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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Field experience has historically been part of formal teacher training in the United States. However, this experience typically was limited to student teaching toward the end of the training process.

Ishler, Lee and Wilhoyte (1978) reported that The Ohio Standards for Colleges and Universities Preparing Teachers called for increased field experience. These experiences were to be planned, to begin in the freshman year, to be fully supervised, and total at least 300 clock hours (one academic term) prior to student teaching. With the increasing use of pre-service field experience, there seems to be an implicit assumption that such experiences will make a significant difference in the performance of entry-level teachers.

As one means of responding to the Ohio State Board of Education's Standards for Colleges and Universities Preparing Teachers, The Ohio State University designed and implemented a two-quarter, common, integrated introduction to teaching called Professional Introduction (hereafter referred to as PI). As stated in the Professional Introduction Proposal dated April 4, 1979:

The major purpose of this program is to introduce prospective teachers to concepts, skills, and problems that are common to teachers across subject matter fields and to provide experiences which help the prospective teacher to explore and understand
these constructs within the context of the real world of the school. The program is heavily oriented toward clinical and field experiences in which there is an integration of knowledge, attitude, and skill development through clinical and field experiences.

With the increasing demand for more and more field experiences as recommended by sources such as the Ohio Standards, and the implementation of more field experiences in programs such as PI, teacher educators must ask themselves what the nature of pre-service field experience should be, and if, in fact, it is an effective component of teacher training.

While there are several rationales for providing pre-service field experiences, this study assumed a position based on John Dewey's (1904) suggestion that the nature of the field experience provided for pre-service teacher candidates should be determined by the ultimate aim of the experience. The specific approach accepted for this study was the laboratory approach which, according to Dewey, is to "supply the intellectual method and material of good workmanship, and is the instrument in making real and vital theoretical instruction" (p. 2). In accepting this approach to determining field experiences, it was important to view teaching as a profession rather than semi-profession or technical occupation.

While teaching may not meet some of the criteria established for a full or mature profession (see Howsam, 1976, pp. 6-7 for a list), the actual act of teaching requires the teacher to assume the role of a professional.
As Cottrell (1956) said:

The effective teacher cannot act by pattern; what is appropriate with one individual or group will interfere with the learning of another. . . . must be competent to use sound educational principles in adjusting to the pupils and to the situation. (p. 147)

This agreed with Howsam's (1976) report that

[T]eachers are involved in constant decision making. Every moment has its uniqueness; every situation is in some ways different from every other. There is no index or craft-like answers available. . . . Teachers must draw upon what they have in professional insights and intervention strategies in order to decide how to help children learn. (p. 11)

Cottrell suggested that experiences for pre-service teacher candidates "should lead to the building of basic educational principles and their use in a variety of situations" (p. 156).

Howsam concluded:

In common with all professions, teaching is a decision-making and a decision-implementing process. . . . Implementing the strategy requires highly professional skills; no two learning cases are ever exactly the same. It is because each moment in the teacher's life means complex situations and new decisions that teachers must possess the knowledge, behaviors, attitudes, and skills required of the professional teaching act. (p. 36)

Due to the complexity and the constantly changing nature of the teaching process as illustrated above, teaching was viewed as a profession for the purposes of preparing the theoretical perspectives for this study.

The six propositions listed below to be considered when planning and implementing a field experience component were arrived at after a review of the literature on pre-service field experience. They were
principally based on the laboratory approach for training reflective professionals as presented by Dewey (1904). The six propositions are:

1. The field experience component should be an integral part of a total teacher training curriculum. Each experience provided for the teacher candidate should be cumulatively linked both to preceding and following experiences.

2. Each field experience should be an integral part of a formal course, closely coordinated and integrated for instructional purposes. Evaluation should be separate from the course content and based on growth and development of each teacher candidate. Use of reflection should be for growth and insight, not for purposes of critical evaluation.

3. Each field experience should consist of preparation, experience, and reflection. Adequate time must be allowed for each phase of an experience.

4. Field experiences should be based on the teacher candidates' own experiences. In order to accomplish this the teacher educator or individual responsible for implementation must know the needs, interests, capabilities, and past experiences of his teacher candidates. Each experience must be associated with the teacher candidates' past experiences and must stimulate a desire to seek new information.

5. The progression of experiences should be from observation to teaching. Experiences must be structured and have a purpose which the teacher candidate understands. Each experience should allow the teacher candidate to gain understanding of children, of the role of the teacher in the classroom, of the total school program, and of the interrelationship of school and community.

6. Guidance should be a cooperative venture of the university and the public schools.

In addition to the theoretical rationale discussed above, there are other rationales for including a field experience component in a teacher training program. One rationale would be external mandates
such as those imposed by a state department of education or an accreditation agency. These mandates appear to be motivated by political issues, societal pressures or tradition.

Another rationale rests on the belief that teaching is an art rather than a science and therefore only requires practice.

For the purposes of later discussions, these rationales will be referred to as 1) theoretical rationale, 2) externally mandated rationale, and 3) common sense rationale.

This study was initiated to examine the relationship of the field experience component of PI at The Ohio State University with the theoretical rationale described above.

Statement of the Problem

The nature of the experiences provided for pre-service teacher candidates in an actual school setting should be determined by the ultimate aim of the experiences. If the ultimate aim was in performing the skills associated with classroom teaching, the experiences would differ from those provided if the ultimate aim was intellectual reasoning. The PI Program at The Ohio State University had a role in the preparation of teacher candidates. It was important to determine what the ultimate aim of the program was and if the field experiences which were provided for the teacher candidates were consistent with the ultimate aim of the program. The questions considered included:

1. Was the field experience component of PI based on a particular theoretical model for pre-service field experience?
2. Was the rationale for the field experience component of PI established prior to designing the field experiences, or did the development proceed from a practical to a theoretical level because implementation and development were occurring simultaneously?

3. Did instructors, cooperating teachers and teacher candidates have common perceptions concerning the implementation of the field experience component of PI?

4. Were the stated objectives of the field experience component of PI being consistently met between the different sections?

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to examine theoretical perspectives for the implementation of pre-service field experience. Based on these perspectives an examination of the field experience component of the Professional Introduction, a pre-service, two-quarter, common, integrated introductory education course at The Ohio State University, was conducted. The study examined the theory, rationale, development and implementation of the field experience component of PI.

The aim of the study was to provide a more informed field experience component of PI.

Need and Significance

Flowers (1948) reported:

There is perhaps no phase of professional laboratory experiences where practices are more confused and more in need of study and experimentation than that of the experiences that should precede student teaching. (p. 139)
Examination of the current literature indicated that this statement would probably be equally relevant today, particularly with the increased use of pre-service field experience. As Zeithner (1980) said:

There is a great deal of confusion and contradiction surrounding the data which do exist on pre-service field-based experiences. . . . [F]rom a review of the literature it can be concluded that field-based experiences are neither all beneficial in their effects as the abundant testimonials and the increased emphasis on these experiences would lead us to believe; nor are they merely vehicles for adapting new personnel into existing patterns as many critics would have us believe. (p. 46)

Haberman (1978) questioned how to preserve the idealism of the beginners from the pragmatism of the practicing professional. Haberman suggested that

teacher education programs prepare students for the best of all non-existent worlds and then toss them into public schools where, quite frequently, the antithesis of everything the university program is trying to teach is an accepted, operating norm. (p. 8)

Haberman said the great challenge for teacher education is to develop experiences which make the teacher education student more realistic about classroom teachers' group norms and the school bureaucracy without simultaneously damaging the high expectations and ideals which beginners might hold in relation to their pupils. (p. 16)

These concerns emphasize the need for purposeful field experiences.

Henry (1977) reported, "Most critics and reformers still seem to feel that the period of actual field experience is the essence of any preparational program" (p. vi). Student teachers often report that
practical experiences are more beneficial to learning to teach than academic experience.

The challenge for teacher educators concerned with field experiences for pre-service teacher candidates would be to determine how best to provide field experiences which are beneficial to the teacher candidate.

From all the sources consulted it seemed that becoming a teacher was related to having a cognitive understanding of theory and its practical applications. Teacher candidates should not be sent into reality experiences if they have not been given any bases for understanding what happens to them there. If they are sent out without preparation, they will only learn what "works" (Dewey, 1904).

For these reasons it was necessary to examine the field component of Professional Introduction which, with Freshman Early Experience Program (FEEP) and student teaching, comprise core courses for the education teacher candidate at The Ohio State University.  

Assumptions, Delimitations

This study was confined to the field experience component of the Professional Introduction program at The Ohio State University, from its conception through Spring Quarter, 1981. The examination of the program during the 1980-1981 academic year was limited to the implementation phase as perceived by the instructors, cooperating teachers, and teacher candidates. Major development work was also occurring during that period. From serving on the staff, attending formal meetings and having informal conversations with staff members it would appear that the program has changed considerably based on the
1980-1981 development effort but that was not part of this dissertation. This study only examined the development that led to the program as it was implemented during the 1980-1981 academic year. This was not an analysis of the present program as it is currently being implemented.

An assumption of this study, as presented earlier, was that teaching is a profession, and programs of teacher education should be support for professionals rather than training the skill of teaching. While the literature contains much discussion concerning whether teaching has matured into a full profession, Denemark (1980) suggested that "many view teaching as a profession in terms of its social significance." Since the program being examined designated itself Professional Introduction (Researcher's emphasis), the assumption was made that teaching was viewed for the purposes of this program as a profession.

Definitions

Since terms related to field experience may be used in a unique way, the terms relevant to this proposed research are defined below. The definitions were from the Professional Introduction Instructor's Manual, 1980 Edition, College of Education, The Ohio State University.

Cooperating Teacher - Experienced teacher under whose guidance and in whose classroom the teacher candidate participates.

Field Experience - A teacher preparation experience that occurs away from the university classroom in a location that provides guided observation or interaction with either students or inservice personnel who are working with students.
**Professional Introduction Faculty** - Faculty recruited to develop and implement the Professional Introduction Program at The Ohio State University. While housed within various academic faculties, a percentage of their time each quarter was devoted to the Professional Introduction Program to provide consistency and stability.

**Professional Introduction Staff** - Other instructional staff, predominantly Teaching Associates, who were not part of the Professional Introduction Faculty as defined above.

**Instructor** - General term used to refer to the instructional staff in Professional Introduction, when it is not necessary to distinguish between the Professional Introduction Faculty and Professional Introduction Staff, as differentiated earlier.

**Teacher Candidate** - A student who, in the process of preparing to teach, spends part time in a classroom observing and teaching under the guidance of an experienced teacher.

**Director/Coordinator** - An individual having administrative and programmatic responsibility for the PI Program and answerable to someone on the Dean's staff.

**Organization of the Study**

Chapter One provided an overview of the problem under investigation. Chapter Two presents a review of the literature related to pre-service field experiences. Chapter Three describes the methodological techniques utilized in developing instruments for the study, data collection procedures followed, and analytical processes involved in interpreting the data. Chapter Four documents the findings obtained
through historical analysis and from the survey and interviews.

Chapter Five presents a summary of the study, interpretations, conclusions, recommendations and suggestions for further study.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE RELATED LITERATURE

This chapter will present a review of the literature related to pre-service field experiences. Materials for this review were gathered utilizing two ERIC Computerized Information Systems searches and manual examination of such standard reference sources as the Dissertation Abstracts International, the Education Index, Reader's Guide to Periodical Literature, Educational Abstracts and Current Index to Journals in Education, among others.

Overview

This presentation of literature on pre-service field experience began with a discussion of the theoretical and experimental information available on pre-service field experience. It then took a fairly comprehensive look at John Dewey's (1904) Model for field experience based on the ultimate aim of the experience. Within this model there was an examination of the apprenticeship approach where the aim is acquisition of skill, and the laboratory approach where the aim is to produce reflective professionals. Examination was also made concerning what constitutes an educative experience, in terms of Dewey's Model. A brief overview presented a look at the theory-practice gap and the artificial dichotomy that appears to exist. The literature reviewed seems to support the interrelationship of the two.
Next, the review examined the organization of field experiences and the importance of assuring that they are an integral part of the total program. This was followed by a look at the importance of each experience being a total experience. This means adequate time is provided for planning, experiencing and reflection. This was followed by a discussion on the importance of considering the teacher candidates' experience in planning experiences.

After this discussion, suggested principles and guidelines for field experiences were listed, followed by a description of the intent and contributions of early field experience programs. The value of a generic component in teacher education programs led into the description of the progression of activities in a program of field experience built on Dewey's concept of the laboratory approach. The chapter concludes with a list of six propositions the writer suggests should be considered when preparing field experiences.

**Pre-Service Field Experiences**

Examination of the literature related to pre-service field experience (see Definitions, p. 7) revealed that a variety of terms were used, and numerous experiences included under the concept of pre-service field experiences. Aichele (undated) referred to these experiences as pre-student teaching clinical experiences; Anderson (1976) as field-based pre-service teacher education; Andrews (1964) called them direct experience in teacher education; Barnett (1975), Elliott (1979), and Seiforth (1979) used the term early field experience; Coleman (1976), Ross and others (1980), and Wegner (1976) referred to them as experiential learning; Flowers (1948) spoke of direct experience and
professional laboratory experiences as did Haberman (1978); Hawk (1980) called them laboratory experiences; Mills (1979) used clinical-field experiences; Smith (1980) classroom experiences in the training laboratory; and Althof (1979), Ishler and others (1978), Heck (1977), Howsam (1976), and Lang (1975) used the term field experience.

The existence of theoretical or experimental support for the inclusion of a field experience component in preservice teacher training was questioned in the literature. Cottrell (1956) stated:

As in all professions, the preparation of teachers has proceeded from simple, intuitive practices to the highly organized and scientifically founded programs that are coming to characterize the modern college of teacher education. (p. 16)

Andrews (1964) said, "Indeed this whole area [field experience] has evolved largely under the impact of pragmatic pressures, rather than from any generally accepted theoretical base" (p. 14). Andrews (1964) continued:

Neither formal research nor theoretical statements give much assistance in identifying the effects of the use of direct experiences as an integral part of the teacher education curriculum. (p. 20)

Andrews (1964) related that a review of literature on student teaching in the last 75 years leads quickly to the conclusion that there is no comprehensive theoretical rationale for the contributions of student teaching and related direct experiences in the development of a professional teacher. (p. 30)

Elliott (1979) noted:

Curiously absent from the list of needs for early field experience is a need based on research that documents emphatically that it will produce better teachers. Unfortunately, nobody yet has been able
to prove completely that early or even late field experiences produce a better professional educator. (p. 9)

A common assumption regarding field experience was that the ultimate aim of the field experience determines the direction it should take. This can be traced back to the work of John Dewey. Andrews (1964) suggested:

Probably the most penetrating theoretical analysis of student teaching yet written—John Dewey's essay, "The Relation of Theory to Practice in Education" . . . differentiates clearly between experience for the development of skill and that for supporting the learning theory. (p. 31)

Dewey (1904) stated that theory and practice are related and that this is the key to learning to teach. He went on to suggest that the ultimate aim of the field experience determines the direction it should take. Dewey discussed two approaches to field experience with different aims. As described by Dewey, one approach was an apprenticeship approach where the aim immediately and ultimately was practical. This approach would be used to equip the teacher candidate with skill and proficiency in the work of teaching.

The second approach was the laboratory approach, which was more consistent with practical training for professionals in other fields. The immediate aim of the laboratory view, according to Dewey, was to "supply the intellectual method and material of good workmanship, and is the instrument in making real and vital theoretical instruction" (p. 2). Dewey went on to say that this approach

is administered primarily with reference to the intellectual reactions it incites, giving the student a better hold upon the educational significance of the subject matter he is acquiring
Dewey (1904) stated that

the aim of the laboratory concept is at control of intellectual methods required for personal and independent mastery of practical skill, rather than the turning out of masters of the craft. . . . [T]his necessarily involves considerable postponement of skill in the routine and technique of the profession until, [in this case, the teacher candidate after graduation begins teaching]. (p. 2)

Other professions, such as medicine, moved from the apprentice system to the laboratory system because of the amount of time available for training and the need for economy. Since there was limited time available for the training process, it was suggested that this time could best be used laying scientific foundations. Dewey said, "These foundations cannot be adequately secured while doing the actual work in a profession, but technical skill can be" (p. 3).

In addition, the university does not have the ability to furnish adequate conditions for the best acquisition and use of skill. For example, "In teacher training schools some of the most fundamentally significant features of the real school are reduced or eliminated" (Dewey, 1904, p. 4). Dewey continued:

In theory the principles of psychology, logic, and history of education are dominant; in practice, the moving forces are the devices and methods which are picked up through blind experimentation, through examples which are not rationalized, through precepts which are more or less arbitrary and mechanical, through advice based upon the experience of others. This leads to the formation of habits of work which have an empirical rather than a scientific sanction. (p. 11)
Based on the laboratory concept, practical work should be pursued primarily with reference to its reaction upon the teacher candidate in making him "a thoughtful and alert student of education, rather than to help him get immediate proficiency in the skills of teaching" (Dewey, 1904, p. 8).

Teacher educators should build on the teacher candidate's own experiences. This use of his experience would show the teacher candidate that there is no psychology of the classroom different from that of the other areas of life; otherwise the teacher candidate comes "unconsciously to assume that education in the classroom is a sort of unique thing having its own laws" (Dewey, 1904, p. 13).

Dewey's belief that all genuine education comes about through experience did not mean that all experiences are genuinely or equally educative. Education and experience cannot be directly equated with each other. In fact, Dewey said, "Any experience is mis-educative if it has the effect of arresting or distorting the growth of further experience" (Dewey, 1904, p. 14). Such an experience may "initially promote growth but it eventually leads to inflexibility and rigidity of mind" (Wegner, 1976, p. 43). If this occurs, then "the possibilities of having richer experiences in the future are restricted" (Dewey, 1904, p. 13).

An individual may have many experiences but unless each is connected to preceding experiences by common elements they may be so disconnected from one another that, while each is agreeable or even exciting in itself, they are not linked cumulatively to one another and are therefore of less value. (Dewey, 1904, p. 14)
A sense of direction is lacking when an individual does not cumulatively link his experiences.

Dewey (1904) emphasized that "Everything depends upon the quality of the experience which is had" (p. 16). Dewey contended that "the central problem of an education based upon experience is to select the kind of present experiences that live fruitfully and creatively in subsequent experiences" (p. 17).

Wegner (1976), after reviewing work of John Dewey, said, "An educative experience is one in which there is continuity, interaction, purpose, and reflection" (p. vi). He also suggested that "to provide the conditions for educative experiences, the educator must know the student, his needs, interests, capabilities, and past experiences" (p. vi).

Dewey (1904) said:

"Continuity of experience means that every experience both takes up something from those which have gone before and modifies in some way the quality of those which come after." (p. 26)

Wegner (1976) went on with Dewey's ideas and suggested:

"Prior to any decision concerning the appropriate conditions for an experience, educators must recognize and respond to two important factors. The educator must first become aware of the capabilities, needs and past experiences of the student. The second factor concerns student participation. An experience should be allowed time to run its course to completion." (p. 26)

Wegner (1976) continued:

"For the experience to be educative, the educator through guidance and direction arouses in the student a desire to search for more information." (p. 48)
While progressing from one situation to another, a common element must exist for the individual or thinking becomes confused. Practical activities improve an individual's ability to grasp meaning. (p. 51)

Dewey (1904) said:

An object or event becomes significant to an individual only when it is connected with his experiences. Associating current input with past experience results in the establishment of relations which are important to the acquisition of actual knowledge. Isolated and separate events are never objects of knowledge. The relationship that exists between these events is the essence of meaning. (p. 14)

Cottrell (1956) added to this discussion by Dewey and Wegner when he said:

Experience, as Dewey points out, is a continuum. Each experience both "takes up something from those which have gone before and modifies in some way those which come after." It is the central problem of education to provide educative experiences—those which contribute to further creative experiences judged desirable in terms of the needs of the individual and the social standards of the culture to which he belongs. These are experiences which include reflection upon the meaning of what is experienced and which increase ability to direct the course of subsequent activities so that desirable changes are brought about in both the individual and his environment. This selection [of experiences] depends both on the goals sought and on the nature of the learning process. (p. 62)

To assure the desired learning it must be an integral part of experiences which have or can have meaning for the student. The more closely learning experiences resemble the situations in which the learning will be used the more adequate they will be. (pp. 64-65)

Howsam (1976) said, "The professional view of teaching emphasizes its demanding complexities" (p. 80). He went on to say:

There is no magic in field experiences. Professional training is not significant simply because it is "out there." It is valuable only if it has been
carefully planned, interpreted, and linked with appropriate conceptual framework. (p. 93)

Cottrell (1956) said:

A spurious dichotomy seems to have grown up in the thinking of some educators in associating intellectual pursuits with vicarious experience and practical endeavors with direct experience. The fallacy of such a dichotomy is suggested by recalling that truly educative experiences require the intellectualizing of practical pursuits and vicarious experiences frequently deal with applied concepts. (p. 68)

Smith (1980) said that in pedagogical education "the acquisition of knowledge and the development of skills have tended to fall apart, one taught as 'theory' and the other as 'practice'" (p. 14). He went on to say:

When knowledge is understood it is clear that the path from knowledge to skills is continuous. . . . It is often asserted that there is no adequate knowledge base of pedagogical education and that the most effective and efficient mode of teacher preparation is an apprentice system conducted largely by teachers in the public schools. This position is herein rejected. (p. 4)

Smith (1980) concluded:

The skills of teaching cannot be acquired by formal courses in methods, or by uncontrolled experience in practice situations or by any other means than that of systematic and progressive training. (p. 85)

While the theoretical bases for practical experience in the training of teachers does not seem to have progressed significantly since the time of Dewey, there seems to be consensus on a program based on the laboratory concept proposed by Dewey if the program aim is to produce thinking, independently functioning professionals.

When organizing field experiences they must be an integral part of the total program. As Flowers (1948) stated, "Professional
laboratory experiences must be seen as an integral part of the program of pre-service education" (p. 40). Flowers went on to suggest that:

Greatest benefit is derived where laboratory experiences are coordinated with the total program . . . where guidance is a cooperative venture of college and laboratory teachers. (p. 83)

Tyler (1950) stated:

In attacking the problem of organization of learning experiences, very little theoretical structure has been developed and widely tested. (p. 46)

No matter how effective an individual learning experience may be, if it is not followed up in subsequent phases, it is not likely that significant changes will take place in the learner. (p. 47)

Smith (1975), Steinkellner (1977) and Seiforth (1979) agreed with the conclusion of Hawk (1980) when he reported Smith's (1970) suggestion that

The effectiveness of clinical experiences is largely determined by the extent to which they are an integral part of a comprehensive teacher education program. The program must be planned to clarify relationships and provide opportunities within the context of the total program. (p. 15)

Wirth (1966) said, "The task of teacher education requires one to conceptualize the kind of teacher he could hope to create, and to propose a program that might produce such a person" (p. 54). Not only does each field experience need to be considered in terms of the total curriculum, but in terms of providing a total experience. Just going into a field situation does not assure an educative experience.

Cottrell (1956) reported:

He [Dewey] insisted that the complete experience included purposing, planning, acting, and evaluating.
Thinking about the experience, relating it to past experiences, and interpreting its significance for future experiences are as much a part of the complete experience as the action itself. . . . Learning, in the broadest sense of the term, is essentially a process of experiencing and of reflecting upon the meaning of what is experienced. (p. 183)

Cottrell (1956) considered when to provide field experiences as he stated that there is a

. . . need to provide direct experience when the student does not have adequate previous contacts by which he can meaningfully interpret a new situation. . . . [D]irect experience is also needed when the student can thus be helped to see his needs more clearly or when he desires to test his ability to act in keeping with his developing concepts and skills. (p. 69)

He concluded that "experiences in professional education be those which have meaning for students and which help them to think vigorously about the continuing problems which all teachers face" (p. 156).

Wegner (1976) reported on Dewey's belief that the student should be the starting point in learning:

If the objective conditions are arranged meaningfully, the student will feel a need or desire to obtain the subject matter. (p. vi)

During an education of experience, the student is stimulated to interact with the environment. The environment or external conditions are arranged so that growth of the student is possible and so that this growth creates conditions for further growth. (p. vii)

Flowers (1948) summed up the general goals of a field experience program when he said they are

to help the student gain understanding of children, of the role of the teacher in the classroom, of the total school program, and of the interrelationship of school and community, and to provide for continuous professional growth of teachers in preparation. (p. 74)
suggest that greatest benefit is derived where laboratory experiences are coordinated with the total program, where guidance is a cooperative venture of college and laboratory teachers. Where the nature and extent of activities are determined by individual needs and abilities of students, and where evaluation is based on the growth and development of each student. (p. 83)

Flowers (1948) presented nine principles relevant to field experience programs. They are referenced frequently in the current literature on field experience education. These principles included:

Principle I: The particular contribution of professional laboratory experiences (including student teaching) to the education of the teachers is three-fold:

1. an opportunity to implement theory—both to study the pragmatic value of the theory and to check with the student his understanding of the theory in application;
2. a field of activity which, through raising questions and problems, helps the student to see his needs for further study; and
3. an opportunity to study with the student his ability to function effectively when guiding actual teaching-learning situations.

Principle II: The nature and extent of professional laboratory experiences should be planned in terms of the abilities and needs of the student and should be an integral part of the total program of guidance.

Principle III: Recognized individual differences in point of beginning laboratory experiences, in the nature of the experiences themselves, in their sequence, and in the length of time of continuing the activity.

Principle IV: The professional program should be so designed as to afford opportunity for responsible participation in all of the important phases of the teacher's activities, both in and out of school.

Principle V: Professional laboratory experiences should be cooperatively developed by the student and his advisors. Adequate supervision and guidance should be provided through cooperative efforts of laboratory and college teachers.
Principle VI: Professional laboratory experiences should be integrated with other phases of the student's program. . . .

Principle VII: Evaluation of professional laboratory experiences should be in terms of growth in understandings and abilities needed in the situations faced by the teacher working in our democracy. . . .

Principle VIII: Physical facilities should be adequate to provide a range of firsthand experiences with children, youth, and adults in varied school, home, and community situations. . . .

Principle IX: Professional laboratory experiences should be developed to recognize needed continuity in the preservice and in-service educational programs. . . .

(Althof, 1979) reviewed the literature on field experience education and produced some basic guidelines important to effective field experience instruction:

1. Both personal development and academic retention are enhanced through field experience. . . . (Quinn, 1972; Keeton, 1978)

2. Field experience activity should be determined by a student's current interests. . . . (Dewey, 1938)

3. Field experience should precede, coincide with and intervene between basic courses. . . . (Coleman, 1975)

4. Field experience should be problem- or task-oriented. . . . (Dewey, 1951)

5. Field experience curriculum should be structured to insure an appropriate continuum of personal support of basic skills and conceptual processes. . . . (Sanford, 1967)

6. Responsibilities should vary in complexity with a student's developmental advancement in both his formal curriculum and his experiences in the field.

7. Learning activities in the field experience program should be jointly determined by the field situation, the student's developmental level, and a placement activity to the student. . . . (Dewey, 1938)
8. Misalignment between the field experience setting and 
the student's cognitive level will advance, slow, halt, 
or regress a student's developmental progress. . . .
(Perry, 1970) (Flowers, 1948, p. 136)

Elliott (1979) stated that the intent of the program field expe-
rience is

to introduce students to career opportunities in 
education, to provide enough exposure to allow 
both the university and the student to determine 
whether teaching is an appropriate career choice, 
and to provide some initial experiences in the 
teaching-learning process. (p. 18)

Elliott (1979) continued:

With an early field experience program, the student 
has the opportunity to examine his personal ideas 
about schools and teaching in light of the reality 
of the situation. With early field experiences the 
preservice teacher can also more accurately deter-
mine the grade level and kinds of students he finds 
most interesting and appealing. (p. 18)

Andrews (1964) provided a very comprehensive list of contributions 
that field experiences make to the education of a teacher. These 
included:

1. Providing a basis for a personal decision to become 
a teacher.

2. Developing readiness for professional courses, profes-
sional experiences, professional growth, and for 
full-responsibility teaching.

3. Developing mature professional purposes and attitudes.

4. Strengthening understanding by exposure to reality 
which adds feeling and other sensory impressions to 
verbalized knowledge.

5. Providing an opportunity to acquire, use, and test 
information.

6. Developing professional understanding of concepts and 
thories from professional and related disciplines.
7. Developing skill in the use of professional techniques.

8. Developing insight and judgment in applying professional knowledge.

9. Providing a basis for evaluating professional, social, and personal growth.

10. Providing a feeling of significant personal worth, the satisfaction that comes from giving useful professional services. (pp. 23-24)

Denemark (1980) presented a case for extended programs of initial teacher preparation which would be generic in nature. This argument was very consistent with the rationale for a laboratory approach to field experience presented earlier and will help clarify this approach. Denemark suggested that the teacher education program must be generic in nature in order to prepare teachers to work effectively in a wide range of educational settings and "to utilize a broad array of instructional skills in responding to the different learning styles of many children" (p. 23). He suggested that

to do otherwise is to make teachers technicians trained in a narrowly prescribed band of procedures; rather than practitioners educated to develop an understanding of the underlying principles for the performance of skills. This way, practice can be modified to meet changed circumstances. (p. 23)

Denemark (1980) proposed a framework for the generic component of teacher training. The domains presented are primarily taken from a manuscript by Smith and Silberman (1979). Denemark pointed out that

the seven domains listed are not to be understood as courses but rather as dimensions of knowledge and skill essential to the professional teacher and subject to treatment at many points in the curriculum. (p. 25)
The domains include:

1. **Observation**: "The ability to observe a phenomenon objectively is one of the primary marks of a professional in any field. In a field that involves human beings, objective observation is especially important. It is a safeguard against biases of all sorts—racial, class, socioeconomic, ideological, and personal." (Smith and Silberman, 1979)

2. **Diagnosis**: Analysis of student abilities, learning difficulties, environmental conditions, and programs of instruction. (Smith and Silberman, 1979)

3. **Instructional Design and Collaborative Planning**: Understanding of different types of learning, skill in defining objectives and determining the sequence of instruction. Preparation of instructional programs, materials, and activities with recognition of the need to coordinate such efforts with colleagues. (Smith and Silberman, 1979)

4. **Instructional Management**: Of space, time, resources, processes of teaching, student conduct. With the possible exception of diagnosis, this is the domain in which more time must be devoted to training than any other. It is here that the perspective teacher must be disciplined in the skills of teaching and all the various aspects of classroom management. (Smith and Silberman, 1979)

5. **Communication**: Communication skills are central to relating not only to students but also to professional colleagues, parents and other community representatives. (Smith and Silberman, 1979)

6. **Evaluation**: Development of skills in the techniques of evaluating pupil progress and analyzing data related to diagnosis and planning of instruction. Also, development of skills in administering and interpreting standardized tests and designing valid, reliable measures of both formal and informal learning. (Smith and Silberman, 1979)

7. **Pedagogical Values**: This domain, like that of observation, permeates all of the other preparation categories. The central task of teacher education is to provide teachers with a philosophy of education that will help them to think seriously and continuously about the purposes and consequences of what they do. (Howsam et al., 1976, p. 89) (pp. 25-26)
Denemark (1980) concluded that there are a number of reasons for identifying common or generic competencies relevant to teaching. These included:

It encourages thinking about teaching less in a personal and particularistic sense and more in terms of broad common understanding. Teachers prepared in programs containing appropriate generic competency elements can communicate with colleagues more effectively, reinforce the efforts of other teachers, and make better use of the resources available for teacher preparation. (p. 26)

From an implementation perspective both Dewey (1904) and Smith (1980) agreed concerning the order and nature of experience. Both agreed that field experiences should be part of a formal course and be closely coordinated and integrated for instructional purposes. However, field experiences should be treated separately for purposes of evaluation and grading. Initial field experiences should be devoted primarily to the mastery of clinical knowledge and skills of observation. Smith (1980) said the experiences should begin with controlled observation in one of the training domains (see p. 22) and proceed to another until the total range of domains was completed. Dewey (1904) suggested:

Experience should begin with observation which allows the teacher candidate to observe with reference to seeing the interaction of "mind with mind." The teacher candidate needs to observe psychologically for personal insight and initiative rather than practically for imitation or to see what "works." (p. 14)

After psychological observation, practical observation will not tend to produce copiers. Properly prepared students will be able to convert practical observations to their psychological equivalents to know how and why something worked. . . . Only by beginning with the values and laws contained in the student's own
experience of his own mental growth, and by proceeding gradually to facts connected with other persons of whom he can know little, and by proceeding still more gradually to influence the mental operations of others, can educational theory be made most effective. (p. 14)

According to Smith (1980), in addition to the observation the teacher candidate should begin a brief introduction to actual teaching. He suggested that for the actual teaching:

The trainee may serve as a teacher of a small group; as a diagnostican working with one or two children who need special help, or as a tutor of one or more exceptional children . . . [with] progressive increase in the amount of responsibility until the student has complete responsibility for classwork or as nearly that as the training lab can allow. (p. 44)

Dewey (1904) described his thoughts on the progression after observation as follows:

After the psychological observation phase the teacher candidate needs consecutive and systematic exercise in the consideration of the subject matter of the elementary and high schools. Making isolated and independent lesson plans for a few days in a separate grade here or there is likely to be detrimental. What is needed is the habit of viewing the entire curriculum as a continuous growth, reflecting the growth of mind. (Dewey, p. 15)

After acquiring psychological insight and a good working acquaintance with educational problems, the teacher candidate can work as an assistant, which would enable the future teacher to make the transition from psychological and theoretical insight to the observation of the more technical points of classroom teaching and management. After assisting, teacher candidates could be given actual teaching with a maximum liberty—not closely supervised, nor minutely and immediately criticized upon either the content or the method of their teaching. There should be critical discussion regarding the results, with the work of the supervisor being directed at getting the student to judge his work critically. What is wanted is not technical skill but an awareness in the teacher candidate of what the educational development of a subject means and, in some typical case, command of a method
of control. After the above conditions are met, students who have gone through the stages already referred to should be ready for work of the apprenticeship type, [which could be compared to a traditional student teaching experience]. (p. 23)

Smith and Dewey differ on the point at which professional training should begin. Smith suggested that the student should complete his/her general education before beginning training in pedagogy during a fifth and sixth year of training. Dewey saw professional training as part of the total curriculum.

Summary

After reviewing the literature on pre-service field experiences, the writer suggests that the field experiences provided for pre-service teacher candidates should be based on the ultimate aim of the training program. The theoretical perspectives for this study suggest that the ultimate aim of a field experience program should be on producing professionals who are able to deal with the complexities of the teaching-learning process, and the moment to moment decision making that is constantly occurring in the classroom. In order to produce teachers who are thinking, who demonstrate continued independent growth as professionals, while mastering the skills of the Profession it will be proposed that training programs need to be based on John Dewey's laboratory approach where teachers in training are taught to be reflective. This reflective process allows the teacher candidate to develop an understanding of the underlying principles for the performance of skills. In this way practice can be modified to meet changing circumstances.
Given these perspectives the writer would like to suggest six propositions which should be given consideration when planning and implementing a field experience component based on the laboratory concept for training reflective professionals.

1. The field experience component should be an integral part of a total teacher training curriculum. Each experience provided for the teacher candidate should be cumulatively linked both to preceding and following experiences.

2. Each field experience should be an integral part of a formal course, closely coordinated and integrated for instructional purposes. Evaluation should be separate from the course content and based on growth and development of each teacher candidate. Use of reflection should be for growth and insight, not for purposes of critical evaluation.

3. Each field experience should consist of preparation, experience, and reflection. Adequate time must be allowed for each phase of an experience.

4. Field experiences should be based on the teacher candidates' own experiences. In order to accomplish this the teacher educator or individual responsible for implementation must know the needs, interests, capabilities, and past experiences of his teacher candidates. Each experience must be associated with the teacher candidates' past experiences and must stimulate a desire to seek new information.

5. The progression of experiences should be from observation to teaching. Experiences must be structured and have a purpose which the teacher candidate understands. Each experience should allow the teacher candidate to gain understanding of children, of the role of the teacher in the classroom, of the total school program, and of the interrelationship of school and community.

6. Guidance should be a cooperative venture of the university and the public schools.

Chapter III will examine the writer's role as participant as well as observer in the Professional Introduction Program at various times.
during the 1980-1981 academic year. This will be followed by an examination of the methodology and procedures used to examine the questions presented in Chapter I.
CHAPTER III

METHODS AND PROCEDURES

This study was primarily descriptive in nature. Its findings are intended to provide a better informed field experience component for the Professional Introduction Program.

The PI Program from its conception through its experimental cycles to its status as approved courses has been complex and in a state of change. The participants at each stage have been many and varied, the perspectives multiple and changing. Curriculum development, implementation, and revision occurred almost simultaneously. The end goals were difficult to specify, and were continually being clarified and refined.

The intent of this study was to capture and describe this dynamic process and to gain insight into the thoughts and actions of the individuals who conceived, developed, and implemented the field experience component of PI.

Researcher's Role: Participant Observer

Since the researcher was a complete participant in the Professional Introduction field experience component and later became an observer of the experience, it became necessary to explain that role as it affected this study. As Mooney (1975) said,

There is no escaping one's self in observing, generalizing, thinking, imagining, proving, testing, dreaming, sleeping—in any act of one's own experiencing. The self is central and though one may be
privileged to speak of goings-on at places not present to him, he is not privileged to deny that it was he who spoke. The world a man knows is a world created within his own experience and not apart from it. (p. 192)

Mooney continued: "Rather than scorn feelings and imaginings, the productive researcher gives these aspects of himself a full and challenging place." (p. 194)

It would be impossible to ignore the researcher's role in the program being examined so it is necessary to describe and clarify that role and therefore keep it in perspective.

The researcher's overall role can probably best be described as participant observation which McCall and Simmons (1969) said is not a single method but rather a characteristic style of research which makes use of a number of methods and techniques—observation, informant interviewing, document analysis, respondent interviewing, and participation with self analysis. (Preface)

Pelto (1978) added:

Since field work observations generally consist of complex mixtures of interviewing and direct observation laced with variable quantities of more specialized procedures, it is frequently impossible to separate data that are operationalized in the forms of informants' statements from those that were based on the anthropologist's direct observation. (p. 43)

Pelto continued:

[I]t is difficult to overestimate the importance of the information that the anthropologist accumulates through direct participation. . . . The relatively unsystematized scanning of information through participant observation is basic to all the other, more refined techniques. (p. 69)

The researcher was a member of the instructional staff for Professional Introduction during the 1980-1981 academic year. During
the Autumn and Winter quarters the researcher served as a teaching associate for a section of Education 450, which is the first quarter of the course sequence. In that capacity the researcher met with teacher candidates three days a week during Autumn Quarter and four days a week during Winter Quarter in a classroom setting. In addition, as the class instructor the researcher was responsible for supervising the field experience component of the course. This meant contact with the cooperating teachers with whom the teacher candidates worked. This basically consisted of individual meetings with the teachers on the day of field experiences. The researcher also remained in the building after each field assignment to be available for questions or concerns from the cooperating teachers. One formal meeting was conducted with the teachers at the school Autumn Quarter who had expressed concerns about the field assignments. In addition to this contact with teacher candidates and cooperating teachers there was a staff meeting with the instructional staff each week for two hours. During this period, in addition to the formal contacts described above the researcher had daily informal contact with members of the instructional staff in the office, at informal lunches and coffee breaks.

Toward the end of the Winter Quarter a decision was made to examine the field experience component of this program for several reasons. One was an interest in pre-service field experiences, second was the concerns generated by the cooperating teachers and teacher candidates with whom the researcher had worked in the role of instructor.
When staffing assignments were being made for Spring Quarter there was a drop in enrollment in the course due to a change or enforcement of policy concerning prerequisites for taking PI. This drop in enrollment left part of the PI staff free to do what became known as development work, and the researcher was assigned to the subgroup called the PI Development Staff which met every week. Each person in this group examined some aspect of the program. The researcher, with permission from the director of the program, decided to examine the field experience component as part of her assignment. The other part of the assignment included working with the Field Development Grant which meant that the researcher met with 15 cooperating teachers in one of the PI field sites.

At this point the researcher had worked with four sections of cooperating teachers, two as course instructor and two with the Field Development Grant; two sections of teacher candidates as their instructor, and one section by supervising a field assignment for another instructor who was attending a conference.

In addition to these sources of information concerning the PI field experience which resulted from direct participation with the staff, cooperating teachers and teacher candidates, after formally assuming the role of researcher of the field experience component of the program the researcher established more formal data collection procedures which are described in detail in the following sections of this chapter.

The researcher has attempted to minimize the dangers of being too close to the population being examined by using various data
gathering techniques. The researcher also tried to use previous training in objective observation to remain as neutral as possible when reporting the findings. However, the insights gained by being a participant should be considered valuable when interpreting the results.

Two approaches were used to examine the questions being considered. First, historical analysis was used to examine the rationale and the development of the field experience component of PI. Second, a questionnaire and interviews were used to examine the current implementation of the program from the perspectives of the role groups involved.

The results of the historical analysis, and questionnaires and interviews were examined in relation to the rationales for providing field experiences discussed in Chapter I. In addition, the questionnaires and interviews were used to obtain recommendations for modifying the field experience component of PI.

**Historical Analysis of the Rationale and Development of the Professional Introduction Field Experience**

**Design**

Historical analysis was used to examine the following questions posed on pages 5 and 6 of this document.

1. Was the field experience component of PI based on a particular theoretical model for pre-service field experience?

2. Was the rationale for the field experience component of PI established prior to designing the field experiences, or did the development proceed from a
practical to a theoretical level because implementation and development were occurring simultaneously?

Procedure and Data Collection

To assess the original rationale for the field experience component of PI, events which impacted the development were identified. This began with an examination of the College of Education's attempt to come into compliance with the State of Ohio's Standards for Colleges and Universities Preparing Teachers, which called for field experience prior to student teaching. In response to the new state standards, TERAC (Teacher Education Redesign Advisory Committee) and other committees were formed to, among other things, examine the undergraduate education program at The Ohio State University.

Minutes from meetings, reports, and inter-member memos from individuals involved in the events related to the conceptualization and implementation of PI were secured. Interviews were conducted with university staff involved in the pre-planning and planning phases of PI concerning the original guidelines regarding the program with particular emphasis given to the field experience component. These interviews included the associate dean responsible for program development, former directors of the program, selected members of the planning committees such as TERAC, and the PI Faculty who were hired specifically to develop and implement the program. These interviews were conducted by the researcher and were tape recorded. These tapes were confidentially transcribed and the data subjected to historical analysis.
**Analysis**

After source materials were collected they were evaluated to determine which were primary sources; these include "the testimony of able eye and ear witnesses to past events, and actual objects used in the past that can be examined directly" (VanDalen, p. 179), and which were secondary sources including "information provided by a person who did not directly observe the event, object or condition" (VanDalen, p. 179). The source materials were then subjected to external criticism to establish the validity of the document. This was used to determine if the source was genuine, authentic, and what it seemed to be, therefore determining whether it was admissible as evidence. The second phase of the critical evaluation was internal criticism to establish the meaning and trustworthiness of the data within the document. Cross-referencing of sources and examination of responses during interviews were used to provide internal validity of content.

After establishing authenticity of the material, synthesis of the information occurred. Central ideas or concepts were pulled together and continuity between them developed (Wiersma, 1980, pp. 176-186). Since the development of PI occurred over several years, chronological ordering was used. The results of this historical analysis are reported in Part 1 of Chapter IV, and a discussion of how they related to the theoretical perspectives as outlined on page 31 of this document is presented in Chapter V.
Examination of the Current Implementation of the Professional Introduction Field Experience

Design

Qualitative techniques were used to examine the following questions which were posed on Page 6 of this document:

3. Did instructors, cooperating teachers and teacher candidates have common perceptions concerning the implementation of the field experience component of PI?

4. Were the stated objectives of the field experience component of PI being consistently met between the different sections?

Procedure and Data Selection

The Survey Sample. This study sought to obtain responses from selected instructional staff members, Ed. 450 cooperating teachers (those involved in the first quarter of PI for the elementary field experiences), Ed. 451 cooperating teachers (those involved in the second quarter of PI for the middle school experiences), and teacher candidates associated with the Professional Introduction Program during the 1980-1981 academic year.

All members of the instructional staff for the 1980-1981 academic year were mailed a questionnaire and asked for an interview. Fifteen individuals returned the questionnaires and 17 individuals were interviewed. One person returned the questionnaire but was unable to schedule an interview. Three were interviewed but did not return the questionnaire. Only one staff member did not participate at all and this was due to demands on his/her time rather than being related to the study.
Education 450 and 451 cooperating teachers used in the study were randomly selected from those who had participated at least one quarter during the 1980-1981 academic year. The Ed. 450 sample included a 15% sample of 171. The total sample included 25 persons, 12% of whom were selected for follow-up interviews. The Ed. 451 sample included a 12% sample of 219. The total sample included 25 persons, 12% of whom were selected for follow-up interviews. Those indicating a willingness to be interviewed included 33% of the Ed. 450 respondents and 72% of the Ed. 451 respondents.

Teacher candidates used in the study were randomly selected from a list containing all teacher candidates who had completed their PI sequence under the 1980 edition of the PI Instructor's Manual. The sample included a 15% sample of 324. The total sample included 50 persons, 10% of whom were selected for follow-up interviews. Sixty percent (60%) of the 25 respondents indicated a willingness to be interviewed.

Identifying the survey sample was different for each role group. For the instructional staff, staffing assignments for each quarter were examined. For those personnel who were employed by PI during Spring Quarter 1981, the survey packets were placed in their staff mailbox in 210 Ramseyer Hall. For those not employed during the Spring Quarter by PI, the survey packets were sent to their home addresses.

A list of Ed. 450 cooperating teachers who had served at least one quarter during the 1980-1981 academic year was drawn up. The list was numbered and a random sample selected using a table of random numbers found in Kerlinger (1973, pp. 714-717). After the sample had been
selected addresses and phone numbers were recorded from those on file in the PI field placement records. The same procedure was used to identify the Ed. 451 cooperating teacher sample.

The teacher candidates who took Ed. 450 during the Autumn Quarter 1980 or Winter Quarter 1981 were identified. The names on the list were numbered and a random sample selected using a table of random numbers found in Kerlinger (1973, pp. 714-717). After selecting the sample, the Ed. 451 rosters were examined to determine if the PI teacher candidate had completed the sequence. Three teacher candidates had not completed the sequence, so using the above list and random table, three additional teacher candidates were selected who had completed the sequence. Following this identification of respondents, addresses and phone numbers were secured using the PI field placement records.

Instrument Development. Two instruments were used to obtain data on the current implementation of the field experience component of PI from the perspectives of the instructional staff, the cooperating teachers and the teacher candidates: 1) a questionnaire and 2) an interview schedule.

The objectives associated with the field component of PI at The Ohio State University were identified from the 1980 edition of the PI Instructor's Manual. After identifying each objective, a survey was designed based on the identified objectives. Criteria considered in the instrument design process were: 1) completeness; 2) clarity of content; and 3) appropriate response mode. An attempt was made to satisfy the criteria by having the PI staff members assigned to
The questionnaire which resulted was piloted during Spring Quarter, 1981, with cooperating teachers who were part of a cooperative program called the Field Development Grant, and a random group of teacher candidates. The respondents were asked to complete the questionnaire and provide feedback on any inconsistencies and ambiguities. Their feedback was used to revise the instrument which was administered for the study.

Specific processes followed in designing the questionnaire and interview schedule are discussed below under separate headings. The Questionnaire: In designing the questionnaire, objectives for each field experience in PI were identified from the 1980 edition of the PI Instructor's Manual. The objectives identified were of two types: 1) experience specific objectives, such as preparing a sociogram, examining a text for its readability level, or charting a teacher's
movement; and 2) general objectives, including becoming skilled in the
techniques of observation, and planning and teaching lessons at an
elementary and secondary level.

The questionnaire had three forms: one for PI instructors, one
for cooperating teachers and one for teacher candidates (see Appen­
dixes B, D and E). The questionnaires contained three sections. The
first section requested information relevant to a participant's role
group and varied with each form. The second section listed the objec­
tives and asked whether each objective was required or not; this section
was the same for each group and used a closed form of question. The
final section contained open form questions and asked for short answers
on changes regarding the field experiences, including additions or
deletions. This section was basically the same on all three forms even
though the wording varied slightly due to participants' roles in either
assigning, performing or observing an activity.

The questionnaires were designed to assess the perceptions of the
three role groups in accomplishing the stated objectives. The ques­
tionnaire was completed at the discretion of the subjects; there was
no monitoring of subjects completing the questionnaire. The question­
aire was mailed with a cover letter written to provide respondents
with an overview of the general purpose and importance of the study
and to enlist their candid and prompt response. A copy of the cover
letters can be found in Appendixes A, C, and E, and a copy of each
role group's questionnaire can be found in Appendixes B, D, and F.
The Interviews. In designing the interview schedules for this study the nature of the problem including its background, possible applications of results, and reasons for using the interview method were considered. The basic reason for using the interview was to gather additional information for the study which could not be obtained adequately by questionnaire or examination of documents.

The interviews were designed to obtain detailed data on the field experience component of the PI Program at The Ohio State University. In addition, recommendations for improving the program were sought.

The basic steps used in developing the interview phase of the study included: 1) selecting a sample; 2) designing the interview schedule; 3) interviewing; 4) recording the data; 5) transcribing the data; and 6) analyzing the results.

Seventeen members of the instructional staff of PI during the 1980-81 academic year were interviewed. Two staff members were unable to schedule an interview due to other commitments during the period interviews were being conducted. Three Ed. 450 cooperating teachers and three Ed. 451 cooperating teachers selected at random from those indicating a willingness to be interviewed on their returned questionnaires were interviewed. Five teacher candidates selected at random from those indicating a willingness to be interviewed on their returned questionnaires were interviewed.

The completed interview schedule consisted of open-ended questions centered around the objectives for each field experience. These interview schedules, while similar, varied with each role group. A copy of
the interview schedules for each role group can be found in Appendixes G, H, and I.

Data Collection: Dissemination and Retrieval of Questionnaires

The questionnaire development process required several draftings before the final form was completed. Each draft was reviewed and critiqued by selected members of the researcher's doctoral committee and selected members of the PI staff working on development activities during the Spring of 1981. The final preliminary draft was piloted on a group of cooperating teachers participating in a cooperative program called the Field Development Grant, and a random group of teacher candidates. Respondents in the piloted sample were instructed to read the items included in the questionnaire and to respond to them as if they were the actual subjects; then they were asked to provide oral and written suggestions for revising the instrument.

The data obtained from the piloted sample revealed little difficulty in responding to items included in the questionnaire. The participants did recommend minor changes in the wording of several objectives and in the directions for clarity.

The questionnaires were numbered and a list of participants kept which corresponded to the number on the form. This was done for the purposes of follow-up only. The names of the respondents were not used for any purpose.

Questionnaire packets were mailed to the survey samples identified. The packets contained a cover letter introducing the study, a questionnaire, and a self-addressed stamped envelope for returning the questionnaire.
As questionnaires from respondents were received, they were identified by the numbers placed on the back of each instrument and immediately checked off the list containing the names of survey participants. If packets were returned as undeliverable, correct addresses were sought from the Columbus telephone directory, the Ohio State University student directory, and personal contacts. Those persons for whom correct addresses were located were remailed the questionnaire packets. Addresses for five teacher candidates could not be located.

After two weeks a follow-up by personal contact was made with the instructional staff. Eighty percent (80%) of the instructional staff returned the completed questionnaires.

A review of the questionnaires which had been received revealed that 36% of the questionnaires for Ed. 450 cooperating teachers had been received. A follow-up telephone campaign to the non-respondents was conducted. Persons who asked for new copies of the questionnaire received them along with a stamped return envelope. Of those returning their questionnaire, 33% agreed to be interviewed.

A review of the questionnaires which had been received revealed that 48% of the questionnaires for Ed. 451 cooperating teachers had been received. A follow-up telephone campaign to the non-respondents was conducted. Persons who asked for new copies of the questionnaire received them along with a stamped return envelope. Of those returning their questionnaire, 72% agreed to be interviewed.
A review of the questionnaires which had been received revealed that 56% of the questionnaires from teacher candidates had been received. This was based on 45 delivered questionnaires, since 5 packets were returned as undeliverable and neither addresses nor phone numbers could be located. A follow-up telephone campaign to the non-respondents was conducted. Persons who asked for new copies of the questionnaire received them along with a stamped return envelope. Of those returning their questionnaire, 60% agreed to be interviewed.

As of the final deadline, a total of 80% of the instructional staff had responded, 60% of Ed. 450 and 72% of Ed. 451 cooperating teachers had responded, and 56% of the teacher candidates responded. A table indicating the figures is included in this chapter.

Part 2 of the questionnaire was analyzed using the Statistical Analysis System. The comments to open-ended questions were then synthesized and typed.

**TABLE 1**

| Number and Percent of Surveys Returned from Three Role Groups Contained in Sample |
|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|
|                                  | Included in Original Sample       | Returned Completed Surveys        |
|                                  | N      | %    | N      | %    |
| Instructional Staff             |        |      |        |      |
| Ed. 450                         | 25     | 15   | 15     | 60   |
| Cooperating Teachers            |        |      |        |      |
| Ed. 451                         | 25     | 12   | 18     | 72   |
| Teacher Candidates              | 50     | 15   | 25     | 56   |
| TOTALS                           | 119    |      | 73     |      |
**Data Collection: The Interview Schedule**

Interviews with the instructional staff were conducted between April and June 1981. Seventeen persons on the staff were interviewed but two were unable to be interviewed due to other commitments.

Interviews were conducted with cooperating teachers in September 1981. Three cooperating teachers from Ed. 450 and three from Ed. 451 were selected for the interview.

Interviews were conducted with the teacher candidates in August 1981. Five teacher candidates were selected for interviewing.

Interviews were conducted by the researcher and were tape recorded. The recordings were transcribed and responses were categorized as they applied to the questions contained in the interview schedule.

**Processing, Analyzing, and Reporting the Data**

Data obtained through the questionnaires were grouped according to role group. The researcher, with the aid of consultants from the statistics lab at The Ohio State University, coded the data for computer analysis and a trained computer technician key punched the data. After the key punching was verified, the data were analyzed using the Statistical Analysis System (SAS).

The SAS yielded both basic descriptive data (frequencies and percents) and an Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) of the variables under investigation. This was followed up with a Duncan's Multiple Range Test for Variable Y.

Distributional characteristics of the sample were obtained, i.e., number and percent of each role group's response to each question; the mean for each question by role group. In addition, an ANOVA was
computed to determine whether the responses of the subjects differed significantly in relation to their role group. Duncan's Multiple Range Test for Variable Y was used to determine where significant differences occurred.

Tables included in the document show through descriptive data (frequencies and percents) the responses of the sample (by role group) regarding their perceptions of accomplishing each of the 20 objectives represented in the questionnaire. An ANOVA table and Duncan's Multiple Range Test for Variable Y are also included to show significant differences in the responses of subjects. For purposes of analysis in this section the 20 questions for each role group were averaged to yield a total response to the field experience component as indicated by perceptions regarding each experience.

The data contained in the tables are discussed in the text of Chapter Four.

Selected interview data (both positive and negative) frequently occurring and supportive of questionnaire data were reported under the categorical headings listed in the questionnaire. These included:
1) additional field assignments currently being performed which are not listed in the manual; 2) field assignments which should be deleted; 3) modifications to existing field assignments; 4) additions to existing field assignments; 5) least productive (useful) aspect of the field component of PI; 6) most valuable aspect of the field experience; and 7) additional comments, recommendations or suggestions.

Questionnaire data obtained in the open ended questions was synthesized and reported as a response to each question. The
synthesized responses were prioritized and are contained in Appendix O. A summary of the responses is reported in Chapter IV, with interpretation in Chapter V.

The results reported in Chapter IV concerning the implementation of the program will be examined in relation to the theoretical perspectives outlined on page 31 of this document, in Chapter V.

Summary

This chapter provided researcher's role in this study, the procedures for the historical analysis, subject selection, validation of the questionnaire, design of the interview schedule, collecting the data from the role groups, and analyzing the data for this descriptive study to determine the development and perceptions of the role groups concerning the implementation of the Professional Introduction field experience component.

Chapter IV will present the results of the study with summary comments.
CHAPTER IV

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The first three chapters of this document stated the problem under investigation, related the purpose and conceptual framework of the study, and explained the procedures followed in conducting the study. This chapter presents the results of the investigation.

The data for the first section of this chapter were obtained through examination of documents related to the conceptualization, development, and implementation of the field experience component of the Professional Introduction Program. In addition, interviews were conducted with key individuals involved in this process. This historical development of PI is subdivided into several sections. Two tables have been prepared to provide clarity. The first of these two tables (Table 2) provides information on the planning phase of PI and on the experimental cycles before PI was approved as a course. The time frame was Autumn Quarter 1976 through Spring Quarter 1979. The second table (Table 3, p. 62) provides information on the PI Program after it was an approved course. This was from Autumn Quarter 1979 through Spring Quarter 1981, when this study ended.

The data for the second section of this chapter were obtained through the use of a questionnaire and interviews.
## TABLE 2
Planning and Experimental Phases of Professional Introduction at The Ohio State University

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>494A</th>
<th>494B</th>
<th>General Conditions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cycle</td>
<td>Section(s)</td>
<td>PI Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autumn 1976</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autumn 1977</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winter 1978</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 1978</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autumn 1978</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winter 1979</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 1979</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* I = Integrated Approach  
† C = Combination large group lectures, small group labs and field studies.

- TERAC (Teacher Education Redesign Advisory Committee) formed; 7 faculty members including first two directors of PI.
- TERAC charged PI Planning Team with developing PI (September 1977).
- 3 experimental cycles for PI approved by Senate (December 1977).
- PI Planning Team refined the content, selected and developed instructional activities and recruited students.
- 1st director of PI resigned (chaired PI Planning Team).
- The PI Faculty (5) joined the staff.
- New Associate Dean joined staff.
- TA coordinating instruction.
- TA coordinating field experiences.
- PI Advisory Committee formed.
- May 23, 1979, 494A and 494B were approved by the College of Education Senate and given course numbers Education 450 and Education 451.
Historical Analysis of the Rationale and Development of Professional Introduction Field Experiences


The Ohio State Board of Education adopted State Standards for Colleges and Universities Preparing Teachers (EDb-303) on December 9, 1974. The teacher training institutions affected by these new standards were to be in compliance by July 1, 1980.

Several sections of the State Standards are directly relevant to the field experience component of the Professional Introduction. These include:

EDb-303-01 Organization

(F) Relationships shall be established between the college or university preparing teachers and approved or chartered schools or school districts for the purpose of providing teacher education students with field-based experiences; and shall be formulated with written agreements when requested by either party, which shall include mutually agreed upon: (1) activities, services, and compensation; (2) roles and responsibilities; (3) provisions for solving problems and the coordination of ongoing activities; (4) means revisions to meet changing needs and conditions; and (5) professional development programs for persons involved in the preparation of teachers. Experiences and objectives shall be jointly developed, with consideration of recognized professional guidelines, by representatives of approved or chartered schools or school districts, including administrators, supervisors and teachers; the college or university preparing teachers; and teacher education students.

EDb-303-02 Curriculum

(D) Each teacher education student shall satisfactorily participate in a series of carefully planned, supervised, and evaluated field-based experiences for which specific learning objectives have been set to assure increasing proficiency in performing the various teaching responsibilities under actual school conditions. Experiences and objectives shall be jointly developed among representatives of approved or chartered schools or school districts, including
administrators, supervisors and teachers; the college or university preparing teachers; and teacher education students. Field-based experiences shall be completed in a variety of urban and suburban or rural settings. Field-based experiences shall include at least one full quarter of student teaching.

(E) The clinical and field-based experiences for teacher education students shall be: (1) an integral part of the teacher education curriculum, commencing early therein and continuing in a sequential manner; (2) related to school-age youth; and (3) equivalent in time to one full quarter in addition to the student teaching experience as specified in Part D of this standard.

(F) A complete description of the teacher education curriculum for each field—including but not limited to, the sequential learning needed within the body of knowledge, skills, attitudes, and values as identified through instructional objectives and syllabus for each course, clinical experience, and field-based experience therein, together with the identification and specification of essential prerequisites—shall be submitted to the State Department of Education for approval at least every five years, or sooner if revisions are desired therein.

In responding to the Standards related to field-based experiences for teacher education students, The College of Education at The Ohio State University, in its "Phase One Report" dated May 1, 1976, stated its rationale as follows:

Field-based experiences provide the teacher education students a natural setting in which they can further study and examine critically their developing concepts of teaching and learning, as well as gradually test their skills of teaching. Moreover, field-based experiences are necessary for the continuous appraisal of career goals on the part of prospective teachers. Through differentiated assignments, including observation, participation and tutoring, they are able to identify, select, and move gradually into a full responsibility for the role (p. 21).

Each field-based assignment puts the teacher education student in an educational setting that is a sample of the larger culture of schools. Several dimensions are important considerations in the selection of the sample
placement: (1) the geographic location of the school—urban, suburban, rural; (2) the pupils—their age, economic, racial, ethnic, and experiential backgrounds; (3) the cooperating teachers—their experiential/educational backgrounds, attitudes, and beliefs about teaching/learning; (4) the administration—the policies and attitudes toward discipline, the degree to which the teaching/learning situation is controlled from outside the classroom, and the relationships with the central office; (5) the size of the school population and the nature of the physical facilities; and (6) the nature of the curriculum, including extent of offerings, organization, and learning resources. Any given placement will contain a different mix of these dimensions and selection will depend to a large degree on the specific purpose of the assignment. (p. 22)

The field experience is ultimately a proving ground wherein the teacher education students are able to test their abilities to provide learning opportunities for others. . . . [C]onditions of the field setting will be such that students will go beyond the performance of teaching acts and engage in critical thinking about the whole educational enterprise; and thus, develop a sense of dedication toward working for the enhancement of personal values, intellect, and critical powers of the young. It would also provide the opportunity to experience the professional setting in such a way as to allow conclusions about the potential of the profession as a personally fulfilling enterprise. Field experience includes: observation, tutoring, participation, teaching, or other leadership activities that occur in a natural setting, as differentiated from simulation or contrived settings. It includes both exploratory and skill development dimensions. (pp. 22-23).

Teacher education should consist of integrated experiences which consist of activities and meanings. The program should include courses wherein students are presented the opportunity to gain the knowledge of teaching and learning through academic activities involving theory and principles. It should include the kinds of strategies applied to teacher education students which assist them in integrating this knowledge through the development of attitudes and values consistent with the intentions of the program. Finally, a sound teacher education program would include the opportunities for developing the necessary teaching and learning skills called for. (p. 24)

While the College of Education was responding to the externally mandated program changes, they were adapting them to meet their own
rationale for using field experiences. Review of the chronological development of events within the College, in their attempt to come into compliance, revealed:

During the 1975-76 academic year the College of Education at The Ohio State University began an effort to assess and revitalize its teacher education mission and to bring the College's many certification programs into full compliance with the new Standards. Task force groups were established to focus attention on each area of the Standards. The task force on Curriculum and Instruction produced, among other things, a task analysis flow chart which showed the directions which the College planned to take in order to come into full compliance. Part of the task analysis flow chart called for the development of a teacher education advisory committee which would guide the College's effort in redesign. (Memo from Phil Lesser, October 25, 1978, p. 2; "Origin," undated, p. 1; Aubrecht, 1977, p. 1)

During the fall quarter, 1976, the Associate Dean selected seven faculty members to serve on the Teacher Education Redesign Advisory Committee (TERAC) for a three-year term. The members of TERAC were selected because of their involvement with undergraduate certification programs, foundations course work, and graduate teacher education programs. The committee met for the first time on November 12, 1976. In his December 20, 1976, memo to the College of Education Faculty, the Associate Dean suggested the TERAC was charged not only with the specific responsibility for guiding and coordinating the College's response to the new State Certification Standards, but also with the broader goal of functioning as "an advocacy group for teacher education at The Ohio State University." TERAC was established as an advisory committee to the Program Committee of the College of Education Senate. (Memo from Phil Lesser, Oct. 25, 1978, p. 3; "TERAC Report," undated, pp. 1-2; "Origin," undated, p. 1; "Professional Introduction: An Experimental Program," undated, p. 1; Aubrecht, p. 1)

TERAC took over the coordination of the Project 419 Curricular Teams and also extensively reviewed the common experiences which most teacher education students took as part of their pre-service training. From this review, it became clear that articulation among the separate elements of the common core was minimal and that articulation between the common elements and the special program areas was virtually nonexistent. ("Professional Introduction Update #1," January, 1979; "Professional Introduction: An Experimental Program," undated, p. 2)
It was also noted that clinical and field experiences were minimal and that professional level faculty were seldom involved in teaching and/or supervisory roles. TERAC was also concerned that for many students the separate elements of the common core did not contribute to a professional socialization of the pre-service teacher. It is from this milieu of events and considerations that ideas for a common, integrated introduction to teaching grew. On September 14, 1977, TERAC charged a planning team with the responsibility to develop the Professional Introduction Program ("Origin," undated, p. 2; "Professional Introduction," undated, p. 2; and Aubrecht, p. 2). This introductory experience was to grow on the Freshman Early Experience Program and be completed prior to the time the student actually begins his/her major course of studies. The introductory block was to include elements of content pursued formerly in Psychology 230, C&F 435, EMCE 461, and Educational Foundations. [Appendixes J, K, L, and M contain the syllabi for these courses.] These materials were to be integrated and synthesized around a school field experience. Special attention within this introductory block would be given to curriculum matters specifically designated in the new State Standards. ("TERAC Report," undated, p. 5-9)

The Professional Introduction (PI) Planning Team began to develop the PI curriculum by examining (a) the course syllabi from introductory courses including Psychology 230, EMCE 460-461, and C&F 435, (b) materials from the 419 Curriculum Redesign Project teams, and (c) the new State Standards. Tentative objectives were outlined, and were submitted to resource persons within the College faculty with expertise in the designated areas, who reacted, criticized, and counter-proposed. Through this process a two-quarter, 15-credit hour sequence developed. The Professional Introduction experimental program was approved by the College Senate in December 1977. Approval was granted for three experimental cycles, with first trial beginning Spring, 1978, and the final trial beginning in Winter, 1979. (Memo from The Professional Introduction Committee, March 22, 1978, pp. 1-2)

The Professional Introduction Rationale as stated in the "Professional Introduction Proposal" dated April 4, 1979, said:

The Professional Introduction has been designed not only to further the College of Education's efforts toward compliance with the State of Ohio's new Standards for the preparation of teachers, but more important, to
maintain and extend the College's leadership in teacher education by redesigning the nature of the common, pre-specialization experiences taken by prospective teachers. The Professional Introduction provides a generic foundation from which more specialized and advanced preparation will develop and it ensures that this foundation is consistent with the new Ohio Standards for preparing teachers.

While Professional Introduction was clearly a response of the College of Education toward compliance with the new State Standards, it was also intended to be a synthesis of the State Standards with the expertise of the College of Education, which would result in the design of an innovative and worthwhile program in pre-service teacher education.

The Professional Introduction is not the mechanism through which each of the curriculum standards will be met. It is an attempt to begin to meet those standards and also to improve the articulation and relevancy of the content and experiences now included in several of the core courses. ("Origin," undated, p. 2; "Professional Introduction: An Experimental Program," undated, p. 2; and Aubrecht, p. 1)

Conceptualization and Experimental Phase of Professional Introduction: 1977-1979

Following approval of the concept of a generic introduction to education sequence, the PI Planning Team began the actual planning of the course. This included selecting and sequencing of content, developing activities, recruiting students, and training the instructional staff.

Documentation showed that

The Professional Introduction Planning Team began conceptualizing the Professional Introduction during the Autumn Quarter 1977. By the end of the Autumn Quarter the general outline of the Professional Introduction was established. TERAC reviewed the proposal for the Professional Introduction and accepted responsibility to process it through the College Senate. In
December 1977 the proposal for the experimental program was approved by the College of Education [Senate].
("Origin," undated, p. 2)

Winter Quarter 1978 was utilized to refine the content, select and develop instructional activities, recruit students, and prepare for the first field test of the program during the Spring Quarter 1978. Also during the Spring Quarter 1978 TERAC suggested that a portion of the State Department funds for 1978-79 be used to recruit six new faculty whose expertise could lend particular support to the redesign effort in the areas of human development, media, teacher education in urban settings, life in schools, human relations, and ethnographic evaluation. Five of these new faculty members were assigned to work directly with the Professional Introduction for a major part of their load beginning in the Autumn Quarter 1978. ("Origin," undated, pp. 2-3)

Twenty-four students were in the first experimental cycle of PI 1. Of these, twenty-two completed PI 2 in the Autumn Quarter 1978. The second experimental cycle started Autumn 1979 with ninety-six students and the third cycle which started in the Winter Quarter 1979 had forty-six students. ("Origin," undated; "Professional Introduction Update #1," January, 1979; Memo from the Professional Introduction Committee, Mar. 22, 1978)

As stated in "Professional Introduction: An Experimental Program"

(undated):

PI will include a wide range of field, laboratory, and classroom experiences. . . . The field experience, although shorter in time than FEEP or Student Teaching, will include observation and practice of teaching, governance and other professional activities. Being closely supervised by university personnel, it will provide an increased opportunity for students to analyze and evaluate their professional practices. (p. 6)

[In PI] learning will be studied in relation to what is known about development. To insure that students can apply the knowledge they are studying and begin to make sound professional judgments, a sequence of structured observations of individual children is planned which will be followed by opportunities to tutor individual students. Emphasis on individual learners will permit PI students to focus on relatively simple learning situations and sequentially build their understanding of the learning process and the effects of educational variables on this process. (p. 8)
The request to the College of Education Senate to include PI on an experimental basis, beginning in the Spring of 1978, described PI I (494) as seven (7) credit hours. The request description said:

"Human development, learning, and schooling will be studied with emphasis on the individual student and teacher. Clinical, fieldwork, and traditional instructional methods will be employed."

The reasons for proposing this 494 (experimental) topic said:

This new experimental course has been designed in response to the State of Ohio's new standards for teacher education and the desire to improve the future teacher's introduction to professional training. The course, which is conceived as an integrated 15 quarter hour experience, will be taken over two consecutive quarters. . . . This experimental course is a major outcome of the College of Education's Teacher Education Redesign Advisory Committee, the committee charged with guiding the College of Education into compliance with the new State mandated regulations.

The experimental request for offering during Autumn 1978 describes PI II (494) as eight (8) credit hours. The request description says it will be a "continuation of Professional Introduction I. Teaching/learning will be studied as they apply to individuals and groups. Micro teaching and field experience will be included." The complete statement of reasons for proposing this experimental topic were identical to the PI I Spring 1978 request. Subsequent requests for the remaining two experimental cycles were the same.

Professional Introduction as an Approved Course: 1979-1981 (See Table 3)

Based on the experiences during the experimental phases of Professional Introduction and interaction with various faculties, modifications were made when the Professional Introduction Program was recommended to the Senate. As stated in the "Professional Introduction
### Table 3
Professional Introduction as an Approved Course
at The Ohio State University

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Education 450</th>
<th>Education 451</th>
<th>General Conditions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cycle</td>
<td>Section(s)</td>
<td>PI Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autumn 1979</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winter 1980</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 1980</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer 1980</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autumn 1980</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winter 1981</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 1981</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **U** = Unit approach.
- **C** = Combination large group lectures, small group labs and fields.
- **S** = Small groups for all experiences.

- First quarter as an approved course.
- Changed from an integrated to a unit approach to instruction.
- PI Faculty member #5 instructional coordinator.
- Director #2 resigned, director #3 assumed position.
- Changed format from combination of large and small group to all small group with one staff member responsible for their group.
- Change from five days in class to four days in class and Fridays reserved as a conference day.
- PI Faculty member #1 instructional coordinator.
- PI Faculty member #5 had left University.
- Instructional coordinator - TA on Dean's Staff.
- PI Faculty members #1 and #2 were not teaching.
- A regular faculty member joined the PI Staff as an instructor.
Update #5, March, 1979:

1. The proposal will recommend a two-quarter sequence of PI with each quarter having a six credit hour designation. PI I will be listed in the Autumn Quarter bulletin as a six hour course with one hour lecture on MWF with three hour labs on T-R. This format will allow us to retain the clinical-field experience focus of PI.

2. The primary foci of human development, general instructional methods, human relations, cultural pluralism, and schools in society will be retained.

3. The briefing-experience-debriefing format will be retained as much as possible.

4. Students will be organized in units of 20 for the T-R clinical-field experiences and for the human relations labs. As often as is possible, debriefing will take place at the unit level immediately after the experience; i.e., at the school site.

5. Professorial level faculty will be responsible for the MWF teaching and for coordinating the clinical-field experiences.

The former director of PI, in his letter of transmittal to the Associate Dean dated April 4, 1979, said:

The Professional Introduction will be a common, integrated prespecialization experience. It will provide a reliable set of understandings and experiences from which the program areas can build. It further extends the College's commitment to the value of clinical and field experiences. The Professional Introduction is designed to be a two quarter sequence with each quarter having a six credit hour designation. As much as is possible, a briefing-experience-debriefing format will be utilized to provide relevance for the students by integrating the substantive content with the planned clinical-field experiences (p. 3).

The Professional Introduction provides a generic foundation from which more specialized and advanced preparation will develop and it ensures that this foundation is consistent with the new Ohio standards for preparing teachers (PI Proposal, April 4, 1979; and "Perspectives on Teaching the Graduates of PI," Winter, 1979).

The major purpose of this program is to introduce prospective teachers to concepts, skills, and problems
that are common to teachers across subject matter fields and to provide experiences which help the prospective teacher to explore and understand these issues within the context of the real world of the school. The program is heavily oriented toward clinical and field experiences. Major areas of focus within the two quarter sequence are human development, general instructional methods, human relations, cultural pluralism, and the school as a social phenomenon. ("PI Proposal" Apr. 4, 1979; and "Perspectives on Teaching the Graduates of PI," Winter, 1979)

As can be seen, several changes occurred when PI became an approved course. The credit hours for the course were reduced from 15 to 12, and contact hours from 15 to 9. An attempt was made to maintain the delivery format with lectures and presentations taking place in large groups for one hour on Monday, Wednesday and Friday, and 3 hours reserved for lab and field experiences on Tuesday and Thursday. The major areas of focus remained the same although there was a shift from an integrated to a unit approach to delivery.

The current rationale for Professional Introduction as taken from the 1980 edition of the Instructor's Manual says:

The Professional Introduction program provides each Teacher Candidate with an identifiable set of common, standardized experiences which serve as theoretical and practical foundations for teaching. This introductory program is a prerequisite for the teacher candidates' coursework in the various specialization areas in the College of Education.

In part, the Professional Introduction program enables the College of Education to address the new Standards for Colleges and Universities Preparing Teachers mandated by the State of Ohio's Board of Education. The new Standards call for sweeping institutional reforms in the professional training of teachers.

The course outline reflected here has undergone numerous revisions during the last several years when the Professional Introduction program was in its experimental phases. The course is a product of this evolution and continues to be revised. In addition to the
individuals directly involved in the development of the program, the program has been shaped by collegewide dialogue and debate involving faculties and programs in all areas.

The input of all concerned may not be obvious in this course manual because the overriding concern in the development of the program has been to strike upon a format and content which best serves the teacher candidate in as many program areas as possible while also being feasible to implement given available resources.

Professional Introduction Field Experience Component

The "PI Proposal" dated April 4, 1979, listed approximately 48 hours of field experiences to be completed during the two quarter sequence. These included:

Three schools of educational beliefs and practices: Observation of and interviews with practicing teachers (3 hours)

Assessment of text and pupils' reading level (6 hours)

Children's literature: primary grades (1 hour)

Cognitive assessment (3 hours)

Assessing children's self concept levels (3 hours)

Values and levels of moral reasoning in children (3 hours)

Teaching a mini-lesson (3 hours)

School organization and the hidden curriculum (3 hours)

Observation of adolescent behavior (3 hours)

Teaching and evaluating a unit of instruction (includes elements of human relations and cultural pluralism content) (18 hours) (p. 10)

As stated in "Professional Introduction Field Component."

November 16, 1978:

The field component is critical to the integration process, as it is during field experiences that PI students are able to integrate the theoretical perspectives and clinical activities.
In general, the field component provides a means for PI students to encounter the realities of schooling, in a systematic manner under careful supervision of PI staff.

As described in "Ed. 494 PI Field Experience Program" (undated), the field experiences are viewed "as a means to test intellectual aspects of Ed. 494 with a reality dimension" (p. 1). This document indicated that each PI student's duties and responsibilities would be determined by the student, the cooperating teacher and the university supervisor. This document listed the purposes of the field experience program as allowing the student to

1. Observe classroom interactions and to participate actively in this interaction.

2. Observe functions that affect the instructional aspects of schooling.

3. Experience introductory activities of planning and teaching lessons and in evaluating the effectiveness of these lessons.

4. Integrate the knowledge gained from campus courses with direct experience in the school setting.

The document went on to suggest that the initial experiences would probably be in the form of observations. These could include physical condition of the room, class orientation, assignments, teacher use of student leaders and type of classroom organization to name a few. This observation could be followed by planning and conducting a lesson. Included in this was small group work; individual activity and materials presentation. Throughout this description of field experiences was an emphasis on adapting them to fit individual situations.

Bunge (1979), when describing the field experience component of PI, said:
The field component is critical to the program, because it is during field experiences . . . that PI students are able to integrate the various theoretical perspectives and clinical activities. Moreover, it allows PI students to encounter the realities of the school experience, in a systematic manner, under careful supervision by PI staff. . . .

During their two quarter sequence in PI, students observe children in elementary, middle schools, and high schools. Beginning with a one-day mini-lesson and progressing to a five-day short course, students gain the experience of planning and implementing lessons in a variety of settings: public, private, rural, urban, and suburban. . . .

The 1980 edition of the Professional Introduction Instructor's Manual listed five field experiences during the first quarter of the course and eight during the second quarter. This totals about thirteen hours of direct experience in a classroom either observing or teaching.

The first quarter experiences (Ed. 450) were at the elementary level and included:

- Observation to identify classroom factors which contribute to learning. Record information about the teacher's activities for twenty minutes. Record information about teacher-student verbal interaction for twenty minutes. (2 hours)

- Teaching a thirty minute media assisted lesson. Observe and record teaching behaviors of fellow PI student. (2 hours)

- Observe and analyze the classroom in terms of the dimensions and categories of the Soar and Soar management model. (2 hours)

- Teaching two thirty minute lessons, on two consecutive days, in an elementary school setting. Observe and record teaching behaviors of fellow PI student. (4 hours)

The second quarter experiences (Ed. 451) were at the middle school level and included:

- Assess the readability level of texts and assess the readability level of learners. Characterize language variation among several pupils. (2 hours)
- Observe and record interactions between the teacher and pupils in the classroom. Administer the sociometric questions to the class. (2 hours)

- Teaching five consecutive daily lessons. Observe other teacher candidate's presentations and complete Peer Evaluation Form every day. (10 hours)

- Observe and record classroom interactions for instances of the hidden curriculum. (2 hours)

On closer examination, what appeared to be a major decrease in field hours from 48 hours listed in 1979 to 26 hours implemented in 1980-81 was not as dramatic as it seemed. This was due in part to combining several activities into one field experience to facilitate integration for the teacher candidates. Another difference was that the 1979 list is hours for a given type of activity, while the 1980-81 list is for a given field experience which, as explained above, could incorporate several activities for more efficient use of time.

Callahan (1981) examined the field experience component of Professional Introduction, using feedback from cooperating teachers who participated in the program from 1978-1980. He sought information related to programmatic concerns such as:

1. Program communications and clarity;
2. Student placement and preparation;
3. Cooperating teacher preparation; and
4. General program development. (p. 3)

He said the PI staff had made numerous changes in the field component of the program in response to suggestions from cooperating teachers in the field. Callahan listed those changes as follows:
--- further delineated program objectives
--- clarified cooperating teacher role expectations
--- instituted an orientation program
--- continued refinement of evaluation measures
--- changed field assignments to better utilize available site experiences and groups
--- adapted programmatic objectives to complement current classroom instructors
--- emphasized the utilization of university supervisors to the maximum by placing a complete 450/451 section in a single school
--- continued to build relationships with administrative and teaching personnel
--- utilized both urban and suburban field settings
--- reduced the number of visitations to the schools. (p. 18)

Callahan's work differed from the current study in two basic ways. First, he examined programmatic concerns rather than the objectives of the field experience component of the program as the current study does. Second, his data were from the perspective of only one role group, the cooperating teachers, whereas the current study examined the questions from the perspectives of all three role groups: instructors, cooperating teachers, and teacher candidates.

**Individual Perceptions of Professional Introduction Development**

Up to this point an examination of the written documentation of the conceptualization, planning and implementation that occurred in PI has been presented. The presentation now turns to an examination of the perceptions of the individuals who were involved in this process as discussed in intensive interviews with the researcher. These
intensive interviews were conducted with the former associate dean for program development, the first two directors of PI, and the five individuals who were recruited to work with PI and were called the PI Faculty (refer to definitions, p. 9). During these intensive interviews the researcher asked each interviewee to relate his/her perceptions on 1) a rationale for the field experience component of PI, 2) reasons for including a field experience component, 3) how specific experiences evolved, 4) his/her personal reactions to the various experiences, 5) how changes in the general curriculum affected the field experiences, 6) the relation of PI field experiences to the total program, 7) whether the field experiences were an integral part of the program, 8) changes they were familiar with that had occurred, and 9) how change in field experiences occurred. The interviews were flexible and open ended so questioning did not necessarily occur in this order.

The development of Professional Introduction from the perspectives of the individuals involved was more problematic than the formal reports might have indicated.

The curriculum and materials for PI I (494) were developed and implemented during the Spring of 1978 with twenty-four (24) students and eight (8) staff members. The following Autumn Quarter (1978) five (5) new faculty members were brought in with various perceptions of their roles. For purposes of clarity, the five new faculty members were randomly assigned a number from one to five and will be referred to by that number each time they are quoted. For example, PI Faculty Member #5 recalled:
I was told that PI I was essentially completed and field tested and was ready to go and that all that was necessary was that we would be fine tuning that but it was essentially ready to go. ... Part of our task would be refining PI II which was supposedly in a process of being developed ... [What] we were confronted with was the PI II students who had had the first quarter the previous spring before we arrived and there was absolutely nothing to teach them. There was absolutely no content, no materials. ... [There had been a] task group ... they generated very little and what they did generate our group found just inappropriate. ... In PI II we were literally teaching one day ahead of the students. ... PI I was piloted with twenty-four students and the instructional and curricular materials that worked with eight faculty and twenty-four students were simply inappropriate for the large number [96] in autumn.

PI Faculty Member #1 summed it up as:

Ultimately it really came down to something needed to get taught and we were really the ones who were most immediate to that and so we were ultimately the ones making the final decision.

PI Faculty Member #4 was not told that the program was already being field tested and said,

What was presented to me when I interviewed is a far cry from what evolved ... Two or three days before the beginning of the quarter, we found that we had not only to develop ... but that we were to meet within three days with 90 some students and teach them and there was no curriculum ... there was nothing, absolutely nothing to go from.

PI Faculty Member #2 reported that

[When we arrived in September there was very little developmental work that was given to us as a basis for the continuation of the projects. So we found ourselves on September 15 looking at 150 students and no curriculum. ... As developers we were responsible for the development, the instruction, the administration, the decision making, and the supervision of this program. ... We were given the state standards and a list of very broad goals that we would aim at.
From the view of an individual involved in the conceptualization of the program who later became the second director:

We brought those people [PI Faculty] in and they essentially took over a fairly well developed notion. . . . We viewed this as something that was ongoing and it certainly wasn't a completely developed notion at all that these people would come in and essentially take the work that had been started and continue to develop it. . . .

In contrast to the seemingly clear purpose, content, and curriculum for PI which was outlined in the historical documents, a whole set of obstacles stood in the way of making PI a viable, coherent course offering. The themes common to each of the above quotes seem to illustrate this. The individuals brought in to develop the specific activities for the program had no time to become familiar with the historical development of PI or with the resources available within the College of Education at The Ohio State University. While one of the original purposes of PI was to help overcome the lack of articulation TERAC identified as existing between courses within the various faculties, four of the five new faculty members were from outside the state of Ohio.

What appeared to be common to these quotations was a group of people needing to work together as a cohesive group, each having a different perception concerning where they were starting and the direction they needed to take.

After arriving at The Ohio State University, the new PI Faculty found other problems not directly related to the lack of clarity regarding their role. As PI Faculty Member #4 noted:
No one apparently gave any attention to whether we [PI faculty] fit philosophically at all or . . . whether there was going to be an attempt made by, say, a senior member of the faculty to show any leadership in facilitating a team effort. . . . Philosophically we were so different, our methods for achieving objectives were significantly different and it did not appear that it would be constructive for us to continue [to work as a team] so it almost became a compartmentalized approach rather than an integrated one.

Faculty Member #5 said the development team was a very mixed group, generally characterized by a lot of confusion, a lot of anxiety; it became abundantly clear very early on that there was no structure . . . all of our development was always constantly characterized by conflict in many of our presuppositions. . . . All tried to deal with everything as a committee and we found that is a very difficult way to develop a program. . . . I wasn't prepared for the awesome complexity of the task and the lack of time so our organizational structure was poor . . . we never really came to a consensus as to what the thrust of the program . . . we never had an image as to what the PI student ought to look like . . . so we had major problems at two levels, one conceptual and the other organizational.

As a result of these philosophic differences among members of the PI Faculty, which caused difficulties in arriving at an integrated curriculum for the course, the development effort shifted to a unit approach. The second director of PI said,

One of the problems when you have different people developing things is you lose that coherence . . . Development went on unit by unit from their individual perspectives and it was extraordinarily uneven, both in terms of quality and in terms of time frame within which the development was supposed to take place. Some people developed stuff quickly . . . other people were three and four quarters late. . . . I'm not sure that the development of that program wouldn't have been better if it had been approached as a total project rather than parceling out stuff to experts . . . We talked about each person's unit--that's no way to build a program.
The associate dean during the development of PI said, "PI was built more from the commitment or philosophy of the developers than from a given perspective."

PI Faculty Member #4 said,

We all developed, but we each developed in a vacuum. It became a compartmentalized approach to something rather than an individual one. . . . We were able to have input into each other's fields but the assumption was this: That we were brought in to develop these areas . . . and while we were to put this together as a course I was not interested in the other developer's definition of my area.

PI Faculty Member #5, after discussing the problems associated with developing as a group, related,

Eventually we did come to assigning individuals units. . . . The units began to acquire an individual developer to be responsible for them. . . . it delivered the products. At that time we were having an awful time coming to consensus because we didn't have any consensus so we couldn't develop coherent units. . . . What happened then was that they became unrelated to one another; . . . but they began to lose any sense of it being an inter-related 2-quarter program. . . . The links were no longer clear and certainly the underlying conceptual links just disappeared entirely . . .

From these quotes concerning the development work in PI it seemed obvious that the field experience component as an integrated, inter-related set of experiences would have been very difficult to achieve. The individuals involved were struggling with the general curriculum and the field experience component was given attention as it related to this curriculum.

The rationale for including a field experience component generally as well as the rationale for specific activities produced varying responses. The first director stated:
I always felt that the field component was thought in the beginning to be an extraordinarily important part of the whole . . . that was all done without specifying very clearly what we do out there. . . . We knew we didn't want to do too much just observation, because the outcomes of that were problematic to say the least, and we knew we wanted to get into diverse kinds of settings and we always saw that as one of our goals so that there was this underlying agreement that we had a lot of field experience but I can't honestly say from the beginning anybody was very sure what the outcomes would be.

PI Faculty Member #2 related that the basic impetus for including a field component in PI came from the state mandates.

I don't recall how many hours of field were planned but there was an outline for what was then PI I [when the PI Faculty arrived in Autumn 1978] . . . We were out in the field basically every week . . . All of the field visits involved a preparation day in which the topic was dealt with in a lecture or discussion, . . . then after the field visit we would come back for de-briefing. . . . There's a lot of substance in terms of what goes on in class and the field assignments are intended to link with that substantive content that has been discussed and dealt with within class. The nature of the field assignments have changed dramatically . . . based on changes in textbooks, feedback from the schools and the relevance of a given field. All in all I think that most of the field changes have been made on the basis of that kind of rationale.

PI Faculty Member #3 said that when the PI Faculty arrived,

[T]he field component was already set up. We had X number of days out in the schools. . . . You could do whatever you wanted, but the dates had been pre-arranged but the substance was pretty much open . . . The rationale behind the field . . . from the very beginning . . . is that you should use the field experience as a shocker, and to show the student how little they know and to bring them to some understanding of the need for debriefing after the field experience occurs. . . . It's a technocratic rationale based upon a traditional educator's viewpoint of what a student should do who's going to be a teacher. . . . The field is the field and the rest of the course is the rest of the course . . . learn a lot in the field . . . but it doesn't integrate in any way . . . I don't think we should use the shocker rationale for sending students out to field.
PI Faculty Member #4 had the following to say about the field experience:

[L]et's use field to develop skills and to broaden what we do know about education. . . . Some [fields] are heavily skill-oriented, and then some are not. I think those that are reflect the personality of the people that developed them . . . whatever activity, there has always been a sense in the program that it should be directed and it should be supervised by faculty or graduate students, whoever happened to be in charge of whatever unit was being taught.

PI Faculty Member #5 said they understood that during Spring of 1978 there apparently had been a lot of field experiences and that was something we were all very much committed to. . . . shared a sense that it was real . . . believed that you learn by doing and it would generate some excitement for undergraduates. My position was, that in order for theoretical perception to exist, these need to be interrelated to actual practice. . . . We thought the field, if it were carefully structured and carefully supervised, would really enrich what we did in the classroom. Little did we know that that was a major political issue in the college. . . . So we were all committed to field experiences but we didn't know we were stepping into a hornet's nest. . . . I saw it as a way of really uniting theory into practice, giving kids a reality check on what they'd get in the classroom. We also had a notion that things we did in the classroom would be reinforced by observing. . . . The substantive matter was lectured to by the professorial level faculty . . . then the students would go out and observe, . . . Then [another faculty member] came up with the notion that it might be very helpful to put them out and then when they would come back you'd have something to talk about. . . . How I developed the field component for the units I developed . . . was to present the kids with theoretical constructs and then have them go out and work with it. . . . So what I really tried to do while developing those field activities was to try to zero in on a couple of concepts and I found it very very difficult because I found—the task was very hard because the students had very little experience in what I thought they needed to know. . . . I wasn't able to reduce the concepts to very simple, observables phenomena. . . . I tried at first to just let them go out and observe for it and that didn't work at all. Then I tried to list different types that they
would go out and find and I'm not sure how successful that was. We never really had adequate time to develop materials... There never really was much of a theoretical base. There was sort of a rationale for building it, a bunch of reasons as to why—there was never theoretical in the terms of theory being systematic. It really was not much that was systematic.

One final description of how the field component of PI evolved according to PI Faculty Member #2 was:

[T]he field experiences evolved from the standpoint that the new state standards suggested—that additional field experiences during teacher preparation was essential. As we first evolved 450 and 451, we evolved on a model of having one day of field experience per week on an average, with a short course in addition to that. That was the basic rationale. We thought that it should be a field-based course... During the first year of the program, 494 met 15 hours a week—3 hours a day 5 days a week... The availability of time to utilize field experiences was far greater than it is currently... The three hours per day made it easy to include transportation time out to the schools and back again and still have students provided with a full two hours of observation or teaching in the schools... greater opportunity to experience a far greater variety of school and educational settings, ... we made visitations to preschools, elementary, middle schools, junior high schools and secondary schools, and to correctional institutions. ... The basic purposes of the field experiences was not to develop teachers; it was to provide an exploratory experience. We have never accentuated skills or skill development in terms of instruction. We have provided some skills in terms of planning and organization but we felt that for the most part we utilized the field to influence and inform the students about the content and the curriculum that they were learning in the class... When the contact hours per week dropped to 10 per week we were limited to two hours per field visit... also hampered the flexibility... necessitated that we concentrate on being much more specific with the type of field experiences and what we wanted the students to gather out in the field... We made the field experiences and assignments very specific and tied specifically to one or more of the lessons and the objectives that we had in each one of the units... At the conclusions of that first quarter I decided that observation was probably more valuable to teacher development than teaching was, because during the act of teaching you're very subjective, you don't
really collect data which is indicative of quality teaching. . . . At the conclusion of the first year, . . . decided to rearrange the units totally and we revamped the entire course. . . . In the early developmental period of the PI program we had a lot of experiences in the field that weren't structured. . . . At the current time our field experiences are extremely valuable. They're structured so that they inform the student of certain events and they also provide the students with information around which they can make judgments and decisions about the content that we give them, so the content becomes far more meaningful and it's a great basis for discussion once they get back into the classroom.

Summary

From the intensive interviews with various individuals in the program, several things seemed to have been important in the development of the Professional Introduction Program. First, the PI Faculty members had differing perceptions of their role in the program when they arrived. The individuals who were already involved with PI when the new PI Faculty arrived also had differing perceptions from each other and from the new PI Faculty. This could partially explain the new faculty's differences in perception.

Second, the new faculty, according to their own accounts, were very diverse and had difficulty functioning as a group. They indicated that this presented difficulties when trying to arrive at a consensus for an integrated curriculum. This seemed to lead to the third major issue they discussed, that of dividing the program into units. The course, according to interviews with the individuals involved, lost its cohesive, integrated format and conceptual links.

The final issue discussed in the interviews was the relationship of the field experience component to the total curriculum of PI. The
Interviewees suggested that the development of these experiences paralleled that of the total curriculum and suffered from the same problems: lack of clarity of purpose, lack of consensus, and lack of integration.

**Examination of the Current Implementation of the Professional Introduction Field Experience**

This section presents data on the implementation of the field experience component of PI during the 1980-81 academic year as perceived by instructors, Ed. 450 and Ed. 451 cooperating teachers, and teacher candidates. Data for this aspect of the study were obtained through questionnaires and interviews.

Responses to questionnaire data were received from 73 persons representing four role groups. The role groups being considered were instructors, Education 450 cooperating teachers, Education 451 cooperating teachers, and teacher candidates who participated in the Professional Introduction field experience component during the 1980-1981 academic year. Thirty-four percent (34%) of the questionnaire survey participants were also interviewed. The responses obtained from these subjects form the basis for the following presentation.

Tables showing frequencies and percentages for each question (objective) for each role group are included with accompanying narration. Quotations from the interview data are interjected in the discussion to provide support for questionnaire results.

Responses of subjects were grouped and compared by role group. Subjects were grouped into four categories: 1) instructional staff;
2) Education 450 cooperating teachers; 3) Education 451 cooperating teachers; and 4) teacher candidates.

A total of 73 respondents were included in the survey sample. Of the 73 respondents, 15 were instructional staff, 15 were Education 450 cooperating teachers, 18 were Education 451 cooperating teachers, and 25 were teacher candidates.

Data on Objectives

Twenty objectives related to the field experience component of PI were identified from the 1980 edition of the Instructor's Manual, and each related to a question on the questionnaire. Percentages were computed for each of the 20 questions (objectives) by role group and collectively to examine group and general perceptions concerning the field experience objectives.

Instructor's Response

Table 4 reported the percentages for instructors relating to their perceptions of whether a given objective was assigned/accomplished. Choices on the questionnaire were: 1.0 "asked to do" and 2.0 "not asked to do." Percentages were computed by averaging responses. The number of respondents varied per question, if a respondent did not respond or responded that a particular objective was not applicable to them. The number given with the table was the average of those responding to the 20 questions.

As indicated by Table 4, most instructors felt that their teacher candidates were asked to perform the objectives. For purposes of comparing interview responses with the questionnaire data, questions 1 and 2 were considered together since they represented one field
TABLE 4
Percent of the Instructors Responding "Yes" to Assignment of a Given Objective

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Objective observation on teacher movement</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Objective observation on classroom verbal interaction</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Teach, mini-lesson incorporating media</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Observation, strategies of emotional climate</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Observation, management of learning and thinking</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Observation, management behavior, learning tasks, and thinking</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Observation, management strategies</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Observation, based on Soar &amp; Soar Model</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Teaching, 2 consecutive days</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Assessment, readability of text and of the level of the learner</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Characterize language variation</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Sociometric technique to analyze pupil interaction</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Teach, 5 day unit</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Observation for hidden curriculum</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Observation, skilled in technique</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Teach in elementary classroom</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Teach in middle school classroom</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Peer partner in Ed. 450</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Peer partner in Ed. 451</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Teaching with sole responsibility</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 13; % = 78.4

Range of response: 1.00 - 2.00
experience, related to teacher movement and verbal interaction. Questions 3, 9 and 16 were discussed together since they represented the teaching experiences in Ed. 450. Questions 4, 5, 6, 7 and 8 were discussed together because they represented various aspects of one field experience, using the Soar & Soar Model to structure observation in an elementary classroom. Questions 10 and 11 were discussed together because they represented one field experience, the readability level of a text and students, and language variation. Questions 12, 14, 15 and 20 were each discussed separately. Questions 13 and 17 were discussed together since they represented the teaching experience in the middle school. Questions 18 and 19 were discussed together since they related to the use of peer partners.

The responses to Questions 1 and 2 indicated that 71% and 85% of the instructors felt their teacher candidates were asked to do these observations. These responses appear to be more positive than the interviews indicated. PI Faculty Member #4, who taught Ed. 450 where this field experience occurs, stated that

I was not able to implement the way it was written. . . . I could not understand the field that was there and I could therefore not ask the kids to go do the field that I myself could not understand. Using observation fit within that unit of instruction OK. . . . It seems a rather superficial introduction to observation.

PI Faculty member #3 said:

. . . the first field . . . I found that to be, as in the materials [PI Instructor's Manual], unimplementable by me and I wrote my own field assignments for that.
Most of the instructors indicated difficulty in implementing the field as it was written and therefore tended to use an observation system with which they were already familiar. Two quotations demonstrated the degree of diversity of opinion concerning this particular assignment. Instructor #3 said:

I think it's a non-meaningful task because they chart the same stuff and they don't make the connection of why or any of that kind of stuff readily. . . . I let them still function on the verbal stuff, which we never used what the manual said because it was so complicated, . . . but I thought it was much more necessary to enhance it, to look at other things besides just verbal behavior of teachers and students.

Instructor #4 said:

I liked the idea of them observing the interaction between the teacher and students. [Did not use the material in the manual for the verbal portion.]

The high positive response (71% and 85%) to Questions 1 and 2 may have been a response to assigning the content, by whatever method, rather than to assigning the content as written in the PI Instructor's Manual.

Questions 3 and 9, which related to specific teaching assignments in the elementary school, each received an 86% positive response. Question 16, which related generally to teaching in an elementary classroom, received a 79% positive response. Interview responses to these experiences were generally positive with some qualifiers added.

PI Faculty Member #4 said:

In the media lesson, the development of media and then the taking it out and using it in the classroom is, I think, a very appropriate way of teaching media. . . . I have some concern about Units 3 and 4, and the sequencing of activities within those two units. . . . I think the mini-lesson is a pretty good combination.
... It has been at two or three different spots and there always seems to be something wrong with the spot it's at, which in a way I think suggests that it's not in the right spot. In terms of teaching I'm not so sure that one day, one day, and one day might not be just as valuable as one day and two days.

Faculty Member #3, when referring to the media, said:

I thought it was a touch artificial in that the students didn't understand why they had to suddenly put on a giant media presentation, but I thought it was a really good experience. I don't think there's any rationale for it being where it is; I don't think it fits, but I think it's a good experience. . . . The technical aspect [of the 2-day lesson], the emphasis on a perfect lesson plan and all that, bothers me just because of my personal orientation. . . . I think that was probably the most successful thing the students did. It was the most useful learning experience they had during [Ed.] 450. . . . I was surprised how well it integrated with the rest of the course, with the rest of 450, just beautifully.

Instructor #2 related some mixed feelings concerning the two teaching experiences.

I feel that it's important to do the media, or I just feel like it's an awful lot for the first lesson plan. I think it's real demanding on the students. I think it [2-day experience] has some advantages. At the same time, last quarter I realized that there were problems that cropped up during the first day and there was no opportunity for me to really correct those problems or to intervene except on an individual basis.

Instructor #3 also expressed mixed feelings when discussing these experiences.

I have mixed feelings about media. I think that it's important but I don't think it's the end-all do-all that we sometimes sell it as. . . . Sometimes they had to create the media before they ever knew what they were going to teach so it was meaningless in that sense. . . . I think it's [2-day experience] a big emotional up and a good experience for them but I don't know that it draws a lot of the things we've done though. It's a 2-day survival experience, and when they get through it they're really elated or some are really sad because it didn't go
like they wanted it to go, or else I'm sad because they got through but that's all that happened to them.

Instructor #4 seemed to have doubts about the way media is approached, and its value.

I'm not too sure of the whole benefit of the way we approach media in PI, how much value it has . . . I didn't go by the guidelines in the manual . . . . My emphasis was on finding what was the most appropriate thing to use rather than trying to come up with something that the main intention was just to develop something, some sort of handmade media.

While the instructors seemed to have some specific concerns related to the teaching experiences in Ed. 450, they did assign them (as indicated by their questionnaire responses) and were generally positive concerning their value.

Questions 4-8 related to using the Soar & Soar Model to guide observation. The positive responses ranged from 79% to 93%, which indicated that most teacher candidates were asked to do these assignments. Interview data indicate some concerns on the part of various staff members.

PI Faculty Member #4 said:

Soar and Soar to me is out of place and has always been out of place, but because it had very strong proponents when it was put in, it has remained . . . . as a classroom management model, I think [it] has a lot to be desired, or as a classroom observation scheme gives a new way of viewing what's going on, but I think you cannot deal with it in 2 or 4 days, and you can't deal with it without a reading . . . . Soar and Soar Model should be dropped and I think there can be a classroom management field that perhaps builds on some of the observation skills that they learned . . . .

Faculty Member #3 related that

I think that it's [Soar & Soar] too difficult for the student to grasp. I don't think the students are
I don't think that it works. It didn't work for me very well. . . . It was terribly rushed. No, it's not adequate. . . . I think that the appropriate model should be one based upon a rationale of practical need so what I would do is use a discipline-driven model.

Instructor #2 said:

I think that's a real useful tool [Soar & Soar]; I see that it's valuable and productive.

This same instructor, when asked if the teacher candidates understood Soar & Soar, responded:

No, I think they're grasping at straws when they use it, although to me it gives them some structure with which to generalize.

Instructor #5 referred to Soar & Soar as "just another observation technique; it was just jammed into them."

The high positive response to the questionnaire indicated that instructors do assign the Soar & Soar Model as an observation technique. The interview data indicated that PI Faculty were less positive and had more difficulty than other instructors.

Questions 10 and 11 referred to the first field assignment in Ed. 451. The positive responses to assigning this experience (85% and 92%) seemed more positive than the interviews indicated. Faculty Member #3, when referring to these two experiences, said they were worthless, totally worthless. . . . There's no rationale for having it where it is. It doesn't fit into developmental theory. . . . If I had it to do over [implement, not develop], I would just substitute some other experience for it.

Faculty Member #4 felt something else could be incorporated in the same field assignment.
Instructor #5 was more positive about the experience but felt it occurred too early in the quarter. About the actual assignment, Instructor #5 stated:

The idea is excellent; I think it's a good tool for them to learn and good that they had an on-hands experience with it. . . . The problems I had in the school is that my students were using public school students who had already done the exercise with other PI students.

Instructor #9, when referring to the first field experience in Ed. 451, said:

I get kind of frustrated sometimes by how we try to just kind of fit it in regardless of how it actually fits in. . . . Prior to that we hadn't really talked about reading and language in terms of assessing.

Instructor #12 stated that the experience was "pertinent and relevant" but that there was not adequate time to prepare the students and therefore "[I] had to make modification and revisions in the schedule in order to get the first field in."

The next field experience, preparing a sociogram in a school, was represented by Question 12. Ninety-two percent of the instructors indicated that they asked their teacher candidates to do this activity. The interviews indicated that this is not a very positively perceived experience by the instructors. PI Faculty member #4 said:

I think it's an extremely poorly organized field. It's almost impossible for the kids to make sense out of it.

PI Faculty member #1 said:

I think the sociogram assignment is kind of the best we've come up with so far but it seems like there might be some other better ideas for that for the purposes of that assignment.
PI Faculty member #3 related that

I altered that assignment so that they did a sociogram in an observation and interpretation of how they would deal with any problems or groups that they saw the sociogram generating.

Instructor #9 said:

I have a lot of mixed feelings about the sociogram. . . . I would almost rather they would go in there with a more structured way to observe what's going on in the classroom and just encourage them to really watch and then come back and write down what they saw and talk about what they saw in a more unstructured way.

Instructor #12 related having problems with the context and the way the sociogram was handled.

It appeared that while 92% of the instructors assigned the sociogram to their teacher candidates, they felt it was poorly organized and structured.

Question 15 represented the culminating experience of the PI field experience component. The response was 84% positive. A comment on a questionnaire indicated that this percentage would have been higher but the use of the term "unit" caused several individuals to respond negatively because it is not approached as a unit.

PI Faculty Member #3, in discussing the 5-day experience, said:

I think the 5-day unit has the potential to be a really valuable experience; however, it was less valuable because there was not connection between that and what came before it, and there was not enough time to prepare the students for it and to deal with bigger issues about "why am I going to teach, what I'm teaching, and what happens if..."

Instructor #9 said in terms of the 5-day experience that the kids [teacher candidates] would like a greater opportunity to get to know their class before they teach.
Instructor #11 agreed that "there is not enough time in the classroom prior to being out there for the 5-day field."

The 5-day experience is assigned and perceived as a positive culminating experience. However, there are some problems as it is currently presented. PI is scheduled only 4 days a week, so the experience is fragmented or teacher candidates individually arrange to teach 5 consecutive days. PI is scheduled in 2-hour blocks, which doesn't allow time for transportation, teaching a full period in a middle school and observing a peer partner.

Question 14 related to the final field experience in Ed. 451, the Hidden Curriculum, and received a 75% positive response. This field experience seemed to generate some strong feelings from the instructors. The three PI Faculty members who taught Ed. 451 during the 1980-1981 academic year said:

Hidden curriculum makes absolutely no sense; it's not deliverable. . . . (Faculty member #4)

. . . the hidden curriculum field might go better with another kind of assignment that makes the point more obvious. . . . (Faculty member #1)

We didn't do it. . . . didn't have time. (Faculty member #3)

The responses from other instructors did not seem to reflect the same opinion as that expressed by the faculty. Some of the comments by instructors were:

. . . the last one [Hidden Curriculum] was, I thought, the most effective of all of them and I thought this relates to the fact that they had taught in the schools and they had learned to look for different kinds of things. . . . (Instructor #6)
It's been excellent. We've had no problems with it. (Instructor #12)

Question 15 related to teacher candidates becoming skilled in techniques of observation and received a 66% positive response. Comments by the staff indicated that they had problems with using the term "skilled" in reference to a skill being developed by a sophomore.

Questions 18 and 19 related to using peer partners in Ed. 450 and Ed. 451. The positive response in Ed. 450 was 79% and in Ed. 451, 59%. These lower than the average percentages for these questions were, according to interviews, attributable to technical problems encountered in assigning two teacher candidates to the same room at the same time. This was particularly problematic in Ed. 451 due to middle school schedules. Some comments by faculty and instructors demonstrated the concerns. PI Faculty member #4 said:

I think the peer partner is good, and I think it's something that should be stressed.

PI Faculty member #3 related:

I thought that the idea of using the peer is a good one. I think it ought to be kept, but the way it's implemented is a poor one in that I think that peers can't be expected to evaluate each other. . . .

Instructor #2 related in terms of the concept of peer partners:

My first impulse is to say they are not taking that seriously. They are afraid of criticizing one another.

Instructor #3 said:

The peer thing, I think, is valuable only in one way, and I think that's because that person is with them the whole time and the rest of us just get one shot at seeing how they are. . . . Unless you're taught to really critically think, then I don't see what impact it has. . . .
Instructor #4 said:

I think having the peers working together in groups as observers and providing feedback is very helpful. I think in any kind of peer evaluation it's extremely difficult for them to be very critical.

Question 20 indicates an 85% positive response to the teacher candidate assuming sole responsibility for the class during teaching assignments. Since the law requires the cooperating teacher to remain in the classroom or at least be legally responsible, this would seem to be questionable.

**Education 450 Cooperating Teacher's Response**

Table 5 reported the percentages for Ed. 450 cooperating teachers relating to their perceptions concerning whether they were aware of a given objective being assigned/accomplished.

Choices on the questionnaire were 1.0 "asked to do" and 2.0 "not asked to do." Percentages were computed by averaging responses. The number of respondents varied per question, if a respondent did not respond, or responded that a particular objective was not applicable. The number given with the table was the average of those responding to the 20 questions.

Questions 10-14, 17 and 19 relate to experiences which occurred in Ed. 451; therefore the Ed. 450 cooperating teachers, represented in Table 5, could not have direct information on whether a teacher candidate was asked to do these. Their responses should have been "not asked to do" with a 0% positive response. The actual combined percentage of positive response for the seven questions was 34.5%.
### TABLE 5

Percent of the Education 450 Cooperating Teachers Responding "Yes" to Whether They Were Aware that a Given Objective Was Assigned

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Objective observation on teacher movement</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Objective observation on classroom verbal interaction</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Teach, mini-lesson incorporating media</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Observation, strategies of emotional climate</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Observation, management of learning and thinking</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Observation, management behavior, learning tasks, and thinking</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Observation, management strategies</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Observation, based on Soar &amp; Soar Model</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Teaching, 2 consecutive days</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Assessment, readability of text and of the level of the learner</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Characterize language variation</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Sociometric technique to analyze pupil interaction</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Teach, 5 day unit</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Observation for hidden curriculum</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Observation, skilled in technique</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Teach in elementary classroom</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Teach in middle school classroom</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Peer partner in Ed. 450</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Peer partner in Ed. 451</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Teaching with sole responsibility</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 14; % = 61.25

Range of response: 1.00 - 2.00
After removing the seven questions related to Ed. 451, the corrected total positive response rate for Table 5 was 72.5%.

For purposes of comparing interview responses with the questionnaire data, Questions 1 and 2 were considered together since they represented one field experience, related to teacher movement and verbal interaction. Questions 3, 9 and 16 were discussed together since they represented the teaching experience in Ed. 450. Questions 4-8 were discussed together because they represented various aspects of one field experience, using the Soar & Soar Model to observe in an elementary classroom. Questions 15, 18 and 20 were each discussed separately.

Questions 1 and 2 received an 80% and an 87% positive response rate. Comments from two of the Ed. 450 Cooperating Teachers who were interviewed suggested that they were aware of the students being there but had no perceptions of the content of the observations. Cooperating Teacher #1 said:

... the first time they observed ... I did not see them really writing anything down or taking any particular notes ... I didn't know what they were actually looking for in my lesson.

Ed. 450 Cooperating Teacher #2 said:

... I knew they were observing but I wasn't aware of exactly which factors they were observing because at the time they came I was already working with students when they came so they would just come in quietly and get started with whatever they had to do and I went right on with reading group.

The high positive responses, 100%, 93% and 100%, to questions 3, 9 and 16 indicated that teaching assignments were carried out consistently. The two main concerns cooperating teachers expressed related
to having the lesson plans in advance and having adequate time for
verbal feedback with the teacher candidates.

The responses on Questions 4–8 ranged from 43% to 87% positive
with an average of 56%. It was difficult to determine from the ques­
tionnaires and interviews whether this assignment was not assigned or
the cooperating teachers were just not aware of the different part
of the Model.

Ed. 450 Cooperating Teacher #1 said:

... I was not familiar with the Soar and Soar Model
at all until it was mentioned to me when it was brought
here. ... I was not aware that they were looking for
anything in particular. They just sat down and watched
as teaching was going on and they did not say anything
to me or ask me any questions. I don't know what they
were looking for that particular day; they did just
observe.

Ed. 450 Cooperating Teacher #2 said:

I knew they were observing management but, again, we
did not really have that much time to talk in terms of
exactly your assignment for today. ... So I knew they
were looking for management techniques but not specif­
ically what they were looking for.

Ed. 450 Cooperating Teacher #3 felt this observation should be
eliminated because they had already observed once and "it would be much
more to their advantage to teach three times ..."

Questions 15 and 18 both received a 93% positive response, indi­
cating that most cooperating teachers were aware of the teacher candi­
date's observation exercises and their peer relationship.

Question 20 received a 36% positive response which was the lowest
for any experience that took place in Ed. 450. This low response
resulted from use of the term "sole". According to the interviews,
the cooperating teacher remained in the room and therefore, by his/her presence, maintained the management structure of the room.

**Education 451 Cooperating Teacher's Response**

Table 6 reported the percentages for Ed. 451 Cooperating Teachers relating to their perceptions concerning whether they were aware of a given objective being assigned/accomplished.

Choices on the questionnaire were 1.0 "asked to do" and 2.0 "not asked to do." Percentages were computed by averaging responses. The number of respondents varied per question, if the respondent did not respond or responded that a particular objective was not applicable. The number given with the table was the average of those responding to the 20 questions.

Questions 1-9, 16 and 18 related to experiences which occurred in Ed. 450; therefore the Ed. 451 cooperating teachers, represented in Table 6, could not have direct information on whether a teacher candidate was asked to do these. Their responses should have been "not asked to do," with a 0% positive response. The actual combined percentage of positive responses for the 11 questions was 59.2%.

After removing the 11 questions related to Ed. 450, the corrected total positive response rate for Table 6 was 80.2%.

For purposes of comparing interview responses with the questionnaire data, Questions 10 and 11 which form one field experience were discussed together. Questions 13, 17 and 20 dealt with the teaching experience in the middle school and were discussed together. Questions 12, 14, 15 and 19 were each discussed separately.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Objective observation on teacher movement</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Objective observation on classroom verbal interaction</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Teach, mini-lesson incorporating media</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Observation, strategies of emotional climate</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Observation, management of learning and thinking</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Observation, management behavior, learning tasks, and thinking</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Observation, management strategies</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Observation, based on Soar &amp; Soar Model</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Teaching, 2 consecutive days</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Assessment, readability of text and of the level of the learner</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Characterize language variation</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Sociometric technique to analyze pupil interaction</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Teach, 5 day unit</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Observation for hidden curriculum</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Observation, skilled in technique</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Teach in elementary classroom</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Teach in middle school classroom</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Peer partner in Ed. 450</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Peer partner in Ed. 451</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Teaching with sole responsibility</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( N = 17; \% = 68.7 \)

Range of response: 1.00 - 2.00
Questions 10 and 11 received a 100% and 78% positive response, which seemed to indicate that the cooperating teachers were more aware of the examination of readability levels than the analysis of language variation. Comments from the interviewees on these experiences indicated that they weren't very aware of the assignments, as Ed. 451 Cooperating Teacher #1 said s/he was "not informed at all beforehand," and when asked about the purpose for the teacher candidate, said that s/he still didn't know.

Ed. 451 Cooperating Teacher #2 said:

The readability exercise . . . the OSU students took my students out in the hall and I never did find out really what they were doing. And that's one thing I didn't like about it, just because I was curious and there was no time to talk because they were in and out during the middle of class. . . . I was never told [what they were looking for] . . . In fact, I knew absolutely nothing . . .

Ed. 451 Cooperating Teacher #3 related:

Readability I did not observe. They took 4 or 5 students out into the hall and had them read part of the science textbook. I didn't see any results—nothing.

These responses and comments seemed to indicate that while cooperating teachers are somewhat aware of the teacher candidate's assignments, awareness was very limited.

Questions 13, 17 and 20 each received a 100% positive response. The cooperating teachers were very positive in their interviews. They expressed an interest in having students out more frequently prior to the actual teaching in order to become familiar with the class. Time to provide verbal feedback was also discussed as a need.
Question 12 on the sociogram assignment received an 89% positive response. Cooperating Teacher #3's response to questions on the sociogram reflects the comments made by the other cooperating teachers.

Ed. 451 Cooperating Teacher #3 said:

I saw them sitting, writing names and things like that one day in class, but they did not show me the results of this or anything, so I really can't give you an accurate description of what they did with that.

Question 14 received a positive response of 24%, which was the lowest for an objective which was part of the Ed. 451 experience. As Ed. 451 Cooperating Teacher #2 expressed it: "I had no idea what that was."

Question 15, on skilled observation, received a 78% positive response. The teachers interviewed expressed the need for the teacher candidates to do more observations.

Question 19, relating to the use of peer partners, received a 53% positive response. Ed. 451 Cooperating Teacher #1 said, "Some days, but not all the time" [peer partners were together]. She didn't know if they were helpful.

When questioned about the use of peer partners, Ed. 451 Cooperating Teacher #2 said, "I thought that was probably valuable to them but it didn't make any difference to me."

Teacher Candidate's Response

Table 7 reported the percentages for Teacher Candidates relating to their perceptions concerning whether they were assigned a given objective.
TABLE 7

Percent of the Teacher Candidates Responding "Yes" to Being Assigned a Given Objective

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Objective observation on teacher movement</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Objective observation on classroom verbal interaction</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Teach, mini-lesson incorporating media</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Observation, strategies of emotional climate</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Observation, management of learning and thinking</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Observation, management of behavior, learning tasks, and thinking</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Observation, management strategies</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Observation, based on Soar &amp; Soar Model</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Teaching, 2 consecutive days</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Assessment, readability of text and of the level of the learner</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Characterize language variation</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Sociometric technique to analyze pupil interaction</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Teach, 5 day unit</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Observation for hidden curriculum</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Observation, skilled in technique</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Teach in elementary classroom</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Teach in middle school classroom</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Peer partner in Ed. 450</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Peer partner in Ed. 451</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Teaching with sole responsibility</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 25; % = 91.4

Range of response: 1.00 - 2.00
Choices on the questionnaire were 1.0 "asked to do" and 2.0 "not asked to do." Percentages were computed by averaging responses. The number of respondents varied per question, if the respondent did not respond or responded that a particular objective was not applicable to them. The number given with the table was the average of those responding to the 20 questions.

As indicated by Table 7, most teacher candidates felt that they were asked to perform the objectives. For purposes of comparing interview responses with the questionnaire data, Questions 1 and 2 were considered together since they represented one field experience, related to teacher movement and verbal interaction. Questions 3, 9 and 16 were discussed together since they represented the teaching experiences in Ed. 450. Questions 4, 5, 6, 7 and 8 were discussed together because they represented various aspects of one field experience, using the Soar & Soar Model to structure observation. Questions 10 and 11 were discussed together because they represented one field experience. Questions 12, 14, 15 and 20 were each discussed separately. Questions 13 and 17 were discussed together since they represented the teaching experience in the middle school. Questions 18 and 19 were discussed together since they related to the use of peer partners.

The responses to Questions 1 and 2 indicated that 100% and 94%, respectively, of the teacher candidates felt these objectives were asked of them. The interview responses on the value of these observations seemed somewhat mixed as the following statements by teacher candidates indicate.
When discussing the movement and interaction assignment, Teacher Candidate #1 said:

Yes, it helped me so then I could do it when I had to student teach those 5 days in 451. . . . It made me more comfortable too because I got to know them [children] a little better.

Teacher Candidate #4, when discussing the movement and interaction assignment, said:

What I got out of it was nothing. . . . Observing that level was interesting to me.

Teacher Candidate #5 said:

It [movement and interaction] was helpful but it was hard to see the basis behind it. . . . The seating chart, and the pupil-teacher interaction was good because by being an observer I could realize and see the students that weren't being noticed maybe, or always raising their hand and never called on.

Questions 3, 9 and 16 related to teaching in the elementary school. Their positive responses were 94%, 96% and 92%, respectively. Comments on these teaching experiences were generally positive. Teacher Candidate #1, when discussing the media lesson, said, "It gave me--really gave me the first taste I'd had of student teaching ever." This same teacher candidate, in reference to the 2-day experience, said:

Oh that was a lot of fun I thought; it went better than I had expected. . . . Benefits of the two was--you more or less--if you didn't finish the first day you knew you had another day when you could continue on and the thought wasn't lost from where we had cut off if we didn't even get finished.

Teacher Candidate #3 said:

It [media lesson] was kind of hard because the school that we were with was out in Grove City so we didn't really have that much communication with the teacher.
S/he continued, in respect to the 2-day assignment: "That went pretty well except that the only complaint that I had about it was the time limits. The school was far away. . . ."

Teacher Candidate #4 said the media-assisted lesson "was very helpful; I think it was valuable mainly because of the Edgar Dale Center."

In discussing the 2-day, this teacher candidate said, "I don't think we did the 2-day. I think we only did one day because we were in a 3-hour block."

Teacher Candidate #5 said the media lesson "was very beneficial."

Concerning the 2-day lesson:

That was real good. . . . It just gave me a chance to teach something and come back the next day and see if what I had taught the first day really stuck with the kids, and I found out that it did and that was a good feeling.

Questions 4–8 related to using the Soar & Soar Model to guide observation. The positive responses ranged from 80% to 96%. Teacher Candidate #1, in the interview, said, "Soar and Soar gave me ideas of how I could, when I had the students by myself, how I could relate to them."

Teacher Candidate #3 was not as positive concerning the value of this experience, as reflected by these comments:

[Soar & Soar] was kind of the worst one because I'm not even sure what it is. . . . The biggest thing that everyone was complaining about during that quarter was that we were a little bit unprepared about what was coming up until like a couple of days before it happened, and so we just felt kind of stupid. . . .

Teacher Candidate #5 said:

I think basically what I got out of that [Soar & Soar] was that there were set guidelines within the classroom.
and by using that model I could pick them out and I could tell [what the guidelines were].

Questions 10 and 11 are related, assessing readability and analyzing language variation. These experiences received positive ratings of 96% and 88%, respectively. This only indicates that they were asked to do them; their comments do not reflect satisfaction with the exercises.

Teacher Candidate #1, in referring to the Cloze Procedure, said, "I thought it was worthless; I didn't see much in it." However, when discussing the SMOG Procedure, Teacher Candidate #1 said, "I thought that was a good idea to see what the readability, and to see what the student's level of reading was."

Teacher Candidate #4 said SMOG "was interesting," but went on to say that the language variation and Cloze Procedure were both "foolish."

Teacher Candidate #5 said:

I didn't really do the readability. My partner did it and gave me the results, so I don't know about that very much. . . . It wasn't that beneficial to me because I didn't participate. . . . Talking to the kids with the language variation was good but I didn't really learn a lot from it.

Ninety-six percent of the teacher candidates responded that they were assigned the sociogram. Four of the teacher candidates indicated that it was a useful activity but Teacher Candidate #4 felt it was "stupid." Candidate #1 said, "I thought that [it] was pretty helpful because I noticed a pattern of the students who sat around who seemed like the most talkative." Teacher Candidate #3 said, "It was kind of interesting because it was a desegregated school."
Questions 13 and 19, related to teaching in a middle school, received 96% and 100% positive responses. The comments were positive and centered around the value of having experience with older students. The only concern listed was lack of feedback from cooperating teachers.

Question 14, observation of the hidden curriculum, received an 88% positive response. Three of the teacher candidates, in their interviews, couldn't remember what this one was; the other two said it was easy.

Question 15 also received an 88% positive response. The teacher candidates indicated that they would have liked more observation time, particularly before the 5-day teaching experience.

Questions 18 and 19, concerning the use of peer partners in Ed. 450 and Ed. 451, received 100% and 60% positive responses. Only one of the teacher candidates interviewed indicated that they had a peer partner during Ed. 451, but all of them had a peer partner in Ed. 450. They indicated that a partner would probably have been helpful in Ed. 451, but due to middle school schedules and their car pools it could not be arranged.

**Total Responses**

Table 8 presents a cumulative percentage of all subjects responding positively to each question.

Question 14, observation of the hidden curriculum, received the lowest total percentage of positive responses. As indicated in earlier statements by subjects, this was due to several sections not having time to complete this field.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Objective observation on teacher movement</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Objective observation on classroom verbal interaction</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Teach, mini-lesson incorporating media</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Observation, strategies of emotional climate</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Observation, management of learning and thinking</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Observation, management behavior, learning tasks, and thinking</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Observation, management strategies</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Observation, based on Soar &amp; Soar Model</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Teaching, 2 consecutive days</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Assessment, readability of text and of the level of the learner</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Characterize language variation</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Sociometric technique to analyze pupil interaction</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Teach, 5 day unit</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Observation for hidden curriculum</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Observation, skilled in technique</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Teach in elementary classroom</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Teach in middle school classroom</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Peer partner in Ed. 450</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Peer partner in Ed. 451</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Teaching with sole responsibility</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 75; % = 78.2

Range of response: 1.00 - 2.00
The next lowest positive response was to Question 19, using peer partners in Ed. 451. Technical problems related to scheduling in middle schools and transportation of teacher candidates helped explain this response rate.

There is a cumulative percentage of 78.2% positive responses for all subjects to all questions, indicating that most objectives are assigned to most teacher candidates.

ANOVA to Determine Differences in Perceptions

An ANOVA was run to determine if there were significant differences in perceptions of the four role groups, instructors, Ed. 450 cooperating teachers, Ed. 451 cooperating teachers, and teacher candidates concerning the implementation of the Professional Introduction Field Experience Component. The analysis confirmed a significant difference, $F(3,69) = 7.53$, $p < .0002$.

**TABLE 9**

ANOVA of the Perceptions of Four Role Groups Concerning Assignment of Twenty Objectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>127.21</td>
<td>7.53*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>16.21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* $p < .0002$

To determine where the significance occurred, a Duncan's Multiple Range Test for Variable Y was run. This analysis indicated no significant differences between the two groups of cooperating teachers. It also indicated no differences between the instructors and teacher
candidates. However, between the Ed. 450 and Ed. 451 cooperating teachers and the instructors and teacher candidates there was a significant difference.

After examination of these results, examination of each question by role group indicated that certain questions were not applicable to either Ed. 450 cooperating teachers or Ed. 451 cooperating teachers. For example, Questions 10-14, 17 and 19 were related to experiences in Ed. 451, so Ed. 450 cooperating teachers could not have first-hand knowledge of them. Similarly, Questions 1—9, 16 and 18 were related to experiences in Ed. 450 and would not be familiar to Ed. 451 cooperating teachers. For these reasons a second Statistical Analysis System (SAS) run was performed, removing the Questions 10-14, 17 and 19 from the Ed. 450 cooperating teachers' responses and Questions 1—9, 16 and 18 from the Ed. 451 cooperating teachers' responses.

This second ANOVA confirmed a significant difference, $F(3,69) = 4.93$, $p < .0038$.

**TABLE 10**

ANOVA of the Perceptions of Four Role Groups Concerning Assignment of Selected Objectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.085</td>
<td>4.93*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>.017</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* $p < .0038$
Following this significance, a Duncan's Multiple Range Test for Variable Y was run. This analysis indicated no significant difference between the Ed. 450 and Ed. 451 cooperating teachers and the instructors. However, these three groups did differ significantly from the teacher candidates.

This indicated that teacher candidates perceived the objectives as being assigned more frequently than the other groups. It should be noted that the lowest positive response level was 77%, which was still quite high.

Summary of Synthesized Responses to Open-Ended Questions

Synthesized lists of responses to each question by role group can be found in Appendix 0.

Recommendations for deletions included (in order from most recommendations for deletion to least) deletion of: 1) movement observations in Ed. 450; 2) sociogram in Ed. 451; 3) analysis of language variation in Ed. 451; 4) observation of the hidden curriculum in Ed. 451; 5) observation using Soar & Soar Model in Ed. 450; 7) observation of teacher-student verbal interaction in Ed. 450; and 8) assessment of readability levels in Ed. 451.

Modifications were recommended for every experience over each quarter of the sequence. In addition, there were general modifications suggested such as building in conferencing time between the teacher candidate and cooperating teacher, being selective in placements to take into consideration the experiences and interests of teacher candidates, and consistency in scheduling field assignments.
Suggested additions were numerous and included: additional experiences with handicapped students, more and varied observations, experiences to emphasize the total role of the teacher, a high school experience, additional debriefing time, video-taping for reflection, diagnostic tools, more teaching time, time to meet with cooperating teachers, discussions on and techniques for classroom management, small group lessons, activities to acquaint teacher candidates with children on an individual level, and activities to build awareness of the school environment outside the classroom.

The least productive aspects of the field experiences closely parallel the list of deletions. In general, those listed included a lack of adequate time to prepare for the experience in terms of the curriculum and in terms of talking to cooperating teachers prior to an assignment. During the visit in the school there was not adequate time allowed for the teacher candidate to discuss the activity with the cooperating teacher. After returning to campus, time is again a factor in finding time for debriefing and reflection. In addition to these more general concerns which were seen as least productive, there were specific assignments which were considered least productive. These included: 1) sociometric experience (12 listed this); 2) analysis of language variation (5 listed this); 3) observation of the hidden curriculum (3 listed this); 4) observation using the Soar & Soar Model; 5) observing teacher-student interaction; and 6) the lesson on media.

The most valuable aspects of the field experiences were general in nature and related to being in the real school, observing, planning,
teaching and receiving feedback. Specific assignments were not focused on as being the most valuable.

Summary

Examination of questionnaires and interview data indicated that the various role groups perceived the field experience component as valuable. The majority of the objectives of the field experience component of PI identified in this study are perceived of as being assigned. According to interviews particularly with instructors, there are often modifications on how the objectives are accomplished.

As reported in the interviews and open-ended questions there are some concerns about implementation and the nature of the field assignments.

One concern, expressed by instructors and teacher candidates, is lack of adequate time to prepare for the field, and to debrief and reflect after the experience.

A second concern related to scheduling. This had several components. One, teacher candidates schedule other courses on campus before and after their Professional Introduction class; therefore, the total time for a field experience is limited to 1 hour and 48 minutes including travel. This became particularly important for PI sections assigned to schools in Grove City where travel one way can be over half an hour. The second issue related to scheduling is trying to fit the assignments into the public school's schedule. This is particularly difficult in the middle schools where students are changing classes. With the limited time in the schools it was sometimes difficult to fit into the school's schedule and see an entire class from start to finish or to
find an opportunity to communicate with the cooperating teacher.

There seemed to be mixed reactions to every field assignment. Those of an observational nature seemed to raise more concerns than teaching experiences.

This chapter presented a discussion of the data obtained through historical analysis, questionnaires and interviews. The chapter to follow present a summarization of the data, interpretations, conclusions and recommendations for further study.
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, INTERPRETATION, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter presents a summary of the current investigation. Part 1 presents a restatement of the problem. Parts 2 and 3 include interpretations and conclusions based on the relationship between the models presented in Chapter I and the results of the historical analysis and analysis of the implementation presented in Chapter IV. The final part offers recommendations and suggestions for further study.

Restatement of the Problem

The intent of this investigation was to examine the development and current implementation of the field experience component of the Professional Introduction Program at The Ohio State University, PI follows the Freshman Early Experiencing Program (FEEP). These two programs are both college level responsibilities and are monitored by college faculty committees. Following these two experiences the teacher education student goes into his/her program area where s/he has field experiences as part of the methods courses and finally the student teaching experience. (A more detailed description of the teacher training program is contained in Appendix P.)

Specifically, the study sought to: 1) identify the original rationale for including a field experience component in Professional Introduction; 2) trace the development of the general content and
specific activities composing the field experience component of PI; 3) examine the current implementation to determine if the objectives of each field experience were being implemented; and 4) utilize the data obtained from the analysis of the field experience component of PI and a survey of the literature to make recommendations concerning the field experience component for other similar programs.

**Summary of Instrumentation and Procedures Used**

Historical analysis, a questionnaire, and interviews were used to gather data for this study.

The historical analysis included document examination and interviews. The interviews were partially structured and were intended to secure information on the rationale for pre-service field experience in teacher training and the rationale for the development of the field experience component of PI. This included questions on the development of general content as well as specific activities.

The questionnaire was divided into three sections. Section 1 requested information relevant to a participant's role group. Section 2 was designed to determine the role group's perceptions on whether the teacher candidate was or was not asked to complete a given objective for the field experience component of PI. Section 3 requested recommendations for changes in the field experiences, i.e., modifications, deletions, and additions. It also asked for the most and least valuable aspect of the field experience component. The final section was provided for any additional comments.

The questionnaire was developed by identifying the objectives for the field experience component of PI as described in the 1980
edition of the PI Instructor's Manual. The instrument was pilot tested on a group of cooperating teachers participating in the Field Development Grant during the Spring Quarter 1981.

The instrument was administered to all (N=19) members of the PI instructional staff, a 15% random sample (N=25) of Ed. 450 cooperating teachers, a 12% random sample (N=25) of Ed. 451 cooperating teachers and a 15% random sample (N=50) of teacher candidates who participated in Professional Introduction during the 1980-81 academic year. (Questionnaires are contained in Appendixes B, D, and F.)

Followup interviews were conducted with each role group to obtain information which could not be determined from the questionnaire. Seventeen instructional staff members, a 12% random sample (N=3) of Ed. 450 cooperating teachers, a 12% random sample (N=3) of Ed. 451 cooperating teachers, and a 10% random sample (N=5) of teacher candidates were interviewed. The random samples were drawn from those questionnaire participants indicating a willingness to be interviewed. (Interview schedules are contained in Appendixes G, H, and I.)

Overview of Ways to Develop Field Experiences

There were three different ways suggested for developing a field experience component in a teacher training program, presented in Chapter I. They were a theoretical model based on the literature, an externally mandated model based on sources such as state standards, and a common sense model based on the belief that teachers are born not made and therefore only need experience to acquire the behaviors of a teacher.
The literature seemed to suggest that in order for teacher candidates to gain the most from their field experiences certain factors or points needed consideration when planning the experiences. These six points, which have been presented in Chapters I and II, form the rationale for using theory as a basis for developing a field component and include:

1. The field experience component should be an integral part of a total teacher training curriculum.
2. Each field experience should be an integral part of a formal course.
3. Each field experience should consist of preparation, experience, and reflection.
4. Field experience should be based on the teacher candidates' own experiences.
5. The progression of experiences should be from observation to teaching.
6. Guidance should be a cooperative venture of the university and the public schools.

This dissertation examined the process involved in the development of the field experience component of the Professional Introduction Program at The Ohio State University.

Interpretation of the Historical Analysis

The results of the historical analysis presented in Chapter IV form the basis for the interpretation of questions 1 and 2 and the resulting conclusions. The questions as presented in Chapters I and III are:
1. Was the field experience component of PI based on a particular theoretical model for pre-service field experience?

2. Was the rationale for the field experience component of PI established prior to designing the field experiences, or did the development proceed from a practical to a theoretical level because implementation and development were occurring simultaneously?

From the written documentation and the intensive interviews, it appeared that the field experience component of PI was a result of external mandates, specifically to the Ohio Standards for Colleges and Universities Preparing Teachers. An examination of the relevant sections of the Standards, presented in Chapter IV, revealed that while the Standards provide guidelines for the teacher training program, they provide very few specifics. For example, the Standards mandated that there shall be a total of one quarter of field experiences prior to student teaching but not how these hours shall be distributed. The Standards also mandated that the experiences shall be continuous and supervised but they do not specify the nature of the experiences. It would appear that while the field experience component of PI was developed in response to external mandates, the specific nature of the field experiences in PI cannot be attributed to the Standards.

Within the Standards there appeared to be a combination of the theoretical and common sense reasons for field experiences. Points 1 and 6 of the theoretical model (field experiences should be an integral part of a total teacher training curriculum, and their guidance should
be a cooperative venture of the university and public schools) are included in the Standards with 6 seeming to receive more attention.

Point 1 is included in EDb-303-02, Section E:

The clinical and field-based experiences for teacher education students shall be: (1) an integral part of the teacher education curriculum, commencing early therein and continuing in a sequential manner; . . .

Point 6 is included in EDb-303-01, Section F, which said:

Relationships shall be established between the college or university preparing teachers and approved or chartered schools or school districts for the purpose of providing teacher education students with field based experiences; . . . Experiences and objectives shall be jointly developed, . . .

Point 6 is also included in EDb-303-02, Section D, which stated:

. . . experiences and objectives shall be jointly developed among representatives of approved or chartered schools or school districts . . . the college or university preparing teachers; and teacher education students. . . .

The common sense approach seemed to be represented in EDb-303-02, Section D, which stated:

Each teacher education student shall satisfactorily participate in a series of carefully planned, supervised, and evaluated field-based experiences for which specific learning objectives have been set to assure increasing proficiency in performing the various teaching responsibilities under actual school conditions. . . .

The key word here is "performing," which seemed to put this in the realm of learning by doing or the common sense approach. If there had been a reference to reflection or using the performance to inform theory it would have fit into the theoretical model but this was not the case.
After examining the lack of specificity in the Standards there was a need to consider why the College chose the approach it did in its efforts to come into compliance with the Standards. This effort to come into compliance was a major effort within the College and involved many individuals and large amounts of time. Two concerns of the College related to coming into compliance led directly to the consideration of a generic introduction to teaching which eventually evolved into PI. First, the Teacher Education Redesign Advisory Committee (TERAC) found that "articulation among the separate elements of the common core was minimal and that articulation between the common elements and the special program areas was virtually nonexistent ("PI Update #1, January 1979). Second, it was noted that "clinical and field experiences were minimal and that professional level faculty were seldom involved in teaching and/or supervisory roles" (Aubrecht, p. 2).

As stated in the "PI Proposal" (April 4, 1979), the rationale for PI was external mandates and "to maintain and extend the College's leadership in teacher education by redesigning the nature of the common, prespecialization experiences taken by prospective teachers."

The role of external mandates is clear from this rationale but it is impossible to determine what the nature of the "redesigning" is.

The "Phase One Report" (May 1, 1976) discusses the College's rationale for field based experiences. While this report touches on two of the six theoretical points: "students will go beyond the performance of teaching acts and engage in critical thinking about the whole educational enterprise . . ." and "teacher education should consist of integrated experiences," there seems to be more of a tone of the
common sense model or "experience is the best teacher." For example, it states that the field experience is

ultimately a proving ground wherein the teacher education students are able to test their abilities to provide learning opportunities for others. . . .

Finally a sound teacher education program would include the opportunities for developing the necessary teaching and learning skills called for. (p. 24)

In referring back to the discussions in Chapters I and II concerning the ultimate aim of an experience, it would appear that this is representative of an ultimate aim based on the apprenticeship model rather than the laboratory approach advocated by the theoretical model of this study.

In examining formal documents on the development of PI, external mandates continued to occupy a key position in terms of rationale for the field experience component of PI. No one document listed all of the six points which combine to form the theoretical model but each of the six points was listed in at least one document. The letter of transmittal from the former director of PI to the Associate Dean, dated April 4, 1979, included three points. Point 1 (related to the experience being an integral part of a total teacher training curriculum) seemed to be implicit when he said, "The Professional Introduction provides a generic foundation from which more specialized advanced preparation will develop. . . ." Points 3 and 2 (each field experience should consist of preparation, experience, and reflection; and each field experience should be an integral part of a formal course) were included in this statement:
As much as is possible, a briefing-experience-debriefing format will be utilized to provide relevance for the students by integrating the substantive content with the planned clinical/field experiences. (p. 3)

Point 2 was also included in "Professional Introduction Field Component" (November 16, 1978) which stated:

The field component is critical to the integration process as it is during field experiences that PI students are able to integrate the theoretical perspectives and clinical activities.

"Ed. 494 Professional Introduction Field Experience Program" (undated) contained points 4, 5, and 6 (the experience should be based on the teacher candidates' own experiences; progression of experiences should be from observation to teaching; and guidance should be a cooperative venture). Point 4 was illustrated in this document where it said an emphasis was placed on adapting each field experience to fit individual situations. Point 5 was demonstrated when they suggested that initial experiences should probably be in the form of observations. This document went on to suggest that this observation could be followed by planning and conducting a lesson. Finally, point 6 was included when it said each PI student's duties and responsibilities would be determined by the student, the cooperating teacher and the university supervisor.

This examination of the events leading up to the field experience component of PI indicates that the primary impetus for PI was external mandates in the form of the State Standards and the College's need to come into compliance. Within this external mandate's model were examples of both the theoretical model and the common sense model.
The common sense model seemed to predominate in the documents prior to the actual decision to develop PI. The documents related specifically to the PI field development included various points of the theoretical model even though none of the documents included all of the theoretical points.

During the first experimental cycle of PI, which occurred during the Spring Quarter of 1978, written documentation and interviews indicated that points 2-6 were included in the field experience component of the program. By all accounts, only the first quarter of the sequence had been developed at that time and therefore it was not possible for the field experience component to be an integral part of a total teacher training curriculum since part of the curriculum was not yet developed.

Several major changes occurred during the Autumn Quarter, 1978. The first change was the addition of five new faculty members to the PI staff. This created a problem since this group was not familiar with the program or the resources within the College of Education.

There seemed to be two basic reasons for bringing in new people to develop and implement a major change in the teacher education program. As the first director said:

... there was no great interest shown by large numbers of seasoned faculty at this institution to become involved with PI ... partly the decision was related to the fact that there was a very direct tie then to the monies that we were going to be paying those new people because they were redesign monies.

This was confirmed by the second director, who added:

... and some of the redesign monies for that next year were used to bring in people that had skills related specifically to some of the redesign standards that were in short supply in the College.
As reported in the section on historical development of the PI field experience, the new faculty members were eager, enthusiastic, hardworking, positive about the program, and dedicated as individuals. However, they had many problems with group dynamics, expectations, and divided responsibilities. The decision was made, as discussed above, to hire individuals with expertise in specific areas addressed by the State Standards, i.e., human development, human relations, urban education, sociology of education, and ethnography. These experts were then brought in to develop a program in teacher education. They were not teacher educators, they were not familiar with the history of the development of PI or the politics involved. As a group, they did not fit philosophically and had difficulty functioning together in confronting the awesome task presented to them. In addition, they each had responsibilities within other faculties where often PI was a low priority. Each individual, as an expert in his/her field and very committed to his/her area of expertise, precipitated a sense of "yours versus mine" with stronger individuals getting a larger percentage of the curriculum for their components.

As discussed in Chapter IV under Individual Perceptions of Professional Introduction Development, the second major change that occurred during Autumn Quarter, 1978, was a large influx of teacher candidates for the second cycle of 494-A, in addition to the 22 teacher candidates taking the second quarter of their sequence (494-B). The Autumn staff found that the curriculum and materials used during the Spring Quarter with 24 teacher candidates and 8 staff in 494-A were not appropriate for the number of teacher candidates and the staff
ratio during the autumn. In addition to trying to implement 494-A with a much larger number of teacher candidates, the staff was faced with delivering 494-B which was not developed. These factors led to a great deal of frustration and attempts to modify the curriculum and field experiences based on practical need. Assignments, in some instances, came about because it was time to go into the field, and as the assignments were not yet developed an alternative was implemented. In many cases these hastily inserted alternatives have remained in the curriculum even when they appeared to be inappropriate or out of place.

Changes in field assignments have often resulted from the feedback of participants, changes in textbooks, and the relevance of a given field.

There have been numerous changes at the program level of Professional Introduction which impacted the field experiences. The first change is related to the contact hours and their arrangement. PI was originally designed as a 15 credit-hour course, meeting three hours a day, five days a week, over two quarters. Monday, Wednesday, and Friday were large group sessions and Tuesday and Thursday were designated for clinical and field activities where students met in groups of 20-24. This format was utilized so one professorial level faculty member could do presentations to the group, thus freeing others for development activities. PI, in its current form, is 12 credit hours with 8 contact hours a week. The format is 24 students to one instructor. Each instructor is responsible for his/her own section. Several reasons were given for decreasing the credit hours and thus the contact hours. The main reasons, according to interview data reported in
Chapter IV, were for the convenience of the faculty and because the teacher candidates were having difficulty coping with the time demands.

Returning now to the six points of the theoretical model, PI's relation to the total teacher training program does not appear to be well documented. There was reference made to its not emulating Freshman Early Experiencing Program, but there was no indication of how it related to the teacher candidate's later field experiences. As the second director said, "The idea of continuation that it should build on FEEP, that was never done very well and as far as I know it isn't done very well to this day."

Moving from an integrated approach to a unit approach in presenting the course content affected point 2 (field experiences should be an integral part of a formal course) in relation to the PI field component. As PI Faculty Member #5 said:

Eventually we came to assigning individuals units. . . . What happened then was that they became unrelated to one another; . . . they began to lose any sense of it being an interrelated 2-quarter program. . . . The links were no longer clear and certainly the underlying conceptual links just disappeared entirely. . . .

Continuing with point 2, it appeared that while an individual experience might be integrated within a given unit, there was every indication that the experiences were not conceptualized to provide a total experience within the program. This has implications for its value particularly since, if it was not followed up in subsequent phases, it was likely that significant changes would take place in the learner.

Point 3 (each experience should consist of preparation, experience and reflection) seems to have been consistently built into the
field experience component since a day a preparation preceded each field experience and time for debriefing was built in following each experience. The one concern here was adequate time for each aspect.

During the first experimental cycle of 494-A the individual teacher candidate and his/her past experiences were considered when planning a given field experience. In the 1980 edition of the PI Instructor's Manual each field experience and the evaluation procedures were very specific. It appeared that in an effort to achieve consistency and a comparable experience for the large number of teacher candidates taking PI, the options for individuals had been lost. Point 4 (basing field experiences on the teacher candidates' own experiences) appears to have been part of PI when the course originated in its experimental cycle but has been lost.

There does seem to be a loose correspondence between the literature and the progression of the field experiences in PI. The PI teacher candidate starts with observation and proceeds to longer and longer teaching experiences interspersed with observations intended to inform the teaching experiences.

The evolution of point 6 (guidance being a cooperative venture) seemed to parallel that of point 4 above (basing the teacher candidate's experience on his/her own experiences). According to the written documentation, both cooperating teachers and the teacher candidates worked with the university staff member in planning field experiences for each individual teacher candidate. This is no longer the case.

Examination of the schedules of field activities and discussion with the PI Faculty indicated that the implementation of the field
experiences was not consistent with the literature. First, there was a lack of consensus on the aim of the field experience and what the PI teacher candidates should look like when they had completed the program. As the second director said, "... there was this underlying agreement that we had a lot of field experience but I can't honestly say from the beginning that anybody was very sure about what the outcomes would be." There seemed to be a split in the PI Faculty as to whether the experiences were to develop skills or to inform the content of the course. There even seemed to be differences from one field experience to the next concerning the purpose.

In conclusion, it seems that the rationale for including the field experience component in PI was the result of external mandates. The implementation, development, and revision were occurring simultaneously; therefore, practical concerns were of first priority.

**Interpretation of Current Implementation**

The results of the analysis of the questionnaires and participant interviews presented in Chapter IV form the basis for the interpretations of questions 3 and 4 and the resulting conclusions. The questions as presented in Chapters I and III are:

3. Did instructors, cooperating teachers and teacher candidates have common perceptions of the implementation of the field experience component of PI?

4. Were the stated objectives of the field experience component of PI being consistently met between sections?

There was a significant difference in the perceptions of the teacher candidates with the other role groups. A larger percentage of
teacher candidates perceived the experiences as being assigned, followed by instructors, Ed. 451 cooperating teachers, and Ed. 450 cooperating teachers. According to the high positive response to the questionnaires, the stated objectives were being consistently met between sections.

The six points of the theoretical model, which have been used to examine the development of the field experience component, will now be used to examine the results of the current implementation. This will illustrate where the program was in relation to theory when it was planned and as it was being implemented. As discussed earlier, there is no evidence that the field experience component of PI is an integral part of a total teacher training program as point 1 suggests it should be.

Point 2, that the field experience should be an integral part of a formal course, is partially addressed. The field experience is an integral part of PI but is evaluated with the course content and is not based on the growth and development of individual teacher candidates. While the field experience component is an integral part of the course, there are concerns regarding certain experiences. For example, as reported in Chapter IV, PI Faculty Member #4 said:

... I have some concern about Units 3 and 4, and the sequencing of activities within those two units. ... I think the mini-lesson is a pretty good combination. ... It has been at two or three different spots and there always seems to be something wrong with the spot it's at, which in a way I think suggests that it's not in the right spot.

PI Faculty Member #3 said in reference to the media assignment, "I don't think there's any rationale for it being where it is; I don't
think it fits." However, in referring to the 2-day assignment s/he differed from No. 4 above by saying, "I was surprised how well it integrated with the rest of the course, with the rest of 450, just beautifully."

These same two faculty members did agree on the observation of the classroom management (Soar & Soar) assignment. PI Faculty Member #4 said, "Soar and Soar to me is out of place and has always been out of place . . ." PI Faculty Member #3 said, "I don't think it works. It didn't work for me very well. . . . It was terribly rushed. No, it is not adequate."

These are just a few examples to illustrate that the field experiences are not consistently recognized as an integral part of the course.

Point 3, which says each experience should consist of preparation, experience, and reflection, is ideally built into the program; however, in practice this does not always occur. In examining the syllabus it appears that a preparation day is built in prior to each field experience and debriefing is built in following each experience. The conflict comes in from lack of time for the preparation and debriefing.

Point 4, using the teacher candidates' past experiences, is not considered when planning field assignments. When examining the structured nature of the assignments and evaluation system, it is obvious that this point is nonexistent.

Point 5, related to the progression of experiences, is partially met and the degree relates to the amount of reflection or debriefing time used to put the experiences into a theoretical framework.
In looking at the cooperating teacher's interview data reported in Chapter IV, point 6 on guidance being a cooperative venture is not met. Cooperating teachers provide a classroom situation and, when asked, feedback on a teaching assignment, but generally don't appear to understand most of the assignments.

In conclusion, the field experience component as developed and implemented does not reflect the theoretical perspectives presented in this study.

**Recommendations**

1. When planning a program or program component, a decision should be reached concerning the ultimate aim of the program or program component. Based on this aim, theoretical perspectives should be identified and followed when developing the program.

2. Adequate time must be allowed for development of the program or program component prior to implementation. The total program needs to be conceptualized as a whole before development starts.

3. Program development needs to be the responsibility of informed individuals who are familiar with the mechanisms established for change.

4. Individuals with major responsibility for implementation of a program need to either be involved in the development or have an understanding and/or commitment to the development that occurred.
Suggestions for Further Study

The following are suggested for exploration by researchers:

1. An examination of the field experience component of PI in terms of its position in the total training program for teacher candidates. This would probably have to occur by certification area since there are 23 certification areas within the College.

2. An examination of the organization and delivery of the content of the Professional Introduction sequence.

3. An in-depth examination of the quality, nature, and consistency of the feedback provided for teacher candidates during their field experiences.

4. Examination of approaches to reflection and its value to teacher candidates.

5. Examination of the feasibility of providing on-campus clinical experiences for activities which don't require a public school setting, i.e., developing observation skills.

6. Examination of the field experience component of PI beginning where this study ended with Director/Coordinator #3.

This study examined the development and implementation of the field experience component of Professional Introduction and its relation to three possible ways of developing programs.
Appendix A

PI Instructors' Cover Letter
Dear Fellow Professional Introduction Staff Member:

As part of a continuing effort to examine the field experience component of Professional Introduction I have gone through the 450 and 451 manuals and listed the objectives for each field experience. In addition, I listed several objectives common to several different field experiences, such as the concepts of observation skills, lesson planning and peer partners. I have used these objectives as the basis for the enclosed survey. This is an attempt to determine which of the stated objectives we are accomplishing. The completion of the enclosed questionnaire will take less than fifteen minutes.

You are guaranteed complete anonymity as an individual respondent.

I know how busy everyone is right now, but your responses are important so please take a few minutes and fill out the questionnaire.

Sincerely,

Karen Nicholson

Karen Nicholson
Appendix B

PI Instructors' Questionnaire


**Professional Introduction Instructor Questionnaire**

The field experience component of Professional Introduction strives to achieve a number of objectives. This questionnaire is designed to provide information on whether these objectives are being met.

Please indicate your assignment for each quarter.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quarter</th>
<th>450</th>
<th>451</th>
<th>Development</th>
<th>Field Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Autumn 1980</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winter 1981</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 1981</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Directions: Please circle "Yes" to indicate that the objective was assigned to your teacher candidates, or "No" to indicate that it was not assigned to your teacher candidates.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objectives</th>
<th>Assigned to do</th>
<th>Not assigned to do</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The teacher candidate will record (objective) information about teacher movement within the classroom. This information should be gathered during a 20-minute period and should incorporate a timed interval approach. (Unit 4, page 6)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The teacher candidate will record (objective) information about teacher-student verbal interaction within the classroom. This information should be gathered during a 20-minute period and should record all interactions directed between teachers and students in either direction. (Unit 4, page 7)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The teacher candidate will teach a lesson plan which incorporates media in a public elementary school setting for approximately 30 minutes. The lesson should include the introduction of information, direction of student learning, and the assessment of student outcomes resulting from the lesson. (Unit 4, page 9)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The teacher candidate will be able to distinguish between teacher behaviors and strategies that contribute to emotional climate as opposed to management of behavior, learning and thinking. (Unit 5, page 1)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. The teacher candidate will be able to distinguish among teacher acts and strategies that involve the management of learning, and the management of thinking. (Unit 5, page 1)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. The teacher candidate will be able to distinguish among teaching acts and strategies that affect student freedom in the management of behavior, learning tasks, and thinking (Unit 5, page 1)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7. The teacher candidate will be able to distinguish whether the teacher is managing by established structure or current interaction. (Unit 5, page 1) 

8. The teacher candidate will be able to observe and analyze a complex classroom in terms of the categories and dimensions of the Soar and Soar Model for classroom management. (Unit 5, page 1)

9. The teacher candidate will have the opportunity to teach 2 consecutive daily lessons. This will provide practice in writing plans, planning instruction for a two-day lesson and managing a classroom. (Unit 6, page 3)

10. The teacher candidate will be able to assess the readability level of texts and assess the readability level of learners. (Unit 8, page 1)

11. The teacher candidate will characterize language variation among several pupils. (Unit 8, page 2)

12. The teacher candidate will apply sociometric techniques to analyze pupil interactions in the classroom. (Unit 10, page 2)

13. The teacher candidate will develop a unit lesson plan which incorporates skills and concepts from previous units in 450-451. These skills and concepts include: lesson plan writing, considerations of learner characteristics (cognitive, affective, developmental, diversity); classroom characteristics, considerations of classroom management and relationship with learners and instructional methods (sequencing and media/materials.) (Unit 11, page 1)

14. The teacher candidate will recognize the hidden curricula in schooling. (Unit 12, page 3)

15. The teacher candidate will have the opportunity to become skilled in the techniques of observation. (Unit 12, page 3)

16. The teacher candidate will be given an opportunity to test their planning and teaching abilities in an elementary classroom. (Unit 4, page 1)

17. The teacher candidate will be given an opportunity to test their planning and teaching abilities in a middle school classroom. (Unit 11, page 1)

18. The teacher candidate will have a peer partner who will record objective information about the delivery and management of the lesson while her/his partner is teaching in 450. (Unit 4, page 6)
19. The teacher candidate will have a peer partner who will record objective information about the delivery and management of the lesson while her/his partner is teaching in 451. (Unit 11, page 1)

20. The teacher candidate will assume sole responsibility for the entire class during teaching assignments. (Unit 4, page 6)

Directions: Please answer the following questions by short answer to provide us with additional information.

21. What additional field activities did you ask your teacher candidates to perform that weren't covered above?

22. Are there field assignments that you think should be deleted from the program? Please list them and tell why you would delete them.

23. What modifications would you make in existing field assignments? Please be specific.

24. What activities would you add to the existing field experiences and why?

25. What is the least productive aspect of the field experience? Please be specific and give examples if possible.

26. What is the most valuable aspect of the field experience? Please be specific and give examples if possible.

27. Additional comments:
Appendix C

Cooperating Teachers' Cover Letter
Dear Cooperating Teacher:

I am conducting a survey of teachers who have served as cooperating teachers with the Professional Introduction Program during at least one quarter of the 1980-1981 school year. This is an effort to determine whether the field experience component of Professional Introduction is meeting its stated objectives. You have been selected as one of the respondents. I realize how busy your schedule is at this time of year, but the completion of the enclosed questionnaire will take less than fifteen minutes, and your responses are of great importance to the survey. Professional Introduction needs to gather information on the field experience to help determine its future direction.

The questionnaire is basically simple to complete. In the first section list the information concerning you and your classroom, in the next section circle your response, and provide short answers in the final section.

You are guaranteed complete anonymity as an individual respondent. The number on the questionnaire is used only to exclude your name from follow-up mailings.

Your responses are important so please take a few minutes now and fill out the questionnaire. Its prompt return and your cooperation are appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

Karen Nicholson
Doctoral Candidate
Early and Middle Childhood Education
Appendix D

Cooperating Teachers' Questionnaire
Professional Introduction Cooperating Teacher Questionnaire

The field experience component of Professional Introduction strives to achieve a number of objectives. This questionnaire is designed to provide information on whether these objectives are being met.

Directions: Please complete the following information concerning your experience with Professional Introduction.

1. What quarter(s) during 1980-81 did you work with Professional Introduction teacher candidates?

2. How many Professional Introduction teacher candidates did you work with during the 1980-81 school year?

3. How many Professional Introduction instructors did you work with during the 1980-81 school year?

4. What grade level and subject(s) did your Professional Introduction teacher candidate work with?

5. How many years teaching experience do you have?

6. Is your school urban, suburban or rural?

Directions: Please circle "Yes" to indicate that the objective was required of your teacher candidate, or "No" to indicate that it was not required of your teacher candidate. If you were not aware that it was an objective, please circle "No".

OBJECTIONS

1. The teacher candidate will record (objective) information about teacher movement within the classroom. This information should be gathered during a 20-minute period and should incorporate a timed interval approach. (Unit 4, page 6)

2. The teacher candidate will record (objective) information about teacher-student verbal interaction within the classroom. This information should be gathered during a 20-minute period, and should record all interactions directed between teachers and students in either direction. (Unit 4, page 7)

3. The teacher candidate will teach a lesson plan which incorporates media in a public elementary school setting for approximately 30 minutes. The lesson should include the introduction of information, direction of student learning, and the assessment of student outcomes resulting from the lesson. (Unit 4, page 9)

4. The teacher candidate will be able to distinguish between teacher behaviors and strategies that contribute to emotional climate as opposed to management of behavior, learning and thinking. (Unit 5, page 1)

5. The teacher candidate will be able to distinguish among teacher acts and strategies that involve the management of learning, and the management of thinking. (Unit 5, page 1)

6. The teacher candidate will be able to distinguish among teaching acts and strategies that affect student freedom in the management of behavior, learning tasks, and thinking. (Unit 5, page 1)
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7. The teacher candidate will be able to distinguish whether the teacher is managing by established structure or current interaction. (Unit 5, page 1)

8. The teacher candidate will be able to observe and analyze a complex classroom in terms of the categories and dimensions of the Soar and Soar Model for classroom management. (Unit 5, page 1)

9. The teacher candidate will have the opportunity to teach 2 consecutive daily lessons. This will provide practice in writing plans, planning instruction for a two-day lesson and managing a classroom. (Unit 6, page 3)

10. The teacher candidate will be able to observe and analyze a complex classroom in terms of the categories and dimensions of the Soar and Soar Model for classroom management. (Unit 5, page 1)

11. The teacher candidate will characterize language variation among several pupils. (Unit 8, page 2)

12. The teacher candidate will apply sociometric techniques to analyze pupil interactions in the classroom. (Unit 10, page 2)

13. The teacher candidate will develop a unit lesson plan which incorporates skills and concepts from previous units in 450-451. These skills and concepts include: lesson plan writing, considerations of learner characteristics (cognitive, affective, developmental, diversity); classroom characteristics, considerations of classroom management and relationship with learners and instructional methods (sequencing and media/materials.) (Unit 11, page 1)

14. The teacher candidate will recognize the hidden curricula in schooling. (Unit 12, page 3)

15. The teacher candidate will have the opportunity to become skilled in the techniques of observation. (Unit 12, page 3)

16. The teacher candidate will be given an opportunity to test their planning and teaching abilities in an elementary classroom. (Unit 4, page 1)

17. The teacher candidate will be given an opportunity to test their planning and teaching abilities in a middle school classroom. (Unit 11, page 1)

18. The teacher candidate will have a peer partner who will record objective information about the delivery and management of the lesson while her/his partner is teaching in 450. (Unit 4, page 6)
19. The teacher candidate will have a peer partner who will record objective information about the delivery and management of the lesson while her/his partner is teaching in 451. (Unit 11, page 1)

20. The teacher candidate will assume sole responsibility for the entire class during teaching assignments. (Unit 4, page 6)

Directions: Please answer the following questions by short answer to provide us with additional information.

21. What modifications would you make in existing field assignments? Please be specific.

22. Are there field assignments that you think should be deleted from the program? Please list them and tell why you would delete them.

23. What activities would you add to the existing field experiences and why?

24. What was the least productive aspect of the field experience for your teacher candidate? Please be specific and give examples if possible.

25. What was the most valuable (useful) aspect of the field experience for your teacher candidate? Please be specific and give examples if possible.

26. Additional comments:

Would you be willing to be interviewed concerning the field experience component of Professional Introduction? _______ If yes, how can you be contacted?
Appendix E

Teacher Candidates' Cover Letter
Dear Teacher Candidate:

I am conducting a survey of teacher candidates who have taken Professional Introduction during the 1980-1981 school year. This is an effort to determine whether the field experience component of Professional Introduction has met its stated objectives. You have been selected as one of the respondents. The completion of the enclosed questionnaire will take less than fifteen minutes, but your responses are of great importance to the survey. Professional Introduction needs to gather information on the field experience to help determine its future direction.

The questionnaire is basically simple to complete. In the first section list the environmental data concerning your field placement, in the next section circle your response, and provide short answers on the final section.

You are guaranteed complete anonymity as an individual respondent.

Your responses are important so please take a few minutes now and fill out the questionnaire. Its prompt return and your cooperation are appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

Karen Nicholson
Doctoral Candidate
Early and Middle Childhood Education
Appendix F

Teacher Candidates' Questionnaire
Professional Introduction Teacher Candidate Questionnaire

The field experience component of Professional Introduction strives to achieve a number of objectives. This questionnaire is designed to provide information on whether these objectives are being met.

Please complete the following information concerning your experience with Professional Introduction.

Quarter taken

School district assigned to

Grade level assigned to

Subject taught

Do you plan to teach when you finish college? If so, what grade and/or subject?

Directions: Please circle "Yes" to indicate that you were asked to complete that objective, or "No" to indicate that you were not asked to complete that objective during your Professional Introduction experience. If an objective is not clear, please indicate "No" to indicate not clearly asked to do.

Objectives

1. The teacher candidate will record objective information about teacher movement within the classroom. This information should be gathered during a 20-minute period and should incorporate a timed interval approach. (Unit 4, page 6)

2. The teacher candidate will record (objective) information about teacher-student verbal interaction within the classroom. This information should be gathered during a 20-minute period and should record all interactions directed between teachers and students in either direction. (Unit 4, page 7)

3. The teacher candidate will teach a lesson plan which incorporates media in a public elementary school setting for approximately 30 minutes. The lesson should include the introduction of information, direction of student learning, and the assessment of student outcomes resulting from the lesson. (Unit 4, page 9)

4. The teacher candidate will be able to distinguish between teacher behaviors and strategies that contribute to emotional climate as opposed to management of behavior, learning and thinking. (Unit 5, page 1)

5. The teacher candidate will be able to distinguish among teacher acts and strategies that involve the management of learning, and the management of thinking. (Unit 5, page 1)

6. The teacher candidate will be able to distinguish among teaching acts and strategies that affect student freedom in the management of behavior, learning tasks, and thinking. (Unit 5, page 1)
7. The teacher candidate will be able to distinguish whether the teacher is managing by established structure or current interaction. (Unit 5, page 1) Yes  No

8. The teacher candidate will be able to observe and analyze a complex classroom in terms of the categories and dimensions of the Soar and Soar Model for classroom management. (Unit 5, page 1) Yes  No

9. The teacher candidate will have the opportunity to teach 2 consecutive daily lessons. This will provide practice in writing plans, planning instruction for a two-day lesson and managing a classroom. (Unit 6, page 3) Yes  No

10. The teacher candidate will be able to assess the readability level of texts and assess the readability level of learners. (Unit 6, page 1) Yes  No

11. The teacher candidate will characterize language variation among several pupils. (Unit 8, page 2) Yes  No

12. The teacher candidate will apply sociometric techniques to analyze pupil interactions in the classroom. (Unit 10, page 2) Yes  No

13. The teacher candidate will develop a unit lesson plan which incorporates skills and concepts from previous units in 450-451. These skills and concepts include: lesson plan writing, considerations of learner characteristics (cognitive, affective, developmental, diversity); classroom characteristics, considerations of classroom management and relationship with learners and instructional methods (sequencing and media/materials.) (Unit 11, page 1) Yes  No

14. The teacher candidate will recognize the hidden curricula in schooling. (Unit 12, page 3) Yes  No

15. The teacher candidate will have the opportunity to become skilled in the techniques of observation. (Unit 12, page 3) Yes  No

16. The teacher candidate will be given an opportunity to test their planning and teaching abilities in an elementary classroom. (Unit 4, page 1) Yes  No

17. The teacher candidate will be given an opportunity to test their planning and teaching abilities in a middle school classroom. (Unit 11, page 1) Yes  No

18. The teacher candidate will have a peer partner who will record objective information about the delivery and management of the lesson while her/his partner is teaching in 450. (Unit 4, page 6) Yes  No
15. The teacher candidate will have a peer partner who will record objective information about the delivery and management of the lesson while her/his partner is teaching in 451. (Unit 11, page 2)  
Yes  No

20. The teacher candidate will assume sole responsibility for the entire class during teaching assignments. (Unit 4, page 6)  
Yes  No

Directions: Please answer the following questions by short answer to provide us with additional information.

21. What additional field activities were you asked to perform that weren't covered above?

22. Are there field assignments that you think should be deleted from the program? Please list them and tell why you would delete them?

23. What modifications would you make in existing field assignments? Please be specific.

24. What activities would you add to the existing field experience and why?

25. What was the least productive (useful) aspect of the field experience for you? Please be specific and give examples if possible.

26. What was the most valuable aspect of the field experience for you? Please be specific and give examples if possible.

27. Additional comments:

Would you be willing to be interviewed concerning the field experience component of Professional Introduction? ______ If yes, how can you be contacted?
Appendix G

PI Faculty Interview Schedule
PI Faculty Interview Schedule

I'd like to discuss the development of the field experience component of PI with you as well as the implementation as it is currently taking place.

1. What kind of charge were you, as developers, given when you joined the PI Staff?

2. What kind of guidelines were you given for the field experience component of PI?

3. Discuss the development of the field experience component of PI.

4. Can you discuss specific changes which have occurred in the field component? Why they occurred and the effect this had?

5. What was the rationale for the order and sequence of the field experiences as they are currently arranged?

The following questions were also used with the other instructional staff members:

6. I'd like to examine each field experience in terms of the following questions:
   a. Did you have adequate time to prepare the teacher candidates for the experience?
   b. Were you able to implement the experience as it was written in the manual?
   c. Did you make changes in the experience as written? Why?
   d. Was adequate time allowed for debriefing and reflection?
   e. How valuable was this experience for your teacher candidates?
   f. How well did the experience fit into the content?
   g. What was the purpose of this field?

7. a. Do you use peer partners?
   b. How valuable is it?
   c. Any problems with it?

8. a. Do the cooperating teachers provide helpful feedback to the teacher candidates?
   b. Are the forms we provide for feedback adequate?

9. Are there changes you would like to see made in the field component?

10. Do you think that the field experiences are an integral part of the curriculum?

11. Do you have other general comments or concerns about the field component?
Appendix H

Cooperating Teachers' Interview Schedule
Cooperating Teacher Interview Schedule

Today I'd like to discuss the field experience component of Professional Introduction with you. I'll be asking some specific questions but feel free to add any comments you'd like.

1. Why do you think Ohio State puts their sophomores in the public school classroom?

2. I'd like to look at each field experience. (Had them on a list, varied for Ed. 450 and Ed. 451 cooperating teachers) and have you answer questions related to it.
   a. What did you do for or with the teacher candidate during this experience?
   b. What effect did the experience have on you or one your class?
   c. What did you observe the teacher candidate doing?
   d. Did you discuss the experience with the teacher candidate after the experience?

3. How adequate were the feedback forms provided with the experiences?

4. How much contact did you have with the university instructor?

5. Did you feel you received adequate communication from the university on what was expected if you and the teacher candidate?

6. Do you feel like you're part of the teacher training process? Would you like more input into the process?

7. Did the teacher candidates have a peer partner and how valuable do you think this is?

8. Do you feel your teacher candidates were adequately prepared for their field experiences?

9. Are there recommendations you would like to make concerning the program?

10. Any additional comments?
Appendix I

Teacher Candidates' Interview Schedule
Teacher Candidate Interview Schedule

Today I'd like to discuss the field experience component of Professional Introduction with you. I'll be asking some specific questions but feel free to add any comments you'd like.

1. What, in your opinion, is the purpose for having the field experience component in PI?

2. Now I'd like to take a look at each individual field experience and have you discuss the purpose of the experience and what you personally got out of it. (Discussed each experience for the two quarter sequence; these were written out so the teacher candidate could read down the list. Questions were inserted as the teacher candidate talked to encourage elaboration or explanations as needed.)

3. Did you have a peer partner in Ed. 450 and Ed. 451? Was that valuable? Why or why not?

4. How helpful was your cooperating teacher in getting you ready for the 5-day experience and in providing feedback?

5. How helpful was your instructor in preparing you for each field experience?

6. What recommendations would you make concerning the program?

7. Any additional comments?
Appendix J

Course Syllabus for Psychology 230
I. Philosophy of Education Psychology at Ohio State
   A. Developmentally oriented; human growth and development through the first two decades of life is emphasized.
   B. Psychology of human learning
   C. Assessment and evaluation of performance
   D. The individual student; working with mental health processes of both child and teachers
   E. Social Psychology of the classroom; the socialization process and the classroom as a social and quasi-primary group
   F. Diagnosis and remediation of learning problems and disabilities

II. The Curriculum
   A. (See pp. 148-49)

III. Procedure for Evaluating Student Performance
   A. Overall Point Distribution: Midterm I: 50 points  Midterm II: 50 points  Final Exam: 70 points  Class Points: 80 points
      TOTAL  250 points

   Both midterms and the final exam are multiple choice. They are norm-referenced exams based on student performance across all sections of Psychology 230. I must be notified if you are going to miss an exam or quiz before the day of the exam or quiz. Otherwise you will not be allowed to take a make-up. All make-ups will be given on the same day, probably the last class day of the quarter. The final exam is comprehensive; the second midterm is not.

   B. Quizzes - There will be three, ten-point quizzes. They will come approximately one week before the exams. They will consist of 20 multiple choice questions similar in content to those on the exams; however, some quiz items will cover classroom lectures and not the Gibson and/or Dantler tests.

   C. Journals - Each week you will be assigned an issue relating to you and Educational Psychology. Your response should be kept to approximately two to four paragraphs. Typing is not necessary. Each journal will be graded on a 0-3 point scale, with a maximum possible 30 points.

   D. Library Research - In order for you to become more intimately acquainted with some material in depth through the psychological and educational literature, you will have two projects in the library.
      1. Abstract analyses - Decide on a topic related to Educational Psychology which intrigues you. Using two of the four abstracting services explained in the "How to Use Research Literature" handout, find an article abstracted that relates to the topic published in the last five years. Reproduce those references and abstracts and hand in on two 3 x 5 cards. Due July 21. (10 points)
      2. Article Review - This time go into more depth. Find an article in one of the below-listed journals published within the last year and a half (1977-1978). Write a three page typewritten review of that article. Due August 11. (10 points)

CLASS POINTS:
   Quiz I - July 6 - 10 points
   Quiz II - July 28 - 10 points
   Quiz III - August 21 - 10 points
   Journals - Weekly - 30 points
   Abstract - July 21 - 10 points
   Review - August 11 - 10 points
   TOTAL  80 points
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Course Syllabus for C & F 435
Education 435 Overview

Theory and Practice in Secondary Education
(An Introduction to Teaching)

Education 435: Its Place in the College

Education 435 is designed and intended by the College's Program Committee to be the first course in the professional sequence for secondary education majors. It teaches basic and common knowledge, skills and attitudes while the special methods courses which follow it will help students apply these fundamentals to their own curricular areas. In order for Education 435 to be most effective and useful, students and their advisers must plan their programs so that Education 435 precedes all special methods courses.

The Common Elements of Teaching

The common elements of teaching to be attained in this course are:

I. Planning

A. To be able to acquire and use information about students as part of preparation for teaching.

B. To be able to select a curriculum for a short course and to specify objectives i.e. how the learners' behavior is to be changed as a result of instruction.

C. To be able to design a sequence of instruction to accomplish the objectives for a short course.

D. To be able to design lessons for the accomplishment of subsets of objectives for the short course.

E. To be able to identify instructional alternatives and materials intended to facilitate accomplishment of lesson objectives or, if they are not available to be able to design and develop them.

F. To be able to identify parts and procedures for operating audiovisual equipment most often used to facilitate learning.

G. To be able to plan a pre-assessment for a unit and/or lesson which determines to what extent learners may already have accomplished any of the objectives.

II. Executing

A. To be able to execute an instructional strategy consistent with the instructional alternatives and materials selected (direct, interactive, group, independent).
B. To be able to execute microteaching skills (based upon principles of learning) which enhance teacher clarity, enthusiasm and variability.

C. To be able to describe factors related to establishing and maintaining a healthful learning climate for each lesson taught.

III. Evaluating

A. To be able to recognize learner difficulties and adjust learning activities accordingly.

B. To be able to judge the extent to which students accomplish the lesson's objectives (post-assessment).

C. To be able to analyze and evaluate teaching by means such as (1) student gain, (2) student ratings, (3) peer ratings, (4) supervisory ratings and (5) use of observational systems.

D. To be able to analyze and reflect on a teaching episode or lesson and propose hypotheses which may account for student gain or lack of it.

IV. Problem Solving

A. To be able to analyze classroom problems for the purpose of posing solutions which may reduce or eliminate the problems.

How the Course Is Taught

The short course. Early in 435, participants are organized into teams of five or six members. Each team is to plan, execute and evaluate a short course. The short course is a unit of work or instructional sequence to be taught to a group of secondary school students once the team members have demonstrated to the 435 instructors that they have attained the requisite planning, execution, evaluation and problem-solving abilities listed earlier. Each 435 instructor works with his or her teams to ensure that the abilities are indeed acquired. That is the instructor's major role—to ensure that the teams are as ready as possible to succeed in accomplishing the objectives of the team's short course. The short course is taught in a school within Franklin County. The school where your team eventually is assigned may be an inner city school, a nonpublic school or some other kind. Since all schools are engaged in teaching American children to live in a democratic, multi-ethnic, multi-racial society and since the secondary teacher education program at Ohio State prepares teachers to work in all kinds of schools—public, private, inner city, suburban, rural, etc., it is the position of the Education 435 staff that teachers-to-be in our program cannot reject short course assignments in schools which they consider "difficult." The team visits the school, collects information about it and the students to be taught, locates the room wherein instruction will occur, and meets the school assigned cooperating teacher who serves as an extension of the 435 faculty.
Microteaching. Some of the abilities to be learned which are listed under "Executing" teaching are practiced in the Microteaching Laboratory located in 115 Ramseyer Hall. Prior to teaching the short course, members of the team are required to study and practice abilities such as communicating clearly, showing enthusiasm or using a variety of stimuli in teaching. After the video taped microteaching lesson the playback is carefully analyzed by the 435 Microteaching Laboratory Instructor with assistance from the team members.

Reflective Teaching Lesson. In order to see how well one teaches compared with others, the notion of the RTL has been introduced. An RTL occurs when several 435 participants are given an identical instructional goal and engage in peer teaching to see which one can achieve it most quickly with the group to whom he is assigned. As in the Microteaching Laboratory the focus is on execution skills such as "describing." Following the engagements hypotheses are projected which could account for the relative success or failure of the teachers and their students.

In summary, the course is directed toward acquiring faculty identified abilities of teachers which are learned and practiced in a variety of ways and settings including RTL's and microteaching. In the short course the abilities are blended and executed as the teams teach in real classrooms.

Miscellaneous

The course is organized so that students work in teams of approximately five students each. Students are expected to share equally the responsibility for conducting the work of the group. Satisfactory teamwork requires that team members agree both on goals or tasks to be accomplished and strategies for accomplishing them. In order to do this it is the responsibility of the team members to be sensitive to and to respect each other's differences and at the same time to cooperate with each other.

Requirements

In order to pass Education 435 participants will satisfactorily

- attend and participate in class and group work
- teach at least two microteaching lessons
- participate in at least one RTL
- teach a short course
- complete course evaluations
- provide evidence of accomplishment of the course abilities individually and on a final examination at the end of the quarter.
- accomplish other requirements which may be specified by individual instructors.
Final examination times* will be as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class hours</th>
<th>Exam date and time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8-10</td>
<td>Tues., Dec. 5, 1:00-2:48 P.M.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-12</td>
<td>Tues., Dec. 5, 8:00-9:48 A.M.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-4</td>
<td>Wed., Dec. 6, 8:00-9:48 A.M.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Additional explanation of course requirements will be provided by your instructors.

Readings

References which are on closed reserve in the Education Library can be found in the Related Readings handout which may be provided by your instructors. Individual instructors will also inform their sections about texts to be used.

435 Individual Faculty Assignments, Autumn Quarter, 1978

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INSTRUCTOR</th>
<th>DAYS</th>
<th>TIMES</th>
<th>ROOMS AVAILABLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Paul Burden</td>
<td>MTWR</td>
<td>8-10</td>
<td>110-136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doug Kammerer</td>
<td>MTWR</td>
<td>10-12</td>
<td>110-136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phyllis Levy</td>
<td>MTWR</td>
<td>10-12</td>
<td>110-136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debbie Phillips</td>
<td>MTWR</td>
<td>2-4</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Paul Burden, Graduate Teaching Associate, 122 Ramseyer, Telephone 422-0980. Assignment: Section Instructor.

Joan Gordon, Graduate Research Assistant, 116 Ramseyer, Telephone 422-0980. Assignment: Laboratory Technician.

Jessica Jahnke, Graduate Teaching Associate, 122 Ramseyer, Telephone 422-0980. Assignment: Microteaching Instructor.

Doug Kammerer, Graduate Teaching Associate, 122 Ramseyer, Telephone 422-0980. Assignment: Section Instructor.

Phyllis Levy, Graduate Teaching Associate, 122 Ramseyer, Telephone 422-0980. Assignment: Section Instructor.

Debbie Phillips, Graduate Teaching Associate, 122 Ramseyer, Telephone 422-0980. Assignment: Section Instructor.

Kevin Ryan, Professor and Coordinator for Education 435, 121C Ramseyer, Telephone 422-5181.

Mary Cay Wells, Graduate Teaching Associate, 122 Ramseyer, Telephone 422-0980. Assignment: Coordinator for Laboratory Experience.
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Course Syllabus for EMCE 461
1. **461. Conceptions of Teaching:**

   Meets twice a week (1½ hour classes)

   The laboratory experience for Education 460 also serves 461

   Prerequisites: Concurrent with 460 - (Students from other major fields which do not require 460 will be assigned to an elementary classroom for observation and participation.)

   Not open in Su. to elementary majors without experience.

   Designed to acquaint students with certain aspects of elementary school programs which cut across separate subject areas, and to acquaint students with certain teaching behaviors.

2 & 3. **Rationale and Objectives:**

   There is substantial agreement among the faculty of early and middle childhood education that there is a need for a course which deals with those aspects of teaching which are common throughout the elementary school program. Particular attention is given to the study of teaching behaviors with emphasis on the role of the creative teacher. Teaching behavior is considered in relationship to such general aspects of classroom experience as: the identification of goals and purposes of elementary education, organization of children for instruction, organization of curriculum toward the end of individualized development of children, classroom control and discipline, supporting personnel, and parents.

4. **Outline of Content:**

   a. Identification of goals and purposes of early and middle childhood education with emphasis on the importance of goal identification in the development of teacher behavior.

   b. Study of teaching styles with emphasis on the effect which each may have on the lives of children and the lives of teachers.

   - repetition
   - guided discovery
   - problem solving

   c. An in-depth study of the problem solving style of teaching with attention given to:

   - classroom management and discipline
   - physical aspects of the classroom
   - interaction within the classroom and within the school
   - organization of the school
   - organization of content
   - evaluation
   - recording and reporting the growth of individual children
   - teacher relationships with teachers, administrators, supporting personnel, parents, and the general community
Experiences are provided for students to engage in divergent thinking, to consider alternatives, and to seek new orders of meanings which are uniquely their own.

d. Individual and group behavior of children as they react to the environment established by the teacher.
   - teacher's attitudes, values, and self-concept
   - children's attitudes, values, and self-concept

5. **Student Requirements:**

   Student evaluation will be based on evidence of individual growth gathered from class participation, reports on reading, reports on observations of teachers in a classroom situation, papers, projects, examinations, etc.

6. **Readings:**

   a. Texts selected from the following:


   b. Selected references from current literature

   c. Related materials and experiences

      - Simulation games
      - Field based experiences
      - Audio-visual materials
      - Media lab (art education - Columbus Campus)
      - Perception lab (Columbus Campus)
      - Introduction to the resources of the education library
Appendix M

Course Descriptions for Foundations Courses
640 FOUNDATIONS OF EDUCATION I  U G 3

640.71 Social Criticism in American Education
An analysis of the major critical stances taken in the history of American education.
1 2½-hr cl. Not open to students with credit for Ed-C&F 636 or 640.71.

640.72 History of Modern Education
Education and schools as factors in the development of the modern world: theories, practice, relations with other social institutions and forces, especially in Europe and America.
3 cl. Not open to students with credit for Ed-C&F 632 or 640.73.

640.73 Introduction to Philosophy of Education
Application of the methods and techniques of philosophical analysis to educational problems.
3 cl. Not open to students with credit for Ed-C&F 637 or 640.73.

641 FOUNDATIONS OF EDUCATION II  U G 3

641.71 People, Politics, and Schools
An analysis of the political forces and ideological positions in American life since the Civil War and their effects on American education.
1 2½-hr cl. Prereq: 3rd yr standing. Not open to students with credit for Ed-C&F 641.71.

641.72 Education in Earlier Times
Schools and educational ideals in ancient and medieval societies; education before the rise of modern nation states; influence on contemporary practice and thinking.
3 cl. Prereq: 3rd year standing. Not open to students with credit for Ed-C&F 632 or 641.72.

641.75 Logic in Teaching
Study of the logical aspects of teaching; includes attention to definitions, arguments, explanations, questions, and value judgments.
2 1½-hr cl. Prereq: 640.72 or 640.73, and 4th yr standing. Not open to students with credit for Ed-C&F 641.75.

641.76 Educational Theory
To assist teachers in securing perspective with reference to the various movements and practices that are embodied
in contemporary theories of education.

3 cl. Prereq: 640.71 or 640.72 or 640.73; or Ed-C&F 640.71 or 640.72 or 640.73; and 4th year standing. Not open to students with credit for Ed-C&F 614.76.

641.77 Comparative Education
Social and cultural factors influencing the differential development of educational institutions and organization.

1 2½-hr cl. Prereq: 640.71 or 640.72 or 640.73; or Ed-C&F 640.71 or 640.72 or 640.73; and 4th yr standing. Not open to students with credit for Ed-C&F 641.77 or 723.

642 FOUNDATIONS OF EDUCATION III UG 3

642.72 Special Topics in History of Education
Develops and examines a selected topic in history of education.

Prereq: 640.71 or 640.72; or Ed-C&F 640.71 or 640.72 and permission of instructor. Not open to students with credit for Ed-C&F 642.72.
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Course Syllabus for Ed. 450-451
EDUCATION 450/451:
THE PROFESSIONAL INTRODUCTION PROGRAM

College of Education
The Ohio State University
1980-81

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The purpose of the Professional Introduction program is to introduce prospective teachers to concepts, skills, and problems that are common to teachers in all subject matter fields, and grade levels. The major areas of focus during the two-quarter sequence are human relations, general instructional methods, human development, diversity among learners, and school as a social phenomenon. Field and clinical experiences are used to link topics studied in class with classroom applications.

TOPIC OUTLINE

The Professional Introduction program begins with a focus on the SELF, addressing concerns such as "How do I become a teacher?" and "What personal skills do I need to become a teacher?" Units 1 (Orientation) and 2 (Communication Skills) deal with these issues.

The program then focuses on concerns of the TEACHER, such as how teachers plan and conduct instruction (Unit 3, Planning and Assessment, Unit 4, Sequencing Instruction) and how teachers deal with classroom management and discipline (Unit 5, Classroom Management). Teacher candidates will practice their newly learned teacher skills in Unit 6, a two-day mini-lesson in the public schools. Unit 7 expands the view of teachers by exploring the "Helping Relationship".

Teachers cannot be effective without knowing the characteristics of their students. Hence, Units 8 and 9 focus on the LEARNER. In Unit 8, teacher candidates get an overview of Human Development and study how language is acquired and how reading is learned. Unit 9 deals with the physical, intellectual and social development of children and adolescents. Unit 10 examines diverse learners, including the handicapped and victims of prejudice and discrimination.

In Unit 11, the Teaching Unit, teacher candidates practice what they have learned in the program by developing and teaching a week-long unit in the public schools.

The program closes with a focus on the CONTEXT teachers work in. Unit 12, Schools as Organizations examines how teachers work with other teachers, with the school norms, and with the community.

Units 1-7 are scheduled in the first quarter of the program (Education 450) and Units 8-12 are scheduled in the second quarter (Education 451).
EDUCATION 450
AUTUMN CALENDAR
(4 Day Class Schedule)

UNIT 1: PROGRAM ORIENTATION
September 24
Introduction to the Program
25 Stages of Teacher Development

September 29
Decision-Making Models

UNIT 2: COMMUNICATION SKILLS
October 1
Goal Setting
2 Sender and Receiver Communication Skills

October 6
Role-Playing Interpersonal Communication Skills

UNIT 3: PLANNING AND EVALUATING INSTRUCTION
October 13
Taxonomy of Objectives
14 Classifying and Writing Objectives
15 Observation Skills
16 MIDTERM EXAM

October 20
Peer Teaching I
21 Debriefing of Peer Teaching/Evaluation Methods

UNIT 4: SEQUENCING
October 27
Unit Readings Test/Sequencing Instruction
28 Field Observation (Elementary School)

UNIT 5: CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT
November 3
Debrief Media-Teaching Lesson
4 Unit Readings Test/Introduction to Classroom Management (Soar and Soar Model)
5 Field #3 Classroom Management
6 Debriefing Field/Classroom Discipline/Problem Ownership

November 10
Language of Acceptance and Non-Acceptance
11 HOLIDAY (No Classes)
12 Modifying the Environment
13 Win-Lose & No-Win Approaches/Conflict Resolution

UNIT 6: MINI-LESSON II
November 17
Field #4 Teaching Day 1
18 Teaching Day 2

UNIT 7: HELPING RELATIONSHIP
November 24
Core Condition 1: Empathy

November 25
Core Condition 2: Respect
26 Core Condition 3: Warmth
27 Core Condition 4: Concreteness

December 1
HOLIDAY (No Classes)
1 Core Condition 5: Genuineness
2 Core Condition 6: Self-Disclosure
3 Core Condition 7: Confrontation
4 Core Condition 8: Immediate/Summary
UNIT 1: PROGRAM ORIENTATION

September 24  Introduction to the Program/Stages of Teacher Development
        25  Decision-Making Models

UNIT 2: COMMUNICATION SKILLS

September 30  Units 1 & 2 Readings Test/Inter-Intrapersonal Communication Skills
October  1  Goal Setting/Sender & Receiver Communication Skills
        2  Role-Playing Interpersonal Communication Skills

UNIT 3: PLANNING AND EVALUATING INSTRUCTION

October  7  Unit Readings Test/Lesson Planning Principles/Writing Objectives
        8  Peer Teaching I
        9  Taxonomy of Objectives/Classifying and Writing Objectives/Observation Skills

October 14  MIDTERM EXAM
        15  Peer Teaching II
        16  Debrief/Evaluation Methods

UNIT 4: SEQUENCING INSTRUCTION

October 21  Unit Readings Test/Sequence Instruction
        22  FIELD #1 Observation
        23  Debrief Field/Media Lecture

October 28  Introduction to Media Center/Mini-Lesson Assignment
        29  Media Workshop
        30  FIELD #2 Use of Media in Teaching

UNIT 5: CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT

November 4  Unit Readings Test/Debrief Field/Introduction to Classroom Management
            (Soars')
        5  FIELD #5 Classroom Management
        6  Debrief Field/Problem Ownership

November 11  HOLIDAY (No Classes)
        12  Language of Acceptance and Non-Acceptance
        13  Modifying The Environment/Win-Lose & No-Win Approaches: Conflict Resolution

UNIT 6: MINI-LESSON II

November 18  FIELD #4 Teaching Day 1
        19  Teaching Day 2

UNIT 7: HELPING RELATIONSHIP

November 25  Introduction to the Helping Relations
        26  Core Conditions 1, 2: Empathy/Respect
        27  HOLIDAY (No Classes)

December 2  Core Conditions 3, 4: Warmth/Concreteness
         3  Core Conditions 5, 6: Genuineness/Self-Disclosure
         4  Core Conditions 7, 8: Confrontation/Immediacy/Summary
EDUCATION 451
AUTUMN CALENDAR 1980

UNIT 8: THE LEARNER I

September 24
Overview of Unit 8 (and 451)
25 Theories of Human Development and Education Implications, Unit 9 Assignments

September 29
Continue Lecture on Theories of Human Development and Education Implication, Unit 9 Assignments
30 Introduction to Language Development

October 1
Unit Readings Test/Language Experiences in the Classroom
2 Assessment of Readability

October 6
FIELD #1 Language Variations
7 Debrief Field Experience/Language Variations
8 Introduction to Physical Development
9 Introduction to Cognitive Development

October 13
Continue Lecture on Cognitive Development
14 Education Applications of Cognitive Development Theories

UNIT 9: THE LEARNER II
15 Unit Readings Test I/Chapter 9 Presentation
16 Chapters 10-11 Presentations

October 20
Chapters 13-14 Presentations
21 Unit Readings Test II/Chapters 15-16 Presentations
22 Chapters 17-18 Presentations
23 Chapters 19-20 Presentations/Summary of Unit

October 27
MIDTERM EXAM

UNIT 10: DIVERSITY AMONG LEARNERS
28 Introduction to Diversity in Classrooms/Planning for Teaching Unit (Unit 11)
29 FIELD #2 Interactions in Schools
30 Unit Readings Test/Debriefing Sociograms/Workshop-Consultations on Teaching Unit Plans

November 3
Handicapped Students and P.L. 94-142
4 Handicapped Students Continued
5 Teacher Expectations
6 Teacher Expectations/Discrimination

November 10
Diversity of Social Classes Applications
11 HOLIDAY (No Classes)

UNIT 11: THE TEACHING UNIT
12 FIELD #3 Teaching Day 1
13 Teaching Day 2
17 Teaching Day 3
18 Teaching Day 4
19 Teaching Day 5

UNIT 12: THE HIDDEN CURRICULUM
20 Debrief Unit 11

November 24
Unit Readings Test/The Hidden Curriculum
25 FIELD #4 The Hidden Curriculum
26 Socialization
27 HOLIDAY (No Classes)

December 1
The Reward Structure
2 Parents and Schools
3 Teachers as Professionals
4 Review of Unit 12 and Professional Introduction Program
EDUCATION 450 READING LIST

MATERIALS PURCHASED BY STUDENTS:


Gordon, Thomas, Teacher Effectiveness Training, New York: Wyden, 1977, Chapters 3, 5, 6, 7, 8

Education 450 Student Materials, 1980-81 Edition

UNIT 1

Instructor Resources
Fuller, Frances F. and Bown, Oliver H., "Becoming A Teacher" in Stages of Teacher Development, NSSE Yearbook (See following pages in Unit 1)

UNIT 2


Optional Background Reading for Instructors
Raths, L., Harmin, M., Simon, S., "Selection From Values and Teaching"

UNIT 3
Orlich, D., et. al., Teaching Strategies, Boston, Heath, 1980, Chapter 2, 4, 5

UNIT 4
Orlich, D., et. al., Teaching Strategies, Boston, Heath, 1980, Chapter 3

UNIT 5
Gordon, Thomas, Teacher Effectiveness Training, New York: Wyden, 1977, Chapters 3, 5, 6, 7, 8

UNIT 7
EDUCATION 451 READING LIST:

MATERIALS PURCHASED BY STUDENTS:
Education 451 Student Materials, 1980-81 Edition

READING LIST

UNIT 8

UNIT 9

UNIT 10
"Serving Special Needs" - Selections drawn from Readings in Education 79/80, Guilford, C.T.: The Dushkin Publishing Group, Inc.; Seymour Sarason and John Doris, "Mainstreaming: Dilemmas, Opposition, Opportunities"; and Gene I. Maesoff, "The unfavored gifted few". (Education Library, Closed Reserve)

Instructors Background Reading

UNIT 12
Jackson, Philip W., Life in Classrooms, N.Y.: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1968, Chapter 1 (Education Library, Closed Reserve)
Slavin, Robert E., "Integrating the desegregated classroom: Actions speak louder than words", Educational Leadership 56 (February, 1979: pp. 322-4 (Education Library, Closed Reserve)
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Synthesized Responses to Open-Ended Questions
Synthesized Responses to Open-Ended Questions

Part 3 of the questionnaire requested information on: 1) additional field assignments asked of teacher candidates not listed in the manual; 2) field assignments which should be deleted; 3) modifications to existing field assignments; 4) additions to existing field assignments; 5) least productive (useful) aspect of the field component of PI; 6) most valuable aspect of the field component of PI; and 7) additional recommendations or suggestions. This information was synthesized, and follows. If more than one individual made the same recommendation it was listed once with the total number of times it was recommended in parentheses.

WHAT ADDITIONAL FIELD ACTIVITIES DID YOU ASK YOUR TEACHER CANDIDATES TO PERFORM?

Instructors' Responses
* Time-motion study of teacher.
* To communicate frequently with the cooperating teacher.
* Follow-up lesson on the material covered in the 2-day unit.
* Visit specialty classroom such as Remedial Reading, Physical Education, etc. Also observe cafeteria and/or playground behavior.
* Interview the teacher concerning textbooks.
* Thirty-minute "case" study of overall reactions to a classroom.

WHAT ADDITIONAL FIELD ACTIVITIES WERE YOU ASKED TO PERFORM?

Teacher Candidates' Responses
* To phone or visit cooperating teachers before teaching.
* More sociologically-related studies.
ARE THERE FIELD ASSIGNMENTS THAT YOU THINK SHOULD BE DELETED FROM THE PROGRAM?

**Instructors' Responses**

* Language variation and readability exercises.

* Movement exercise in 450.

* First teaching lesson shouldn't involve media.

**Ed. 450 Cooperating Teachers' Responses**

* Second observation. Students learn more by teaching.

**Ed. 451 Cooperating Teachers' Responses**

* Sociogram (2 recommended deleting it).

* Readability test being given to same students over and over (2 recommended deleting it).

**Teacher Candidates' Responses**

* Recording teacher movement (5 recommended deleting this).

* Sociogram (2 recommended deleting this).

* Hidden Curriculum (2 recommended deleting this).

* Recording teacher-student verbal interaction.

* Characterizing language variation among pupils.

* Soar & Soar observation.
WHAT MODIFICATIONS WOULD YOU MAKE IN EXISTING FIELD ASSIGNMENTS?

Instructors' Responses
* Five-day teaching (3 recommended making modifications).
* Soar & Soar Observation (3 recommended making modifications).
* Language Variation (2 recommended making modifications).
* Hidden Curriculum (2 recommended making modifications).
* Sociogram assignment.
* Observations in 450.
* Feedback and conferencing time.
* Media assignment.

Ed. 450 Cooperating Teachers' Responses
* More time for communication with teacher candidate, i.e., feedback, planning (4 recommended making modification).
* More time to observe and plan before actual teaching (2 recommended making modifications).
* Better communication of expectations of cooperating teacher and teacher candidate (2 recommended this).
* Meet teacher candidate socially first.
* Use teacher candidates who are specifically interested in elementary.

Ed. 451 Cooperating Teachers' Responses
* Allow time for discussion between cooperating teacher and teacher candidate (2 recommended this).
* Assign teacher candidates who are interested in a given area (2 recommended this).
* Make field schedule more consistent (2 recommended this).
* More teaching time.
* Schedule peer partners.
* Teach the same lesson to two classes.
* Observe on consecutive days.
* Amount of detail in assignments.
* Teacher candidates' class schedules.
Teacher Candidates' Responses

* Different materials to use with the SMOG and Cloze Procedures (4 recommended this).
* More time in field during observations (3 recommended this).
* More relevant placements for teacher candidates (3 recommended this).
* Lengthen amount of time spent teaching in Ed. 450.
* Allow more time between field assignments.
* Effective use of peer partners.
* 5-day experience in Ed. 451—make it consecutive days.
* More consistency in scheduling fields, i.e., every week.
* Introductory assignment at beginning of Ed. 451 to enable the teacher candidate to become familiar with the classroom.

WHAT ACTIVITIES WOULD YOU ADD TO THE EXISTING FIELD EXPERIENCES, AND WHY?

Instructors' Responses

* More observations of different styles and experiences—to expand awareness affectively and cognitively. These observations should be debriefed in terms of the theoretical perspectives represented (4 made this recommendation).
* Video taping for purposes of reflection (3 recommended this).
* Other activities pertaining to handicapped students as regular classroom teachers have very little exposure prior to their entering the field.
* Tasks which would enhance the total role of teacher, i.e., board meetings.
* Field with emphasis on gathering information about the school-community-special needs students and teachers.
* A high school level experience.
* A heavy debriefing component.
* More diagnostic tools.

Ed. 450 Cooperating Teachers' Responses

* Require participants to spend a minimum of 1 hour in the assigned classroom per visit.
* Add more actual teaching time.
* Observe for 2 consecutive days—gives them a feeling of your continuity, planning and class expectations.
* Call the teacher to clear the lesson plan the night before lesson is presented.
* A scheduled block of time to meet with the cooperating teacher at a time other than teaching time.
* Discussions on classroom management so the teacher candidate will know some techniques of classroom management and discipline prior to taking over a class.
* Visiting other grade levels and establishing a teacher-student relationship.

**Ed. 451 Cooperating Teachers' Responses**

* More observation of, and communication with, cooperating teacher prior to actual teaching (.4 recommended this).
* Small group lessons (2 recommended this).
* Have teacher candidate run an experiment or activity in class by himself.
* A more detailed explanation of the responsibilities and objectives of all parties involved should be given at a meeting of all parties before the teaching experience takes place.
* Encourage students to try different approaches to each lesson.
* Let teacher candidate do some aide-type work after observation but before taking over for lessons.
* Exercises or activities that deal (either directly or not directly) with discipline.
* OSU students should meet the teacher before they walk in the first day to observe, or sometime shortly after when the teacher is not in class.

**Teacher Candidates' Responses**

* I would add more teaching experiences because people learn through doing (3 recommended this).
* I would add activities which would enable the teacher candidate to get better acquainted with the children on an individual level (2 recommended this).
* A whole day of teaching; that way students would be more comfortable and not feel rusted through.
* I would like to teach 2 consecutive full days at a school; teaching 6 math classes, or spending the entire day with 30 kids would be a lot different than going for a couple of hours and being able to hand the class back to the cooperating teacher.
* More time! In 450 we were in the schools fairly regularly. However, in 451 sometimes it was a few weeks before we went back. Hardly a chance for teacher-student interaction.
* Additional time to speak with the cooperating teacher and with our supervisors about our experiences and how well we are doing.

* There should be time to meet with the cooperating teacher before the week lesson in 451, so we could go over the lesson plans.

* The students should attend a board meeting to see what is going on in the school they are teaching.

* More days to observe different "special" classrooms such as music, so students can get better acquainted with programs like this.

WHAT WAS THE LEAST PRODUCTIVE ASPECT OF THE FIELD EXPERIENCE?

Instructors' Responses

* Sociometric experience—not enough time to apply data (3 listed this).

* Lack of time for conferencing with teachers and for feedback.

* Structure of lesson plans.

* Arrangement of the assignments; should be restructured.

* Inadequate brief and debrief time as well as reflection in a cumulative manner.

* The Soar & Soar Observation.

* Lack of time for observing each teacher candidate.

* The field experiences are squeezed in and rushed—at the school site—and then back at the University.

* Hidden Curriculum is too open-ended.

Ed. 450 Cooperating Teachers' Responses

* The time factor, as indicated above, had a negative effect on the productivity of all aspects of the program—shortened lessons taught, little time for observation and discussion.

* All of the teaching assignments were very productive; was not aware of all aspects of the observation part.

* I never read the reports of the 2 observations the students made so I don't know how productive observing for 20–30 minutes was, but I would suspect that this part may have been the least productive, especially since there was no opportunity for the students to discuss with me what they observed or to question me about things I did.

* Second observation, probably.

* Teacher candidates were not familiar enough with the curriculum material. They were limited in being able to respond to questions slightly off the subject matter.

* Soar & Soar Observation.
* The time span was too short to teach; as a result the testing was not accurate.

* Lack of time in the classroom made it difficult for them to just "jump right in" and conduct a lesson. Perhaps more observation before teaching would be helpful. More time was needed for follow-up on the lessons they taught.

**Ed. 451 Cooperating Teachers' Responses**

* Since I really had no chance at the end of the teaching session to talk to the students, I can only guess at the answer to this question. I would say doing the sociogram and the readability test were least valuable (4 listed this).

* The assessment phase was completely useless in a Special Education classroom.

* I don't feel they were prepared to meet the discipline problems. This is a criticism of the education department as a whole rather than the field experience. But I think emphasis could be put on classroom management before they have to teach.

* Feelings of frustration at not having had previous short time teaching or helping teach in a regular classroom.

* The lack of time for student candidates to communicate with classroom teachers.

* Observing a non-science teacher teaching science who didn't want to be.

**Teacher Candidates' Responses**

* Sociogram (5 listed this).

* Language variation activity (4 listed this).

* The Hidden Curriculum (2 listed this).

* Teaching in the middle school.

* Complex lesson plans.

* I feel we were unprepared. Sometimes I was embarrassed because my cooperating teacher would ask about an upcoming field and I wouldn't know anything.

* Being placed in a Math class (451) when I am not good in Math.

* Peer evaluation was good; but no one took the sheets seriously.

* Watching my peer teach. It was horrendous. The kids couldn't stand her. By the end of the first lesson neither could I.

* Observing teacher-student interaction.

* Lesson on media.

* Observations—hard to connect them with their objectives.
WHAT IS THE MOST VALUABLE ASPECT OF THE FIELD EXPERIENCE?

Instructors' Responses
* Ed. 451 5-day teaching experience (4 listed this).
* Ed. 450 media presentation (2 listed this).
* Planning through in-depth planning, the student gains confidence to carry out actual in-class teaching.
* Students participate in educational environments; they look at self, teachers and students and are more positive about being teachers.
* The 2-day unit in 450 because it's so strongly tied to a debriefing that is useful.
* Peer observations; contact time with cooperating teachers.
* The reality of an actual school setting.

Ed. 450 Cooperating Teachers' Responses
* Teaching a 2-day lesson gave them a feeling of the continuity of teaching; gave them a chance to evaluate their first day's lesson and make changes (4 listed this).
* The opportunity to prepare a lesson and teach the lesson to the students.
* Actual involvement with students.
* Preparing the lessons, then actually testing/teaching the lesson was an excellent opportunity for feedback from the teacher and "self-feedback."
* Being responsible for teaching a skill and evaluation of that skill.
* The acceptance from the children.
* They were totally in charge and had to respond to a child's needs as they saw it, without any background or previous experience with the class. This is good training in handling new and different situations.

Ed. 451 Cooperating Teachers' Responses
* Actually having to handle the class themselves.
* The actual teaching act itself seemed most valuable. Ability to observe student reactions to situations and gaining a feeling of control over the students is important.
* Being able to teach a small group of children, as found in a Special Education classroom.
* Actual teaching; discovering need for clearer directions, classroom arrangement and organization. (Learning from real experience.)
* Lesson plans and the teaching experience (4 listed this).
* Getting an idea of their ability to cope with problems of classroom management (2 listed this).
* They were able to teach 5 days in a row and thereby really develop lesson plans and learn to alter them as needed.
* Simply the direct experience in a classroom, implementing what had previously been only theoretical.
* Seeing all the preparation and time that goes into teaching a lesson or unit.
* The ability to interact with the children, to try their teaching methods and determine their successes or failures.
* Experience of observing others with different classes (one quite easy to handle, the following group was not an easy group to control).

Teacher Candidates' Responses

* The actual teaching—especially the week-long field, where we taught for 5 days and had complete control of a classroom (7 listed this).
* Getting in front of a class and teaching (4 listed this).
* The actual teaching and lesson planning; I learned to always plan more than you need.
* Writing out lesson plans and following them through.
* Teaching in the elementary school was the most valuable aspect of the field experience for me.
* Just having the opportunity to be in a classroom with children and observing them and their reaction to me.
* Making lesson plans and using them.
* I'm grateful that I finally had an opportunity to teach my own lessons. We learned ideas from each other and some people could decide if teaching is the right career choice.
* Dealing with the little first graders, which shows how important teaching really is. Also, becoming acquainted with my two cooperating teachers. They were both very helpful and gave me many hints for the future.
* Working in small groups with the students in Math—talking, and joking around with them as they stumbled over Math problems.
* Most valuable aspect was my cooperating teacher feedback form. I had a teacher who took the time to write out praises and comments and helpful hints.
* To observe the teacher and how she handled all the problems that came about.
Additional Comments

Instructors' Comments

* Micro-teaching experience is needed. More emphasis is to be placed in classroom management skills prior to actual field.

* The schedule would not permit this for all students so I did not use it for any students (peer partners). Rationale: could not adhere to the concept of "similar experiences" by eliminating part of class.

* Each major concept addressed in 451 (and 450) needs to have a meaningful field observation or field experience/activity involved.

* The aspects of brief/debrief need to be strengthened. This means more concentration on reflective procedures and integration of knowledges, skills and attitudes.

Ed. 450 Cooperating Teachers' Comments

* I feel this is an invaluable program for teacher candidates to participate in. Programs of this type should have been in operation years.

* Experience was worthwhile, lessons were productive.

* The PI students I received Spring '81 were not well informed on what was expected of them. I know this was because their instructor was new, but I wonder what would have happened to their field experience if I hadn't had previous PI experiences and hadn't known what was usually expected.

* Very good course. I enjoyed working with the students. I felt that only one of the six students I worked with utilized my suggestions to the fullest. (I fully realize that it was to be their lesson, not mine.)

* The teacher candidates presented well thought out, well planned lessons. With only 2 or so visits before they presented a lesson, this was remarkable.

* I feel the program would be more productive if I had more time to work with the candidates before and after their lessons to give them some input.

Ed. 451 Cooperating Teachers' Comments

* The teaching situation allows the students the freedom to teach and test strategies without actually having to worry about discipline. Students in a controlled classroom are on their best behavior when they know their classroom teacher is observing in the room.

* I really like this program!!

* Because of the lack of organization and the time schedule of the program, I would not like to participate again. I have had FEEP candidates and find that program much more beneficial to both the teacher
candidate and myself. I also was not informed until the night before the student started that she had multiple handicaps. I was thus unable to prepare students.

* The university should quit pretending they have an objective formula to build a successful teacher; and let the teacher-candidate quit pretending to fit a mold that doesn't exist.

* The two in my class were great. The students and I looked forward to their coming.

Teacher Candidates' Comments

* I don't really believe that the field experience helped me very much. I feel that taking 450 and 451 was a waste of my time.

* Don't get rid of any of the field experiences, especially the actual teaching of a lesson to a classroom ones. The field experiences really help a person to know if teaching is what they want to do, or if secondary or elementary is for them, which one suits them the best (and) they feel most comfortable in.

* I wish someone would question me on the rest of the PI program aside from the field experience.

* 450 and 451 were very, very badly handled. I feel 450 was knowledgeable as far as lesson plans, but learned very little in 451.

* My instructor for 451 was very poor; she made the whole course difficult to stick with. However, the field experience made the quarter worthwhile.

* I feel this program is very beneficial to some education majors. Some of the people in our class were teaching first graders when their career aimed towards high school. Why not a separate program?

* I enjoyed the program thoroughly.

* A peer partner probably would have been very helpful also. I would have liked to have one—maybe he/she could point out something the other feedbacks were missing.

* The field experience was productive, but much of 450 and 451 classroom time proved to be wasteful.

* Possibility the field experiences would be more productive if the teacher candidates were to engage students in activities and learning experiences that are directly tied to the teacher candidate's field of concentration (English, Math).
Appendix P

Descriptions of Core Field Experience Courses
THE TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAM

The purpose of this brief summary is to provide a general description of the teacher education programs offered at The Ohio State University. Although there are 25 specific teacher training program areas, there are some common elements of these programs that can be described. These common elements depict a typical student's progress through the teacher training program, and in general represent prerequisite experiences to student teaching.

During the entry year at The Ohio State University the prospective teacher education student concentrates largely on the basic education requirements of the University. This course work is equivalent to 45 hours, with 15 hours being taken each from humanities, social science, and natural science. A student may choose to take these 45 hours during the freshman year, or extend the requirements across the four years of enrollment.

Early Experiencing Program. FEEP is designed to provide career exploration and career experience for students prior to the time when career decisions and/or admission applications are necessary in their College program. The program has two major components: the field experience in which the student participates as a teacher's aide to "try on" the role of the teacher; and the seminar, where that experience is integrated into a meaningful personal framework. Even though college students have been participating in school experiences for perhaps more
than two-thirds of their lives, those experiences have been seen and interpreted from a student point of view. The FEEP experience is from "the other side of the desk." The seminar sessions assist in developing awareness of the personal reactions and interactions of those experiences from a teacher point of view. The experience carries 8 hours of credit, and requires that a student be in a school setting for 16 hours a week, and attend a weekly seminar on campus.

In addition to the general University requirements, a student must complete a set of general College of Education requirements in order to be considered for a teaching degree in most program areas. These requirements include earned course credit in educational psychology, educational foundations (e.g., history of education, logic in teaching), and general math, English and health requirements. During this period, students may also choose to gain additional field experience as academic tutors.

As a part of these general College requirements, all secondary students must enroll in a course on theory and practice in secondary teaching. Although four-fifths of this course involves on-campus discussion and clinical practice, students do go into school settings daily for two weeks to teach various short courses to available students. In this course students also micro-teach (practicing teaching skills in video labs), engage in simulated teaching activities, and peer teach.*

*At this time the College of Education is offering an experimental alternative to existing general methods and foundations courses. This experience is called Professional Introduction, and is often referred to as P.I. Some of the student teachers will have had these alternative courses rather than the current required general methods courses.
The teacher training program may culminate in the student teaching experience, or may be taken as soon as the student has completed all prerequisite experiences for the practicum quarter. In order for a student to be eligible to student teach, the following requirements must be met:

1. Completion of at least 75% of the credit hours for the major area in which the student teaching is to be done;
2. Attainment of a point-hour ratio of at least 2.25 in the teaching major and required professional courses; and
3. Completion of prerequisite methods courses.

More specific information about the specific undergraduate teacher education programs is found in The Ohio State University Bulletin, Book 8, College of Education. Copies can be obtained from:

The Ohio State University
Office of Admissions
Lincoln Tower
1800 Cannon Drive
Columbus, Ohio 43210

The following is a list of definitions for the University’s most typical field laboratory experiences:

1. Early Experiencing - freshman and sophomore students who indicate an interest in teaching are placed in field settings for an exploratory experience to include four half-days per week for an entire quarter.
2. Tutoring - students may elect to take course credit for tutoring individuals or small groups of students in field settings, usually to include several days a week of contact for an entire quarter.
3. Observation and Participation - all other teacher education students are required to spend varying amounts of time in field settings for the purpose of observing and participating in instructional activities, typically during the sophomore, junior and senior years, as a part of both general and special methods course requirements (graduate students are also involved in this type of experience depending on the nature of their program).
4. Student Teaching - all teacher education students are required to complete at least one full quarter of student teaching, typically in the senior year, during which time the teacher education student will be expected to follow the teacher's regular schedule.
5. Research - this experience is typically a part of the graduate programs for school service personnel preparation and other program areas and includes data collection, observation and other course requirements for the conduct of research in the field.

III. STUDENT TEACHING POLICIES

The University is pleased to have the opportunity to place student teachers in elementary and secondary schools. As guests in these systems, we support the following operational rules as guidelines for student teachers in the schools:

A. Student teaching officially begins on the first day of each quarter. However, the actual day on which student teachers report to schools may vary, and will be announced quarterly.

B. The student teaching experience at The Ohio State University is a full quarter (eleven week) experience, beginning when University classes begin and ending on the last day of final exams. Graduating seniors may need to culminate their student teaching experience two days before commencement in order to attend graduation practice and the commencement exercises.

C. Absences must be kept to an absolute minimum. Student teachers may be excused by their cooperating teacher with advance approval of the University supervisor and principal for the following reasons:

1. personal illness;
2. illness or death in the immediate family; and/or
3. professional meetings.

Excessive absences for any reason will result in an extension of the student teaching period.
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