Table 3, the combined columns ("non-teaching items" -- "How do I relate to my students?" and "Where do I stand?" -- "How can I improve myself as a teacher?") do not represent a logical combined category.

As indicated in Chapter II, Fuller (1969, pp. 218-222) stated that statements (concerns) comprising categories one, two, and three represent (concerns with self as teacher" and statements comprising categories four, five, and six refer to "concerns with pupils." These two categories were used to organize the data, and presented in Table 4 are the observed and expected frequencies of statements pertaining to "concerns with self as teacher" and "concerns with pupils" for each group.

Below are the pertinent results presented in Table 4.

1. Category zero (non-teaching items) has been eliminated, therefore the raw total for each group is three less than the raw total displayed in Table 1.

2. The finding that a difference exists between items organized to reflect "concerns with self as teacher" and "concerns with pupils" as expressed by the two groups is significant at the .05 level.

The data were also organized into the two dichotomous groups ("concerns with self as teacher" and "concerns with pupils")

---

2Because the 2 x 2 contingency table produced one degree of freedom, Yates correction factor was applied (Ferguson, 1966, p. 207; Runyon and Haber, 1967, p. 209; Young and Veldmann, 1972, p. 373).
TABLE 4

OBSERVED AND EXPECTED FREQUENCIES OF STATEMENTS PERTAINING TO "CONCERNS WITH SELF AS TEACHER" AND "CONCERNS WITH PUPILS" AS EXPRESSED BY THE TWO GROUPS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;Concerns with self as teacher&quot; (categories 1-3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Teachers</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(94.88)</td>
<td>(123.12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Supervisors</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(83.12)</td>
<td>(109.63)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>231</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ x^2 = 5.39; \text{df 1; } p < .05 \]
for each of the three rounds. Similar analysis of this data generated
the results presented in Tables 5, 6, and 7.3

An inspection of Tables 5, 6, and 7 reveals the following
information.

1. The finding of no differences between statements
organized to reflect "concerns with self as teacher" and "concerns with pupils" between the two groups
at the end of rounds one and three exist.

2. The finding that a difference does exist between the
two groups at the end of round two when the cate-
gories are organized dichotomously.

Discussion of the Results

As noted in Chapter II, Fuller (1969, pp. 218-221) sug-
gested that a "developmental conceptualization of concerns" is
possible. Such a conceptualization is composed of: (1) a pre-
teaching phase - non-concerns; (2) an early teaching phase - concerns
with self; and (3) late concerns - concerns with pupils. According to
Fuller (1969, pp. 211-213), during the first three weeks of the stu-
dent teaching term the student teachers were mostly concerned with
themselves. During the fourth, fifth, and sixth weeks the student
teachers were still concerned about themselves but their concerns
begin to shift to concerns they had regarding their pupils. During

3 Because each 2 x 2 contingency table produced one degree
of freedom, Yates correction factor was applied to Tables 5, 6, and
7 (Ferguson, 1966, p. 207; Runyon and Haber, 1967, p. 209; Young
and Veldmann, 1972, p. 373).
TABLE 5

OBSERVED AND EXPECTED FREQUENCIES OF STATEMENTS PERTAINING TO "CONCERNS WITH SELF AS TEACHER" AND "CONCERNS WITH PUPILS" AS EXPRESSED BY EACH GROUP DURING ROUND ONE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>&quot;Concerns with self as teacher&quot; (categories 1-3)</th>
<th>&quot;Concerns with pupils&quot; (categories 4-6)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student Teachers</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(35.50)</td>
<td>(41.50)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Supervisors</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(29.50)</td>
<td>(34.50)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ x^2 = 1.02; \text{df 1; ns.} \]
TABLE 6

OBSERVED AND EXPECTED FREQUENCIES OF STATEMENTS PERTAINING TO "CONCERNS WITH SELF AS TEACHER" AND "CONCERNS WITH PUPILS" AS EXPRESSED BY EACH GROUP AT THE END OF ROUND TWO

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;Concerns with self as teacher&quot; (categories 1-3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Teachers</td>
<td>38 (30.96)</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>33 (40.04)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Supervisors</td>
<td>20 (27.03)</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>42 (34.96)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>133</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ x^2 = 5.25; \text{df} 1; p < .05 \]
TABLE 7

OBSERVED AND EXPECTED FREQUENCIES OF STATEMENTS PERTAINING TO "CONCERNS WITH SELF AS TEACHER" AND "CONCERNS WITH PUPILS" AS EXPRESSED BY EACH GROUP AT THE END OF ROUND THREE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;Concerns with self as teacher&quot; (categories 1-3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Teachers</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(28.52)</td>
<td>(41.48)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Supervisors</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(26.48)</td>
<td>(38.52)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$x^2 = .11; \text{df } 1; \text{ns.}$
the seventh through eleventh weeks the student teachers were concerned more with their pupils than they were with themselves. Because this study began the third week of the term and lasted through the eighth week, the time periods of this study do not coincide with those of Fuller. In spite of this fact it is possible to examine the data in Table 1 and determine if a developmental trend similar to the one suggested by Fuller exists.

This study began the third week of the term, and one would expect that student teachers and college supervisors would have few statements in category one ("Where do I stand?"). (See Table 1 for the exact number of statements in this category.) Statements which are classified in category one, such as questions pertaining to the school, co-operating teacher, principal, et cetera, would have been resolved in most cases by the student teachers. Usually such concerns disappear within a few days after the beginning of the student teaching term because the student teacher has an opportunity to discover for himself the answers to the question "Where do I stand?"

Perhaps another reason can be offered which might help to explain why both groups initiated and discussed few items in category one. All of the student teachers in this study were required to complete Education 320, "Reading and Language Arts in the Elementary School," prior to student teaching. As part of the
requirements for the successful completion of this course, all of the students must participate in a practicum experience in an assigned elementary classroom during three mornings each week. During this time the student works with a small group of children in the areas of reading and language arts.

Before a practicum student reports to his assigned school, it is very possible that he wonders about such things as the organization of the school, personality of the supervising teacher, size of his class, et cetera. During the beginning weeks of student teaching, a student teacher is concerned about the same items. Because the students in this study probably experienced these adjustment problems with respect to their practicum experience, it is possible that the personal adjustment to the student teaching situation was less difficult. The practicum experience plus the late beginning of the data collection could explain why both groups (student teachers and supervisors) initiated and discussed few statements in category one.

Relatively few frequencies were recorded in categories five ("Are my pupils learning what they need?") and six ("How can I improve myself as a teacher?") by both groups. Since the study ended the eighth week of the fifteen week trimester, it is possible that the student teachers as a group had not entered the developmental level associated with these categories ("concerns with pupils"). Given more time it is possible that the student teachers would enter
this developmental level, and both student teachers and supervisors would find it necessary to initiate and discuss more statements in these categories.

Many frequencies appear in categories two ("How adequate am I?") and four ("Are my students learning from me?") for both groups; few frequencies appear in category three ("How do I relate to my students?") for both groups. One would expect a large number of statements in all three categories because during the third through the eighth weeks of student teaching the students should probably be shifting from "concerns with self as teacher" (categories two and three) to "concerns with pupils" (category four). If this pattern of development was evident, it would parallel the pattern Fuller reported during the fourth through the sixth weeks. This, however, was not the case.

Probably a major reason why so many statements were recorded for both groups in categories two and four was the fact that a video recording of the student teacher's performance was viewed by both the student teacher and college supervisor before the conference began. The statements initiated and discussed during the conference had to refer to the student's teaching; these statements did not have to refer to the video recording of the student's teaching. Unfortunately, it appears that many of the statements did pertain to the video tape. Because the acts which comprise categories two and
four (gestures, facial expressions, verbal interaction, methodology, for example) are easily observable when viewing a tape, it is possible that the use of the video tape restricted the thinking of both groups. The statements that would comprise category three are not easy to observe because they pertain to the student teacher's emotional, personal, and social relationship with his students.

In summary, one may state that the items initiated and discussed followed Fuller's developmental pattern, but that an over reliance upon the video tape inflated the number of statements in categories two and four for each group.

As noted in Table 2, a significant difference does not exist between the statements initiated and discussed by the student teachers and college supervisors when the statements are organized into seven categories. A close inspection of Table 2 reveals that the critical value of 12.59 with six degrees of freedom was not reached because the differences between the observed and expected frequencies in ten of the fourteen cells (categories zero, one, three, five, and six-ten cells) were small. The differences between the observed and expected frequencies in four of the cells (categories two and four-four cells) were large, and if the data are organized according to Fuller's dichotomous schema of "concerns with self as teacher" and "concerns with pupils" and arranged in a 2 x 2 contingency table the results are significant at the .05 level.
This finding indicates that the hypothesis of no difference can be rejected. In general, the student teachers were more likely to initiate and discuss statements which referred to "concerns with self as teacher" while the college supervisors were more interested in initiating and discussing statements pertaining to "concerns with pupils."

Such a finding is plausible because the groups, student teachers and college supervisors, most likely perceive a student's teaching from different vantage points. Because a student teacher is trying to learn the role of the teacher, it is conceivable that he is concerned about himself. When the student feels that he has made a partial adjustment to his new role, he then begins, as Fuller has indicated, to direct his thinking toward his pupils.

College supervisors, on the other hand, look at a student's teaching from another perspective. Because of a college supervisor's experience and training, he probably thinks about teaching in a more analytical fashion. If this is the case, one would expect the college supervisors to be concerned about such items as methodology, verbal interaction, evaluation, et cetera.

The finding indicated above seems credible, but when Tables 5, 6, and 7 are examined, one notes that the results are somewhat illogical. As noted in Table 5, the finding is not significant, suggesting that the two groups discussed similar statements when the
statements are arranged into dichotomous divisions. This finding is plausible because during the first conference both parties may have unconsciously attempted to establish a harmonious relationship by initiating and discussing statements which would not disturb the other person. In other words, it is possible that both parties did not feel that they could be intellectually honest with one another during the first conference.

At the end of the second round (see Table 6) the finding is significant. This suggests that both groups discussed statements which were not similar in nature when the statements were arranged dichotomously. It is possible that this situation prevailed because both parties felt free to be intellectually honest with one another.

The non-significant finding at the end of round three (see Table 7) is somewhat difficult to interpret. If the intellectually honest theory discussed above is accepted, one might expect that the finding should be highly significant. It could be that intellectual honesty did prevail but a non-significant finding resulted because both parties were able to focus their attention upon similar statements due to a better understanding of the student's needs.

In summary, student teachers and college supervisors initiated and discussed different statements during conferences when the statements are arranged according to the dichotomous division proposed by Fuller. Also, when the statements initiated and
discussed by both groups were analyzed at the end of each of the three rounds, the results were not significant at the end of the first and third rounds but a significant finding occurred at the end of round two.

Results pertaining to hypotheses two and three are dis-
cussed in the next section.

**The Conference and Students' Attitudes Toward the Five Concepts**

Because the same instrument (the semantic differential) was used to collect data in conjunction with hypotheses two and three and because the same statistical procedures (the one way analysis of variance for a completely randomized design, the chi square goodness of fit test, and the Kruskal-Wallis H-test) were employed to analyze this data, the results and discussion pertaining to these re-
results for both of these hypotheses are treated in this section. Below is a discussion relating to the results obtained with respect to the second hypothesis.

**Results--The Conference**

The second hypothesis stated that no significant differences exist among the student-initiated, college supervisor-initiated, and joint-initiated conferences with respect to the students' attitude toward the concept "conference."
Thirty-six student teachers participated in this study, but the data from six student teachers were not used in tabulating the results for this hypothesis. Three student teachers transferred schools before the experiment ended, and one student teacher was subjected to the wrong type of conference. Results from two other students were eliminated because the college supervisor implied that additional conference(s) with these students were held.

Table 8 contains the means and standard deviations of the student teachers in each of the three conferences with respect to their attitude toward the concept "conference."

**TABLE 8**

**MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS OF STUDENT TEACHERS' ATTITUDES TOWARD THE CONCEPT "CONFERENCE"**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student-initiated</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>103.75</td>
<td>14.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint-initiated</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>101.46</td>
<td>15.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor-initiated</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>111.00</td>
<td>18.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>30</strong></td>
<td><strong>104.60</strong></td>
<td><strong>15.59</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4 The mean length of time of the student-initiated conference was 13.70 minutes, the supervisor-initiated 11.97 minutes, and the joint-initiated 13.59 minutes. The mean length of time for all conferences was 13.09 minutes.
When one interprets the mean scores above, a negative attitude score with respect to the concept "conference" would range from 19 to 76, while a positive attitude score would range from 76 to 133. Assigning the low score (19) to the unfavorable pole and the high score (133) to the favorable pole is the procedure suggested by Osgood, Suci, and Tannenbaum (1957, pp. 191-192).

Below is the information which can be obtained from inspecting Table 8.

1. The mean scores indicate that each group possesses a positive attitude toward the concept "conference."

2. The mean score of the students in the supervisor-initiated conference is higher than the mean scores of the students in the other two conference types. This suggests that taken as a group these students have a more positive attitude toward the concept "conference" than do the other two groups.

3. The mean score of the students in the joint-initiated conference is lower than the mean scores of the students in the other two conference types. This denotes that taken as a group these students have the least positive attitude of the three groups toward the concept "conference."

4. The distribution of the scores is not normal. The highest possible score one could attain was 133, and if three standard deviations of 15.59 each are added to the grand mean (104.60), this total exceeds 133. If three of the appropriate standard deviations are added to each mean score for each conference type, the results surpass 133.00 (146.92 for the student-initiated, 147.30 for the joint-initiated, and 166.17 for the supervisor-initiated).
To determine if the null hypothesis could be rejected, a one way analysis of variance for a completely randomized design was performed. The data presented in Table 9 indicate the results of this treatment (conference type) with respect to the students' attitudes toward the concept "conference."

**TABLE 9**

**ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF STUDENT TEACHERS' ATTITUDES TOWARD THE CONCEPT "CONFERENCE"**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>ms</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Types of Conferences</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>404.25</td>
<td>202.13</td>
<td>.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>6,641.00</td>
<td>245.96</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>7,045.25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Information obtained by inspecting Table 9 indicates:

1. No significant differences exist among the three groups (.05 level), therefore the null hypothesis is not rejected.

Since the distribution of the data is not normal, a non-parametric test, the Kruskal-Wallis H-test, was performed. The value of H was 3.29 with two degrees of freedom. This finding also was not significant at the .05 level.
To determine if a significant difference exists among the three groups with respect to pairs of bi-polar adjectives, the nineteen bi-polar adjectives which comprised this instrument were analyzed. The mean for each of the three groups for each pair of adjectives was computed. Table 10 contains the means for each group for each pair of adjectives.

The results presented below can be obtained by examining Table 10.

1. Students in the supervisor-initiated conference compiled the highest mean scores on sixteen of the nineteen pairs of bi-polar adjectives. The adjective pairs were: good-bad, complete-incomplete, timely-untimely, sociable-unsociable, kind-cruel, harmonious-dissonant, graceful-awkward, pleasurable-painful, successful-unsuccessful, meaningful-meaningless, important-unimportant, positive-negative, believing-skeptical, wise-foolish, useful-useless, and valuable-worthless.

2. Students in the student-initiated conference amassed the highest mean scores on two of the nineteen pairs of bi-polar adjectives. The adjective pairs were: grateful-ungrateful and relaxed-tense.

3. Students in the joint-initiated conference compiled the highest mean score on one pair of bi-polar adjectives. The adjective pair was long-short.

4. As noted above, the number of adjective pairs placed first by the students were sixteen (supervisor-initiated conference), two (student-initiated conference), and one (joint-initiated conference). To determine if a significant difference existed among the adjective pairs placed first (based on mean scores) by the three groups, a chi square goodness of fit test was performed on this data. The value of chi square was significant at the .001 level ($\chi^2 = 22.22; 2 \text{ df}; p < .001$).
# TABLE 10

MEANS FOR EACH OF THE THREE CONFERENCE TYPES
FOR EACH PAIR OF ADJECTIVES FOR
THE CONCEPT "CONFERENCE"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Means</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student-Initiated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>good</td>
<td>6.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>complete</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>timely</td>
<td>4.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sociable</td>
<td>5.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kind</td>
<td>5.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>grateful</td>
<td>5.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>harmonious</td>
<td>5.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>graceful</td>
<td>5.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pleasurable</td>
<td>5.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>long</td>
<td>4.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>successful</td>
<td>6.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>meaningful</td>
<td>6.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>important</td>
<td>6.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>positive</td>
<td>5.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>believing</td>
<td>5.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wise</td>
<td>5.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>useful</td>
<td>6.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>valuable</td>
<td>6.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>relaxed</td>
<td>6.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In summary, the null hypothesis of no difference cannot be rejected. No significant differences existed among the student-initiated, college supervisor-initiated, and joint-initiated conferences with respect to the students' attitude toward the concept "conference." A significant difference, though, was found among the adjective pairs placed first by each of the three groups of students.

The results pertaining to hypothesis three are discussed in the next section.

Results—The Five Concepts

The third hypothesis stated that no significant difference exists among the student-initiated, college supervisor-initiated, and joint-initiated conferences with respect to the students' attitudes toward each of the following concepts: "teaching a mini lesson," "being video taped," "preparing the conference agenda," "items (statements) discussed during the conference," and "communication during the conference."5

Thirty-six student teachers participated in this investigation, but results from six students were not used in tabulating the results for this hypothesis. Three student teachers transferred schools

5The results from a sixth dependent variable "summarizing the conference" were not used in this study. Because eighteen of ninety conferences failed to conclude with a summary, the summary data from seventeen of thirty students was not complete, therefore this data could not be used.
before the experiment ended and one student was subjected to the wrong type of conference. Results from two other students were eliminated because the supervisor implied that additional conference(s) with these students were held.

Table 11 contains the means and standard deviations of the thirty student teachers in each of the three conferences in connection with the students' attitude toward the concept "teaching a mini lesson."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student-initiated</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>73.17</td>
<td>13.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint-initiated</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>74.18</td>
<td>9.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor-initiated</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>73.29</td>
<td>11.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>73.57</td>
<td>11.36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When one interprets the mean scores above, a negative attitude score toward the concept "teaching a mini lesson" would range from 14 to 56, while a positive attitude score would vary from 56 to 98. Assigning the low score (14) to the unfavorable pole and the high score (98) to the favorable pole is the procedure suggested by Osgood, Suci, and Tannenbaum (1957, pp. 191-192).
The following information can be obtained by inspecting Table 11.

1. The mean scores suggest that each group holds a positive attitude toward the concept "teaching a mini lesson."

2. The mean score of the students in the joint-initiated conference is higher than the mean scores of the students in the other two groups. This implies that when taken as a group the students in the joint-initiated conference have the most positive attitude of the three groups toward the concept "teaching a mini lesson."

3. The mean scores of the students in the student-initiated conference is lower than the mean scores of the students in the other two groups. This suggests that taken as a group the students in the student-initiated conference have the least positive attitude of the three groups toward the concept "teaching a mini lesson."

4. The distribution of the scores is not normal. The highest possible score one could attain was 98.00, and if three standard deviations of 11.36 each are added to the grand mean (73.57), the total of 107.65 exceeds 98.00. If three of the appropriate standard deviations are added to each mean score for each conference type, the results surpass 98.00 (112.92 for the student-initiated conference, 103.55 for the joint-initiated conference, and 108.90 for the supervisor-initiated conference).

To determine if the null hypothesis could be rejected, a one way analysis of variance for a completely randomized design was performed. The data illustrated in Table 12 indicate the results of the treatment (conference type) with regard to the students' attitudes toward the concept "teaching a mini lesson."
TABLE 12

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF STUDENT TEACHERS' ATTITUDES TOWARD THE CONCEPT "TEACHING A MINI LESSON"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>ms</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type of Conference</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.63</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>3,734.75</td>
<td>138.32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>3,741.38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Information obtained by examining Table 12 illustrates that:

1. No significant differences exist among the three groups (.05 level), therefore the null hypothesis cannot be rejected.

Since the distribution of the data is not normal, a non-parametric test, the Kruskal-Wallis H-test, was performed. The value of H was .01 with two degrees of freedom. This finding was not significant at the .05 level.

To determine if a significant difference exists among the three groups with respect to pairs of bi-polar adjectives, the fourteen bi-polar adjectives which comprise this instrument were also analyzed. The mean for each of the three groups for each pair of adjectives was computed. Table 13 contains the means for each group for each pair of adjectives.
## TABLE 13

MEANS FOR EACH OF THE THREE CONFERENCE TYPES FOR EACH PAIR OF ADJECTIVES FOR THE CONCEPT "TEACHING A MINI LESSON"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Student-Initiated</th>
<th>Joint-Initiated</th>
<th>Supervisor-Initiated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7       6       5       4       3       2       1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>good</td>
<td>bad</td>
<td>5.33</td>
<td>6.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wise</td>
<td>foolish</td>
<td>5.33</td>
<td>5.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>meaningful</td>
<td>meaningless</td>
<td>5.58</td>
<td>6.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>complete</td>
<td>incomplete</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>4.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tense</td>
<td>relaxed</td>
<td>5.58</td>
<td>4.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>successful</td>
<td>unsuccessful</td>
<td>6.17</td>
<td>6.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>true</td>
<td>false</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>4.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pleasurable</td>
<td>painful</td>
<td>5.42</td>
<td>5.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>timely</td>
<td>untimely</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>graceful</td>
<td>awkward</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>4.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>valuable</td>
<td>worthless</td>
<td>5.33</td>
<td>5.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>positive</td>
<td>negative</td>
<td>5.50</td>
<td>5.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>important</td>
<td>unimportant</td>
<td>5.50</td>
<td>5.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>useful</td>
<td>useless</td>
<td>5.67</td>
<td>5.82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The following information can be obtained by examining Table 13.

1. Students in the supervisor-initiated conference amassed the highest mean scores on six of the fourteen pairs of bi-polar adjectives. The adjective pairs were: meaningful-meaningless, pleasurable-painful, timely-untimely, graceful-awkward, positive-negative, and useful-useless.

2. Students in the joint-initiated conference compiled the highest mean scores on six of the fourteen pairs of bi-polar adjectives. The adjective pairs were: good-bad, wise-foolish, complete-incomplete, tense-relaxed, valuable-worthless, and important-unimportant.

3. Students in the student-initiated conference had the highest mean scores on two of the fourteen pairs of bi-polar adjectives. The adjective pairs were: successful-unsuccessful and true-false.

4. As noted above, the number of adjective pairs placed first by the students were six (supervisor-initiated conference), six (joint-initiated conference), and two (student-initiated conference). To determine if a significant difference existed among the adjective pairs placed first (based on mean scores) by the three groups, a chi square goodness of fit test was performed on the data. The value of chi square was not significant at the .05 level ($x^2 = 2.29; df; ns$).

The concept "being video taped" constituted the second concept in connection with this hypothesis. Table 14 contains the means and standard deviations of the student teachers in each of the three conferences with respect to their attitude toward the concept "being video taped."
TABLE 14

MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS OF STUDENT TEACHERS' ATTITUDES TOWARD THE CONCEPT "BEING VIDEO TAPED"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student-initiated</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>87.00</td>
<td>18.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint-initiated</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>87.27</td>
<td>14.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor-initiated</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>89.71</td>
<td>11.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>87.73</td>
<td>14.78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When one interprets the mean scores above, a negative attitude score with respect to the concept "being video taped" would vary from 16 to 64, while a positive attitude score would range from 64 to 112. Assigning the low score (16) to the unfavorable pole and the high score (112) to the favorable pole is the procedure suggested by Osgood, Suci, and Tannenbaum (1957, pp. 191-192).

The following information can be acquired from examining Table 14.

1. The mean scores indicate that each group holds a positive attitude toward the concept "being video taped."

2. The mean score of the students in the supervisor-initiated conference is higher than the mean scores of the students in the other two groups. This suggests that when taken as a group the students in this type of conference have the most positive attitude of the three groups toward the concept "being video taped."
3. The mean score of the students in the student-initiated conference is lower than the mean scores of the students in the other two groups. This indicates that when considered as a group the students in the student-initiated conference have the least positive attitude of the three groups toward the concept "being video taped."

4. Distribution of the scores is not normal. The highest possible score one could achieve was 112.00. If three standard deviations of 14.78 each are added to the grand mean (87.73), the total of 132.07 exceeds 112.00. If three of the appropriate standard deviations are added to each mean score for each conference type, the results surpass 112.00 (141.03 for the student-initiated conference, 129.63 for the joint-initiated conference, and 122.89 for the supervisor-initiated conference).

To determine whether the hypothesis of no difference could be rejected, a one way analysis of variance for a completely randomized design was performed. The data presented in Table 15 illustrate the results of the treatment (conference type) with regard to the students' attitudes toward the concept "being video taped."

| TABLE 15 |
| ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF STUDENT TEACHERS' ATTITUDES TOWARD THE CONCEPT "BEING VIDEO TAPED" |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>ms</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type of Conference</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>36.25</td>
<td>18.13</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>6,295.63</td>
<td>233.17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>6,331.88</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Information obtained by inspecting Table 15 indicates:

1. No significant difference exists among the three groups (.05 level), therefore the null hypothesis cannot be rejected.

Since the distribution of the data is not normal, a non-parametric test, the Kruskal-Wallis H-test, was performed. The value of $H$ was .06 with two degrees of freedom. This finding also was not significant at the .05 level.

To discover if a significant difference existed among the three groups of students with regard to the pairs of bi-polar adjectives, the sixteen bi-polar adjectives which constituted this instrument were inspected. The mean for each of the three groups for each pair of adjectives was calculated. Table 16 contains the means for each group for each pair of adjectives.

An inspection of Table 16 illustrates the following results.

1. Students in the supervisor-initiated conference compiled the highest mean scores on eight of the sixteen pairs of bi-polar adjectives. The adjective pairs were: complete-incomplete, useful-useless, pleasurable-painful, beautiful-ugly, relaxed-tense, positive-negative, valuable-worthless, and graceful-awkward.

2. Students in the student-initiated conference amassed the highest mean scores on four of the sixteen pairs of bi-polar adjectives. The adjective pairs were: successful-unsuccessful, important-unimportant, believing-skeptical, and wise-foolish.
### TABLE 16

**Means for Each of the Three Conference Types**  
*For Each Pair of Adjectives for the Concept "Being Video Taped"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Student-Initiated</th>
<th>Joint-Initiated</th>
<th>Supervisor-Initiated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>good</td>
<td>. . . . . . . . . .</td>
<td>5.92</td>
<td>6.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>complete</td>
<td>. . . . . . . . . .</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>useful</td>
<td>. . . . . . . . . .</td>
<td>5.83</td>
<td>5.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kind</td>
<td>. . . . . . . . . .</td>
<td>5.17</td>
<td>5.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pleasurable</td>
<td>. . . . . . . . . .</td>
<td>5.42</td>
<td>4.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>beautiful</td>
<td>. . . . . . . . . .</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>relaxed</td>
<td>. . . . . . . . . .</td>
<td>5.42</td>
<td>4.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>successful</td>
<td>. . . . . . . . . .</td>
<td>6.17</td>
<td>5.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>meaningful</td>
<td>. . . . . . . . . .</td>
<td>5.75</td>
<td>6.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>important</td>
<td>. . . . . . . . . .</td>
<td>5.83</td>
<td>5.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>positive</td>
<td>. . . . . . . . . .</td>
<td>5.58</td>
<td>5.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>valuable</td>
<td>. . . . . . . . . .</td>
<td>6.08</td>
<td>6.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>believing</td>
<td>. . . . . . . . . .</td>
<td>5.33</td>
<td>4.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wise</td>
<td>. . . . . . . . . .</td>
<td>5.42</td>
<td>5.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>true</td>
<td>. . . . . . . . . .</td>
<td>4.83</td>
<td>5.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>graceful</td>
<td>. . . . . . . . . .</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>4.73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. Students in the joint-initiated conference compiled the highest mean scores on four of the sixteen pairs of bi-polar adjectives. The adjective pairs were: good-bad, kind-cruel, meaningful-meaningless, and true-false.

4. As noted above, the number of adjective pairs placed first by the students were eight (supervisor-initiated conference), four (student-initiated conference), and four (joint-initiated conference). To determine if a significant difference existed among the adjective pairs placed first (based on mean scores) by the three groups, a chi square goodness of fit test was performed. The value of chi square was not significant at the .05 level ($x^2 = 2.00; 2\, df; \text{ns}$).

The concept "preparing the conference agenda" comprised the third concept in connection with this hypothesis. Table 17 contains the means and standard deviations of the student teachers in each of the three conferences with respect to their attitude toward the concept "preparing the conference agenda."

**TABLE 17**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student-initiated</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>81.33</td>
<td>11.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint-initiated</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>82.82</td>
<td>14.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor-initiated</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>82.00</td>
<td>14.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>82.03</td>
<td>12.94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
When one reads the mean scores above, a negative attitude score with regard to the concept "preparing the conference agenda" would vary from 15 to 60, while a positive attitude score would range from 60 to 105. Assigning the low score (15) to the unfavorable pole and the high score (105) to the favorable pole is the procedure suggested by Osgood, Suci, and Tannenbaum (1957, pp. 191-192).

The following information can be obtained by examining Table 17.

1. The mean scores suggest that each group holds a positive attitude toward the concept "preparing the conference agenda."

2. The mean score of the students in the joint-initiated conference is higher than the mean scores of the students in the other two groups. This implies that when taken as a group the students in the joint-initiated conference have the most positive attitude of the three groups toward the concept "preparing the conference agenda."

3. The mean score of the students in the student-initiated conference is lower than the mean scores of the students in the other two groups. This suggests that when taken as a group the students in the student-initiated conference have the least positive attitude toward the concept "preparing the conference agenda."

4. The distribution of the scores is not normal. The highest possible score one could attain was 105.00. If three standard deviations of 12.94 each are added to the grand mean (82.03) this total (120.85) exceeds 105.00. If three of the appropriate standard deviations are added to each mean score
for each conference type, the results surpass 105.00 (115.86 for the student-initiated conference, 127.01 for the joint-initiated, and 124.78 for the supervisor-initiated conference).

To determine whether the null hypothesis could be rejected, a one way analysis of variance for a completely randomized design was computed. The data presented in Table 18 indicate the results of the treatment (conference type) with respect to the students' attitude toward the concept "preparing the conference agenda."

**TABLE 18**

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF STUDENT TEACHERS' ATTITUDES TOWARD THE CONCEPT "PREPARING THE CONFERENCE AGENDA"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>ms</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type of Conference</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12.63</td>
<td>6.31</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>4,846.38</td>
<td>179.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>4,859.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Information obtained by inspecting Table 18 illustrates that:

1. No significant difference exists among the three groups at the .05 level, therefore the null hypothesis cannot be rejected.

Since the distribution of the data is not normal, a non-parametric test, the Kruskal-Wallis H-test, was computed. The
value of H was .30 with two degrees of freedom. This finding also was not significant at the .05 level.

The fifteen pairs of bi-polar adjectives which comprised this instrument were examined to see if a significant difference existed among the three groups with respect to the pairs of bi-polar adjectives. The mean for each of the three groups for each pair of adjectives was calculated. Table 19 contains the means for each pair of adjectives.

An examination of Table 19 indicates the following results.

1. Students in the joint-initiated conference had the highest mean scores on six of the fifteen pairs of bi-polar adjectives. The adjective pairs were: wish-foolish, complete-incomplete, sociable-unsociable, important-unimportant, pleasurable-painful, and believing-skeptical.

2. Students in the student-initiated conference amassed the highest mean scores on five of the fifteen pairs of bi-polar adjectives. The pairs were: good-bad, useful-useless, positive-negative, successful-unsuccessful, and meaningful-meaningless.

3. Students in the supervisor-initiated conference collected the highest mean scores on four of the fifteen pairs of bi-polar adjectives. The adjective pairs were: timely-untimely, valuable-worthless, kind-cruel, and harmonious-dissonant.

4. As noted above, the number of adjective pairs placed first by the students were six (joint-initiated conference), five (student-initiated conference), and four (supervisor-initiated conference). To determine if a significant difference existed among the adjective pairs placed first by the three groups of
### TABLE 19

MEANS FOR EACH OF THE THREE CONFERENCE TYPES FOR EACH PAIR OF ADJECTIVES FOR THE CONCEPT "PREPARING THE CONFERENCE AGENDA"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Means</th>
<th>Student-Initiated</th>
<th>Joint-Initiated</th>
<th>Supervisor-Initiated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 6 5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>good</td>
<td>bad</td>
<td>5.50</td>
<td>5.27</td>
<td>4.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wise</td>
<td>foolish</td>
<td>5.17</td>
<td>5.18</td>
<td>5.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>complete</td>
<td>incomplete</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>5.36</td>
<td>4.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>useful</td>
<td>useless</td>
<td>5.75</td>
<td>5.27</td>
<td>5.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>timely</td>
<td>untimely</td>
<td>4.58</td>
<td>4.91</td>
<td>5.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>positive</td>
<td>negative</td>
<td>5.67</td>
<td>5.35</td>
<td>5.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>valuable</td>
<td>worthless</td>
<td>5.83</td>
<td>5.82</td>
<td>6.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sociable</td>
<td>unsociable</td>
<td>5.75</td>
<td>6.18</td>
<td>5.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>important</td>
<td>unimportant</td>
<td>5.67</td>
<td>6.09</td>
<td>5.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kind</td>
<td>cruel</td>
<td>5.25</td>
<td>5.64</td>
<td>5.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>harmonious</td>
<td>dissonant</td>
<td>5.25</td>
<td>5.55</td>
<td>5.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pleasurable</td>
<td>painful</td>
<td>5.42</td>
<td>5.91</td>
<td>5.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>successful</td>
<td>unsuccessful</td>
<td>6.17</td>
<td>5.91</td>
<td>5.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>meaningful</td>
<td>meaningless</td>
<td>6.08</td>
<td>5.55</td>
<td>5.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>believing</td>
<td>skeptical</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5.55</td>
<td>4.86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
the students (based on mean scores) a chi square goodness of fit test was performed on the data. The value of chi square was not significant at the .05 level ($x^2 = .20; 2 \text{ df}; \text{ns}$).

The concept "discussing items (statements) during the conference" constituted the fourth concept with regard to this hypothesis. Table 20 contains the means and standard deviations of the student teachers with respect to their attitude toward the concept "items (statements) discussed during the conference."

**TABLE 20**

MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS OF STUDENT TEACHERS' ATTITUDES TOWARD THE CONCEPT "ITEMS (STATEMENTS) DISCUSSED DURING THE CONFERENCE"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student-initiated</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>82.25</td>
<td>9.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint-initiated</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>81.27</td>
<td>11.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor-initiated</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>83.43</td>
<td>13.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>82.43</td>
<td>10.76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When one interprets the mean scores above, a negative attitude score with regard to the concept "discussing items (statements) during the conference" would vary from 14 to 56, while a positive attitude score would range from 56 to 98. Assigning the low score (14) to the unfavorable pole and the high score (98) to the
favorable pole is the procedure suggested by Osgood, Suci, and Tannenbaum (1957, pp. 191-192).

The following information can be acquired from inspecting Table 20.

1. The mean scores show that each group holds a positive attitude toward the concept "discussing items (statements) during the conference."

2. The mean score of the students in the supervisor-initiated conference is higher than the mean scores of the other two groups. This denotes that when taken as a group the students in the supervisor-initiated conference have the most positive attitude of the three groups toward the concept "discussing items (statements) during the conference."

3. The mean score of the students in the joint-initiated conference is lower than the mean scores of the other two groups. This implies that when considered as a group the students in the joint-initiated conference have the least positive attitude of the three groups toward the concept "discussing items (statements) during the conference."

4. The distribution of the scores is not normal. The highest possible score one could achieve was 98.00, and if three standard deviations of 10.76 each are added to the grand mean (82.43), the total of 114.71 surpasses 98.00. If three of the appropriate standard deviations are added to each mean score for each conference type, the results exceed 98.00 (110.99 for the student-initiated, 114.93 for the joint-initiated, and 123.51 for the supervisor-initiated).

To determine if the null hypothesis would be rejected, a one way analysis of variance for a completely randomized design was computed. The data illustrated in Table 21 shows the results of the
treatment (conference type) with respect to the students' attitude toward the concept "items (statements) discussed during the conference."

TABLE 21

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF STUDENT TEACHERS' ATTITUDES TOWARD THE CONCEPT "ITEMS (STATEMENTS) DISCUSSED DURING THE CONFERENCE"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>ms</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type of Conference</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>3,340.19</td>
<td>123.71</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>3,360.19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Information obtained from studying Table 21 denotes that:

1. No significant differences exist among the three groups (.05 level), therefore the null hypothesis cannot be rejected.

Since the distribution of the data is not normal, a non-parametric test, the Kruskal-Wallis H-test, was computed. The value of H was .41 with two degrees of freedom. This finding was not significant at the .05 level.

To discover if a significant difference existed among the three groups with regard to pairs of bi-polar adjectives, the fourteen bi-polar pairs of adjectives which made up this instrument were
analyzed. The mean for each of the three groups for each pair of adjectives was calculated. Table 22 contains the means for each group for each pair of adjectives.

An examination of Table 22 reveals the following facts.

1. Students in the supervisor-initiated conference amassed the highest mean scores on seven of the fourteen pairs of bi-polar adjectives. The adjective pairs were: good-bad, complete-incomplete, sociable-unsociable, fair-unfair, pleasurable-painful, honest-dishonest, and positive-negative.

2. Students in the joint-initiated conference compiled the highest mean scores on four of the fourteen pairs of bi-polar adjectives. The adjective pairs were: timely-untimely, useful-useless, meaningful-meaningless, and important-unimportant.

3. Students in the student-initiated conference scored the highest mean scores on three of the fourteen pairs of bi-polar adjectives. The adjective pairs were: successful-unsuccessful, wise-foolish, and valuable-worthless.

4. As noted above, the number of adjective pairs placed first by the students were seven (supervisor-initiated conference), four (joint-initiated conference), and three (student-initiated conference). To determine if a significant difference existed among the adjective pairs placed first by the three groups of students (based on mean scores), a chi square goodness of fit test was performed on the data. The value of chi square was not significant at the .05 level ($\chi^2 = 1.86; 2 \text{ df}; \text{ns}$).

The concept "communication during the conference" constituted the fifth concept in connection with this hypothesis.

Table 23 contains the means and standard deviations of the student
TABLE 22

MEANS FOR EACH OF THE THREE CONFERENCE TYPES FOR EACH PAIR OF ADJECTIVES FOR THE CONCEPT "ITEMS DISCUSSED DURING THE CONFERENCE"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Means</th>
<th>Student-Initiated</th>
<th>Joint-Initiated</th>
<th>Supervisor-Initiated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7 6 5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>good</td>
<td>bad</td>
<td>6.08</td>
<td>6.18</td>
<td>6.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>complete</td>
<td>incomplete</td>
<td>5.08</td>
<td>4.55</td>
<td>5.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>timely</td>
<td>untimely</td>
<td>4.58</td>
<td>5.09</td>
<td>4.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sociable</td>
<td>unsociable</td>
<td>5.42</td>
<td>5.73</td>
<td>6.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>useful</td>
<td>useless</td>
<td>6.42</td>
<td>6.73</td>
<td>6.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fair</td>
<td>unfair</td>
<td>5.92</td>
<td>5.64</td>
<td>6.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pleasurable</td>
<td>painful</td>
<td>5.33</td>
<td>5.55</td>
<td>5.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>successful</td>
<td>unsuccessful</td>
<td>6.33</td>
<td>5.73</td>
<td>6.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>meaningful</td>
<td>meaningless</td>
<td>6.17</td>
<td>6.27</td>
<td>5.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>important</td>
<td>unimportant</td>
<td>6.50</td>
<td>6.64</td>
<td>6.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wise</td>
<td>foolish</td>
<td>5.75</td>
<td>5.73</td>
<td>5.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>valuable</td>
<td>worthless</td>
<td>6.58</td>
<td>6.27</td>
<td>6.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>honest</td>
<td>dishonest</td>
<td>6.17</td>
<td>6.18</td>
<td>6.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>positive</td>
<td>negative</td>
<td>5.92</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>6.43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
teachers in each of the three conference types with respect to their attitude toward the concept "communication during the conference."

**TABLE 23**

MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS OF STUDENT TEACHERS' ATTITUDES TOWARD THE CONCEPT "COMMUNICATION DURING THE CONFERENCE"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student-initiated</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>96.50</td>
<td>15.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint-initiated</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>98.36</td>
<td>15.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor-initiated</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>108.00</td>
<td>10.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>30</strong></td>
<td><strong>99.87</strong></td>
<td><strong>14.52</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When one examines the mean scores above, it needs to be noted that a negative attitude toward the concept "communication during the conference" would vary from 17 to 68, while a positive attitude score would range from 68 to 119. Assigning the low score (17) to the unfavorable pole and the high score (119) to the favorable pole is the procedure suggested by Osgood, Suci, and Tannenbaum (1957, pp. 191-192).

The following information can be acquired from inspecting Table 23.

1. The mean scores suggest that each group holds a positive attitude toward the concept "communication during the conference."
2. The mean scores of the students in the supervisor-initiated conference is higher than the mean scores of the students in the other two groups. This denotes that when treated as a group the students in this type of conference have the most positive attitude toward the concept "communication during the conference."

3. The mean score of the students in the joint-initiated conference is lower than the mean scores of the students in the other two groups. This suggests that when considered as a group these students have the least positive attitude of the three groups toward the concept "communication during the conference."

4. The distribution of scores is not normal. The highest possible score one could attain was 119.00. If three standard deviations of 14.52 each are added to the grand mean (99.87), the total of 143.43 surpasses 119.00. If three of the appropriate standard deviations are added to each mean score for each group, the results exceed 119.00 (141.86 for the student-initiated, 143.63 for the joint-initiated, and 140.40 for the supervisor-initiated).

A one way analysis of variance for a completely randomized design was calculated to determine if the hypothesis of no difference could be rejected. The findings presented in Table 24 illustrate the results of the treatment (conference type) with respect to the students' attitude toward the concept "communication during the conference."

Information obtained by examining Table 24 indicates:

1. No significant differences exist among the three groups (.05 level), therefore the null hypothesis is retained.
TABLE 24

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF STUDENT TEACHERS' ATTITUDES TOWARD THE CONCEPT "COMMUNICATION DURING THE CONFERENCE"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>ms</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type of Conference</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>623.94</td>
<td>311.97</td>
<td>1.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>5,491.56</td>
<td>203.39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>6,115.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Since the distribution of the data is not normal, a non-parametric test, the Kruskal-Wallis H-test was performed. The value of H was 3.35 with two degrees of freedom. This finding was not significant at the .05 level.

The seventeen pairs of bi-polar adjectives which constituted the instrument employed to measure the concept "communication during the conference" were examined to discover if a significant difference exists among the three groups with respect to these adjective pairs. The mean for each pair of adjectives was compiled. Table 25 contains the mean scores for each group for each pair of adjectives.

An examination of Table 25 indicates the following results.

1. Students in the supervisor-initiated conference attained the highest mean scores on fourteen of the seventeen pairs of bi-polar adjectives. The
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Student-Initiated</th>
<th>Joint-Initiated</th>
<th>Supervisor-Initiated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7 6 5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>good</td>
<td>bad</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>complete</td>
<td>incomplete</td>
<td>5.33</td>
<td>5.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>timely</td>
<td>untimely</td>
<td>4.92</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>useful</td>
<td>useless</td>
<td>5.75</td>
<td>6.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sociable</td>
<td>unsociable</td>
<td>5.83</td>
<td>6.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kind</td>
<td>cruel</td>
<td>5.83</td>
<td>6.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>harmonious</td>
<td>dissonant</td>
<td>5.83</td>
<td>5.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>graceful</td>
<td>awkward</td>
<td>4.83</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pleasurable</td>
<td>painful</td>
<td>5.33</td>
<td>5.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>successful</td>
<td>unsuccessful</td>
<td>6.25</td>
<td>6.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>meaningful</td>
<td>meaningless</td>
<td>6.17</td>
<td>6.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>important</td>
<td>unimportant</td>
<td>6.25</td>
<td>6.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>true</td>
<td>false</td>
<td>5.33</td>
<td>5.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>positive</td>
<td>negative</td>
<td>5.75</td>
<td>5.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>believing</td>
<td>skeptical</td>
<td>5.33</td>
<td>5.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wise</td>
<td>foolish</td>
<td>5.58</td>
<td>5.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>valuable</td>
<td>worthless</td>
<td>6.17</td>
<td>6.27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
adjective pairs were: good-bad, complete-incomplete, sociable-unsociable, kind-cruel, harmonious-dissonant, graceful-awkward, pleasurable-painful, successful-unsuccessful, important-unimportant, true-false, positive-negative, believing-skeptical, wise-foolish, and valuable-worthless.

2. Students in the joint-initiated conference compiled the highest mean scores on three of the seventeen pairs of bi-polar adjectives. The adjective pairs were: timely-untimely, useful-useless, and meaningful-meaningless.

3. Students in the student-initiated conference did not amass the highest mean score on any of the seventeen pairs of bi-polar adjectives.

4. As noted above, the number of adjective pairs placed first by the students were fourteen (supervisor-initiated conference), three (joint-initiated conference), and zero (student-initiated conference). To determine if a significant difference existed among the adjective pairs placed first by each of the three groups of students (based on mean scores), a chi square goodness of fit test was performed on this data. The value of chi square was significant at the .02 level ($x^2 = 9.07; 2 \text{ df}; p < .02$).

In summary, the mean scores of the students toward the concepts "teaching a mini lesson," "being video taped," "preparing the conference agenda," "items (statements) discussed during the conference," and "communication during the conference" were positive when the students were considered as a group. This suggests that as a group the students possess a positive attitude toward these concepts. When the data from this hypothesis were subjected to parametric and non-parametric analysis, it was found that the
null hypothesis could not be rejected. Finally, the chi square goodness of fit test was used to determine if a significant difference existed among the adjective pairs placed first by each of the three groups of student teachers for each of the six concepts. The adjective pairs placed first for the concept "communication during the conference" was significant at the .02 level of confidence.

Discussion of the Results--Hypotheses Two and Three

Before discussing possible reasons why the results were not significant when the analysis of variance was performed, it is necessary to comment briefly on the results relating to the mean scores, chi square goodness of fit test, and the Kruskal-Wallis H-test.

All of the mean scores reported were positive values, that is, they fell between the neutral and favorable points on the continuum. Therefore, one can conclude that collectively all of the student teachers showed a positive attitude toward the concepts "conference," "teaching a mini lesson," "being video taped," "preparing the conference agenda," "items (statements) discussed during the conference," and "communication during the conference." Apparently the students felt that the conference and components associated with the conference (mini lesson, video tape, conference
agenda, statements discussed, and communication) were of value to them.

An explanation needs to be advanced as to why a significant chi square goodness of fit test finding was found for two of the concepts--"conference" and "communication during the conference." With regard to the concept "conference," students in the supervisor-initiated conference scored the highest mean scores on sixteen of the nineteen pairs of bi-polar adjectives. The mean score of this group toward the concept "conference" was 111.00. This score is 8.25 points higher than the mean score for the next conference type. A similar condition exists in relation to the concept "communication during the conference." Students in the supervisor-initiated conference amassed the highest mean scores on fourteen of the sixteen pairs of bi-polar adjectives. The mean score of this group toward the concept "communication during the conference" was 108.00. This score is 9.64 points higher than the mean score for the next conference type.

A non-significant chi square goodness of fit test finding was reported for the concepts "teaching a mini lesson," "being video taped," "preparing the conference agenda," and "items (statements) discussed during the conference." Examination of the number of adjective pairs placed first by each group reveals that the distribution is quite homogenous, that is, the number of adjective pairs
placed first by each group for each concept is similar. Also, the
three total mean scores, one for each treatment group, are homoge-
 nous for each concept. Therefore, one can conclude that the chi
square goodness of fit test was significant if the dispersion of ad-
 jective pairs placed first was varied, that is, two low scores and
one high score. If, on the other hand, the dispersion of adjective
pairs placed first was not varied, that is, all three scores were
similar, then in all probability a non-significant chi square goodness
of fit value should result.

The Kruskal-Wallis H-test was also used to analyze the
data in connection with these six concepts. Since the Kruskal-Wallis
H-test is a non-parametric one way analysis of variance (Siegel, 1956,
p. 184), it was used because the distribution of the data for each
concept was not normal. As noted in the results section, a non-
significant H value was reported for each of the six concepts. Also
reported in the results section was the fact that a non-significant F
ratio was computed for each of the six concepts. Perhaps this
finding lends support to what Norton (1952, p. 120); Ferguson (1966,
p. 294); Cochran (1947, p. 24); and Lindquist (1953, p. 84) have re-
ported, that is, the parametric F test can be used with data when
the assumption of non-normality is not seriously violated. (See
page 128 for a further explanation concerning the non-normality
assumption.)
As noted above, a non-significant finding was reported when the Kruskal-Wallis H-test was used to analyze the data for each of the six concepts. A non-significant finding was also reported when the results were subjected to the analysis of variance.

Before discussing possible reasons why the results were not significant with respect to hypotheses two and three, it is necessary to define the analysis of variance, describe the F ratio which indicates if a finding is significant, and discuss the assumptions which underlie the use of the one way analysis of variance.

The analysis of variance is a procedure for dividing the variations observed in an experiment into different parts and is used to test for a significant difference among means of a number of different samples (Ferguson, 1966, p. 281). The statistic which indicates if a finding is significant or not significant is the F ratio which is the relationship of variance between a set of scores and variance within sets of scores (Kerlinger, 1964, p. 194).

The most appropriate way to classify variance, according to Kerlinger (1964, p. 96), is to refer to systematic variance and error variance. Systematic variance is between groups or experimental variance while error variance is within group variance. In an experiment one attempts through experimental manipulation to cause between group variance to increase more than the within group or error variance (Kerlinger, 1964, pp. 93, 192-193).
What is the source of this error? According to Glass and Stanley (1970, p. 341) error can be attributed to the individual difference in subjects, unreliable measuring instruments, and uncontrolled happenings which occur during the experiment.

In an experimental study, then, one attempts to manipulate the variance between groups and control the variance within groups. If the variance between groups is manipulated experimentally, the variance with respect to the scores should be heterogeneous. If the variance within groups is controlled, the variance with respect to these scores should be homogeneous. If both of the conditions mentioned above are maximized, a significant $F$ ratio should result.

Before one attempts to use the one way analysis of variance several assumptions need to be satisfied. The assumptions outlined by Ferguson (1966, pp. 294-295) state that the variables in the populations from which the samples are drawn are normally distributed, that the variances are homogeneous, and that the various factors which comprise a score are additive in nature instead of multiplicative.

With respect to the first assumption, it was noted in the results section that the sample was not normal. Even though this was the case, the $F$ test will not be seriously affected unless there is a reason to suspect an extreme departure from normality.
(Lindquist, 1956, p. 84; Ferguson, 1966, p. 294; Norton, 1952, p. 120; Cochran, 1947, p. 24). The effect of a departure from normality would make the results somewhat more significant than they are. In such a case, a more rigorous confidence level may be employed (Ferguson, 1966, p. 294).

The second assumption indicates that the variances in the samples need to be homogeneous. To test if this assumption is satisfied, one can use Hartley's F max test (Winer, 1971, pp. 206-207). The F max equals the largest of K treatment variances divided by the smallest of the treatment variances. If the observed F max is greater than the tabled value associated with a prescribed confidence level, then the hypothesis of homogeneity of variance is rejected. With respect to each of the five dependent variables, the F max statistic was computed. In each case the observed value was less than the tabled value at the .05 level; therefore, one can assume that the assumption of homogeneity of variance has not been violated. (F max's of 1.83, 2.65, 1.64, 1.94, and 1.21 were computed for the concepts "teaching a mini lesson," "being video taped," "preparing the conference agenda," "items (statements) discussed during the conference," and "communication during the conference.")

The third assumption stated that the model be additive in nature. The mathematical model for the one way analysis of variance indicated that $x_{ij} = \mu + \alpha_i + \epsilon_{ij}$ (Glass and Stanley, 1970, p. 340)
where $x_{ij}$ is the $i^{th}$ score in the $j^{th}$ group, $\mu$ a constant, is the population mean, $\alpha_j$ is the treatment effect of $j^{th}$ treatment, and $e_{ij}$ is the error term of the $i^{th}$ score in the $j^{th}$ group. The important point to note is that the factors which make up the $x_{ij}^{th}$ score are additive.

It was stated before that the F ratio is the relationship of the variance between scores (treatment) and within scores (error). Examination of Tables 9, 12, 15, 18, 21, and 24 reveals that the variance estimate or mean square or the variance between groups was smaller than the variance due to error. This indicated that the effects of the treatment variable, conference type, were not pronounced enough to produce significance. What factors might have contributed to this insignificant treatment effect?

Perhaps one reason for such a negligible treatment effect can be attributed to the length of the treatment. The experiment lasted six weeks and during this six week period each student teacher participated in three conferences.

Perhaps the independent variable, conference type, was not able to be maximized because too few conferences were held. Thus extending the length of the study so that additional conferences could be held might help to maximize the influence of the independent variable.
On the other hand, it is possible that too many conferences were planned. Perhaps the third conference became too routine for both participants because, based on two previous conferences, each participant was too familiar with the procedure. Thus, over-familiarity with the procedure may have had an unknown effect on the maximization of the independent variable.

Another factor which might have affected the variance between scores could have been supervisor preference for a particular conference type. Although each college supervisor was trained during the pilot study to conduct each type of conference, it is possible that at the conclusion of this period a supervisor may have held a distinct preference for one conference type. During the experimental phase of the study this bias could have resulted in covert actions or feelings which may have affected the administration of the treatment.

At the conclusion of the experiment the supervisors were asked which conference type they most and least preferred. The joint-initiated conference was most preferred by four of the supervisors, and the student-initiated conference was listed as the most preferred by the fifth supervisor. The supervisor-initiated conference was listed by all of the supervisors as the one they least preferred. If the supervisors felt this way before the experiment began, this could have affected the treatment.
The treatment or between group variance could have been affected by such factors as the length of the experiment and supervisor bias. If these conditions could be controlled, one should be able to increase the between group variance.

What factors might have contributed to within group or error variance? As stated before, the sources of error are those caused by the differences in individuals, faulty measuring devices, and uncontrolled happenings.

Errors caused by differences in individuals arise in an experiment even though the individuals are treated alike. Most of the variation in an experiment caused by the differences in individuals cannot be controlled; instead, such causes of variations need to be minimized.

A procedure employed to distribute individuals fairly and thus control this type of error is the assignment of subjects to treatment groups in a random fashion. Even though this procedure was followed, not all of the sources of error due to individual differences could be controlled.

Another factor which could affect the amount of error variance in an experiment is that error which results from the use of unreliable measuring devices. The instruments used in this study, however, were reported to be reliable. (See Chapter III for a discussion relating to the reliability of the instruments.)
The measuring instruments were also reported to be valid with respect to measuring attitudes and perceptions. (See Chapter III for a discussion pertaining to the validity of the instruments.) Even though an instrument is reported to be valid, a possible source of error could arise because of the imperfect nature of such measuring devices. In Chapter I the experimenter stated that attitudes could be measured through inferences made by assessing a person's non-verbal overt behavior. This overt behavior may not be a true indication of a person's covert behavior. Because one has to make this inference if he is engaged in attempting to measure attitudes, this condition could contribute to error variance.

Some unexpected events which could have arisen during the course of the experiment and contributed to the source of error variance include such items as the student teacher-cooperating teacher relationship, grade level taught, type of community, intelligence of the children, organization of the school, et cetera. Identification of such sources of error would enable the investigator to control them and thus reduce the amount of error.

In summary, one attempts through experimental manipulation to cause much variation in the between group variance. Since non-significant results were obtained with respect to hypotheses two and three, probable methods of increasing the treatment variance and decreasing the error variance were explored.
In the next section the results pertaining to the fourth hypothesis are discussed.

**Conference and Personal and/or Professional Growth**

**Results**

The fourth hypothesis stated that no significant differences exist among the student-initiated, college supervisor-initiated, and joint-initiated conferences with respect to the students' perceptions as to whether the conference aided their personal and/or professional growth.

Thirty-six student teachers participated in this study, but data from eight student teachers were not used in tabulating the results for this hypothesis. Three student teachers transferred schools before the experiment ended, and one student teacher was subjected to the wrong type of conference. Results from two other students were eliminated because the supervisor implied that additional conference(s) with these students were held. Finally, one student failed to answer the question with respect to this hypothesis, and one student answered the question by stating both yes and no.

Presented in Table 26 are the results which illustrate how the students answered the question presented below.
Do you feel that you learned about yourself (personal growth) and/or about your teaching (professional growth) as a result of participating in the three audio taped conferences with your college supervisor? Please answer by stating yes or no.

**TABLE 26**

OBSERVED AND EXPECTED FREQUENCIES OF PERCEPTIONS OF STUDENT TEACHERS WITH RESPECT TO WHETHER THE CONFERENCES AIDED THEIR PERSONAL AND/OR PROFESSIONAL GROWTH

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Student-Initiated Conference</th>
<th>Supervisor-Initiated Conference</th>
<th>Joint-Initiated Conference</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>6 (6.50)</td>
<td>10 (10.21)</td>
<td>10 (9.29)</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>1 (.50)</td>
<td>1 (.79)</td>
<td>0 (.71)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ x^2 = 1.37; \text{df} 2; \text{ns.} \]

Information obtained by inspecting Table 26 indicates the following results.

1. Twenty-six students indicated that their conferences aided their personal and/or professional growth.

2. Two students felt that the conferences did not aid their personal and/or professional growth.
3. The expected frequencies in three of the cells were less than 5.00.

4. The value of chi square was 1.37 with two degrees of freedom. The finding is not significant at the .05 level, therefore the null hypothesis was not rejected.

Guilford (1965, pp. 241-242) suggested that when the expected frequencies in any cell(s) of a contingency table larger than 2 x 2 are less than 5.00, one should combine rows and/or columns with other rows and/or columns which have small expected frequencies. In three of the cells the expected frequencies are less than 5.00. If row one was combined with row two, this procedure would produce a yes-no row. If column one were joined with column three, this would result in two student teacher categories—student-initiated conference and supervisor-initiated conference. Since combining rows and/or columns would distort the arrangement of the data, Guilford's correction factor was not applied.

The students were also asked to answer the following question with respect to this hypothesis:

If you answered yes to question one, please discuss what you feel you learned about yourself and/or what you learned about your teaching.

Responses for the twenty-six student teachers who answered yes to this question are presented in Table 27 and are organized according to Fuller's seven categories. Both observed and expected frequencies are shown.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Categories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;Non teaching concerns&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student-Initiated Conference</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N = 10</td>
<td>(1.54)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint-Initiated Conference</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N = 10</td>
<td>(2.50)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor-Initiated Conference</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N = 6</td>
<td>(0.96)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \chi^2 = 10.31; \text{df 12; ns.} \]
Inspection of Table 27 reveals the following results.

1. The most statements occurred in categories two ("How adequate am I?") and four ("Are my pupils learning from me?").

2. No statements were mentioned in category five ("Are my pupils learning what they need?").

3. The chi square value of 10.31 was not significant at the .05 level.

Guilford's correction factor was not applied to the above data because combining rows and/or columns would distort the data. Instead, the data were organized to reflect Fuller's two dichotomous categories—"concerns with self as teacher" and "concerns with pupils." Presented in Table 28 are the observed and expected frequencies pertaining to "concerns with self as teacher" and "concerns with pupils" for each group in response to the question of how the conference aided the students' personal and/or professional growth.

Information obtained by examining Table 28 includes the following facts.

1. The students felt that the conference aided personal more than professional growth.

2. The expected frequencies in two cells were less than 5.00.

3. The finding was not significant at the .05 level, therefore one can conclude that no difference existed among the three groups with respect to how the conferences aided their personal and/or professional growth.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;Concerns with self as teacher&quot; (categories 1-3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;concerns with pupils&quot; (categories 4-6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student-Initiated</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(13.14)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(4.86)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint-Initiated</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(23.37)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(8.63)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor-Initiated</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(9.49)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(3.51)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>63</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ x^2 = 1.36; \text{df} 2; \text{ns.} \]
Although the expected frequencies in two of the cells were less than 5.00, because combining rows and/or columns would distort the organization of the data, Guilford's correction factor was not applied.

Two students answered no to the open ended question below.

If you answered no to question one, please discuss why you feel you did not learn about yourself and/or learn about your teaching.

One student who participated in the joint-initiated conference stated that she "already knew what she needed to work on and what her strong points were as a teacher as well as a person."

The second student who took part in the supervisor-initiated conference stated the following reason.

If I had seen the tapes by myself, and could analyze them over a period of time I myself could decide what I felt needed to be developed or changed in order to fit my idea of a good teacher. Different people naturally have different ideas on this, and I think the teacher's personality has a lot to do with how he or she will react in order to reach this goal.

Data presented in Table 29 refer to the number of statements mentioned and the number of students who indicated in how many ways the conferences aided their growth.
TABLE 29

NUMBER OF STATEMENTS MENTIONED AND NUMBER OF STUDENTS WHO INDICATED IN HOW MANY WAYS THE CONFERENCES AIDED THEIR GROWTH

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Statements Mentioned</th>
<th>Number of Students Who Indicated in How Many Ways the Conferences Aided Their Growth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following information can be obtained by examining Table 29.

1. All twenty-six of the students who answered "yes" to the forced choice question ("Do you feel that you learned about yourself and/or about your teaching as a result of participating in the three audio taped conferences with your college supervisor?") felt that the conferences aided them in at least one way.

2. Nine of the students indicated that the conferences aided them in three ways.

3. Twenty-one of the twenty-six students stated that the conferences aided them in only one, two or three ways.
**Discussing the Results**

It is not surprising that the null hypothesis was not rejected. One would expect that student teachers learned something about themselves and/or their teaching as a result of participating in supervisory conferences. What is surprising, however, is that in large part the student teachers felt that the conferences aided only their personal growth. More specifically, the conferences seemed to help the student teachers acquire confidence as teachers. Perhaps one has to acquire assurance of himself as a teacher before he is ready to learn about such matters as methodology, pupil needs, et cetera.

The data presented in Table 29 are interesting to study. Twenty-one out of the twenty-six students felt that the conferences aided them in only one, two or three ways. If the conference is defined as an individualized teaching session, can supervisors expect more learning to take place? On the other hand, if a student teacher benefits in one major way as a result of taking part in conferences, is this amount of learning satisfactory? Perhaps it is unrealistic to be concerned about how much learning takes place in a conference because learning is an individual matter. It might take three conferences for some students to learn one major concept, whereas other students could possibly learn four, five or more major concepts during the same time.
Thus, the majority of the student teachers stated that they learned something about themselves and/or teaching as a result of participating in student teacher-college supervisor conferences.

Also, a majority of the student teachers stated that the conferences aided them in only one, two or three ways.

In this chapter the results and a discussion pertaining to the results for each hypothesis were presented. The results indicated that the null hypothesis cannot be rejected for hypotheses two, three, and four. With respect to hypothesis one, the null hypothesis can be rejected if the statements expressed by college supervisors and student teachers are categorized dichotomously.

Chapter V contains a summary, conclusions, and suggestions for future research.
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS,
AND SUGGESTIONS

In this chapter a summary of the study is contained in part one, while in part two the conclusions reached as a result of the study are presented. Implications for teacher educators are discussed in part three, and in the final section of the chapter are presented suggestions for future research.

Summary of the Study

The purpose of the study was to investigate the effects of different styles of college supervisor-student teacher conferences upon the phenomena associated with the conference. The specific purposes of the study were to investigate the effect different conference types would have upon:

1. what was discussed during the conference,
2. the students' attitude towards the concept "conference,"
3. the students' attitude toward the concepts "teaching a mini lesson," "being video taped," "preparing the conference agenda," "items (statements) discussed during the conference," and "communication during the conference," and
4. the students' perceptions as to whether the conferences aided their personal and/or professional growth.

From the problem statement the following hypotheses were generated:

$H_0 1$ - No significant differences exist between conference statements initiated by student teachers and conference statements initiated by college supervisors.

$H_0 2$ - No significant differences exist among the student-initiated, college supervisor-initiated, and joint-initiated conferences with respect to the students' attitude toward the concept "conference."

$H_0 3$ - No significant differences exist among the student-initiated, college supervisor-initiated, and joint-initiated conferences with respect to the students' attitudes toward each of the following concepts: "teaching a mini lesson," "being video taped," "preparing the conference agenda," "items (statements) discussed during the conference," and "communication during the conference."

$H_0 4$ - No significant differences exist among the student-initiated, college supervisor-initiated, and joint-initiated conferences with respect to the students'
perceptions as to whether the conferences aided their personal and/or professional growth.

Thirty-six student teachers and five college supervisors participated in this investigation which took place during a part of the second trimester of 1973 (January to April). The student teachers who took part in the study were assigned to one of three equal-sized treatment groups (student-initiated, college supervisor-initiated, and joint-initiated) in a random fashion. This procedure resulted in having twelve students comprise each treatment group.

Each student teacher taught three mini lessons once during each round (a two week period). Each lesson was video taped. At the beginning of each conference the student teacher and college supervisor viewed the tape.

After the viewing of the tape, the conference agenda was planned. In the case of a student-initiated conference, the student teacher prepared the agenda by listing four to six statements pertaining to his teaching. In the case of the supervisor-initiated conference, the college supervisor prepared the agenda by listing four to six statements pertaining to the student's teaching. With respect to the joint-initiated conference, both the college supervisor and student teacher prepared the agenda by listing two or three statements pertaining to the student's teaching. Statements which comprised the
agenda could refer to the taped lesson or to any item which had reference to the student's teaching.

Immediately following the preparation of the agenda the conference was held. In the student-initiated conference the student teacher was responsible for initiating for discussion the statements which he had prepared after viewing the video tape. Similarly, in the supervisor-initiated conference the supervisor was responsible for initiating for discussion his prepared statements, and in the joint-initiated conference each participant was required to initiate for discussion his prepared statements.

Statements discussed by the supervisors and student teachers were classified according to the schema developed by Fuller and Case. The students' attitudes toward the six concepts were measured by using an instrument called the semantic differential. The students' perceptions toward the usefulness of the conferences were measured by employing a questionnaire which was constructed by the investigator.

A variety of statistical procedures was employed to analyze the data. These procedures included the computation of the mean, variance, chi square, chi square goodness of fit test, Kruskal-Wallis H-test, and the analysis of variance.
Conclusions Reached as a Result of Analyzing the Data

The first hypothesis stated that no significant differences exist between conference statements initiated by student teachers and conference statements initiated by college supervisors. Conclusions reached in connection with this hypothesis are presented below.

1. The student teachers initiated for discussion more statements (221) than did the college supervisors (194).

2. Both groups (student teachers and college supervisors) discussed more statements in categories two ("How adequate am I?") and four ("Are my students learning from me?") than in other categories.

3. When the data were organized into seven categories (Fuller and Case's schema) for each group and the value of chi square was computed, the results were not significant at the .05 level of confidence, therefore the null hypothesis could not be rejected.

4. Comparison of supervisor statements to student teacher statements when the data for each group were organized into two divisions ("concerns with self as teacher" and "concerns with pupils") produced findings significant at the .05 level of confidence. Supervisors tended to be interested in discussing with student teachers statements pertaining to the student teachers' "concerns with pupils", while the student teachers seemed to be interested in discussing statements pertaining to "concerns with self as teacher."

The second hypothesis stated that no significant differences exist among the student-initiated, college supervisor-initiated, and joint-initiated conferences with respect to the students' attitude
toward the concept "conference." Presented below are the conclusions reached with respect to this hypothesis.

1. As a group the student teachers expressed a positive attitude toward the concept "conference."

2. When the data were subjected to a one way analysis of variance, the result was not significant at the .05 level of confidence. Thus, the null hypothesis could not be rejected, that is, there were no appreciable differences discernible among the three conference types with respect to the students' attitude toward the concept "conference."

3. A non-parametric test, the Kruskal-Wallis H-test, was also performed. The results were not significant at the .05 level of confidence and again the null hypothesis could not be rejected.

4. A chi square goodness of fit test was performed to determine if a significant difference existed among the adjective pairs placed first by each of the three groups. The results were significant at the .001 level of confidence indicating that the responses placed first were widely dispersed among the three groups. With regard to the concept "conference" the students in the supervisor-initiated conference differed from the students in the other two conference groups in how they responded to this concept.

The third hypothesis stated that no significant differences exist among the student-initiated, college supervisor-initiated, and joint-initiated conferences with respect to the students' attitudes toward each of the following concepts: "teaching a mini lesson," "being video taped," "preparing the conference agenda," "items (statements) discussed during the conference," and "communication
during the conference." Conclusions reached with regard to this hypothesis are presented below.

1. As a group the student teachers signified that their attitudes toward the concepts "teaching a mini lesson," "being video taped," "preparing the conference agenda," "items (statements) discussed during the conference," and "communication during the conference" were positive.

2. The analysis of variance produced results which were not significant at the .05 level of confidence and the null hypothesis could not be rejected. That is, there seems to be no significant difference among the three conference types with respect to the students' attitudes toward each of the five concepts.

3. The Kruskal-Wallis H-test, a non-parametric test, was also computed. For each of the five concepts the results were not significant at the .05 level of confidence, therefore, on the basis of this test, the null hypothesis could not be rejected.

4. A chi square goodness of fit test was calculated to determine if a significant difference existed among the adjective pairs placed first by each of the three groups for each of the five concepts. The results were significant (.02 level of confidence) for only one concept—"communication during the conference." This finding indicates that the responses placed first by each of the three groups in regard to this concept were widely dispersed. The students in the supervisor-initiated conference differed from the students in the other two conference types in how they responded to this concept. With the other four concepts the responses placed first by each of the three groups were not widely dispersed, indicating that the students in each group tended to respond the same way with regard to each of the four concepts.

The fourth hypothesis stated that no significant differences exist among the student-initiated, college supervisor-initiated, and
joint-initiated conference with respect to the students' perceptions as to whether the conference aided their personal and/or professional growth. Conclusions reached are listed below.

1. Twenty-six of twenty-eight student teachers expressed the opinion that the conference aided their personal and/or professional growth. When these data were subjected to the chi square test, the value of the chi square was not significant at the .05 level of confidence, therefore the null hypothesis was not rejected. Type of conference does not appear to influence the student teachers' perceptions of the value of the conference.

2. When asked in what area the conference had been of most help, student responses most frequently fit the Fuller-Case categories of "How adequate am I?" and "Are my students learning from me?"

3. Twenty-one of the twenty-six students stated that the conferences aided them in only one, two or three ways.

Implications for Teacher Educators

The conclusions of this study have implications for educators who are involved with the preparation of pre-service teachers. These implications are presented below.

1. Generally speaking, the students in this study and those in Fuller's study experienced similar developmental patterns. Thus, it appears that beginning student teachers are initially concerned about statements pertaining to "concerns with self as teacher."

As they gain more teaching experience, the concerns
shift from "concerns with self as teacher" to "concerns with pupils." Those persons involved with the supervision of student teachers should understand that such a professional developmental pattern exists.

2. Many student teacher statements were classified in Fuller-Case categories two and four, namely, "How adequate am I?" and "Are my pupils learning from me?" Because the statements which comprised these categories are easily derived from a video tape recording of the student teacher's performance, it is possible that an over-reliance on the use of such video tapes could inhibit the range of statements identified for discussion. If a video tape is used, the college supervisor needs to realize that the use of the tape might restrict his or his student teacher's selection of statements for discussion.

3. All the students involved in this study participated in a pre-student teaching practicum. These students worked with elementary-age children in the area of reading and language arts during three mornings each week for one trimester. During the study, very few statements were discussed by either group (student teacher or college supervisor) in category one—
"Where do I stand?" This finding might suggest that such pre-student teaching experiences aid the student teacher in adjusting to the student teaching situation more easily, that is, early student teaching experiences and practicum experiences may require similar adjustments. If this is true, such pre-student teaching experiences should be encouraged if teacher educators wish to help prospective teachers learn how to handle such adjustment problems readily.

4. When statements concerning a student's teaching were arranged dichotomously, it was found that college supervisors tended to generate statements pertaining to "concerns with pupils" while student teachers gravitated toward statements referring to "concerns with self as teacher." This finding should alert college supervisors to the beginning student teacher's need to feel confident about himself before he is ready to learn about matters which affect his pupils (teaching methodology, verbal interaction, et cetera).

5. No significant differences existed among the students in the student-initiated, supervisor-initiated, and joint-initiated conferences with respect to the students' attitude toward the concept "conference." Consequently,
so far as student attitude is concerned, it would appear that college supervisors can hold effective conferences which are direct (supervisor-initiated), non-direct (student-initiated), or a combination of both approaches (joint-initiated).

6. As a group, the student teachers expressed a positive attitude toward the concept "conference" even though a required number of statements had to be initiated for discussion. This finding might indicate to college supervisors that student teachers presumably value participating in conferences which are structured in this fashion.

7. No significant difference existed among the student teachers in the three types of conferences with respect to the students' attitudes toward each of the following concepts: "teaching a mini lesson," "being video taped," "preparing the conference agenda," "items (statements) discussed during the conference," and "communication during the conference." As attitudes toward all concepts were positive, it would appear that supervisory techniques used in this study can be effectively coupled with any one of the three conference types.
8. A majority of the student teachers stated that the conferences aided their personal and/or professional growth. From this one might be able to infer that a conference between a student teacher and college supervisor is viewed by the student teachers as a profitable learning experience and necessary supervisory function and this should be retained as one of the methods employed by teacher educators in the preparation of prospective teachers. Studies by Lingren (1958, pp. 468-470), Wilkinson (1958, pp. 363-364), and Bennie (1964, pp. 131-133) stated that student teachers felt that an important supervisory technique was the holding of conferences.

**Suggestions for Future Research**

Presented below are suggestions for future research.

1. Maximize the independent variable, conference type, by
   a. Extending the time length of the study, or
   b. Using the post-test only control group design as suggested by Campbell and Stanley (1963, pp. 25-26). If this design were applied to this problem, one group of student teachers would participate
in the mini teaching and video taping, but no conference would be held.

2. Change the experimental design by employing a repeated measures (one dimensional) design (Dayton, 1970, pp. 246-255). With this design each subject participates at least once in each type of conference. At the end of each conference, the measuring instruments are administered. The use of this design should reduce the amount of familiarity regarding procedures that occurs when a student is exposed to the same conference type three times. One disadvantage of this design, however, is the fact that the student may become "test wise" since the same measuring instruments are administered repeatedly.

3. Control the extraneous variables which apply to the elementary-age children (for example, grade level, intelligence, school and classroom organization) and discover what statements student teachers express regarding their teaching. Do statements pertaining to a student's teaching differ between two groups of students if one group teaches children in a suburban area and the other group teaches in an inner city school, or at different grade levels, et cetera.
4. Determine the effect of pre-student teaching experiences upon the student teacher's acquisition of self confidence. The results of this study tend to indicate that even with a pre-student teaching experience the student teachers were still very much concerned about their self adequacy. If the student's feelings of self adequacy as a person and teacher persist during a major portion of his student teaching, what can be done to overcome this?

5. Determine why so many students feel that the supervisory conference aids them in only one way. If the conference is regarded as a learning situation, can more be taught during these sessions?

6. Control the personal bias of the college supervisor by determining what conference type each prefers and have each supervisor participate in the conference of his choice. Perhaps the students' attitude toward the concept "conference" would be affected.

7. Determine if and/or when a conference should be directive (supervisor-initiated), non-directive (student teacher-initiated), or a combination of both procedures (joint-initiated).
8. Eliminate the structuring effects of the video recording, that is, use the same design indicated in this study, but do not have the student teacher video taped. Have the two participants hold a conference after the supervisor has observed the student teacher in the classroom.

This chapter was divided into four sections. A summary of the study was presented in part one, and in part two the conclusions reached as a result of analyzing the data were presented. Implications for teacher educators were discussed in part three, and in part four suggestions for future research were described.
APPENDIX A
### Student Teacher

#### Biographical Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypotheses</th>
<th>Personal Information</th>
<th>N = 29</th>
<th>Hypotheses Two, Three, and Four</th>
<th>Personal Information</th>
<th>N = 30</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Sex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Year in School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Marital Status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Approximate Grade Point</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average in Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6. Approximate Overall Grade Point Average

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. Entered University of Dayton as a Freshman

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Entered</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. Transferred to the University of Dayton

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transferred</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. Academic Minor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minor</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociology</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Economics</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Studies</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Education</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Studies</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
10. Present Size of Birthplace\(^1\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 - 50,000</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000 - 200,000</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200,000 - 500,000</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500,000 - 1,000,000</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>over 1,000,000</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. Present Size of Permanent Address\(^2\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 - 50,000</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000 - 200,000</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200,000 - 500,000</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500,000 - 1,000,000</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>over 1,000,000</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12. Socio-Economic Level of Permanent Address (City)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lower</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13. Type of Community of Permanent Address

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inner city</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburban</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outer city</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14. Father's Occupation\(^3\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Processing</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Machine</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bench</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---


\(^2\)Ibid.

\(^3\)U. S. Department of Labor, *Dictionary of Occupational Titles: 1965*.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Unknown</th>
<th>Deceased</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15. **Mother's Occupation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16. **Husband's Occupation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

17. **Number of Brothers**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Brothers</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

18. **Number of Sisters**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Sisters</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

19. **Age of Children Worked with**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>multiple grouping</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

4 Ibid.

5 Ibid.
20. Number of Children in the Class

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Children</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>17</th>
<th>18</th>
<th>20</th>
<th>21</th>
<th>22</th>
<th>23</th>
<th>24</th>
<th>25</th>
<th>26</th>
<th>27</th>
<th>28</th>
<th>30</th>
<th>32</th>
<th>33</th>
<th>34</th>
<th>40</th>
<th>No answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

21. Intelligence Quotient of Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intelligence Quotient</th>
<th>Below 90</th>
<th>90 - 110</th>
<th>Above 110</th>
<th>Unknown</th>
<th>Combination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

22. Type of School Organization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of School Organization</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Graded</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-graded</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open space</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Departmental</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graded &amp; Departmental</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

23. Type of community where school is located

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Community</th>
<th>25</th>
<th>26</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inner city</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outer city</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburban</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
24. Socio-economic level of school community

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lower</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

25. Did you participate in the 320 (reading and language arts) practicum?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>30</th>
<th>.0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

26. Did you participate in the freshman practicum?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>23</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

27. Before this term have you been video taped?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

28. How many times were you video taped before?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Times</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no answer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX B
DESCRIPTION AND EXAMPLES OF FULLER'S AND CASE'S
SEVEN CATEGORIES OF TEACHING CONCERNS

(Fuller-Case, 1970, pp. 3-4, 8-18)

I. Concerns about Self

Code 0 - Non teaching concerns

Statement contains information or concerns which are unrelated to teaching. Codes one through six are always concerned with teaching. All other statements are coded 0.

Examples:

1. Today is a pretty day.
2. If I don't improve my GPA I may not get to teach.
3. Right now I am concerned about getting married.

II. Concerns about Self as Teacher

Code 1 - Where Do I Stand?

Concerns with orienting oneself to a teaching situation, i.e., psychological, social and physical environment of the classroom, school and/or community. Concerns about supervisors, cooperating teachers, principal, parents. Concerns about evaluation, rules, or administrative policy, i.e., concern about authority figures and/or acceptance by them.

Examples:

1. What will my new school be like?
2. What are their parents like?
3. Can I go into the teacher's lounge?
4. How will the faculty and staff accept me?
Code 2 - How Adequate Am I?

Concern about one's adequacy as a person and as a teacher. Concern about discipline and subject matter adequacy.

Examples:

1. I hope I can teach children successfully.
2. Do I really know my subject matter?
3. What will the students be likely to do to 'try me out?'
4. I hope I will have enough material to put on the bulletin board.

Code 3 - How Do Pupils Feel About Me? What Are Pupils Like?

Concern about personal, social, and emotional relationships with pupils. Concern about one's own feelings toward pupils and about pupils' feelings toward the teacher.

Examples:

1. I was concerned if they would like me.
2. Right now I'm just having a great time with the kids.
3. I am concerned about becoming too personally involved with the children.
4. Some children have such poor home lives they just can't concentrate.

III. Concern about Pupils

Code 4 - Are Pupils Learning What I'm Teaching?

Concern about whether pupils are learning material selected by the teacher. Concern about teaching methods which help pupils learn what is planned for them. Concern about evaluating pupil learning.
Examples:

1. I want to be sure they understand the fundamentals.
2. I want them not only to understand what is said, but also to be able to apply what is said.
3. I want to make the subject alive and meaningful to the student so that he can learn.
4. I worry about finding the means of presenting the material in such a manner that the maximum number of students can grasp it easily.

Code 5 - Are Pupils Learning What They Need?

Concern about pupils' learning what they need as persons. Concern about teaching methods (and other factors) which influence that kind of learning.

Examples:

1. How do you teach a boy who doesn't seem to hear anything that is going on?
2. I want them to realize why they are learning what they are and to enjoy it because it is valuable.
3. I am concerned that students become open-minded, well-rounded individuals. I want to help them learn to help themselves be better able to live full lives.
4. What can I do with a child like this? A child who will freeze in front of the class and won't utter a sound, but will come in after school and make up all the required work?

Code 6 - How Can I Improve Myself As A Teacher? (And Improve All That Influences Pupils?)

Concern with anything and everything which can contribute to the development, not only of the pupils in the class, but of children generally. Concern with personal and professional development, ethics,
educational issues, resources, community problems and other events in or outside the classroom which influence pupil gain.

Examples:

1. Should a teacher tell a parent the children's IQ score?

2. The school lunch program needs to be extended to breakfast. Hungry children cannot learn.

3. I think this class should be smaller. Some children are so nervous and talk so much. The regular sized class stimulates them too much.

4. Textbook selection methods in this state need to be changed so books can make sense to children with varied backgrounds.
DESCRIPTION OF MODIFIED
FULLER-CASE INSTRUMENT

Below are the descriptive categories of the modified Fuller-
Case instrument which was used in this study. Also included is a
description of the kind of statements and/or activities which comprise
each category.

I. Concerns About Self

Code 0 - Non-teaching Concerns

This description is the same as the one provided by
Fuller and Case.

II. Concerns about Self as Teacher

Code 1 - Where Do I Stand?

This description is the same as the one provided by
Fuller and Case.

Code 2 - How Adequate Am I?

In addition to the description provided by Fuller and
Case, statements pertaining to lesson planning, the
student's voice or use of gestures, and the use of
pet expressions were included.

Code 3 - How Do I Relate To My Students?

This description is the same as the one provided by
Fuller and Case.
III. Concerns about Pupils

Code 4 - Are My Students Learning From Me?

In addition to the description provided by Fuller and Case, statements pertaining to the evaluation of methodology, comments relating to the giving of directions, and verbal interaction were also included.

Code 5 - Are My Pupils Learning What They Need?

This description is the same as the one provided by Fuller and Case.

Code 6 - How Can I Improve Myself As A Teacher? (And Improve All That Influences Pupils?)

This description is the same as the one provided by Fuller and Case.
## BIOGRAPHICAL INFORMATION
(COLLEGE SUPERVISORS)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supervisor Number</th>
<th>Highest Degree Held</th>
<th>Professorial Rank</th>
<th>Number of Years of Experience in Education</th>
<th>Number of Years of College Teaching Experience</th>
<th>Number of Years at the University of Dayton</th>
<th>Number of Teaching Hours (Second Tri-semester - 1972-1973)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Doctor of Education</td>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Doctor of Education</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9.5&lt;sup&gt;(a)&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Doctor of Education</td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Doctor of Philosophy</td>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Master of Education (Doctor of Philosophy Candidate)</td>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>(a)</sup>Also Chairman of Department
NUMBER OF STUDENT TEACHERS ASSIGNED TO EACH SUPERVISOR AND TYPE OF CONFERENCE FOR EACH STUDENT TEACHER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supervisor Number</th>
<th>Student Number</th>
<th>Type of Conference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Supervisor-Initiated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Supervisor-Initiated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Joint-Initiated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Joint-Initiated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Student-Initiated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Student-Initiated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Student-Initiated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Supervisor-Initiated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Supervisor-Initiated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Supervisor-Initiated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Joint-Initiated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Joint-Initiated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Student-Initiated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Student-Initiated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Supervisor-Initiated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Joint-Initiated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Student-Initiated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Supervisor-Initiated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Supervisor-Initiated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Joint-Initiated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Joint-Initiated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Student-Initiated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Student-Initiated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Student-Initiated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Supervisor-Initiated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Supervisor-Initiated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Joint-Initiated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Joint-Initiated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Student-Initiated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Student-Initiated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31</td>
<td>Student-Initiated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Supervisor-Initiated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Supervisor-Initiated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>34</td>
<td>Joint-Initiated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35</td>
<td>Joint-Initiated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>36</td>
<td>Joint-Initiated</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SUPERVISOR'S ASSESSMENT

JOINT-INITIATED AND SUPERVISOR-INITIATED CONFERENCES

Name of College Supervisor ___________________________ Date __________

Name of Student Teacher ____________________________________________

Type of Conference ________________________________________________

Answer the following items with respect to the student teacher named above.

Grade Level Assignment ____________________________________________

Type of School (circle the most appropriate choice)

Inner City       Outer City       Suburban       Rural

Other (please specify) _____________________________________________

Type of School Organization (circle the most appropriate choice)

Self-contained       Open Space       Departmental

Other (please specify) _____________________________________________

DIRECTIONS: Answer the statement printed below. When you answer this statement, list what comes to YOUR mind with respect to your student's teaching. Do not list what others think about your student's teaching.

Items listed may refer to what you observed on the video tape or to incidents which occurred in the past. Supply 4 to 6 items for a college supervisor-initiated conference and 2 to 3 items for a joint-initiated conference.
STATEMENT: WHEN I THINK ABOUT YOUR TEACHING (student named above), I THINK ABOUT:

1. ________________________________

2. ________________________________

3. ________________________________

4. ________________________________

5. ________________________________

6. ________________________________

(At the end of the conference, give this form to your college supervisor.)
STUDENT TEACHER SELF ASSESSMENT
(STUDENT-INITIATED CONFERENCE)

Name ___________________________ Date__________________

Name of College Supervisor ____________________________

Grade Level Assignment ________________________________

Type of School (circle the most appropriate choice)
Inner City       Outer City       Suburban       Rural
Other (please specify) ________________________________

Type of School Organization (circle the most appropriate choice)
Self-contained       Open Space       Departmental
Other (please specify) ________________________________

DIRECTIONS: Answer the statement printed below. When
you answer this statement, list what comes to YOUR mind when you
think about your teaching. Do not list what others think about your

Items listed may refer to what you observed on the video
tape or to incidents which occurred sometime in the past. List 4
to 6 items.
STATEMENT: WHEN I THINK ABOUT MY TEACHING, I THINK ABOUT:

1. __________________________________________________________

2. __________________________________________________________

3. __________________________________________________________

4. __________________________________________________________

5. __________________________________________________________

6. __________________________________________________________

(At the end of the conference, give this form to your college supervisor.)
STUDENT TEACHER SELF ASSESSMENT  
(JOINT-INITIATED CONFERENCE)

Name ____________________________ Date ____________

Name of College Supervisor ________________________________

Grade Level Assignment ________________________________

Type of School (circle the most appropriate choice)

Inner City    Outer City    Suburban    Rural

Other (please specify) ________________________________

Type of School Organization (circle the most appropriate choice)

Self-contained    Open Space    Departmental

Other (please specify) ________________________________

DIRECTIONS: Answer the statement printed below. When you answer this statement, list what comes to YOUR mind when you think about your teaching. Do not list what others think about your teaching.

Items listed may refer to what you observed on the video tape or to incidents which occurred sometime in the past. List 2 to 3 items.
STATEMENT: WHEN I THINK ABOUT MY TEACHING, I THINK ABOUT:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Do not write in this space</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. _________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. _________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. _________</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(At the end of the conference, give this form to your college supervisor.)
APPENDIX F
PILOT STUDY PROCEDURES
STUDENT-INITIATED CONFERENCE

1. During the trimester you will participate in two structured conferences with your college supervisor. With the information gained from this study we hope to improve the teacher education program at the University of Dayton.

2. In regard to these conferences, please follow the procedures outlined below.

3. You will be asked to prepare and teach two mini lessons at different times to a small group of children (4 to 6). Each complete lesson should last from 4 to 8 minutes. Each lesson will be video taped outside the regular classroom. You will have ample time to prepare each lesson.

4. At the time you have been assigned to teach your lesson, bring your small group of children to the room where the taping will take place. (The room number and time of your video taping will be given to you by your college supervisor.)

5. Begin the taping session when the technician signals you to do so. Start by giving your name, the date, the number of students present, and the name of the school. Begin your lesson after this information has been given.

6. After you have taught the lesson, the video tape will be checked by the technician to see if a useable recording resulted. YOU
ARE NOT TO VIEW THE VIDEO TAPE AT THIS TIME. If the technician indicates to you that the tape is all right, return with your children to class. If the technician indicates that the lesson needs to be re-taught because the tape is of a poor quality, re-teach the same lesson to the same group of students.

7. Schedule a conference with your college supervisor. This conference will most likely take place the afternoon following the taping. All conferences will be held at the University of Dayton in Chaminade 202B. (Inside of Room 202A - Education Research Center.)

8. When the conference begins, view the tape with your college supervisor. After you have viewed the tape prepare the CONFERENCE AGENDA by writing down 4 to 6 concerns you have regarding your teaching. These concerns may be based on what you view on the tape or they may be concerns which occurred sometime in the past. Use the form provided to list your concerns.

9. Discuss your concerns with your college supervisor. When the audio recorder is turned on, give your name, the date, and the type of conference. When your college supervisor asks you to read your first concern, read it and discuss it thoroughly with your college supervisor. Continue with this procedure until you have initiated and discussed 4 to 6 of your concerns.
10. Near the end of the conference, your college supervisor will ask to SUMMARIZE THE CONFERENCE. Summarize the conference by reiterating the main points discussed. The whole conference should last 10 to 20 minutes.

11. Turn in your list of concerns to your college supervisor at the end of the conference.

THANK YOU FOR YOUR COOPERATION
PILOT STUDY PROCEDURES
SUPERVISOR-INITIATED CONFERENCE

1. During the trimester you will participate in two structured conferences with your college supervisor. With the information gained from this study we hope to improve the teacher education program at the University of Dayton.

2. In regard to these conferences, PLEASE follow the procedures outlined below.

3. You will be asked to prepare and teach two mini lessons at different times to a small group of children (4 to 6). Each complete lesson should last from 4 to 8 minutes. Each lesson will be video taped outside the regular classroom. You will have ample time to prepare each lesson.

4. At the time you have been assigned to teach your lesson, bring your small group of children to the room where the taping will take place. (The room number and time of your video taping will be given to you by your college supervisor.

5. Begin the taping session when the technician signals you to do so. Start by giving your name, the date, the number of students present, and the name of the school. Begin your lesson after this information has been given.

6. After you have taught the lesson, the video tape will be checked by the technician to see if a useable recording resulted. YOU
ARE NOT TO VIEW THE VIDEO TAPE AT THIS TIME. If the technician indicates to you that the tape is all right, return with your children to class. If the technician indicates that the lesson needs to be re-taught because the tape is of a poor quality, re-teach the same lesson to the same group of students.

7. Schedule a conference with your college supervisor. This conference will most likely take place the afternoon following the taping. All conferences will be held at the University of Dayton in Chaminade 202B. (Inside of Room 202A – Education Research Center).

8. When the conference begins view the video tape with your college supervisor. After you have viewed the tape, your college supervisor will prepare the CONFERENCE AGENDA by writing down 4 to 6 concerns he has regarding your teaching. These concerns would be based on what he views on the tape or they could be concerns he has regarding your teaching which occurred in the past.

9. Your supervisor will discuss his concerns with you. When the audio recorder is turned on, the student teacher needs to identify himself, give the date, and relate what type of conference it is. Your college supervisor will initiate the first concern by stating, "My first concern is..." and discuss it thoroughly
with you. He will continue this procedure until he has initiated and discussed 4 to 6 concerns.

10. Near the end of the conference your college supervisor will SUMMARIZE THE CONFERENCE by reiterating the main points discussed. The whole conference should last 10 to 20 minutes.

THANK YOU FOR YOUR COOPERATION
PILOT STUDY PROCEDURES
JOINT-INITIATED CONFERENCE

1. During the trimester you will participate in two structured conferences with your college supervisor. With the information gained from this study we hope to improve the teacher education program at the University of Dayton.

2. In regard to these conferences, PLEASE follow the procedures outlined below.

3. You will be asked to prepare and teach two mini lessons at different times to a small group of children (4 to 6). Each complete lesson should last from 4 to 8 minutes. Each lesson will be video taped outside the regular classroom. You will have ample time to prepare each lesson.

4. At the time you have been assigned to teach your lesson, bring your small group of children to the room where the video taping will take place. (The room number and time of your video taping will be given to you by your college supervisor.

5. Begin the taping session when the technician signals you to do so. Start by giving your name, the date, the number of students present, and the name of the school. Begin your lesson after this information has been given.

6. After you have taught the lesson, the video tape will be checked by the technician to see if a useable recording resulted. YOU
ARE NOT TO VIEW THE VIDEO TAPE AT THIS TIME. If the technician indicates to you that the tape is all right, return with your children to class. If the technician indicates that the lesson needs to be re-taught because the tape is of a poor quality, re-teach the same lesson to the same group of students.

7. Schedule a conference with your college supervisor. This conference will most likely take place the afternoon following the taping. All conferences will be held at the University of Dayton in Chaminade 202B. (Inside of Room 202A - Education Research Center.)

8. When the conference begins, view the video tape with your college supervisor. After you have viewed the tape, prepare your part of the CONFERENCE AGENDA by writing down 2 to 3 concerns you have regarding your teaching. These concerns may be based on what you view on the tape or they may be concerns which occurred sometime in the past. Use the form provided to list your concerns. Your college supervisor will prepare the other portion of the CONFERENCE AGENDA by writing down 2 to 3 concerns he has regarding your teaching.

9. Discuss your concerns with your college supervisor. When the audio recorder is turned on, give your name, the date, and the type of conference. When your college supervisor asks you to read your first concern, read it and discuss it thoroughly with
your college supervisor. When you have finished discussing
your first concern, your college supervisor will initiate and
discuss his first concern by saying, "My first concern is. . . ."
Continue with this procedure until each of you have initiated and
discussed 2 to 3 concerns.

10. Near the end of the conference your college supervisor will ask
you to SUMMARIZE THE CONFERENCE. Summarize your
portion by reiterating the main points discussed. Your college
supervisor will also SUMMARIZE his portion of the CONFERENCE.
The whole conference should last 10 to 20 minutes.

11. Turn in your list of concerns to your college supervisor at the
end of the conference.

THANK YOU FOR YOUR COOPERATION
VIDEO TAPING AND CONFERENCE PROCEDURES
SUPERVISOR-INITIATED CONFERENCE

I. GENERAL INFORMATION

1. You have been selected to participate in a study to be conducted during the first part of the term. In regard to the study, PLEASE FOLLOW THE PROCEDURES outlined below.

2. You will be asked to prepare and teach three (3) mini lessons to a group of children and participate in three (3) conferences with your college supervisor.

3. Your three mini lessons will be taught by you on dates assigned to you by your college supervisor. You will have ample time to prepare each lesson. Your conference will be held the same day you do your mini teaching. Be sure that you know when (time) and where (room) your video taping session and conference will be held.

4. A lesson plan must be prepared for each mini lesson. Your supervisor will discuss with you what elements it should contain. The lesson plan should be turned into Mr. Dave Joseph, audio-visual specialist, at the end of the taping session.

5. Each mini lesson should contain all the elements of a regular
lesson. Your college supervisor will discuss with you what these elements are.

6. Each lesson must be taught to a group of FOUR to SIX children. A different group of children may be used for each mini lesson.

7. Each lesson should last from EIGHT to TWELVE minutes.

8. Each lesson will be video taped OUTSIDE the regular classroom.

II. VIDEO TAPING DAY

1. Before you leave your classroom to report to the video room, please be sure that you have your lesson plan, video taping information sheet (to be found in this packet), and any audio visual aids or materials you wish to use during the lesson.

2. Take your children to the taping room. Arrange them according to the diagram below.

   x  Teacher faces students

   Two or three  x  x  Two or three
   children      x  x  children

   x  Camera

   The children should sit opposite one another.

3. Arrange any materials you wish to use.

4. Hand the video taping information sheet to Mr. Joseph.
This will indicate to Mr. Joseph that you have everything arranged and are ready to begin.

5. Mr. Joseph will record the information off the video information sheet. When he signals you and says "Begin lesson" begin your lesson.

6. Notify Mr. Joseph when you have finished your lesson by saying "End lesson." Turn in your lesson plan to him at this time.

7. After you have taught the lesson, the video tape will be checked by Mr. Joseph to see if a useable recording resulted. He will check the quality of the tape by playing back a portion of it to the children. Leave the room during the playback.

YOU ARE NOT TO VIEW THE TAPE AT THIS TIME. After Mr. Joseph has checked the tape, he will ask you to return to the classroom with your children. (If the quality of your tape is poor, Mr. Joseph will tell you the time set aside for you to tape the same lesson to the same or another group of children.)

III. CONFERENCE PROCEDURES

1. The total conference components consist of viewing the tape, preparing the conference agenda, discussing the statements, and summarizing the conference. The conference proper consists of discussing the statements prepared and
summarizing the conference. This portion (conference proper) should last between ten (10) and twenty (20) minutes.

2. Your college supervisor will introduce the tape by stating your name, the date, and the type of conference by letter only. After he/she has given this information, he/she will replay the tape to see if the recorder is recording properly. When this is finished, your college supervisor will begin the conference by saying "BEGIN CONFERENCE."

3. Report for your conference at the time and place designated by your college supervisor.

4. When the pre-conference begins, view the video tape with your college supervisor. After you both have viewed the tape, your college supervisor will prepare the CONFERENCE AGENDA by writing down four (4) to six (6) statements he/she has concerning your teaching.

5. When the CONFERENCE PROPER begins, your college supervisor will read his/her first statements and discuss it thoroughly with you. Each statement will be introduced by the remark "My first, second, etc. statement is. . . ." This procedure will continue until your college supervisor has initiated and discussed four (4) to six (6) statements.
6. Near the end of the conference your college supervisor will SUMMARIZE THE CONFERENCE by reiterating the points discussed. The conference will conclude when your supervisor says "END CONFERENCE."

7. Your college supervisor will check the quality of the tape before you leave the conference room. If another conference needs to be re-scheduled due to a poor recording, your college supervisor will re-schedule another conference with you.

8. Turn in your list of statements to the investigator.

THANK YOU FOR YOUR COOPERATION
VIDEO TAPING AND CONFERENCE PROCEDURES
JOINT-INITIATED CONFERENCE

I. GENERAL INFORMATION

1. You have been selected to participate in a study to be conducted during the first part of the term. In regard to this study, PLEASE FOLLOW THE PROCEDURES outlined below.

2. You will be asked to prepare and teach three (3) mini lessons to a group of children and participate in three (3) conferences with your college supervisor.

3. Your three mini lessons will be taught by you on dates assigned to you by your college supervisor. You will have ample time to prepare each lesson. Your conference will be held the same day you do your mini teaching. Be sure that you know when (time) and where (room) your video taping session and conference will be held.

4. A lesson plan must be prepared for each mini lesson. Your supervisor will discuss with you what elements it should contain. The lesson plan should be turned in to Mr. Dave Joseph, audio-visual specialist, at the end of the taping session.

5. Each mini lesson should contain all the elements of a
regular lesson. Your college supervisor will discuss with you what these elements are.

6. Each lesson must be taught to a group of FOUR to SIX children. A different group of children may be used for each mini lesson.

7. Each lesson should take from EIGHT to TWELVE minutes.

8. Each lesson will be video taped OUTSIDE the regular classroom.

II. VIDEO TAPING DAY

1. Before you leave your classroom to report to the video room, please be sure that you have your lesson plan, video taping information sheet (to be found in this packet), and any audio visual aids or materials you wish to use during the lesson.

2. Take your children to the taping room. Arrange the students according to the diagram below.

   x  Teacher faces students

   Two or three  x  x  Two or three
   children       x  x  children

   x  Camera

   The children should sit opposite one another.

3. Arrange any materials you wish to use.

4. Hand the video taping information sheet to Mr. Joseph.

   This will indicate to Mr. Joseph that you have everything arranged and are ready to begin.
5. Mr. Joseph will record the information off the video information sheet. When he signals you and says "Begin lesson" begin your lesson.

6. Notify Mr. Joseph when you have finished your lesson by saying "End lesson." Turn in your lesson plan to him at this time.

7. After you have taught the lesson, the video tape will be checked by Mr. Joseph to see if a useable recording resulted. He will check the quality of the tape by playing back a portion of it to the children. Leave the room during the playback. YOU ARE NOT TO VIEW THE TAPE AT THIS TIME. After Mr. Joseph has checked the tape, he will ask you to return to the classroom with your children. (If the quality of your tape is poor, Mr. Joseph will tell you the time set aside for you to tape the same lesson to the same or another group of children.

III. CONFERENCE PROCEDURES

1. The total conference components consists of viewing the tape, preparing the conference agenda, discussing the statements, and summarizing the conference. The conference proper consists of discussing the statements prepared and summarizing the conference. This portion (conference proper) should last between ten (10) and twenty (20) minutes.
2. Your college supervisor will introduce the tape by stating your name, the date, and the type of conference by letter only. After he/she has given this information, he/she will replay the tape to see if the recorder is recording properly. When this is finished, your college supervisor will begin the conference by saying '"BEGIN CONFERENCE."'

3. Report for your conference at the time and place designated by your college supervisor. Be sure you have with you the STUDENT TEACHER SELF ASSESSMENT form which can be found in this packet.

4. When the pre-conference begins, view the video tape with your college supervisor. After you have viewed the tape, prepare the CONFERENCE AGENDA by writing down two (2) to three (3) statements you have regarding your teaching. Use the Student Teacher Self Assessment form for this purpose. Your college supervisor will prepare the other portion of the CONFERENCE AGENDA by writing down two (2) to three (3) statements he/she has regarding your teaching.

5. When the CONFERENCE PROPER begins, read your first statement when requested to do so. Preface each statement with the remark, "My __________________________ statement is first, second, etc."
. . . ." Use this preface for all the statements you initiate. Discuss this statement thoroughly with your college supervisor. When you have finished discussing your first statement, your college supervisor will initiate and discuss his/her first statement regarding your teaching. He/she will introduce each statement by saying, "My ____________ first, second, etc. statement is. . . ." Continue with this procedure until each of you has initiated and discussed two (2) to three (3) concerns.

6. Near the end of the conference your college supervisor will ask you to SUMMARIZE YOUR PORTION OF THE CONFERENCE. Summarize your portion by reiterating the main points discussed. Your college supervisor will also summarize his/her portion of the conference. The conference will conclude when your supervisor says "END CONFERENCE."

7. Your college supervisor will check the quality of the tape before you leave the conference room. If another conference needs to be re-scheduled due to a poor recording, your college supervisor will re-schedule another conference with you.

8. Turn in your list of statements to your college supervisor at the end of the conference.
VIDEO TAPEING AND CONFERENCE PROCEDURES
STUDENT-INITIATED CONFERENCE

I. GENERAL INFORMATION

1. You have been selected to participate in a study to be conducted during the first part of the term. In regard to the study, PLEASE FOLLOW THE PROCEDURES outlined below.

2. You will be asked to prepare and teach three (3) mini lessons to a group of children and participate in three (3) conferences with your college supervisor.

3. Your three mini lessons will be taught by you on dates assigned to you by your college supervisor. You will have ample time to prepare each lesson. Your conference will be held the same day you do your mini lesson. Be sure that you know when (time) and where (room) your video taping session and conference will be held.

4. A lesson plan must be prepared for each mini lesson. Your supervisor will discuss with you what elements it should contain. The lesson plan should be turned in to Mr. Dave Joseph, audio-visual specialist, at the end of the taping session.

5. Each mini lesson should contain all the elements of a regular lesson. Your college supervisor will discuss with you what these elements are.
6. Each lesson must be taught to a group of FOUR to SIX children. A different group of children may be used for each mini lesson.

7. Each lesson should last from EIGHT to TWELVE minutes.

8. Each lesson will be video taped OUTSIDE the regular classroom.

II. VIDEO TAPING DAY

1. Before you leave your classroom to report to the video room, please be sure that you have your lesson plan, video taping information sheet (to be found in this packet), and any audio visual aids or materials you wish to use during the lesson.

2. Take your children to the taping room. Arrange the students according to the diagram below.

```
  x  Teacher faces students
  x  x  Two or three children
  x  x  Two or three children
  x  x  Camera
```

The children should sit opposite one another.

3. Arrange any materials you wish to use.

4. Hand the video taping sheet to Mr. Joseph. This will indicate to Mr. Joseph that you have everything arranged and are ready to begin.

5. Mr. Joseph will record the information off the video
information sheet. When he signals you and says "Begin lesson" begin your lesson.

6. Notify Mr. Joseph when you have finished your lesson by saying "End lesson." Turn in your lesson plan to him at this time.

7. After you have taught the lesson, the video tape will be checked by Mr. Joseph to see if a useable recording resulted. He will check the quality of the tape by playing back a portion of it to the children. Leave the room during the playback. YOU ARE NOT TO VIEW THE TAPE AT THIS TIME. After Mr. Joseph has checked the tape, he will ask you to return to the classroom with your children. (If the quality of your tape is poor, Mr. Joseph will tell you the time set aside for you to tape the same lesson to the same or another group of children.)

III. CONFERENCE PROCEDURES

1. The total conference components consist of viewing the tape, preparing the conference agenda, discussing the statements, and summarizing the conference. The conference proper consists of discussing the statements prepared and summarizing the conference. This portion (conference proper) should last between ten (10) and twenty (20) minutes.
2. Your college supervisor will introduce the tape by stating your name, the date, and the type of conference by letter only. After he/she has given this information, he/she will replay the tape to see if the recorder is recording properly. When this is finished, your college supervisor will begin the conference by saying "BEGIN CONFERENCE."

3. Report for your conference at the time and place designated by your college supervisor. Be sure you have with you the STUDENT TEACHER SELF ASSESSMENT form which can be found in this packet.

4. When the pre-conference begins, view the video tape with your college supervisor. After you both have viewed the tape, prepare the CONFERENCE AGENDA by writing down four (4) to six (6) statements you have regarding your teaching. Use the Student Teacher Self Assessment form for this purpose.

5. When the CONFERENCE PROPER begins, read your first statement when requested to do so. Preface each statement with the remark "My _________________ statement first, second, etc. is..." Use this preface for all the statements you initiate. Discuss this statement thoroughly with your college supervisor. Continue with this procedure until you have initiated and discussed four (4) to six (6) of your statements.
6. Near the end of the conference, your college supervisor will ask you to SUMMARIZE THE CONFERENCE. Summarize the conference by reiterating the main points discussed. The conference will conclude when your supervisor says "END CONFERENCE."

7. Your college supervisor will check the quality of the tape before you leave the conference room. If another conference needs to be re-scheduled due to a poor recording, your college supervisor will re-schedule another conference with you.

8. Turn in your list of statements to your college supervisor at the end of the conference.

THANK YOU FOR YOUR COOPERATION
APPENDIX G
SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL  
(Pilot Instrument)

The purpose of these instruments is to measure the meaning of certain concepts. These concepts are related to the conferences you have had with your college supervisor regarding your teaching. In reacting to the concept listed at the top of each page, please make your judgment on the basis of what that concept means to you.

Here is how you are to use each scale. If you feel that the concept listed at the top of the page is VERY CLOSELY RELATED to one end of the scale, you should place an X as follows:

MAN (This is the concept.)

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{fast} & \quad \text{X: } : \ : \ : \ : \ : \ : \ : \text{slow} \\
\text{fair} & \quad \text{X: } : \ : \ : \ : \ : \ : \text{unfair}
\end{align*}
\]

OR

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{fast} & \quad : \ : \ : \ : \ : \ : \ : \ : \text{X: } : \ : \ : \ : \ : \text{slow} \\
\text{fair} & \quad : \ : \ : \ : \ : \ : \text{X: } : \ : \ : \ : \ : \text{unfair}
\end{align*}
\]

If you feel that the concept is quite CLOSELY RELATED to one or the other end of the scale, you should place an X as follows:

MAN (This is the concept.)

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{fast} & \quad : \ : \ : \ : \ : \ : \text{X: } : \ : \ : \ : \ : \text{slow} \\
\text{fair} & \quad : \ : \ : \ : \ : \ : \text{X: } : \ : \ : \ : \ : \text{unfair}
\end{align*}
\]
If the concept seems only SLIGHTLY RELATED to one side as opposed to the other side, you should place an X as follows:

MAN (This is the concept.)

active __: ___: X: ___: ___: ___ passive

OR

active __: ___: ___: ___: X: ___: ___ passive

The direction toward which you check depends upon which of the two ends of the scale seem most characteristic of the concept you are judging.

If you consider the concept to be NEUTRAL or if the scale is COMPLETELY IRRELEVANT, then you should place your X in the middle space:

MAN (This is the concept.)
safe __: ___: ___: X: ___: ___: ___ unsafe

IMPORTANT:

1. Place your X's in the middle of the spaces, not on the boundaries:

__: ___: X: ___: ___: ___: X

2. Be sure you check each scale for each single concept--DO NOT OMIT ANY.

3. Never put more than one X on a single scale.

Sometimes you may feel as though you have had the same concepts on this instrument. This is not the case, so do not look
back and forth through these pages. Do not try to remember how you checked similar items earlier. Make each item a separate and independent judgment. Work at a fairly high rate of speed. DO NOT WORRY OR PUZZLE over individual choices. It is your first impressions, the immediate feelings about the concepts that we want. On the other hand, please do not be careless because we want your true impressions.
VIDEO TAPE

good ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___ bad
complete ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___ incomplete
cruel ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___ kind
pleasurable ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___ painful
beautiful ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___ ugly
unsuccessful ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___ successful
meaningful ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___ meaningless
important ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___ unimportant
negative ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___ positive
believing ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___ skeptical
wise ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___ foolish
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MINI TEACHING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>kind</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>believing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>meaningful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>incomplete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unsuccessful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>true</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pleasurable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>untimely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>graceful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sociable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>egotistical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>harmonious</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CONFERENCE PREPARATION

good ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___  bad
foolish ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___  wise
complete ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___  incomplete
false ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___  true
timely ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___  untimely
positive ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___  negative
egotistical ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___  altruistic
sociable ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___  unsociable
unimportant ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___  important
kind ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___  cruel
harmonious ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___  dissonant
awkward ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___  graceful
pleasurable ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___  painful
successful ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___  unsuccessful
meaningless ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___  meaningful
believing ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___  skeptical
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adj</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>good</td>
<td>get</td>
<td>go</td>
<td>com</td>
<td>ple</td>
<td>te</td>
<td>__</td>
<td></td>
<td>__</td>
<td></td>
<td>incomplete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>complete</td>
<td>__</td>
<td></td>
<td>__</td>
<td></td>
<td>__</td>
<td></td>
<td>__</td>
<td></td>
<td>__</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>timely</td>
<td>__</td>
<td></td>
<td>__</td>
<td></td>
<td>__</td>
<td></td>
<td>__</td>
<td></td>
<td>__</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unsociable</td>
<td>__</td>
<td></td>
<td>__</td>
<td></td>
<td>__</td>
<td></td>
<td>__</td>
<td></td>
<td>__</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kind</td>
<td>__</td>
<td></td>
<td>__</td>
<td></td>
<td>__</td>
<td></td>
<td>__</td>
<td></td>
<td>__</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>grateful</td>
<td>__</td>
<td></td>
<td>__</td>
<td></td>
<td>__</td>
<td></td>
<td>__</td>
<td></td>
<td>__</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dissonant</td>
<td>__</td>
<td></td>
<td>__</td>
<td></td>
<td>__</td>
<td></td>
<td>__</td>
<td></td>
<td>__</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>graceful</td>
<td>__</td>
<td></td>
<td>__</td>
<td></td>
<td>__</td>
<td></td>
<td>__</td>
<td></td>
<td>__</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pleasurable</td>
<td>__</td>
<td></td>
<td>__</td>
<td></td>
<td>__</td>
<td></td>
<td>__</td>
<td></td>
<td>__</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ugly</td>
<td>__</td>
<td></td>
<td>__</td>
<td></td>
<td>__</td>
<td></td>
<td>__</td>
<td></td>
<td>__</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>successful</td>
<td>__</td>
<td></td>
<td>__</td>
<td></td>
<td>__</td>
<td></td>
<td>__</td>
<td></td>
<td>__</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>meaningful</td>
<td>__</td>
<td></td>
<td>__</td>
<td></td>
<td>__</td>
<td></td>
<td>__</td>
<td></td>
<td>__</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unimportant</td>
<td>__</td>
<td></td>
<td>__</td>
<td></td>
<td>__</td>
<td></td>
<td>__</td>
<td></td>
<td>__</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>positive</td>
<td>__</td>
<td></td>
<td>__</td>
<td></td>
<td>__</td>
<td></td>
<td>__</td>
<td></td>
<td>__</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>believing</td>
<td>__</td>
<td></td>
<td>__</td>
<td></td>
<td>__</td>
<td></td>
<td>__</td>
<td></td>
<td>__</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wise</td>
<td>__</td>
<td></td>
<td>__</td>
<td></td>
<td>__</td>
<td></td>
<td>__</td>
<td></td>
<td>__</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# CONFERENCE SUMMARY

| good       | _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ | bad       |
| foolish    | _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ | wise      |
| complete   | _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ | incomplete|
| false      | _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ | true      |
| timely     | _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ | untimely  |
| positive   | _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ | negative  |
| egotistical| _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ | altruistic|
| sociable   | _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ | unsociable|
| unimportant| _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ | important |
| kind       | _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ | cruel     |
| harmonious | _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ | dissonant |
| awkward    | _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ | graceful  |
| pleasurable| _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ | painful   |
| successful | _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ | unsuccessful|
| meaningless| _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ | meaningful|
| believing  | _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ | skeptical |
CONCERNS DISCUSSED DURING THE CONFERENCE

good __: __: __: __: __: __: __: __ bad
incomplete __: __: __: __: __: __: __: __ complete
timely __: __: __: __: __: __: __: __ untimely
sociable __: __: __: __: __: __: __: __ unsociable
kind __: __: __: __: __: __: __: __ cruel
graceful __: __: __: __: __: __: __: __ awkward
pleasurable __: __: __: __: __: __: __: __ painful
unsuccessful __: __: __: __: __: __: __: __ successful
meaningful __: __: __: __: __: __: __: __ meaningless
important __: __: __: __: __: __: __: __ unimportant
foolish __: __: __: __: __: __: __: __ wise
harmonious __: __: __: __: __: __: __: __ dissonant
beautiful __: __: __: __: __: __: __: __ ugly
positive __: __: __: __: __: __: __: __ negative
## COMMUNICATION DURING THE CONFERENCE

| Good          | Bad       | Complete         | Incomplete | Untimely         | Timely   | Altruistic      | Egotistical | Sociable        | Unsocial | Cruel      | Kind     | Harmonious | Dissonant | Graceful | Awkward | Pleasurable | Painful | Successful | Unsuccessful | Meaningful | Meaningless | Important | Unimportant | True      | False     | Positive | Negative | Believing | Skeptical | Wise    | Foolish   |
|---------------|-----------|------------------|------------|------------------|----------|-----------------|------------|-----------------|----------|------------|----------|------------|-----------|----------|---------|------------|--------|------------|------------|-----------|------------|-----------|-----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|
REVISED SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL
PERSONAL QUESTIONNAIRE

(This questionnaire was used with the revised semantic differential.)

Please answer the statements printed below. Individual responses to these items and the items accompanying this form will be kept confidential.

BIOGRAPHICAL INFORMATION

1. Sex___________ 2. Age_______ 3. Year in School _______
4. Marital status ____________
5. Your approximate grade point average in education _______
6. Your approximate overall university grade point average ______
7. Did you enter the University of Dayton as a freshman? (yes - no) _______
8. Are you a transfer student to the University of Dayton? (yes - no) _______
9. Your academic minor ______________
10. Your birthplace (city & state) ________________________________
11. Your permanent address (city & state) _________________________
12. Circle type of socio-economic level of the community mentioned in Number 11. ( lower, middle, upper )
13. Circle type of community mentioned in Number 11. ( rural, inner city, suburban, outer city )
14. Approximate size of community mentioned in Number 11.

________________________

15. Occupation of father

________________________

16. Occupation of mother

________________________

17. Occupation of husband

________________________

18. Number of brothers _______ Their ages ________________

19. Number of sisters _______ Their ages ________________

STUDENT TEACHING INFORMATION

Please answer the following questions in relationship to your student teaching assignment.

1. Age of children you worked with ________

2. Number in class ________________

3. Approximate IQ span of children ________________

4. Type of school organization (graded, non graded, open space, departmental, etc.) ________________

5. Circle type of community where school is located
   ( rural, inner city, outer city, suburban )

6. Circle type of socio-economic level of community where school is located ( lower, middle, upper )

7. Did you participate in the 320 (reading and language arts) practicum? (yes - no) __________

8. Did you participate in the freshman practicum? (yes - no) __________
9. Before this term have you been video taped?
(yes - no) _________ How many times? _________

GENERAL DIRECTIONS

This packet contains measuring devices which we wish to use to gain information pertaining to the research project you participated in. All of you taught three mini lessons and all of you were video taped three times. Also, every student participated in a CONFERENCE with his college supervisor following each taping session. Each of the three CONFERENCES was audio taped.

Please think back to these CONFERENCES. ANSWER ALL OF THE ITEMS WITH RESPECT TO THESE THREE CONFERENCES.

Individual responses to these items and the items on this personal questionnaire will be kept confidential.

THANK YOU FOR YOUR KIND COOPERATION
SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL
(REvised)

The purpose of these attached forms is to measure the meaning of certain concepts. These concepts are related to the THREE AUDIO TAPED conferences you have had with your college supervisor regarding your teaching. In reacting to the concept listed at the top of each page, please make your judgment on the basis of what that concept means to you.

Here is how you are to use each scale. If you feel that the concept listed at the top of the page is VERY CLOSELY RELATED to one end of the scale, you should place an X as follows:

        MAN (This is the concept.)

fair

fair

If you feel that the concept is CLOSELY RELATED to one or the other end of the scale, you should place an X as follows:

        MAN (This is the concept.)

fast

fast
If the concept seems only SLIGHTLY RELATED to one side as opposed to the other side, you should place an X as follows:

MAN (This is the concept.)

active ______: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___ passive

OR

active ______: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___ passive

The direction toward which you check depends upon which of the two ends of the scale seem most characteristic of the concept you are judging.

If you consider the concept to be NEUTRAL or if the scale is COMPLETELY IRRELEVANT with respect to that concept, then you should place your X in the middle space:

MAN (This is the concept.)

safe ______: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___ unsafe

IMPORTANT:

1. Place your X's in the middle of the spaces, not on the boundaries:

This ______: ___: ___: ___: ___ Not this ______: ___: ___: ___

2. Be sure you check each scale for each single concept--DO NOT OMIT ANY.

3. Never put more than one X on a single scale.

Sometimes you may feel as though you have had the same concepts on this instrument. This is not the case, so do not look
back and forth through these pages. Do not try to remember how you checked similar items earlier. Make each item a separate and independent judgment. Work at a fairly high rate of speed. DO NOT WORRY OR PUZZLE over individual choices. It is your first impressions, the immediate feelings about the concepts that we want. On the other hand, please do not be careless because we want your true impressions.

THANK YOU FOR YOUR COOPERATION
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>bad</th>
<th>__: __: __: __: __: __: __</th>
<th>good</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>wise</td>
<td>__: __: __: __: __: __: __</td>
<td>foolish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>meaningful</td>
<td>__: __: __: __: __: __: __</td>
<td>meaningless</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>incomplete</td>
<td>__: __: __: __: __: __: __</td>
<td>complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tense</td>
<td>__: __: __: __: __: __: __</td>
<td>relaxed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unsuccessful</td>
<td>__: __: __: __: __: __: __</td>
<td>successful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>true</td>
<td>__: __: __: __: __: __: __</td>
<td>false</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pleasurable</td>
<td>__: __: __: __: __: __: __</td>
<td>painful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>untimely</td>
<td>__: __: __: __: __: __: __</td>
<td>timely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>graceful</td>
<td>__: __: __: __: __: __: __</td>
<td>awkward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>valuable</td>
<td>__: __: __: __: __: __: __</td>
<td>worthless</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>negative</td>
<td>__: __: __: __: __: __: __</td>
<td>positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>important</td>
<td>__: __: __: __: __: __: __</td>
<td>unimportant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>useless</td>
<td>__: __: __: __: __: __: __</td>
<td>useful</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
BEING VIDEO TAPED

## Preparing the Conference Agenda

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word</th>
<th>__: __: __: __: __: __: __: __</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>good</td>
<td></td>
<td>bad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>foolish</td>
<td></td>
<td>wise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>complete</td>
<td></td>
<td>incomplete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>useful</td>
<td></td>
<td>useless</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>timely</td>
<td></td>
<td>untimely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>positive</td>
<td></td>
<td>negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>worthless</td>
<td></td>
<td>valuable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sociable</td>
<td></td>
<td>unsociable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unimportant</td>
<td></td>
<td>important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kind</td>
<td></td>
<td>cruel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>harmonious</td>
<td></td>
<td>dissonant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pleasurable</td>
<td></td>
<td>painful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>successful</td>
<td></td>
<td>unsuccessful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>meaningless</td>
<td></td>
<td>meaningful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>believing</td>
<td></td>
<td>skeptical</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ITEMS (STATEMENTS) DISCUSSED DURING THE CONFERENCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Incomplete</th>
<th>Timely</th>
<th>Sociable</th>
<th>Useful</th>
<th>Unfair</th>
<th>Pleasurable</th>
<th>Unsuccessful</th>
<th>Meaningful</th>
<th>Important</th>
<th>Foolish</th>
<th>Valuable</th>
<th>Dishonest</th>
<th>Positive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
COMMUNICATION DURING THE CONFERENCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>word</th>
<th>good</th>
<th>incomplete</th>
<th>timely</th>
<th>useless</th>
<th>unsociable</th>
<th>kind</th>
<th>dissonant</th>
<th>awkward</th>
<th>painful</th>
<th>unsuccessful</th>
<th>meaningless</th>
<th>unimportant</th>
<th>false</th>
<th>negative</th>
<th>skeptical</th>
<th>foolish</th>
<th>valuable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: __</td>
<td>bad</td>
<td>___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___</td>
<td>incomplete</td>
<td>timely</td>
<td>useless</td>
<td>unsociable</td>
<td>kind</td>
<td>dissonant</td>
<td>awkward</td>
<td>painful</td>
<td>unsuccessful</td>
<td>meaningless</td>
<td>unimportant</td>
<td>false</td>
<td>negative</td>
<td>skeptical</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### SUMMARIZING THE CONFERENCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Bad</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Foolish</td>
<td>Wise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>Incomplete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>False</td>
<td>True</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timely</td>
<td>Untimely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>Negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Useless</td>
<td>Useful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociable</td>
<td>Unsociable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unimportant</td>
<td>Important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kind</td>
<td>Cruel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harmonious</td>
<td>Dissonant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awkward</td>
<td>Graceful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pleasurable</td>
<td>Painful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Successful</td>
<td>Unsuccessful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meaningless</td>
<td>Meaningful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Believing</td>
<td>Skeptical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valuable</td>
<td>Worthless</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Word</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>good</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>complete</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>timely</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unsociable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kind</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>grateful</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dissonant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>graceful</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pleasurable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>long</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>successful</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>meaningful</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unimportant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>positive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>believing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wise</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>useful</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>worthless</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tense</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bad</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>incomplete</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>untimely</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sociable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cruel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ungrateful</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>harmonious</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>awkward</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>painful</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>short</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unsuccessful</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>meaningless</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>important</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>negative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>skeptical</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>foolish</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>useless</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>valuable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>relaxed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DIRECTIONS: The questions below refer to the THREE AUDIO TAPED CONFERENCES YOU HAD WITH YOUR COLLEGE SUPERVISOR. Please keep this in mind when answering the questions printed below.

I. Do you feel that you learned about yourself and/or learned about teaching as a result of participating in the three audio taped conferences with your college supervisor? Please answer by stating YES or NO. _____________

II. If you answered yes to question one, please discuss what you feel you learned about yourself and/or what you learned about your teaching.

(Continue on the other side, if necessary.)

III. If you answered no to question one, please discuss why you feel you did not learn about yourself and/or learn about your teaching.

(Continue on the other side, if necessary.)
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