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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

Stewart, Shinn and Richardson (1977) found that teacher education ranked third highest in a list of concerns of the professionals in agricultural education. "Improving preservice education programs for teachers of vocational agriculture teacher education was ranked as being of greatest concern in this area" (p. 284). When one thinks about the preservice program in teacher education one sees a general studies component and a professional studies component. The focus of Stewart, Shinn and Richardson's work was the professional studies component. The professional studies component can be broken into four parts: content for teaching specialty, humanistic and behavioral studies addressed to the problems of education, teaching and learning theory and the practicum (Cruickshank, 1981). The practicum is any directed experience spread over the students' time in college. A major portion of the practicum is student teaching.

Student teaching is a period of guided teaching when a college student assumes increasing responsibility for directing the learning of a group or groups of learners over
a period of consecutive weeks (Andrews, 1964). As a culminating experience, it functions as a "maturing" activity. Student teaching is the most important "learning by doing" portion of the preservice teacher education program. Also, it provides a setting in which the student teacher often functions in the role of a self-critic.

Student teaching has long been accepted as a vital component in teacher education programs. In fact, "student teaching is the most universally approved education course, both by educators and the general public - approved rather generally by the severest critics of professional teacher education" (Andrews, 1964). Conant (1963) stated that academic professors of education are all in complete agreement only on one point: that practice teaching if well conducted is important. Aside from practice teaching and the accompanying methods, there is little agreement among professors of education on the nature of the corpus of knowledge they are expected to transmit to the future teacher (p. 210).

There is almost nationwide agreement that the student teaching experience is one of the most important, if not the most important phase in the preparation of a teacher (National Education Association, 1966).

Thorpe (1972) discussed student teaching by saying that the immediate supervision of the student teaching experience is a result of a triadic relationship between the student teacher, cooperating teacher and university supervisor. The need for synergistic action in this triad is fundamental to
a well integrated student teaching program. With such action the total effect upon the student teaching program will be greater than the sum action of the student teacher role, cooperating teacher role and university supervisor role taken independently.

The cooperating teacher is a teacher of high school students who directs the work of the student teacher with these same students. The university supervisor is a regular college staff member who is responsible for the supervision of the activities of student teachers and the relationship and conditions under which these students carry on their work (Andrews, 1964).

The new Standards for Colleges and Universities Preparing Teachers (1975) in the State of Ohio include increased field experiences for students because of a genuine concern for the quality of teacher education programs. Even though there is presently much emphasis on increasing field experiences, there is little empirical evidence for the need of these experiences.

Since student teaching is such an important part of the teacher education program it is important that it be a high quality experience. A continuing objective of the faculty of the Department of Agricultural Education at The Ohio State University is the maintenance and improvement of a good student teaching program. To determine if the program provides a high quality experience it is first necessary to
determine what experiences are expected of a student teacher and then determine if these experiences are actually occurring. Next, the effectiveness of the student teaching program in accomplishing the experiences must be measured. When relating determination of quality to the student teacher--university supervisor--cooperating teacher triadic relationship one must evaluate the performance of the university supervisor and cooperating teacher in the supervision of the student teacher. The reason for evaluating their performance is because their role is to help the student teacher have a professionally rewarding experience. It has been said that there is a need to delimit and understand the interrelationships among participants within the context of the total student teaching experience (Zimpher, DeVoss and Nott; 1980). The need for evaluation of effort and outcomes is axiomatic if an individual or group is really concerned with direction and growth. Merely to continue without evaluating is somewhat analogous to the marksman who continues shooting with no heed as to what is happening to the target (Flesher, 1958).

Currently, the prime evaluation of the student teaching program in Agricultural Education at The Ohio State University is completed informally by student teachers at the last seminar of the student teaching quarter. During this evaluation session the students are divided into small
groups and requested to make suggestions for improving the preservice technical agriculture courses, professional courses, seminars, assignments, visitations, cooperating teachers and cooperating schools. If evaluation is a process which determines the extent to which objectives have been met (Cross, 1982) and the most important reason for evaluation is to provide a solid foundation for decision-making regarding program planning and improvement (Mannebach and Drawbaugh, 1982) then teacher education institutions must strive to improve existing student teaching programs through formal evaluation. If student teaching programs are to facilitate adequate preparation of prospective teachers, experiences and responsibilities within the triad must be carefully planned and carried out to achieve definite purposes. Evaluation must be made of types, quantity and quality of experiences expected during student teaching and the responsibilities desired of cooperating teachers and university supervisors to determine their effectiveness.

Constant change is occurring in the student teaching program in Agricultural Education at The Ohio State University. These circumstances make an evaluation of the present student teaching program extremely important. The present study was conducted to enable the researcher to make recommendations for needed improvements regarding the experiences deemed desirable for student teaching and the
performance of university supervisors and cooperating teachers.

Statement of the Problem

The purpose of this study was to evaluate the student teaching program in Agricultural Education at The Ohio State University by answering the following research questions:

1. To what extent are the experiences and assignments a student teacher is expected to have in Agricultural Education at The Ohio State University needed in preparing a prospective teacher for successful teaching in vocational agriculture as perceived by university supervisors, cooperating teachers and student teachers in Agricultural Education at The Ohio State University?

2. To what extent are these experiences and assignments accomplished by the student teaching program as perceived by university supervisors, cooperating teachers and student teachers in Agricultural Education at The Ohio State University?

3. How do cooperating teachers and student teachers rate the performance of university supervisors in their supervision of student teachers in Agricultural Education at The Ohio State University?

4. How do university supervisors and student teachers rate the performance of cooperating teachers in their supervision of student teachers in Agricultural Education at The Ohio State University?
State University?

5. What suggested changes can be made by the researcher to improve the student teaching program in Agricultural Education at The Ohio State University concerning expected experiences and assignments during student teaching and the performance of university supervisors and cooperating teachers?

Need for the Study

The Department of Agricultural Education at The Ohio State University has recently undergone a self-study. The Department took a close look at itself to determine its strengths and weaknesses and how to improve itself. One aspect of the self-study was the undergraduate program of which student teaching was a part. This study will add more in-depth information for the self-study. Since the Department was undergoing this self-study and was willing to make changes, it was appropriate to conduct a study to evaluate the expected experiences during student teaching and the performance of university supervisors and cooperating teachers.

The last formal evaluation of the undergraduate program in Agricultural Education at The Ohio State University was completed by Tanner in 1955. Part of his research evaluated selected experiences in student teaching and some weaknesses were in evidence but, Tanner did not look at the performance
of university supervisors and cooperating teachers. Even so, twenty-seven years is a long time between evaluations and it was time to take a close look at student teaching.

Related closely to evaluation is the fact that we are in an era of accountability. Education has come under scrutiny and budgets have been cut to the bone as a result of inflation and taxpayer resistance. Consolidation of gains and the opportunity for continued experimentation and improvement in the quality of educational programs call for documentation of successful outcomes. Hence, it is important for evaluations to be conducted.

After reviewing the literature, descriptive data about the nature of student teaching including experiences for student teaching and responsibilities of both university supervisors and cooperating teachers were abundant, but there were very few studies about the effectiveness of the student teaching triad (Zimpher, deVoss and Nott, 1980). More specifically, the researcher found no recent literature involving evaluation of agricultural education student teaching programs. For this reason, a study such as this was important to lay the foundation for further evaluations of student teaching in agricultural education.
CHAPTER II
REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

A survey of the literature related to student teaching programs revealed a copious amount of information. Since complete coverage of the entire field was prohibitive in this study, selected contributions pertaining to evaluation and student teaching were reviewed. The aspects of student teaching were: rationale of student teaching, objectives of student teaching, desirable student teaching experiences, responsibilities of the university supervisor and responsibilities of the cooperating teacher.

Evaluation

Evaluation, as used in this study, is determining the worth of some phenomena (Worthen and Sanders, 1973). Evaluation provides a solid foundation for decision-making in program planning and improvement. Other reasons for evaluation include:

1. to justify expenditures.
2. to promote an objective and valid description of the program.
3. to establish benchmarks for future comparisons.
4. to serve as a logical review for the identification of areas of strengths and weaknesses.
5. to assist with public relations.
6. to involve significant people in the evaluation and cause them to be knowledgeable about the program.
7. to motivate faculty and staff (Mannebach and Drawbaugh, 1982).

For an evaluation to be successful, it is important to keep in mind some general principles of evaluation. The following general principles were discussed by Mannebach and Drawbaugh in *Teacher Education in Agriculture* (1982).

Evaluation needs to start with an understanding of the philosophy and objectives of the program. For this study, a philosophical base for student teaching and the expected experiences of a student teacher were the foundation of the evaluation. The criteria for judging or evaluating must then be stated as early as possible. It is important that a variety of evidence be assembled through many instruments, rather than a single instrument. Also, objectives should be established and measured by those who are responsible for, involved with and affected by the program. For this study, the three members of the student teaching triad (university supervisor, cooperating teacher and student teacher) were involved in the study and asked to respond to questionnaires and telephone surveys. Also, for an evaluation to be useful, objective measures and subjective numbers should be
included. Through the methods of data collection used in this study both quantitative and qualitative data were secured. Evaluation should be a continuous procedure and outcomes should be measured periodically. It is hoped that a formal evaluation of the student teaching program will be continued beyond this study.

The practice of evaluation research in vocational education has increased dramatically in the last decade. Perhaps the chief catalyst for this growth is the public's and thus the state and federal governments' role in requiring accountability. As a result of this growth, the methodology used in evaluation research has been questioned (Pearsol, 1980).

Two types of methodology for evaluation research are available each with its advantages and disadvantages. First, quantitative research methods used in evaluation typically attempt to reduce observed social phenomena to numerical notations. Then mathematical models of analysis are applied to the numerical data. This system of analysis when combined with a conceptual framework enables quantitative methods to move beyond assumptions of laws to explanation and prediction. If a random sample from a population is selected and appropriate controls are used to eliminate possible external causes of observed changes then the research can "explain" a cause for change in some measure of outcomes and "predict" that these outcomes can be
expected for similar populations (Pearsol, 1980). But, what happens when social phenomena can not be reduced to key variables? What if complex social phenomena do not adhere well to mathematical models? Are the conclusions drawn appropriate?

Qualitative methods of inquiry bring the researcher intimately close to the subjects and setting under study. "Qualitative researchers, in contrast to their quantitative colleagues, claim forcefully to know relatively little about what a given piece of observed behavior means until they have developed a description of the context in which the behavior takes place and attempted to see that behavior from its origination (Van Maanen, 1979). Qualitative methods of evaluation consist of interviews, participant observations, reviews of documents, informal conversations, observations of meetings and reviews of statistical data. The qualitative researcher also introduces his or her personal bias about the study, where the quantitative researcher acts as an impartial observer. A weakness of qualitative research is that it lacks the power of quantitative research. Also, the qualitative researcher lacks the capacity to compare across sites on common specified variables (Pearsol, 1980).

Pearsol (1980) and Baltzell (1980) offered a solution to the dilemma of which methodology to use and suggested integration of both quantitative and qualitative approaches.
Such an integration could counterbalance the weaknesses and capture the strengths of each approach. The researcher in this study integrated approaches through the use of triangulation. Triangulation is the combination of methodologies in the study of a single program (Patton, 1980). Triangulation moves from description to verification through the use of four basic types of triangulation as described by Denzin (1978):

1. **data triangulation** - the use of a variety of data sources in a study.
2. **investigator triangulation** - the use of several different investigators.
3. **theory triangulation** - the use of multiple perspectives to interpret data.
4. **methodological triangulation** - the use of multiple methods to study a single program.

The basis for combining methods lie in the domains discussed by Pearsol (1980): comprehensiveness, outcomes tied to meanings, utility, political needs, interpretation and exploration.

**Rationale and Objectives of Student Teaching**

Identifying a philosophical base is the beginning of evaluation. Answering the question "Why do we have student teaching and what are its objectives?" will be the starting point. "Learning by doing" is often heard and has been
widely used in the field of education since Dewey challenged
the traditional methods of teaching more than a half century
ago. Other early educators including Froebel, Pestollozi,
Rousseau and Plato also emphasized the need for experience
in education. Dewey clarified the understanding of the
nature of the thinking process by showing that thinking
originates in a problem situation and results in action and
evaluation of action. Also, he clarified what experience
is. He felt that a complete experience included proposing,
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 (Cottrell,
1956). Student teaching provides the student an opportunity
to plan an activity with children based upon previous
vicarious and direct experiences, to perform the activity
under the supervision of a skilled teacher, to evaluate the
experience in light of purposes established in planning, and
to evaluate the significance of the experience in light of
past learning and for future experience.

The rationale for student teaching is based on the
belief that real education comes about through experience.
This also provides a psychological foundation for student
teaching. Contributing to this belief are three assumptions
which have been tested and command a great degree of
acceptance:
(1) that one learns best when he is actively involved in achieving his purposes, when he is solving his problem; (2) that the funded experience of others should serve as resource material for learning but should not circumscribe it; and (3) that valuing, thinking, and acting are all parts of the process of living and cannot be divorced from each other (Cottrell, 1956 p. 189).

Student teaching provides the student the opportunity to experience and to reflect upon the meaning of what has been experienced. This brings student teaching into close proximity with the method of science, which is a method of observation, experimenting and thinking. The nature and value gained from student teaching is determined by the quality of the experience and how successfully student teaching is related to its purposes (Dewey, 1938).

The modern concept of the role of student teaching is that it will give the student teacher the opportunity to solve problems. Problems arise when the prospective teacher becomes perplexed because he or she is not quite sure of the demands that will be faced in an actual teaching situation or whether he or she will be capable of meeting these demands. Student teaching becomes a large problem area and the student has the opportunity to analyze his or her needs; bring previous learning, understandings, and skills to bear upon the problems in planning activities to overcome the problems; and to actually carry out the planned activity and then evaluate it in terms of the degree that the problem was
solved. Modern education insists that:

in order to be able to work effectively with children the teacher must not only know what has been learned about their nature and behavior...that is, theory, but he must also be able to recognize the significance of those generalizations in the behavior of children and be able to take appropriate action (Cottrell, 1956, p. 191).

A teacher may know that extreme frustration may lead to aggression, but unless the teacher can recognize the symptoms of aggression for what they are, the theoretical foundation is of no value. Student teaching provides an avenue by which the prospective teacher can develop skill in this area.

Lewin (1948) believed that values and beliefs are acquired from the culture. He also suggested that the individual accepts new values and beliefs by accepting membership in a new group.

Student teaching places the student in a professional group with which he is able to identify himself. The degree to which he becomes actively involved in the problems of school is a factor of great importance in bringing about changes in his values and attitudes as well as understanding (Cottrell, 1956, p. 192).

Student teaching allows the opportunity to become actively involved in learning principles of child growth and development. Many times students are ignorant of these principles because of a lack of past experience. It would be a serious mistake to permit teachers to enter into active
participation in the teaching profession without both developing a background for judgement and practice in judgement under supervision.

To be sure an integration of theory and experience occurs, Little (1950) reports ten specific objectives of student teaching:

1. The development of a sound philosophy of teaching.
2. The understanding of the total school program, and the realization of the relationship of the particular work of the student to the whole school.
3. An understanding of the physical, mental, social and emotional development of the individual pupil and of groups of pupils with the knowledge of how to collect, interpret, and use data about an individual in the guidance of his development and behavior.
4. The ability to arrange environment and manage routine matters so that they will foster individual and group growth and development.
5. The ability to direct student activities, such as assemblies, clubs, public entertainment, special day programs and library work.
6. The ability to make and properly use plans and instruction.
7. The knowledge of the relationship of the school, the community, and the ability to participate in community activities as a teacher in the community.
8. Ability to assume full responsibility for teaching over a reasonable length of time.
9. Ability to evaluate learning and teaching.
10. Continued personal and professional growth. (p. 2)

Andrews (1964) synthesizes the objectives of student teaching into three types of goals:
1. To provide for growth in professional and personal attributes, understandings and skills as a teacher.

2. To assist a student in discovering if teaching is what he or she really wants to do and actually can do.

3. To permit a student to demonstrate the ability and potential needed to obtain a teaching certificate.

To facilitate thinking further, Andrews (1969) asks the question, "What makes good student teaching experiences different from regular, beginning full-time teaching?". In other words, what is the purpose of student teaching? His reply was in eight parts. Student teaching is designed to allow for close professional direction, assistance and consultation through the use of university supervisors and cooperating teachers. It is a time for observing all the roles of the teacher and a gradual induction into the responsibilities of the teacher. Student teachers can make mistakes, usually of limited consequence. Student teaching enables the prospective teacher to experiment with a variety of approaches, methods and teaching procedures. It's one time when a teacher can over prepare. Student teachers can explore the various teaching styles and begin to develop a personal style. Lastly, the prospective teacher can intellectualize the teaching experience through group seminars with the university supervisor and other student teachers.
Student teaching in agricultural education has some specific expectations and objectives which are different from the traditional student teaching subject areas. Peterson (1978) identifies four areas which should occupy a majority of the time during student teaching – the development of the ability to conduct in-school classes, provide adult instruction in agriculture/agribusiness, provide supervised occupational experience instruction and provide leadership for the FFA. Ohio also emphasizes planning for and conducting instruction in the laboratory. The major objectives of student teaching as stated by Peterson in the student teaching handbook for the University of Minnesota (1978) were:

1. To demonstrate the ability to teach students in high school and adult or young farmer programs of instruction.
2. To observe a complete secondary program.
3. To describe the purposes of vocational agriculture.
4. To demonstrate the ability to organize and operate a vocational agriculture department.
5. To demonstrate the use of community resources in a vocational agriculture program.
6. To demonstrate the ability to work effectively with all phases of a complete vocational agriculture program.
7. To demonstrate the ability to function effectively in various non-teaching activities related to the operation of a complete school program.
The Agricultural Education Department at The Ohio State University has developed a list of behavioral objectives for the student teaching experience.

The student teacher

- combines philosophies of agriculture and education with knowledge of today's society in forming professional beliefs.
- has developed and uses an educational philosophy in decision-making as an agricultural teacher.
- assumes responsibilities and code of ethics appropriate to the professional role.
- is aware of educational trends and implications that have relevance for the agriculture taxonomy program.
- utilizes information about the learners, their homes, the community, and the larger society in planning agricultural programs.
- organizes taxonomy offerings into a sequential and integrated pattern to meet the needs of learners.
- plans agricultural programs which will contribute to the total educational goals.
- selects and directs a variety of learning experiences appropriate to the achievement of objectives.
- establishes and maintains a classroom climate which facilitates learning.
- uses evaluation as an integral part of the teaching and learning process.
- utilizes motivation of learner in carrying out an instructional plan.

The above behavioral objectives build a foundation for student teaching in Agricultural Education at The Ohio State University. Through the literature, an answer to the
question "Why do we have student teaching and what are its objectives?" has been discussed and it is time to look at the desirable student teaching experiences.

Desirable Student Teaching Experiences

The types of experiences a student has during student teaching are very important for the success of the experience. To carry out an evaluation, the student teaching experiences must be identified, the appropriateness of the experiences must be determined and whether or not the experiences are actually accomplished must be determined. Depending on the teacher education institution and the field of study, a variety of experiences have been cited as desirable for student teaching.

Brown (1969) divided student teaching into four phases. The first phase of the student teaching assignment should provide an opportunity for the student to simply become acquainted with the whole school. The next activity in the student teaching experience should provide a period of time during which the student teacher observes an experienced cooperating teacher. A third phase should be the involvement of the student teacher in the teaching-learning process on a participating basis. During this period the cooperating teacher retains most of the teaching responsibility, while the student teacher participates as a partner in instruction or assumes responsibility for small
blocks of teaching time. The final phase of student teaching is when the student teacher assumes full responsibility for directing the activities of the class.

There seem to be four general areas which encompass all the experiences of student teaching. These areas include: classroom teaching, the core of a student teaching assignment; at least one extra-class assignment, an essential in the preparation of a complete teacher; participation in all school functions, the duty of a professional teacher; and participation in civic activities, the mark of a good citizen and an up-to-date teacher (Steeves, 1963).

Through a review of literature, Chambliss (1963) developed a list of fifty-two desirable student teaching experiences. The list was extensive and summarized the literature of the authorities in student teaching. The experiences ranged from recognizing individual differences and providing for the individual needs of students to fostering an understanding of the cooperative contribution of various personnel for the improvement of the total school program. This list of 52 experiences is located in Appendix A.

For evaluation to be as effective as possible it is important to compare the current experiences expected during student teaching in the Agricultural Education Department at The Ohio State University with the best contemporary view of
what experiences ought to be included. More recently and as a result of a major research effort, the National Center for Research in Vocational Education (1978) developed a set of 100 performance-based teacher education learning packages. The packages focus on specific professional competencies of vocational teachers. Module 1-7 reveals many types of experiences appropriate during student teaching. Seven categories of experiences have been identified: experiences requiring a variety of teaching techniques, experiences with a variety of evaluation instruments, experiences in program management, experiences in student guidance, experiences in school-community relations, professional development activities and overall teaching experiences. A discussion of the seven categories follow.

The experiences involving teaching techniques included: leading or guiding group discussion; demonstrating manipulative skills; using team teaching; directing individualized study; using resource people; employing oral questioning techniques; directing laboratory experience; using simulation; illustrating with bulletin boards, models, real objects, chalkboards and flip charts; presenting information with overhead projectors, filmstrips, films, audio recordings and video equipment; and directing students in problem solving (National Center for Research in Vocational Education, 1978).

Evaluation of students is an important aspect of
student teaching. The first experience should be the establishment of criteria for student performance. Assessing student cognitive, psychomotor and affective performance using appropriate devices is the next evaluation experience. The appropriate devices may include pretests, objective tests, essay tests, performance tests, check sheets, rating sheets, attitude scales, observation conferences and discussions. A student teacher should also gain experience in evaluating instructional effectiveness. Lastly, student teachers should have the opportunity to recommend grades for students during the period of student teaching (National Center for Research in Vocational Education, 1978).

When a teacher takes his or her first position, one of the most immediate concerns is that of program management. Student teaching is the prime time to gain practical experience in program management. Experiences should include:

1. learning how books, equipment, instructional materials and supplies are purchased.
2. learning the procedures for upkeep and maintenance of the physical facilities.
3. providing safety and first aid needs of students.
4. arranging for and operation of audiovisual equipment as well as all laboratory equipment.
5. assisting students in developing self-discipline.
6. contributing to the updating of program files.
(National Center for Research in Vocational Education, 1978)

Experience in student guidance is the fourth category. It is important for a student teacher to have experience in gathering data about students. This data can come from cumulative records, test files, student's home environment and student's in-school activities. It is one thing to gather the data, but the data should also be used to assist in teaching the student. Formal and informal conferences with students should be held to discuss career opportunities, applying for employment, further education and classroom concerns (National Center for Research in Vocational Education, 1978).

Since vocational programs are community based, public relations should be emphasized during student teaching. As a result of student teaching, a prospective teacher should be able to interpret the vocational program to the school and community through personal contacts with administrators, counselors, students, parents, business and industry. Also, feedback should be obtained from the school and community on the vocational education program (National Center for Research in Vocational Education, 1978).

Student teaching is the time when the prospective teacher should act and be treated as a professional. The student teacher should read professional publications and attend as many professional meetings as possible. The
purpose of professional organizations, trends in vocational education and issues and legislation should be discussed with the cooperating teacher (National Center for Research in Vocational Education, 1978).

The student teaching experience is as close to actual teaching as a student can come before being a full fledged teacher in his or her own right. Thus, a student teacher should teach one or more classes in two different areas of the service area for the major part of the class period. The student teacher should also introduce and complete a full unit of instruction. It is important that a student teacher assume all the instructional responsibilities of the cooperating teacher for a specified period of time. Most vocational programs have student organizations so a student teacher should be able to coordinate the student vocational organization with the total program (National Center for Research in Vocational Education, 1978).

In the publication "Professional Performance Activities in Agricultural Education" (1981) the Department of Agricultural Education at The Ohio State University has identified a set of competencies to be accomplished during student teaching. These competencies represented the expected experiences utilized in this study. As mentioned previously, these experiences determine the success or failure of the student teaching program. Following is the list of experiences:
1. The student teacher can plan for teaching.
2. The student teacher can write a lesson plan.
3. The student teacher can direct student learning activities.
4. The student teacher can apply basic teaching procedures.
5. The student teacher can use instructional media and resources.
6. The student teacher can evaluate performance of students.
7. The student teacher can plan and supervise student's occupational experience programs.
8. The student teacher can use the high school guidance program and obtain background information concerning a student.
9. The student teacher is able to counsel students.
10. The student teacher is able to advise the FFA as an integral part of the total vocational agriculture program.
11. The student teacher is able to advise and work with the FFA Alumni affiliate as part of the local program of vocational agriculture.
12. The student teacher can administer and manage physical facilities.
13. The student teacher can conduct a continuing agricultural education (young and adult) program.
14. The student teacher can conduct those activities which aid in developing general school and community relations.
15. The student teacher can plan and develop a vocational agricultural program.
16. The student teacher can contribute to and perform professional activities.
17. The student teacher can administer and manage a summer program of activities. (p. 11)

Related to these experiences, the Agricultural Education faculty has identified a set of eleven assignments for student teachers to complete during student teaching.
These assignments assist in making sure the experiences have been accomplished. The list of assignments follow with a short description of each.

1. Establish a teacher's notebook using subject dividers.
2. Maintain all lesson plans in the teacher's notebook. Each lesson plan should include teaching objectives, interest approach, content, learning activities, conclusions and applications. The cooperating teacher should evaluate all lesson plans.
3. Conduct supervised occupational experience visits. Turn in two reports describing satisfactory visits. Include an evaluation and list of suggestions made on the visit.
4. Arrange and conduct a field trip. Have the cooperating teacher evaluate the field trip and include necessary forms explaining the field trip.
5. Evaluate the FFA program. With the FFA officers, use the chapter contest form as a guide for the evaluation. Prepare a brief description of the chapter including areas which are strong and weak as suggested by the officers. Understand the chapter budget and note how finances are handled with the school office.
6. Gain experience with continuing education. Conduct a set of interviews with the cooperating teacher, principal or adult education supervisor and some adult class members. Submit a brief report concerning the attitudes encountered during the interviews, the issues raised, the type of
program offered and your conclusions. Participate in planning and conducting a meeting of adult students.

7. Conduct a case study of a selected student.

8. Complete a reading assessment of the students. Complete a reading survey of the students reading habits, determine the grade level of reading materials used during class and review with guidance personnel the reading levels of students in the agricultural classes.

9. Submit a brief article to the school or local newspaper. Introduce yourself as the student teacher in the vocational agriculture department.

10. Evaluate the student teaching experience. Submit two honest and objective brief reports: (1) identify your strengths and limitations and (2) evaluate the cooperative training center and make suggestions for improving the student teaching experience.

11. Maintain a diary of activities and teaching in the notebook. Also complete the student teaching activities report and maintain a local mileage report indicating visits and travel during the quarter (Handbook for Student Teachers, 1981).

Returning to the research questions, the list of expected experiences and assignments during student teaching at The Ohio State University were used to determine whether or not the experiences and assignments were appropriate and whether or not the experiences and assignments were
accomplished.

Responsibilities of the University Supervisor and the Cooperating Teacher

In agricultural education the student teacher is placed in a public school setting under the direction of a cooperating teacher. Also, a university supervisor is assigned to supervise the student teacher's experience. As a result, a triad is formed between the student teacher, cooperating teacher and university supervisor.

The influence of the university supervisor on the student teacher has been a controversial issue. Several studies reported that university supervisors have little identifiable effect on student teacher attitudes and behaviors (Sandgren and Schmidt, 1956; Schueler, Gold and Mitzel, 1962; and Morris, 1974). Contrary to the preceding studies, however, there were data that suggested the university supervisor does influence the student teacher. Bennie (1964) found that the influence of the university supervisor was favorable in the area of actual student teacher performance. Friebus (1977) found that an important role of the university supervisor was to provide suggestions and ideas about what to do in specific instances. Corrigan and Griswold (1963) found that student teachers working with certain university supervisors consistently demonstrated high positive attitudes while those working with other
university supervisors showed lower or less positive attitude changes.

Much more research was available on the student teaching triad examining the influence of the cooperating teacher. According to Yee (1969), Seperson and Joyce (1973), Morris (1974), Chiu (1975), and Karmos and Jacko (1977) the cooperating teacher was the primary influence in the student teaching triad. Also, studies by Dunham (1958) and Price (1961) indicated that the attitudes of student teachers merge toward those of their cooperating teacher as student teaching progresses. Price (1961) also found that student teachers acquire many of the practices of cooperating teachers.

For this study it was assumed that both cooperating teacher and university supervisor influence the student teacher and for this reason it was important to examine their performance during student teaching. In order to complete an effective evaluation of their performance, it is important that the evaluator know the responsibilities of the university supervisor and cooperating teacher.

The role of the university supervisor is to help the student teacher have a professionally rewarding student teaching experience. Andrews (1964) analyzed the functions of the university supervisor by synthesizing from all the lists of functions known to him in the hopes of clarifying the role and responsibilities of the university supervisor.
Seven general categories were used for discussing the responsibilities of the university supervisor - liaison agent between college and schools, placement and planning, relations with cooperating teachers, supervision of student teachers, evaluation of student teachers, service to schools and service to college. A summary of Andrews' thoughts follow.

While acting as a liaison agent between college and schools, the university supervisor interprets the college program needs with particular reference to student teaching and related experiences. He or she works actively to promote good working relationships among all the personnel involved in the experience phases of teacher education. The university supervisor should assist professional personnel in understanding their roles in teacher education and especially define the student teacher's role for the student teacher and for all others concerned. Also, serving as a "trouble-shooter" for the college to resolve serious problems relating to student teaching and to facilitate the improvement in general school-college relationships is part of the many responsibilities of the university supervisor (Andrews, 1964).

For placement and planning the university supervisor works as a public relations consultant visiting schools and teachers constantly searching for high quality schools and additional cooperating teachers. The university supervisor
should cooperate closely with principals in completing student teacher assignments, in planning for orientation of student teachers to the school and community, in setting up a good program of experiences for and guidance of student teachers, and in studying and resolving problem situations. When necessary and after careful study, it may be necessary to change the placement of or remove a student teacher in a professional manner so as to protect the integrity of all concerned and it is up to the university supervisor to do so (Andrews, 1964).

Relations with cooperating teachers is the key to the success of student teaching. The university supervisor should get acquainted with the cooperating teacher before the student teacher arrives and provide the cooperating teacher with professional and personal information on the student teacher and the nature of the assignment and its relation to the college curriculum. The university supervisor should also assist the cooperating teacher in planning a variety of activities and procedures to stimulate the professional growth of the student teacher. As frequently as circumstances permit conferences with the cooperating teacher should be made to assist him or her since it is the cooperating teacher who is responsible for the day-to-day guidance of the student teaching experience. When appropriate, the university supervisor should hold three-way conferences with the cooperating teacher and
student teacher to facilitate the setting of goals, planning, evaluation, the arranging of additional experiences, and the resolving of problems (Andrews, 1964).

As a supervisor of student teachers the university supervisor should serve in a counselor relationship with student teachers before, during, and after student teaching. The university supervisor is responsible for holding conferences with student teachers, preferably both on and off campus to help them prepare for their experiences and to orient them to particular schools and their philosophies. A visit should be made to each school very early in the term to check the adequacy of the placements and the expectations of the chief members of each student teacher team. On the first and second visit the university supervisor tries to check on the adjustment and apparent adequacy of each student teacher. Adjustment and relationships throughout the experience can be a problem for the student teacher. The university supervisor should assist in resolving these problems and provide the student teacher with a "safety valve" opportunity by being a good listener and confidante on problems and matters which student teachers prefer not to discuss in the school community. Individual or small group conferences with student teachers following an observation should be conducted by the university supervisor. The cooperating teacher should be included in this conference (Andrews, 1964).
Evaluation by the university supervisor and cooperating teacher may cause anxiety for the student teacher. The university supervisor should assist the cooperating teacher in planning and carrying through a program of evaluation of the student teacher and developing the student teacher's self-evaluation. Data for evaluation should be collected through several observations of the student teacher and in conferences with the cooperating teacher, student teacher, and other members of the student teaching team. All reports and materials completed by the student teacher should be used in the evaluation process. A final conference with the student teacher should be conducted to discuss grading and then the university supervisor needs to complete the necessary recommendations for the placement office (Andrews, 1964).

The university supervisor's job does not end when the student teacher concludes the student teaching experience. Usually the university supervisor provides service in all aspects of the teacher education program. This would include service regarding teaching methods and suggestions or referrals on matters of information, materials and equipment (Andrews, 1964).

To be sure the college is providing a high quality student teaching program, the university supervisor helps the college staff understand and respect the schools' professional integrity, their needs, their proper role in
teacher education, and helps the college personnel relate properly to school personnel. The university supervisor assists the college in developing and modifying professional programs in response to problems and changing conditions in the schools and communities. A continuous evaluation of the student teaching program must be made and input from the university supervisor is essential (Andrews, 1964).

Inlow (1967) agreed with Andrews and pointed out that the role of the university supervisor should be to interpret the university to the cooperating schools and the schools to the university. The university supervisor should also be an intermediary between the cooperating teacher and the student teacher. He or she should be a skilled interviewer of students prior to student teaching and should aid in placing the student teacher in the most appropriate cooperating school. The university supervisor should counsel the student teacher during student teaching and lead seminars and other classes related to student teaching.

A more recent study by Zimpher, DeVoss and Nott (1980) looked at the traditional triad of student teaching to see what really is happening. They identified four activities of the university supervisor, three of which coincided with and summarized Andrews' views while the fourth added another dimension. First, the university supervisor is to define and communicate the purposes and expectations to be fulfilled by the student teacher and cooperating teacher.
Next, it is the responsibility of the university supervisor to phase the student teacher into the classroom's ongoing instructional activity. Evaluation and constructive criticism of the student teacher and the student teaching experience is appropriate for the university supervisor. Last, the university supervisor is to act as a personal confidante to the cooperating teacher and the student teacher.

As a result of a review of the literature on roles and responsibilities of university supervisors the Department of Agricultural Education at The Ohio State University has devised a list of responsibilities of the university supervisor. This list was the basis for evaluating the performance of the university supervisor. The university supervisor is responsible for:

1. Selecting cooperating teachers and cooperating training centers conducive to meaningful student teaching experiences.
2. Explaining the student teaching program to local administration and cooperating teachers, and providing them with necessary materials.
3. Working cooperatively with the school administration, cooperating teacher, and student teacher to provide the best possible student teaching experience.
4. Preparing the student teacher for the student teaching experience.
5. Providing seminars and conferences for both the cooperating teacher and the student teacher.
6. Visiting the cooperative training center early in the quarter to review with the cooperating teacher and the student teacher the plan of activities.
and responsibilities for the student teaching experience.
7. Periodically visiting the school during the quarter and observing the student teacher in varying teaching situations. Conferring with the cooperating teacher regarding the student teacher's progress.
8. Serving as a resource person for the cooperating teacher in terms of helping secure current reference materials, utilizing new methods and techniques of teaching, and examining evaluation techniques to be used with student teachers and/or pupils.
9. Evaluating the student teacher's professional and personal growth with the cooperating teacher during the entire student teaching experience. Data for this evaluation are collected through observations and conferences with the cooperating teacher, and other appropriate school personnel. These findings serve as a basis for the final grades and a written recommendation.
10. Providing the cooperating school with background materials on each student teacher.
11. Providing each student teacher a profile of possible student teaching sites to allow student teachers to take advantage of strong programs in areas of personal weakness (A Handbook for Student Teachers, 1981, p. 9).

The researcher can identify some additions to this list of responsibilities as a result of a review of the literature. First, four of the responsibilities should be identified as responsibilities of the director of student teaching and not the university supervisor. These four responsibilities will not be included in this study (1, 4, 10, 11). Also, additional responsibilities should be included concerning evaluating lesson plans and critiquing the student teacher after observing his or her teaching.
The literature also discusses the responsibilities of the cooperating teacher. As with the university supervisor the Agricultural Education faculty at The Ohio State University has defined a specific list of responsibilities for the cooperating teacher as a result of the literature.

The most frequent question of a teacher interested in being a cooperating teacher is "What is expected of me"? The cooperating teacher plays a key role in providing the experiences necessary to become a successful teacher. The student teacher arrives at the cooperating school armed with knowledge, eagerness and ideas. The student teacher looks to the cooperating teacher for advice, help and guidance and it is up to the cooperating teacher to feed these needs. Elkind (1976) suggests some ideas for a rewarding experience. When the student teacher arrives, the cooperating teacher should build a welcoming atmosphere. The student teacher should be introduced as a co-professional to the school, principal and teachers. Providing a table or desk for the student teacher along with school schedules, calendars, curriculum guides and other necessary information helps the student teacher become acquainted with the program and feel more at home. A cooperating teacher should also try to get a feel for the student teacher's anxieties and expectations. Ample opportunity should be provided for the student teacher to browse through available curriculum materials and ask any
questions.

Observation is the next step. The student teacher should observe the cooperating teacher looking for specific things previously identified. It is then up to the cooperating teacher to discuss the student teacher's observations (Elkind, 1976).

Soon the student teacher will be ready to teach a lesson. The cooperating teacher should let the student teacher select an area of competence and plan the lesson, but be available for advice. The cooperating teacher should be a silent observer during the lesson and make a few notes regarding the strengths and weaknesses of the lesson. The key for improvement is the conference for critiquing between the cooperating teacher and the student teacher. The student teacher should evaluate the lesson first looking at the strengths and then the weaknesses. The cooperating teacher can then expand on the student teacher's cues. As time passes, the student teacher should assume more and more responsibility for teaching. An important concept that the cooperating teacher should remember is to let the student teacher be responsible for planning and teaching a unit of work which develops over a period of several weeks (Elkind, 1976).

A full student teaching experience requires more than just classroom activities. It is important that the cooperating teacher require the student teacher to visit the
library, psychologist, nurse, school secretary, remedial education teachers, physical education specialist and any other special service people in the school (Elkind, 1976).

Two comprehensive studies have been completed which look at the responsibilities of the cooperating teacher. The first is a study completed by Kuehl (1976) where 43 critical tasks for cooperating teachers were identified from the literature. A summary of the critical tasks follow. The effective cooperating teacher:

1. possesses knowledge of district educational philosophy, instructional goals and objectives, personnel policies and performance standards.
2. understands the supervisory role.
3. willingly fulfills occupational responsibilities.
4. possesses professional characteristics and personal qualities.
5. is an exemplary model of a good teacher.
6. accepts the student teacher as a co-worker.
7. assists the student teacher to make the transition from college student to student teacher.
8. orients the student teacher to significant elements in the student teaching experience.
9. provides for the gradual induction of the student teacher into teaching tasks.
10. provides a flexible work schedule for the student teacher.
11. provides freedom to teach.
12. conducts purposeful conferences with the student teacher.
13. utilizes various tools and techniques to analyze and modify the teaching behavior of the student teacher.
14. provides for evaluation of student teacher's performance.
15. is capable of self-evaluating professional development as a supervisor of a student teacher.
16. provides facilitating environment for the student teacher.
17. shares his or her beliefs about the students with the student teacher.
18. uses self in working with the student teacher.
19. develops and maintains excellent helping relationships.
20. helps the student teacher develop his or her own teaching style.
21. helps the student teacher to become knowledgeable about district curriculum.
22. helps the student teacher understand curriculum planning and development strategies.
23. helps the student teacher to become knowledgeable about content and skill areas.
24. helps the student teacher become knowledgeable about learning resources.
25. helps the student teacher to become knowledgeable about learning processes and learning styles.

26. helps the student teacher develop assessing/diagnosing strategies.

27. helps the student teacher develop instructional and planning strategies.

28. helps the student teacher develop management and classroom discipline strategies.

29. helps the student teacher develop supervision strategies.

30. helps the student teacher develop evaluation strategies.

31. helps the student teacher develop communication strategies.

32. helps the student teacher develop problem solving/decision-making strategies.

33. helps the student teacher develop a positive learning environment.

34. helps the student teacher develop human relations strategies.

35. helps the student teacher develop multicultural/nonsexist strategies.

36. helps the student teacher develop motivation strategies.

37. helps the student teacher develop a wholesome self-image.
helps the student teacher develop role awareness and ethics of the profession.

The second study is a national study conducted by the National Center for Research in Vocational Education (1978). The center developed a module on supervising student teachers identifying areas of importance for a cooperating teacher to accomplish with the student teacher (Module I-8). First, the cooperating teacher should provide learning experiences and guidance for the student teacher. With the assistance of the student teacher, the cooperating teacher should select a set of instructional techniques to demonstrate. Then the cooperating teacher should prepare the student teacher to observe the demonstration for each technique by explaining the technique’s importance and why it is being used. A checklist should be provided to guide the student teacher in observing the demonstration. The cooperating teacher should be able to demonstrate the chosen instructional techniques with a high level of skill. After each demonstration a follow-up conference should be held to review the lesson and the technique and discuss ways in which the technique could be incorporated into the student teaching experience. Early in the student teaching experience it is up to the cooperating teacher to schedule a series of conferences with the student teacher on planning, executing and evaluating teaching. The literature has constantly emphasized the importance of the student
teacher-cooperating teacher conference. The cooperating teacher should adequately prepare for the conference and keep records of all conferences held including any plans and suggestions. The topic of each conference should be reviewed and the cooperating teacher should maintain a positive, supportive attitude. The student teacher should be given the opportunity to express his or her concerns, anxieties or satisfactions. The cooperating teacher should elicit ideas for self-improvement from the student teacher and then assist the student teacher in suggesting possible courses of actions and/or alternative solutions to teaching problems. Evaluation should be a continuous open process throughout the student teaching experience and when at all possible all three members of the student teaching triad should be present and involved. Self-evaluation by the student teacher is essential. If available, audiotapes, videotapes and evaluation instruments should be employed because they aid in objectivity and accuracy in observing and recording student teacher performance.

The specific list of responsibilities of the cooperating teacher identified by the faculty in Agricultural Education at The Ohio State University follow. They are a result of a review of the literature and are very similar to the critical tasks identified by Kuehl (1976) and the responsibilities identified by the National Center for Research in Vocational Education (1978). This list was used
to evaluate the performance of the cooperating teacher.

The cooperating teacher is responsible for:

1. Finding housing for the student teacher.
2. Becoming familiar with the background of the student teacher.
3. Preparing the class for the student teacher's arrival.
4. Involving the student teacher as a part of the faculty.
5. Discussing with the student teacher the student and faculty handbooks.
6. Orienting the student teacher to the school and community.
7. Providing the student teacher with accessibility to instructional materials, an area for work and personal belongings, student records, audio-visual equipment and other resource materials.
8. Reviewing the student teacher curriculum plans for teaching agricultural education.
9. Providing opportunities for various teaching experiences with some freedom to experiment with teaching strategies.
10. Providing the student teacher the opportunity to assume full teaching responsibilities near the end of the student teaching quarter, according to the student teacher's ability.
11. Demonstrating good teaching techniques and encouraging the student teacher to observe and ask questions.
12. Providing the student teacher with an understanding of the extent of teacher authority and responsibilities.
13. Assisting with the professionalization of the student teacher.
14. Giving the student teacher every possible opportunity to serve as an FFA advisor.
15. Giving the student teacher opportunities to work with adult and continuing education or a special assignment that would meet these requirements.
16. Keeping records and writing evaluative reports about the student
teacher's progress and general promise as a teacher including: training evaluation reports, letters of recommendation, inventory of student traits, and confidential statement.
17. Providing frequent encouragement, constructive criticism, and recognition of success.
18. Evaluating the student teacher's progress and experiences and giving daily feedback.
19. Conducting a formal evaluation at the end of the third, sixth, and tenth weeks.
20. Discussing and evaluating the student teacher's performance with the university supervisor.
22. Evaluating own strengths/weaknesses as a cooperating teacher.
23. Reviewing the PRIDE report with the student teacher.
24. Providing an enthusiastic and professional example for the student teacher.
25. Having the students' occupational goals organized for the student teacher; go over this organized plan with the student teacher.
26. Not expecting the student teacher to teach exactly as the cooperating teacher does; try not to let your biases show and influence the student teacher.
27. Taking the student teacher on occupational experience visits the second or third day of the student teaching experience.
28. Identifying the necessary procedures to follow in conducting an occupational experience visit.
29. The student teacher planning a unit of instruction at least two-three weeks prior to actual teaching. This is to be done throughout the term (Handbook for Student Teachers, 1981, p. 11).

As derived from the literature, the researcher has some comments on this list of responsibilities for the cooperating teacher. Additional focus should be included on
critiquing lesson plans and critiquing student teacher performance. Also, all the responsibilities can be used to rate the performance of the cooperating teacher but some are more appropriate for the university supervisors to rate than the student teachers.

In summary, student teaching is the most important "learning by doing" portion of the preservice teacher education program. Since student teaching plays such an important role in the preparation of teachers, it is important that it be a high quality experience. To determine if the student teaching program provides a high quality experience it is necessary to evaluate the experience. Program evaluation is determining the worth or value of a specific program resulting in improvements to the program.

There was considerable literature available on the nature of student teaching. The rationale of student teaching, objectives of student teaching, desirable student teaching experiences, responsibilities of the university supervisor and responsibilities of the cooperating teacher were discussed extensively in the literature. For this study, it was assumed that the appropriate model for student teaching in Agricultural Education at The Ohio State University was the traditional triad approach including student teacher, cooperating teacher and university supervisor. Research showed that both university supervisor
and cooperating teacher have influence on the student teacher. However, very few studies were identified concerning the effectiveness of this student teaching triad. More specifically, the researcher found no recent literature involving evaluation of agricultural education student teaching programs. Therefore, a study evaluating the student teaching program in Agricultural Education at The Ohio State University was conducted to lay a foundation for further evaluations of student teaching programs.

The instruments designed for this study were a result of what has been discussed in this chapter. Previous literature and current expectations of the Department of Agricultural Education at The Ohio State University provided the foundation for the list of expected experiences during student teaching, responsibilities of university supervisors and responsibilities of cooperating teachers.
CHAPTER III
METHODOLOGY

Population and Sample

Three populations were used in this study. The first population was the university supervisors. This population consisted of all the full-time regular faculty members of the Department of Agricultural Education at The Ohio State University who were responsible for the supervision of student teachers for the school years 1979, 1980, 1981. Since the number of university supervisors was small (N=14) the whole population received the descriptive survey.

The second population for the study was comprised of all the cooperating teachers with whom agricultural education student teachers were placed over the same three year period. Department records were used to identify the cooperating teachers and the 1981-82 Ohio Agricultural Education Directory was used to locate addresses. Again, since the number of subjects was small (N=88), it was appropriate to use the entire population for the descriptive survey.

The third population consisted of undergraduates who student taught in agricultural education during the school
years 1979, 1980, 1981 (N=141). Department records were also used to identify the student teachers. The College of Agriculture Alumni Association records and the 1981-82 Ohio Agricultural Education Directory were used to locate addresses. As before, the complete population was used for the study.

Design

A descriptive-survey design was used to accomplish the objectives of this study. This design answered the research questions pertaining to:
- the extent to which the experiences and assignments during student teaching are needed in preparing a prospective teacher for successful teaching in vocational agriculture as perceived by university supervisors, cooperating teachers and student teachers in Agricultural Education at The Ohio State University.
- the extent to which these experiences and assignments are accomplished during the student teaching program as perceived by university supervisors, cooperating teachers and student teachers in Agricultural Education at The Ohio State University.
- how cooperating teachers and student teachers rate the performance of university supervisors in their supervision of student teachers in Agricultural Education at The Ohio State University.
- how university supervisors and student teachers rate the performance of cooperating teachers in their supervision of student teachers in Agricultural Education at The Ohio State University.

Data Collection and Instrumentation

Data were collected by means of three separate mailed questionnaires followed by face to face interviews with the university supervisors and telephone interviews with the cooperating teachers and student teachers to probe deeper into the responses of selected participants.

A questionnaire was mailed to each university supervisor, cooperating teacher and student teacher in the populations selected for inclusion in the study with a cover letter from the Department Chairperson explaining the study. It was assumed that the Department Chairperson's sponsorship would elicit a higher response. A stamped self-addressed envelope was enclosed with each questionnaire. Ten days after the original mailing a reminder card was sent asking those who had not returned the questionnaire to please do so. Three weeks after the original mailing, a second questionnaire with a new cover letter and return envelope was sent to the non-respondents. Data contained in questionnaires received after the established deadline of November 9, 1982 were not included in the analysis of data. A ten percent random sample was drawn from the
non-respondents of the cooperating teachers group (n=1) and the student teachers group (n=3) for the purpose of examining possible differences between the respondent and non-respondent groups. Data from the non-respondent groups were obtained by mail and telephone. Differences between the respondents and non-respondents were determined by examining each questionnaire. Results showed no differences between the responding and non-responding groups for both populations. Therefore, results were generalized to the populations under study. Samples of all cover letters and the post card reminder are located in Appendix B.

A group of selected respondents then participated either in a face to face interview or a telephone interview. Five weeks after mailing the first instrument, appointments were made with selected university supervisors for face to face interviews and selected cooperating teachers and student teachers for telephone interviews. Two days later the interviews began. The purpose of the interviews was to follow-up the mail questionnaire so that the researcher could probe deeper into the responses of the participants to find out why respondents answered the items in the questionnaire the way they did and how they perceived why others responded the way they did. The end product of this triangulation technique was the development of a procedure for improving the experiences and assignments during student teaching and the performance of both the university
supervisor and the cooperating teacher.

Due to the time and expense involved in telephone surveys it was impossible to interview all 198 respondents. Therefore, a group of respondents from each population was asked to participate in the interviews. The university supervisor group consisted of six randomly selected university supervisors (42.9%) stratified by number of student teachers supervised. The stratification was used to ensure that both more experienced and less experienced university supervisors participated in the interview. Two university supervisors were selected from each stratum and the three stratum were: one to ten student teachers supervised, 11 to 30 student teachers supervised and 100 or greater student teachers supervised.

The cooperating teacher group consisted of nine randomly selected cooperating teachers (11.8%) stratified by number of student teachers supervised. Again, the stratification was used to ensure that both more experienced and less experienced cooperating teachers were interviewed. Three cooperating teachers were selected from each stratum and the three stratum were: one to three student teachers supervised, four to ten student teachers supervised and eleven or greater student teachers supervised.

The student teacher group consisted of eight randomly selected student teachers (7.7%) stratified based on whether the student teacher entered or did not enter the field of
teaching. Then each of the two stratum were further divided based on grades earned during student teaching. Those students who earned a 3.60 grade point average or above were in one group while those who earned below a 3.60 grade point average were in another group. It was felt that those students who earned higher grades during student teaching and entered the field of teaching may answer questions differently than those who earned lower grades and did not enter the field of teaching. Therefore, two student teachers were selected from each of the four stratum.

Since the university supervisors were located in Columbus and on The Ohio State University campus it was determined that face to face interviews would be most appropriate for gathering data. The cooperating teachers and student teachers were not so easily accessible because of their current employment so it was felt a 45 minute telephone interview would be more appropriate.

Mailed Questionnaires

University Supervisor Questionnaire

The questionnaire mailed to the university supervisors was developed by the researcher and had two parts. The first part was a checklist evaluating the experiences and assignments for student teachers in agricultural education at The Ohio State University. Respondents were asked to rate the extent to which each experience and assignment was
needed in preparing a prospective teacher for successful teaching in vocational agriculture. The rating scale included essential, desirable, optional and not needed. Then the respondents were to indicate the extent to which each experience and assignment was accomplished during student teaching. The four choices for extent of accomplishment were "accomplished well", "satisfactorily accomplished", "partially accomplished" and "not accomplished". Twenty-three experiences and twenty assignments were included in the checklist. The experiences and assignments used to develop the checklist were a result of a review of the literature and a list of experiences and assignments identified by the Department of Agricultural Education at The Ohio State University as part of student teaching.

The second part of the questionnaire was a rating of the performance of the cooperating teacher in Agricultural Education at The Ohio State University. The university supervisor was asked to evaluate the cooperating teacher's performance on each of 30 items identified as responsibilities of the cooperating teacher in Agricultural Education at The Ohio State University and expanded based on a review of the literature. A nine point rating scale, from 9 "superior", to 1 "poor", was used to obtain a performance score for the cooperating teacher. In both parts the respondent had the opportunity to make further comments if
he or she wished to do so. The university supervisor questionnaire is located in Appendix C.

Cooperating Teacher Questionnaire

The questionnaire that was mailed to the cooperating teachers was developed by the researcher and was very similar to the university supervisor questionnaire. Again, two parts were used with the first part being exactly the same as in the university supervisor questionnaire. The second part was different in that it was a rating of the performance of the university supervisor by the cooperating teacher. The cooperating teacher was asked to evaluate the university supervisor's performance on each of 12 items. The 12 items were derived from the literature and a list of previously identified responsibilities of the university supervisor in agricultural education at The Ohio State University. A nine point rating scale, from 9 "superior," to 1 "poor," was used to obtain a performance score for the university supervisor. As in the university supervisor questionnaire, the respondent was to make further comments if he or she so chose. See Appendix D for a copy of the cooperating teacher questionnaire.

Student Teacher Questionnaire

The student teachers were mailed a questionnaire containing a combination of the above two questionnaires. The researcher developed this questionnaire and it had three parts. The first part was exactly the same as the first
part of the university supervisor questionnaire and the cooperating teacher questionnaire. The first part was a checklist pertaining to the need of the experiences and assignments in preparing a prospective teacher and then whether the experiences and assignments were actually accomplished during student teaching.

The student teachers were then asked to evaluate the performance of both the university supervisor and the cooperating teacher. There were eight items pertaining to the performance of the university supervisor (which were also included on the cooperating teacher questionnaire) and twenty-seven items pertaining to the performance of the cooperating teacher (which were also on the university supervisor questionnaire). The same nine point rating scale was used to evaluate the university supervisor and the cooperating teacher as described for the previous two questionnaires. Space was available for making further comments. Eleven fill in the blank questions were asked to gain quantitative data regarding student teaching. A copy of the student teacher questionnaire is in Appendix E.

Validity of the Questionnaires

The validity of an instrument is defined as the extent to which a test measures what it is intended to measure (Kerlinger, 1973). Content validity of all parts of each questionnaire was ascertained in two steps. First, an item was included in the instrument only if it was representative
of the student teaching program in agricultural education at The Ohio State University. The second step was to ask a panel of experts to critique the instruments. Each item was examined for its relevance to student teaching regarding experiences and assignments expected and responsibilities of university supervisors and cooperating teachers. "Content validation consists primarily in judgement" (Kerlinger, 1973, p. 458). Panel members included seven university supervisors, two cooperating teachers and three student teachers. The suggestions of the panel of experts were used to modify or clarify the items. One item was deleted.

**Reliability of the Questionnaires**

"Reliability is the accuracy or precision of a measuring instrument" (Kerlinger, 1973, p. 457). In other words, the ability to obtain the same results over and over again. A pilot test was completed with three past university supervisors, six past cooperating teachers and six past student teachers not included in the study. After the pilot test for each questionnaire, the reliability was evaluated by the Cronbach Alpha method of assessing internal consistency. Since Cronbach’s Alpha can only be used with homogeneous tests (only one dimension) reliabilities were calculated by using the responses of the separate populations and the combined responses of all three populations. A series of 14 Cronbach Alphas were calculated. A summary of the Cronbach Alphas for the pilot
study is in Table 1.

Table 1
Reliabilities for the Various Parts of the Questionnaire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questionnaire</th>
<th>Reliability Coefficients</th>
<th>Cronbach Alphas</th>
<th>Pilot Study</th>
<th>Actual Study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cooperating Teacher Questionnaire</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need of Experiences and Assignments</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accomplishment of Experiences and Assignments</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation of University Supervisor</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Supervisor Questionnaire</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need of Experiences and Assignments</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accomplishment of Experiences and Assignments</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation of Cooperating Teacher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student teacher Questionnaire</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need of Experiences and Assignments</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accomplishment of Experiences and Assignments</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation of University Supervisor</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation of Cooperating Teacher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combined Reliabilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need of Experiences and Assignments</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accomplishment of Experiences and Assignments</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation of University Supervisor</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation of Cooperating Teacher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Cronbach Alphas of greatest concern in the pilot study were .28 (university supervisor—accomplishment of experiences and assignments), .42 (university supervisor—evaluation of cooperating teacher) and .55 (combined rating of university supervisor). When looking closer, the reliability of .28 could not really be changed because it was important that the researcher be able to combine data in that section of the questionnaire and the combined reliability was .93. Also only three past university supervisors participated in the pilot study and with such a small number of participants the Cronbach Alpha may not really indicate a realistic reliability.

The same problem was true for the evaluation of the cooperating teacher. A Cronbach Alpha of .96 was calculated for the student teachers’ evaluation of the cooperating teacher, but it was a .42 for the university supervisors’ evaluation of the cooperating teacher. Again, since data were to be combined the overall Cronbach Alpha of .74 indicates very strong association and was acceptable (Davis, 1971). The combined .55 reliability for the rating of the university supervisor can also be explained. The separate reliabilities for the rating of the university supervisors by the cooperating teachers and student teachers were .68 and .87 respectively, but a reliability of .55 fell well below these reliabilities. The researcher looked closer to the responses and found that the student teachers
consistently rated the university supervisor higher than the cooperating teachers thus a wider range of scores resulted causing lower reliability for the combined Cronbach Alpha. Based on the reliabilities and suggestions from the respondents a few changes were made to make the questions clearer but none were deleted for the final questionnaire.

Also shown in Table 1 is a summary of the Cronbach Alphas for the actual study. As Table 1 reports, all Cronbach Alphas were .79 or above indicating a very strong association (Davis, 1971).

Face to Face and Telephone Interview Schedules

The preliminary analysis of the mailed questionnaire assisted in formulating the face to face and telephone interview schedules. The researcher was seeking qualitative data to answer questions such as:
1. Why were there discrepancies between the university supervisor, cooperating teacher and student teacher groups as to what experiences and assignments should be essential during student teaching?
2. Why were specific experiences and assignments rated essential and not satisfactorily accomplished?
3. What were some examples the respondent could cite?
4. What were some strengths and weaknesses of the student teaching program?
5. What were some suggestions the respondent had to improve
the item under question?

Each group's interview schedule emphasized the same major concerns resulting from the mailed questionnaire but, since the mailed questionnaire was slightly different for each group some questions were common to only one or two groups. Copies of the interview schedules for the university supervisor group, cooperating teacher group and student teacher group are in Appendices F, G and H respectively.

Analysis of Data

Since the study was descriptive in nature, descriptive statistics were primarily used to summarize and analyze the data. For the first and second research question frequencies, percentages, measures of central tendency and Kendall's coefficient of concordance W were used to describe the extent the experiences and assignments were needed in preparing a prospective teacher for successful teaching in vocational agriculture and the extent these same experiences were accomplished. Frequencies, measures of central tendency and Kendall's Coefficient of Rank Correlation were used to describe the performance of the university supervisor and cooperating teacher as posed in the third and fourth research questions. The fifth research question required a list of suggested changes to improve the student teaching program in Agricultural Education at The Ohio State
University. A synthesis of the above descriptive statistics and the information gained from the open-ended questions, face to face interviews and telephone interviews was completed to produce a list of suggested changes to improve the student teaching program.

For the descriptive analysis, data were keypunched onto computer cards and analyzed by means of the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences at the Instruction and Research Computer Center at The Ohio State University.
CHAPTER IV
FINDINGS

Three populations were involved in this evaluation of the student teaching program in Agricultural Education at The Ohio State University. The population of university supervisors consisted of the full-time regular faculty members of the Department of Agricultural Education at The Ohio State University who were responsible for the supervision of student teachers for the school years 1979, 1980 and 1981 (N=14). All fourteen questionnaires were returned, all of which were useable, for a response rate from the university supervisors of 100%.

The second population involved in the study consisted of all the cooperating teachers with whom agricultural education student teachers were placed over the same three year period (N=88). A total of 76 questionnaires were returned and deemed useable. Four were not delivered because the cooperating teacher had either left teaching or retired leaving no forwarding address. A response rate of approximately 90% was calculated using the four undelivered questionnaires as no contact made.
The last population consisted of undergraduates who student taught in agricultural education during the school years 1979, 1980 and 1981 (N=141). A total of 108 questionnaires were returned all of which were useable. Seven questionnaires were returned to the sender because they did not reach their destination. The Department of Agricultural Education does not maintain an up-to-date list of addresses for graduates. The list the Department uses is the list that the College of Agriculture Alumni Office has which means that the addresses of those students who choose not to join the Alumni Association may become out-dated. It is impossible to know how many other letters did not reach their destination. A response rate of approximately 81% was calculated using the seven not delivered questionnaires as no contact made.

Characteristics of Respondents

University Supervisors

University supervisors were asked to indicate how many years they had been a university supervisor and the approximate number of student teachers they had supervised. Table 2 illustrates the number of years the faculty member had been a university supervisor. Fifty percent of the faculty members had supervised student teachers for less than ten years. The average number of years supervising student teachers was approximately 15.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Years</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MEAN = 15.50
SD   = 12.38
Table 3 indicates the approximate number of student teachers supervised by these fourteen faculty members. Fifty percent of the faculty members have supervised 20 or fewer student teachers. The average number of student teachers supervised was approximately 69.

### Table 3

Approximate Number of Student Teachers Supervised by University Supervisors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Student Teachers</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>275</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>360</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL 14 100.0

**MEAN = 68.93**  
**SD = 109.19**
Cooperating Teachers

Cooperating teachers were asked how many years they had been a cooperating teacher and the approximate number of student teachers with whom they had worked. As Table 4 indicates the range was from one year to 20 years as a cooperating teacher with a mean of approximately six years. However, 46 of the cooperating teachers (64%) were a cooperating teacher for six or fewer years.

Table 4

Number of Years as a Cooperating Teacher

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Years</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>19.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean = 6.458
SD = 4.491

*4 questionnaires with missing data
Table 5 indicates the approximate number of student teachers with whom the cooperating teachers had worked. The mean number of student teachers was 5.4 with a range of one to thirty-two. However, 50% of the cooperating teachers had worked with one to three student teachers.

Table 5

Approximate Number of Student Teachers Supervised by Cooperating Teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Student Teachers</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>18.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL 70 100.0

MEAN = 5.414 *6 questionnaires with missing data
SD = 5.681
**Student Teachers**

Sixty-two (57.4%) of the student teachers indicated they entered full-time teaching directly after graduation. Forty-five (41.7%) student teachers reported they did not teach directly after graduation and one student teacher has yet to graduate.

The student teachers were also asked if they student taught in a joint vocational school or a comprehensive high school. About three-quarters (76.9%) indicated they had student taught in a comprehensive high school, while approximately one-quarter (23.1%) taught in a joint vocational school.

Next, the student teachers were asked the type of school in which they were currently employed. Of the 108 student teachers, eleven (10.2%) were currently in a joint vocational school, thirty-seven (34.3%) were in a high school and two (1.9%) were currently in a position at the post-secondary level. Fifty-eight (53.7%) reported they currently were not teaching. This finding illustrates that 13 of the student teachers began teaching after graduation but have left the teaching profession.

Table 6 illustrates a summary of the occupations of those 58 student teachers who were not teaching at the time this study was conducted. Eight (13.8%) of those student teachers who were not teaching were in occupations that were not agriculturally related. Farming was the most popular
agriculturally related occupation.

Table 6

Occupations of the Student Teachers Who Were Not Teaching When This Study was Conducted

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Farming</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales, Field or Service Representative for the Agriculture Industry</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-agriculture related occupations</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substitute teacher</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student (Graduate or Undergraduate)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florist, Horticulturist, Garden Center employee</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livestock Marketing</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loan Officer</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horse trainer</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extension Agent</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>58</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Results From the Mailed Questionnaires

The levels of need for the experiences and assignments, the extent to which the experiences and assignments are accomplished, the performance of the cooperating teacher and the performance of the university supervisor reported by the three groups of respondents were analyzed by computing the respective means for each of the experiences, assignments and activities completed during student teaching. A scale was used to allow for meaningful interpretation of the results of these mean scores. The mean levels of need were analyzed and discussed using the values shown on the scale below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not Needed</th>
<th>Optional</th>
<th>Desirable</th>
<th>Essential</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 ---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 1.599</td>
<td>2.599</td>
<td>3.599</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Similarly, all mean levels of accomplishment were interpreted using the values illustrated below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not Accomplished</th>
<th>Partially Accomplished</th>
<th>Satisfactorily Accomplished</th>
<th>Well</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-----------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 1.599</td>
<td>2.599</td>
<td>3.599</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The mean ratings of performance were interpreted using the values on the scale below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Below Average</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Above Average</th>
<th>Superior</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1----</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 1.999</td>
<td>3.999</td>
<td>5.999</td>
<td>7.999</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The results presented in the following pages that pertain to need of experiences and assignments, accomplishment of experiences and assignments and rating of performance reported by university supervisors, cooperating teachers and student teachers will be discussed around the framework provided by these three scales.

Level of Need for Experiences

In response to the first research question posed in Chapter I, university supervisors, cooperating teachers and student teachers were asked to rate the extent to which each of the 23 experiences expected during student teaching were needed in preparing a prospective teacher for successful teaching in vocational agriculture. The level of need was examined on a continuum, beginning with not needed and ending with essential. Therefore, these data were treated as interval data, and the mean and standard deviation were calculated for each experience. Table 7 presents the means and standard deviations for the 23 experiences as perceived by each population.

As shown in Table 7 the average level of need for experiences was 3.6 or greater for 11 of the 23 experiences as perceived by the university supervisors. This would indicate that the 11 highest ranked experiences were essential in preparing a prospective teacher for successful
Table 7
Rank Order of Mean Levels of Need for Experiences
as Perceived by University Supervisors, Cooperating Teachers, and Student Teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experiences</th>
<th>University Supervisors</th>
<th>Cooperating Teachers</th>
<th>Student Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RANK MEAN (N = 14)</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>RANK MEAN (N = 108)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directs student learning activities</td>
<td>1 4.000 0.000</td>
<td>3 3.787 0.454</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writes lesson plans</td>
<td>2 3.929 0.267</td>
<td>6 3.360 0.620</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identifies and outlines unit topics and develops behavioral objectives for classes taught</td>
<td>4 3.857 0.363</td>
<td>4 3.806 0.422</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applies basic teaching procedures</td>
<td>4 3.857 0.363</td>
<td>12 3.400 0.658</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluates the performance of students</td>
<td>4 3.857 0.363</td>
<td>15 3.105 0.759</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaches the students to use, summarize and analyze the record books of supervised occupational experience programs</td>
<td>7.5 3.786 0.426</td>
<td>10 3.605 0.568</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advises the FFA</td>
<td>7.5 3.786 0.426</td>
<td>11 3.573 0.619</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can plan and conduct a summer program of activities</td>
<td>7.5 3.786 0.426</td>
<td>15 3.092 0.734</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develops a weekly schedule of teaching</td>
<td>10.5 3.714 0.469</td>
<td>16 3.286 0.426</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uses instructional media and resources</td>
<td>10.5 3.714 0.469</td>
<td>17 3.697 0.462</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develops a plan for teacher and/or employer supervision of occupational experience programs</td>
<td>12 3.571 0.646</td>
<td>18 3.105 0.759</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plans and supervises long time occupational experience programs</td>
<td>14 3.357 0.497</td>
<td>19 3.092 0.734</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counsels students</td>
<td>14 3.357 0.745</td>
<td>19 3.092 0.734</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can plan and develop a vocational agriculture program</td>
<td>14 3.357 0.929</td>
<td>20 3.092 0.734</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participates in teachers' meetings and professional conferences</td>
<td>16 3.286 0.426</td>
<td>21 3.105 0.759</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepares and conducts group instruction in adult education</td>
<td>18 3.071 0.730</td>
<td>21 3.286 0.514</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conducts visits concerning individual problems of adults</td>
<td>18 3.071 0.730</td>
<td>22 3.247 0.756</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conducts activities which aid in developing good school and community relations</td>
<td>18 3.071 0.829</td>
<td>23 3.247 0.878</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uses high school guidance program to obtain and interpret background information concerning students</td>
<td>20 3.000 0.784</td>
<td>15 3.173 0.705</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administers and maintains physical facilities</td>
<td>21.5 2.857 0.770</td>
<td>16 3.243 0.642</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identifies appropriate topics for an adult education program</td>
<td>21.5 2.857 0.770</td>
<td>17 3.243 0.642</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advises the FFA Alumni Affiliate</td>
<td>23 2.143 0.663</td>
<td>22 2.491 0.842</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*1 = not needed
2 = optional
3 = desirable
4 = essential

Kendall coefficient of concordance = W = .91
teaching in vocational agriculture. Only one experience (advises FFA Alumni affiliate) was shown to be optional and none were identified as not needed.

The average level of need for experiences was 3.6 or greater for ten of the twenty-three experiences as perceived by the cooperating teachers. Two experiences were perceived as optional (conducts visits concerning individual problems of adults and advises the FFA Alumni affiliate) and none were identified as not needed.

The student teacher group perceived the average level of need for experiences was 3.6 or greater for seven of the twenty-three experiences. Of the three populations, seven was the fewest number of experiences that were perceived as essential for preparing prospective vocational agriculture teachers. Two experiences were considered optional: 1) advises the FFA Alumni affiliate and 2) conducts visits concerning the individual problems of adults. These same two experiences were considered optional by the cooperating teacher group. The university supervisor group also rated advises the FFA Alumni Affiliate as optional.

Table 7 shows the similarities and differences among the three groups in how they ranked the 23 experiences. Though the three groups exhibited variations in ranking the value of the Kendall coefficient of concordance W was .91, which indicates a very strong agreement on the rankings of need of the 23 experiences for preparing a prospective
teacher for successful teaching in vocational agriculture (Davis, 1971).

Level of Accomplishment for Experiences

In response to the second research question posed in Chapter I, university supervisors, cooperating teachers and student teachers were then asked to rate the extent to which the same 23 experiences were accomplished during student teaching. The level of accomplishment was examined on a four point continuum with not accomplished at one end and accomplished well at the other end. Again, data were treated as interval data, and the mean and standard deviation for each experience were calculated. Table 8 presents the mean and standard deviations for the 23 experiences as perceived by university supervisors cooperating teachers and student teachers respectively.

As Table 8 indicates, the average level of accomplishment for experiences was 2.6 or greater for nine of the twenty-three experiences as perceived by university supervisors. However, none of the experiences had an average level of accomplishment which reached the 3.6 mark, indicating the experience was accomplished well during student teaching. At this point it is necessary to refer back to Table 7 to see that of the ten experiences identified as essential three experiences were not
Table 8
Rank Order of Mean Levels of Accomplishment for Experiences
as Perceived by University Supervisors, Cooperating Teachers and Student Teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experiences</th>
<th>University Supervisors</th>
<th>Cooperating Teachers</th>
<th>Student Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RANK</td>
<td>MEAN</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluates the performance of students</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.077</td>
<td>0.494</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applies basic teaching procedures</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3.071</td>
<td>0.730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participates in teacher's meetings and professional conferences</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3.071</td>
<td>0.829</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develops a weekly schedule of teaching</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>2.929</td>
<td>0.475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uses instructional media and resources</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>2.929</td>
<td>0.616</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identifies and outlines unit topics and develops behavioral objectives</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.857</td>
<td>0.663</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writes lesson plans</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.786</td>
<td>0.579</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directs student learning activities</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.786</td>
<td>0.699</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develops a procedure to insure students' safety and protection</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.786</td>
<td>0.699</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uses high school guidance program to obtain and interpret background</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.558</td>
<td>0.519</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>information concerning students</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.500</td>
<td>0.760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advises the FFA</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.429</td>
<td>0.514</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counsels students</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2.214</td>
<td>0.426</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develops a plan for teacher and/or employer supervision of occupational</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2.214</td>
<td>0.214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>experience programs</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2.214</td>
<td>0.699</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administers and maintains the physical facilities</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>1.929</td>
<td>0.475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conducts activities which aid in developing good school and community</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>1.929</td>
<td>0.475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>relations</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>1.929</td>
<td>0.616</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plans and supervises long time occupational experience programs</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>1.929</td>
<td>0.730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepares and conducts group instruction in adult education</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>1.929</td>
<td>0.616</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can plan and develop a vocational agriculture program</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>1.929</td>
<td>0.616</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identifies appropriate topics for an adult education program</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>1.714</td>
<td>0.611</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can plan and conduct a summer program of activities</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>1.714</td>
<td>0.855</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conducts visits concerning individual problems of adults</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1.571</td>
<td>0.756</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*1 = not accomplished
2 = partially accomplished
3 = satisfactorily accomplished
4 = accomplished well

Kendall coefficient of concordance = \( \omega = .93 \)
satisfactorily accomplished. These three experiences were:
1) advises the FFA, 2) teaches students to use, summarize
and analyze the record books of supervised occupational
experience programs and 3) can plan and conduct a summer
program of activities. One experience had an average level
of accomplishment indicating the experience was not
accomplished. This experience was advising the FFA Alumni
affiliate.

Cooperating teachers reported that the average level of
accomplishment was 2.6 or greater for 15 of the 23
experiences indicating the experiences were accomplished
satisfactorily. None of the experiences reached the 3.6
mark indicating the experience was accomplished well during
student teaching. One average level of accomplishment
indicated that the experience was not accomplished during
student teaching and that experience was advises the FFA
Alumni affiliate. It is important to note that all ten
experiences identified as essential in Table 7 were rated as
satisfactorily accomplished, but six experiences rated as
desirable were only partially accomplished.

The average level of accomplishment for the experiences
was 2.6 or greater for 16 of the 23 experiences as perceived
by student teachers. None of the experiences reached the
3.6 mark which indicated the experience was accomplished
well. The seven remaining experiences had an average level
of accomplishment falling in the partially accomplished
area. The lowest three experiences, all with an average level of accomplishment below 2.0 were: 1) prepares and conducts group instruction in adult education, 2) conducts visits concerning individual problems of adults, and 3) advises the FFA Alumni affiliate. These same three experiences had the lowest average level of accomplishment as perceived by cooperating teachers and the first and third were the lowest two as perceived by university supervisors. After referring back to Table 7, all of the seven experiences rated as essential by the student teachers were satisfactorily accomplished.

Table 8 also was designed to compare the rankings of the university supervisor, cooperating teacher and student teacher groups on the accomplishment of the 23 experiences. Even though there were some differences the Kendall coefficient of concordance $W$ was .93, which indicates a very strong agreement on the rankings of the accomplishment of the 23 experiences (Davis, 1971).

Levels of Need for Assignments

To continue in response to the first research question posed in Chapter I, all three populations were asked to rate the extent to which the 20 assignments during student teaching were needed in preparing a prospective teacher for successful teaching in vocational agriculture. The level of need was examined on a continuum, beginning with not needed
and ending with essential. The data were treated as interval data and the mean and standard deviation were calculated for each assignment. Table 9 reports the means and standard deviations for the 20 assignments as perceived by university supervisors, cooperating teachers and student teachers respectively.

As shown in Table 9, the average level of need for assignments was 3.6 or greater for one of the 20 assignments as perceived by university supervisors. This assignment was for the student teacher to prepare an objective self-evaluation with his or her strengths and limitations as a teacher of vocational agriculture. The other 19 assignments had an average level of need of 2.6 or better indicating these assignments were desirable for preparing a prospective teacher for successful teaching in vocational agriculture.

The cooperating teacher group perceived the average level of need for assignments was 3.6 or greater for one of the twenty assignments and that assignment was planning and conducting a field trip. The other 19 assignments were perceived by the cooperating teachers as desirable for preparing a prospective teacher.

In comparison, the student teacher group rated all assignments from 2.6 to 3.59 indicating desirable but not essential.
Table 9
Rank Order of Mean Levels of Need for Assignments
as Perceived by University Supervisors, Cooperating Teachers and Student Teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assignments</th>
<th>University Supervisors</th>
<th>Cooperating Teachers</th>
<th>Student Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prepares evaluation of student teacher's strengths and limitations as a teacher of vocational agriculture</td>
<td>1 3.643 0.199</td>
<td>5 3.474 0.553</td>
<td>9 3.311 0.695</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepares two brief reports describing satisfactory supervised occupational experience visits</td>
<td>2 3.571 0.646</td>
<td>6 3.461 0.576</td>
<td>8 3.561 0.742</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintains a notebook containing all lesson plans</td>
<td>4 3.500 0.760</td>
<td>3 3.566 0.618</td>
<td>1 3.579 0.630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have cooperating teacher evaluate each lesson plan using the lesson plan check sheet</td>
<td>4 3.500 0.760</td>
<td>11 3.257 0.651</td>
<td>6.5 3.383 0.682</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan and conduct a field trip</td>
<td>4 3.500 0.174</td>
<td>1 3.707 0.487</td>
<td>2 3.575 0.616</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establish a notebook for teaching to be reviewed by agricultural education faculty</td>
<td>7.5 3.429 0.646</td>
<td>9 3.347 0.688</td>
<td>6.5 3.383 0.682</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have cooperating teacher evaluate field trip</td>
<td>7.5 3.429 0.646</td>
<td>4 3.526 0.553</td>
<td>11 3.093 0.838</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review chapter budget and discuss with cooperating teacher how finances are handled with the school office</td>
<td>7.5 3.429 0.646</td>
<td>8 3.395 0.655</td>
<td>3 3.472 0.618</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepare evaluation of the cooperative training center with suggestions for improving the student teaching experience at that school</td>
<td>7.5 3.429 0.756</td>
<td>7 3.400 0.615</td>
<td>5 3.406 0.714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluate the FFA program of activities with the FFA officers</td>
<td>10 3.357 0.663</td>
<td>10 3.263 0.661</td>
<td>10 3.322 0.601</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participate in planning and conducting a meeting for adult students</td>
<td>11 3.214 0.802</td>
<td>17 2.840 0.699</td>
<td>16 2.764 0.750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintain mileage report</td>
<td>12.5 3.143 0.665</td>
<td>2 3.579 0.617</td>
<td>4 3.435 0.752</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepare a brief report after interviewing suggested persons concerning adult and continuing education program</td>
<td>12.5 3.143 0.864</td>
<td>16 2.880 0.770</td>
<td>17 2.676 0.946</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Determine grade level of reading material used in supervised study in agriculture classes</td>
<td>14.5 3.000 0.784</td>
<td>19 2.684 0.677</td>
<td>13 2.889 0.740</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepare an article for school or local newspaper concerning student teacher in vocational agriculture department</td>
<td>14.5 3.000 0.784</td>
<td>14 3.092 0.831</td>
<td>20 2.611 0.915</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Select student for case study and prepare report</td>
<td>16 2.929 0.997</td>
<td>15 2.961 0.871</td>
<td>15 2.853 0.942</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review with guidance personnel reading levels of students in agriculture classes</td>
<td>17 2.857 0.663</td>
<td>18 2.711 0.708</td>
<td>19 2.659 0.791</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Write a brief description of chapter noting strengths and weaknesses suggested by officers</td>
<td>18 2.786 0.802</td>
<td>13 3.133 0.664</td>
<td>12 3.009 0.743</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintain a daily diary of activities</td>
<td>19.5 2.643 0.842</td>
<td>12 3.197 0.712</td>
<td>14 2.845 1.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete a survey of each student's reading habits in classes taught</td>
<td>19.5 2.643 0.929</td>
<td>20 2.653 0.797</td>
<td>18 2.673 0.898</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*1 = not needed
2 = optional
3 = desirable
4 = essential

Kendall coefficient of concordance \( w = .80 \)
The Kendall coefficient of concordance \( W \) was calculated to determine the strength of agreement between the university supervisor, cooperating teacher and student teacher groups on the need of assignments. Table 9 shows the similarities and differences among the three groups in how they ranked the need of assignments and the Kendall coefficient of concordance \( W \) exhibited very strong agreement \( (W = .80) \) (Davis, 1971).

Levels of Accomplishment for Assignments

To further respond to the second research question posed in Chapter I, university supervisors, cooperating teachers and student teachers were then asked to rate the extent to which the same assignments were accomplished during student teaching. Level of accomplishment was examined on a continuum ranging from not accomplished to accomplished well. The mean and standard deviation for each assignment were calculated. Table 10 illustrates the means and standard deviations for the 20 assignments as perceived by university supervisors, cooperating teachers and student teachers, respectively.

The university supervisor group reported the average level of accomplishment for assignments was 2.6 or greater for 16 of the 20 assignments as shown in Table 10. However, none of the average levels of accomplishment reached the 3.6 mark. Three of the assignments were identified as partially
Table 10
Rank Order of Mean Levels of Accomplishment for Assignments as Perceived by University Supervisors, Cooperating Teachers and Student Teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assignments</th>
<th>University Supervisors</th>
<th>Cooperating Teachers</th>
<th>Student Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maintain a mileage report</td>
<td>1 3.500 0.760</td>
<td>2 3.520 0.685</td>
<td>6 3.274 0.931</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan and conduct a field trip</td>
<td>2.5 3.357 0.633</td>
<td>1 3.611 0.618</td>
<td>3 3.491 0.759</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Select a student for case study and prepare report</td>
<td>2.5 3.357 0.633</td>
<td>9 3.227 0.669</td>
<td>4 3.396 0.699</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintain a daily diary of activities</td>
<td>4 3.286 0.726</td>
<td>8 3.253 0.717</td>
<td>7 3.250 0.867</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establish a notebook for teaching to be reviewed by agricultural education faculty</td>
<td>6 3.214 0.802</td>
<td>5 3.452 0.646</td>
<td>1 3.566 0.602</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintain a notebook containing all lesson plans</td>
<td>6 3.214 0.802</td>
<td>3 3.493 0.665</td>
<td>2 3.509 0.636</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepare two brief reports describing satisfactory supervised occupational experience visits</td>
<td>6 3.214 0.699</td>
<td>6 3.360 0.561</td>
<td>5 3.393 0.749</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have cooperating teacher evaluate field trip</td>
<td>8 3.071 0.829</td>
<td>4 3.480 0.601</td>
<td>8 3.217 0.946</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepare evaluation of student teacher's strengths and limitations as a teacher of vocational agriculture</td>
<td>9 3.000 0.577</td>
<td>7 3.293 0.731</td>
<td>9 3.076 0.863</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Write a brief description of chapter noting strengths and weaknesses suggested by officers</td>
<td>11 2.929 0.616</td>
<td>15 2.917 0.884</td>
<td>14 2.850 1.017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review chapter budget and discuss with cooperating teacher how finances are handled with the school office</td>
<td>11 2.929 0.616</td>
<td>10 3.160 0.823</td>
<td>11 3.019 0.911</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepare evaluation of cooperative training center with suggestions for improving the student teaching experience in that school</td>
<td>11 2.929 0.730</td>
<td>12 3.086 0.974</td>
<td>10 3.057 0.994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepare an article for school or local newspaper concerning student teacher in vocational agriculture department</td>
<td>13 2.857 0.663</td>
<td>13 3.067 0.963</td>
<td>15 2.848 1.133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review with guidance personnel reading levels of students in agriculture classes</td>
<td>14 2.692 0.855</td>
<td>18 2.493 0.891</td>
<td>18 2.548 0.954</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluate the FFA program of activities with the FFA officers Complete a survey of each student's reading habits in classes taught</td>
<td>15 2.643 0.745</td>
<td>14 3.041 0.851</td>
<td>12 2.879 1.013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Determine the grade level of reading materials used in supervised study in agriculture classes</td>
<td>16 2.615 0.870</td>
<td>17 2.514 0.983</td>
<td>17 2.683 1.054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepare a brief report after interviewing suggested persons concerning continuing education program</td>
<td>17 2.462 0.660</td>
<td>19 2.400 0.900</td>
<td>16 2.745 1.052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participate in planning and conducting a meeting for adult students</td>
<td>18.5 2.000 0.784</td>
<td>16 2.671 0.987</td>
<td>19 2.314 1.041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have cooperating teacher evaluate each lesson plan using the lesson plan check sheet</td>
<td>18.5 2.000 0.555</td>
<td>20 2.360 0.895</td>
<td>20 2.087 1.049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20 1.929 0.475</td>
<td>11 3.108 0.786</td>
<td>13 2.860 0.966</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*K = not accomplished
2 = partially accomplished
3 = satisfactorily accomplished
4 = accomplished well

Kendall coefficient of concordance = $w = .91$
accomplished and one was identified as not accomplished. The assignment that was identified as not accomplished was the cooperating teacher evaluates the student teacher’s lesson plan using the lesson plan check sheet.

Table 10 also indicates the average level of accomplishment for assignments was 2.6 or greater for 16 of the 20 assignments as perceived by cooperating teachers. One of these assignments, planning and conducting a field trip, had an average level of accomplishment of 3.6 indicating it was accomplished well. None of the assignments were perceived as not being accomplished.

The student teachers perceived the average level of accomplishment for the assignments was 2.6 or greater for 18 of the 20 assignments indicating satisfactory accomplishment. None of the average levels of accomplishment revealed the assignment was accomplished well. Two assignments were in the partially accomplished area and they were: 1) prepare a brief report after interviewing suggested persons concerning the adult and continuing education program and 2) participate in planning and conducting a meeting for adult students.

Table 10 also compares the rankings of the accomplishment of the 20 assignments as perceived by all three groups. Though some variations were exhibited, the value of Kendall coefficient of concordance W was .90 indicating a very strong agreement in the rankings of the
Performance of University Supervisor

The third research question posed in Chapter I asked how well university supervisors performed those activities identified as responsibilities of university supervisors. Cooperating teachers were asked to rate the performance of university supervisors with whom they had worked on twelve activities while student teachers were asked to rate university supervisors on eight activities. The eight activities performed by the university supervisor rated by student teachers were eight of the twelve activities rated by the cooperating teachers. The level of performance was rated on a continuum from poor to superior. The data were treated as interval data, and the mean and standard deviation were calculated for each activity along with an overall average for all activities of the university supervisors. Table 11 illustrates the means and standard deviations for each activity as perceived by cooperating teachers and student teachers.

The average overall performance for the university supervisor group as perceived by the cooperating teacher group was 7.53 indicating above average performance. Table 11 reports that the university supervisors were rated at least above average in performance for all twelve activities. Conducting conferences where: the student
teacher is encouraged to express concerns, anxieties and satisfactions; the university supervisor elicits ideas for self-improvement from the student teacher; and the university supervisor assists the student teacher in suggesting alternative solutions to teaching problems was rated as superior. It should be noted that 1) evaluates each lesson plan before observing the student teacher teach in varying teaching situations, and 2) serves as a resource person for the cooperating teacher were the two activities rated the lowest as perceived by the cooperating teacher group.

The student teacher group perceived the average level of performance for the university supervisor group was 6.0 or greater (above average) for seven of the eight activities. None of the activities had an average level of performance of 8.0 or better indicating superior performance. The one activity rated as average, evaluates each lesson plan before observing the student teacher teach in varying teaching situations, was rated as the second lowest activity by the cooperating teacher group. An overall average level of performance for the university supervisor group as perceived by the student teacher group was 6.97 indicating above average performance.
Table 11
Rank Order of Mean Levels of Performance of University Supervisors as Perceived by Cooperating Teachers and Student Teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Cooperating Teachers</th>
<th>Student Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conducts conferences where: the student teacher expresses concerns, anxieties and satisfactions; the university supervisor elicits ideas for self-improvement from the student teacher; and the university supervisor assists the student teacher in suggesting alternative solutions to teaching problems</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confers with cooperating teacher during visits regarding the student teacher's progress</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.961</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visits the cooperative training center early in the quarter</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.829</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conducts conferences with both cooperating teacher and student teacher to provide encouragement, constructive criticism and recognition of success</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.816</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Works cooperatively with school administration, cooperating teacher and student teacher to provide the best possible student teaching experience</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7.603</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepares a written recommendation for the student teacher</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7.712</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visits the school at least three times during the quarter and observes the student teacher in varying teaching situations</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7.684</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviews with cooperating teacher and student teacher the plan of activities and responsibilities for the student teaching experience early in the quarter</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7.645</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explains the student teaching program to local administration and cooperating teacher and provides them with necessary materials</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assists cooperating teacher in planning and carrying through a program of evaluation of the student teacher</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7.240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluates each lesson plan before observing the student teacher teach in varying teaching situations</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6.770</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serves as a resource person for the cooperating teacher</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6.697</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Grand Means for Common Activities = 7.570
Grand Means = 7.539

Kendall coefficient of rank correlation = .64
Performance of the Cooperating Teacher

In response to the fourth research question posed in Chapter I, university supervisors and student teachers were asked to rate how well the cooperating teachers with whom they had worked performed the activities that were identified as responsibilities of the cooperating teacher. University supervisors were asked to rate the performance of the cooperating teacher on 30 activities while student teachers were asked to rate the cooperating teachers on 27 activities. It is important to note that the 27 activities rated by student teachers were also rated by the university supervisors. The level of performance was examined on a continuum beginning with poor and ending with superior. The data were treated as interval data, and the mean and standard deviation for each activity were calculated along with an overall average level of performance for all cooperating teachers. Table 12 presents the means and standard deviations for the 30 activities identified as responsibilities of the cooperating teacher by university supervisors and student teachers, respectively.

As shown in Table 12 the average level of performance for cooperating teachers as perceived by university supervisors was 6.0 or greater for 19 of the 30 activities. However, none of the average levels of performance reached the 8.0 mark indicating superior performance on the activity. Three activities had an average level of
Table 12
Rank Order of Mean Levels of Performance for Cooperating Teachers as Perceived by University Supervisors and Student Teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>University Supervisors</th>
<th>Student Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rank (no. 1-10)</td>
<td>Rank (no. 1-10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writes a reference letter for student teacher's placement file</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discusses and evaluates student teacher's performance with university</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>supervisor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involves student teacher as part of faculty</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides student teacher opportunity to assume full teaching</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>responsibilities near end of quarter</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides student teacher accessibility to instructional materials, an</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>area for work and personal belongings, audio-visual</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>equipment and other resource materials</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does not expect student teacher to teach exactly as cooperating teacher</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>does and tries not let biases show and influence student teacher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepares class for arrival of student teacher</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oriented student teacher to school and community</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides opportunities for various teaching experiences with some</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>freedom to experiment with teaching strategies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides student teacher with understanding of the extent of teacher</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>authority and responsibilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides enthusiastic and professional example for student teacher</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Becomes familiar with background of student teacher</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Able to evaluate his or her own strengths and weaknesses as a</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cooperating teacher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides frequent encouragement, constructive criticism and recognition</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of success</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviews student and faculty handbooks with student teacher</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviews plan of activities and responsibilities for student teaching</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in agricultural education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gives student teacher every possible opportunity to serve as FFA advisor</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keeps records and writes evaluative reports about student teacher's</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>progress and general promise as a teacher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrates good teaching techniques</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviews PRIE report with student teacher</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourages student teacher to observe teaching and ask questions</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conducts a formal evaluation at the end of the third, sixth and tenth</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>weeks of student teaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identifies the necessary procedure to follow in conducting</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>occupational experience visits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluates the student teachers progress and experiences and gives daily</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>feedback</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Takes student teacher on many occupational experience visits during the</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>first three days of student teaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has high school student occupational goals summarized for student</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teacher and reviews them with student teacher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critique each lesson prepared by student teacher prior to the</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lesson being taught</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has student teacher plan each unit of instruction at least two weeks</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prior to actual teaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gives student teacher opportunity to plan and conduct an adult and/or</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>continuing education program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Grand Means for Common Activities +

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University Supervisors</th>
<th>Student Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.815</td>
<td>6.602</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Grand Means

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University Supervisors</th>
<th>Student Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.915</td>
<td>6.602</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*1 = poor
5 = average
9 = superior
Kendall coefficient of rank correlation = .69
performance of 3.99 or below indicating below average performance. These three activities were critiques each lesson plan prepared by the student teacher prior to the lesson being taught, has the student teacher plan each unit of instruction at least two weeks prior to actual teaching, and gives the student teacher opportunity to plan and conduct an adult and/or continuing education program. The average level of performance for cooperating teachers on all activities as perceived by university supervisors was 5.93 which indicates average performance overall.

Table 12 also reports the average level of performance was 6.0 or greater for 21 of the 27 activities as perceived by student teachers. One activity, provides the opportunity to assume full teaching responsibilities near the end of the student teaching quarter, had an average level of performance indicating superior. Three of the lowest four activities in Table 12 were also rated below average by the university supervisor group. These three activities were:

1) critiques each lesson plan prepared by the student teacher prior to the lesson being taught, 2) has the student teacher plan each unit of instruction at least two weeks prior to actual teaching, and 3) gives the student teacher opportunity to plan and conduct an adult and/or continuing education program. This would indicate consistency in the perceptions of the performance of the cooperating teacher as seen by the student teacher group and the university
supervisor group. Overall, the student teachers rated the cooperating teacher group as above average with an average level of performance of 6.60.

Responses to Open-Ended Questions

The student teacher group was also asked eleven open-ended questions for the purpose of going beyond how well the cooperating teacher performed the activity and determine how often the activity was completed. Data were treated as interval data and frequencies, percentages and a mean were calculated for each question. Some respondents chose not to answer the questions for various reasons and they have been treated as missing data.

Table 13 illustrates the number of productive hours spent with the cooperating teacher during the quarter discussing the assignments for student teaching. The average number of hours was 20.5.
Then the student teacher group was asked to indicate the percent of their lesson plans which were critiqued either verbally or in writing by the cooperating teacher (Table 14). The mean was 58%. Approximately 43% of the student teachers indicated at least 70% of their lesson plans were critiqued by their cooperating teacher.

Ninety-two of the 106 valid cases (85.2%) indicated they were not videotaped during student teaching. Twelve students indicated they were videotaped once or twice.
Table 14

Percent of Lessons Critiqued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 - 10</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 - 20</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 - 30</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 - 40</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 - 50</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51 - 60</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61 - 70</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71 - 80</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81 - 90</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91 - 100</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>21.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MEAN = 58.308  *4 questionnaires with missing data

Student teachers reported that on an average they assumed full teaching responsibilities during the fifth week of the quarter. As seen in Table 15, about 36% of the student teachers reported they assumed full teaching responsibilities in either the fourth or sixth week of the quarter.

The student teachers were then asked to report the number of hours they spent observing the cooperating teacher teaching and then indicate what percent of the observations resulted in discussion afterwards. Table 16 reports the number of hours spent observing and Table 17 reports the percent resulting in discussion.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL 103 100.0

MEAN = 4.932
SD = 2.182 *5 questionnaires with missing data

The average number of hours spent observing the cooperating teacher teaching was 43.8 as shown in Table 16. Approximately half of the respondents (52.1%) spent 25 or fewer hours observing the cooperating teacher teaching. Of these observations, student teachers reported a mean of approximately 52% that resulted in discussion afterwards (Table 17).
Table 16

Hours Spent Observing the Cooperating Teacher Teaching

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Hours</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 - 10</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 - 20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 - 30</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 - 40</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 - 50</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51 - 60</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61 - 70</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71 - 80</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81 - 90</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91 - 100</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>greater than 100</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>96</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MEAN = 43.800  *13 questionnaires with missing data

Table 17

Percent of Observations Resulting in Discussion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent of Observations</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 - 10</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>21.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 - 20</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 - 30</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 - 40</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 - 50</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51 - 60</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61 - 70</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71 - 80</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81 - 90</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91 - 100</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>105</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MEAN = 52.400  *3 questionnaires with missing data
Adult education is considered a part of vocational agriculture. Table 18 reports the number of hours of adult and/or continuing education instruction the student teacher taught. Sixty-eight student teachers (66.7%) reported they experienced no adult and/or continuing education instruction. The mean number of hours was 1.4.

Table 18
Number of Hours of Adult and/or Continuing Education Instruction Taught

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Hours</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>66.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - 5</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>26.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - 10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 - 20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 - 30</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL 102 100.0

MEAN = 1.422 *6 questionnaires with missing data

Each student teacher was asked to identify the percentage of classes that the cooperating teacher remained in the classroom while the student teacher was teaching. Twenty-one student teachers (20%) reported that the cooperating teacher remained in the classroom for less than 20% of the time. Table 19 illustrates that on an average, the cooperating teacher remained in the classroom while the student teacher was teaching 52.2% of the time.
Table 19
Of Classes Taught, Percent Cooperating Teacher Remain in the Classroom

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 - 10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 - 20</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 - 30</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 - 40</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 - 50</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51 - 60</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61 - 70</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71 - 80</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81 - 90</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91 - 100</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL 105 100.0

MEAN = 52.210 *3 questionnaires with missing data

For this study, a formal evaluation was defined as a time when the student teacher could express concerns anxieties and satisfactions; the cooperating teacher would elicit ideas for self-improvement from the student teacher; and then assist the student teacher in suggesting courses of action. Table 20 presents the results of the student teachers’ responses to the number of formal evaluations conducted during student teaching. Nine student teachers (9.4%) reported no formal evaluation occurring. The average number of formal evaluations was approximately five. It is important to note that these evaluations excluded those completed while the university supervisor was present.
Table 20
Number of Formal Evaluations Conducted by Cooperating Teacher Without Presence of University Supervisor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Evaluations</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL: 96 100.0

MEAN = 5.448 *12 questionnaires with missing data

The last two open-ended questions referred to supervised occupational experience visits. Student teachers were asked to indicate the number of visits completed where the cooperating teacher taught the student teacher the procedures to follow in conducting occupational experience programs and then they were to report the number of times the cooperating teacher supervised the student teacher's ability to conduct occupational experience visits. Tables 21 and 22 indicate the findings for these two questions.
As Table 21 illustrates, the average number of visits where the cooperating teacher taught the student teacher the procedures to follow in conducting occupational experience programs was five. Eleven student teachers (10.7%) reported no such visits were conducted. Sixty-six student teachers (64.1%) reported one to five visits completed.

Table 21

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Visits</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>21.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL            | 103 | 100.0  

MEAN = 5.291     *5 questionnaires with missing data
On the average, three visits were completed where the cooperating teacher supervised the student teacher's ability to conduct occupational experience visits. As Table 22 indicates, 31 student teachers (30.1%) reported no such visits being completed and 24 student teachers (23.3%) experienced one such visit.

Table 22

Number of Visits Completed Where Cooperating Teacher Supervised Student Teacher's Ability to Conduct Occupational Experience Visits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Visits</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>30.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>23.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>103</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MEAN = 3.204  *5 questionnaires with missing data
Results From the Interviews

A randomly selected group of respondents from each population participated in an interview. The researcher conducted a face to face interview with six university supervisors and interviewed eight cooperating teachers and nine student teachers via telephone. Specific responses to the interviews are located in Appendix I. For the purpose of this section major findings of the interviews are summarized. Nine major topic areas were created for the summary: FFA, supervised occupational experience programs, adult education, summer program of activities, assignments, performance of the university supervisor, performance of the cooperating teacher, strengths of the student teaching program and weaknesses of the student teaching program.

FFA

Experiences in advising the FFA were rated essential by university supervisors and desirable by cooperating teachers and student teachers as a result of the mailed questionnaire. During the interviews both cooperating teachers and student teachers indicated that FFA was an integral part of the vocational agriculture program but in general cooperating teachers felt that classroom teaching was the first priority and the other areas of vocational agriculture were emphasized after classroom teaching was successful. Student teachers and cooperating teachers
reported that the student teacher was at the school for such a short time that it was difficult to give any responsibility to the student teacher. They felt it was easier for the cooperating teacher to do it him or herself and have the student teacher observe the activities than turn the responsibility over to the student teacher.

When responding to the questionnaire, university supervisors indicated that experiences in advising FFA were partially accomplished. Reasons suggested for this in the interviews were: cooperating teacher is reluctant to turn over much responsibility to the student teacher, it is hard for the student teacher to do a good job in ten weeks and there are no assignments to force the student teacher to get experience in advising the FFA. University supervisors felt that better preparation in FFA during the preservice program would be beneficial.

Supervised Occupational Experience Programs

All three groups rated experiences in planning and conducting supervised occupational experience programs as desirable and partially accomplished. When asked if supervised occupational experience programs were an integral part of vocational agriculture all three groups indicated that it was. The cooperating teacher sample felt that the philosophy of supervised occupational experience programs had changed over the years and teachers were not stressing
the importance as much because of the time involved and the diversified interests of students. It was also the general feeling of those interviewed that agricultural education was paying lip service to supervised occupational experience programs and saying they were important, but doing nothing to show it. The student teacher sample felt that supervised occupational experience programs were not stressed enough at the university prior to student teaching thus, they did not stress it during student teaching. If the student teacher had no background in vocational agriculture, he or she had no real concept of what supervised occupational experience was. It was the general feeling of all three samples that additional experience in supervised occupational experience prior to student teaching was essential.

Record books are a part of supervised occupational experience programs. Experiences in teaching high school students to use, analyze and summarize record books was rated as essential by university supervisors and cooperating teachers, but desirable by student teachers. Also, student teachers and university supervisors rated this experience as partially accomplished while cooperating teachers rated it satisfactorily accomplished in the questionnaire. When interviewed, the student teacher sample reported that this experience was rated desirable because the university put no emphasis on it and they had no training in it. The student teachers also reported that if they had vocational
agriculture in high school they could get by with no training at the university, but with no vocational agriculture experience they were lost. In contrast to this, the cooperating teachers interviewed felt that student teachers were not prepared to deal with record books. When asked why this experience was partially completed university supervisors and student teachers indicated it was not stressed at the university so the cooperating teacher and student teacher did not stress it during student teaching. The cooperating teachers were asked to react to the inconsistency in ratings regarding accomplishment. Their response was that maybe cooperating teachers do not see record books being as important as university supervisors do and that cooperating teachers have an entirely different idea of what record books are and should be. It was the general feeling of all three groups that further training in record books for students prior to student teaching is needed to do a good job.

Adult Education

When responding to the mailed questionnaire, all three groups rated experiences in adult education as desirable or optional and partially accomplished. There was no real consensus as to the importance of adult education among the three groups. A majority of the respondents interviewed reported adult education was an integral part of vocational
agriculture but in the same breath they said it depends on the goals of the student teacher as to whether experiencing adult education during student teaching was essential. All three groups indicated the profession was saying adult education was important but was doing nothing to show it was important. Two of the university supervisors interviewed indicated that because of declining numbers in secondary schools the profession had better consider adult education important. It was the feeling of all three samples interviewed that if adult education is to be considered essential further training prior to student teaching would be beneficial.

For each of these three areas - FFA, supervised occupational experience programs and adult education - the same response was heard over and over again. An attitude of importance must be instilled in the university supervisor, cooperating teacher and student teacher; then something can be done to improve the situation.

**Summer Program of Activities**

Experience in planning and conducting a summer program of activities was rated essential by university supervisors and desirable by cooperating teachers and student teachers. All three groups rated it partially accomplished. The university supervisors interviewed were asked to respond to this issue and it was their feeling that there was really no
way to accomplish this without being in the schools during the summer. To be realistic, this experience is not as high in priority as some of the other areas in student teaching. They also reported that summer programs were not stressed in the preservice program.

**Assignments**

All assignments except two were rated as desirable in the questionnaire. When asked if this meant that student teachers should not be expected to do assignments as they have done in the past, all respondents in the sample reported that the assignments were important and gave structure to student teaching. It was suggested that assignments enhance the student teaching experiences and reflect the role of the vocational agriculture teacher. Too many of the assignments were considered busy work by cooperating teachers and student teachers. It was their contention that the university supervisor does not pay close enough attention to the assignments so why should they. The Department must determine what assignments will benefit the student teacher and then do an effective job of explaining the importance and purpose of the assignments to both cooperating teacher and student teacher. It was the feeling of the university supervisor sample that it should be the responsibility of the cooperating teacher to be sure the assignments are completed.
The cooperating teachers rated the assignment planning and conducting a field trip as essential in the questionnaire. It was the feeling of the cooperating teachers who were interviewed that since much of what is learned in vocational agriculture is taught outside the classroom, a student teacher should know the procedures to follow when conducting a field trip.

When questioned about the reading assignments there was no consistent response regarding their appropriateness. The cooperating teachers felt it was important for the student teacher to review with guidance personnel the reading levels of students, but they also said they probably would not do it as a teacher. Because of this, the cooperating teacher also learned from the assignment. The student teachers reported the survey of reading habits was of little value, but reviewing the students' reading levels was important. The student teachers also felt that the reading level of most recent reference materials has already been determined and that they were not sure of the appropriateness of that assignment. They did understand the importance of making sure students could use the reference materials available in the classroom. Some of the cooperating teachers reported that the reason these reading assignments were partially accomplished was because they were new and need time to develop.
As a result of the questionnaire, the assignment - have the cooperating teacher evaluate each lesson plan using the lesson plan check sheet - was rated as not accomplished by the university supervisor group. When asked to reflect on this finding, a majority of the respondents in all three groups agreed with the finding. The university supervisor sample felt that the cooperating teacher saw this as busy work, taking too much time and not fitting to their mode of thinking. The cooperating teachers reported they would much rather evaluate after the lesson was taught. They also felt that this assignment was only completed if the student teacher asked the cooperating teacher to do it. When asked if this was an appropriate assignment all three groups indicated it was, especially in the beginning. As the quarter progresses it becomes less important. The only comment specific to the lesson plan check sheet was that it may be too detailed and that the cooperating teacher was primarily looking for an interest approach, content, teaching methods, and what the students were to learn as a result of the lesson. The common suggestion for making sure this assignment was completed was to emphasize the importance with the cooperating teacher and be sure that the cooperating teacher knows how to evaluate effectively.
Performance of the University Supervisor

The assignment, evaluate each lesson plan before observing the student teacher teach, was rated the lowest by the student teacher group and second lowest by the cooperating teacher group in the questionnaire. It was the feeling of both samples that this activity was not really being done. Too often the university supervisor arrived in the middle of a lesson or did not have time to look at the lesson before it was taught. Both groups felt it was an appropriate activity of the university supervisor but that the formal conference after teaching was much more important and that it was being handled well.

The lowest activity of the university supervisor rated by cooperating teachers was being a resource person for the cooperating teacher. This was rated above average though. The researcher was interested in learning what the cooperating teacher expected from the university supervisor and if the university supervisor could do anything better to serve the cooperating teacher. The major expectation resulting from the interview was keeping the cooperating teacher abreast of what his or her responsibilities are during student teaching. Also, the cooperating teachers wanted feedback as to their performance as cooperating teachers.

To be of better service, a frequent suggestion was for the university supervisors to get into the school system and
teach so that they can see what really is going on in the schools. Another suggestion was better training on the role of the cooperating teacher.

**Performance of the Cooperating Teacher**

In looking at the performance of the cooperating teacher, three areas of concern surfaced as a result of the mailed questionnaire to university supervisors. The three areas were critiquing each lesson plan prior to it being taught, have student teacher plan each unit of instruction two weeks prior to actual teaching, and give student teacher opportunity to plan and conduct adult and/or continuing education program. When asked if these were realistic expectations the major response was that planning two weeks ahead of time was unrealistic. It should be to have the plan completed three to four days prior to teaching so that the cooperating teacher can evaluate and make suggestions and the student teacher has time to make the necessary changes if needed. Also, the Department has not demanded that adult education be in the high schools so it is not realistic to expect student teachers to plan and conduct a meeting.

Three major areas of concern also surfaced from the student teachers’ evaluation of the cooperating teacher. These concerns were consistent with the university supervisors’ concerns. The first area of concern was having
the high school students' occupational goals summarized for the student teacher and take the student teacher on many occupational experience visits. When interviewed, the student teacher sample felt that these were appropriate expectations of the cooperating teacher. In many cases, it was their feeling that agricultural educators must "practice what they preach" and insist that these activities be completed. It was the general feeling of the sample that some cooperating teachers believe in supervised occupational experience programs but more should. About half responded that an undergraduate course in supervised occupational experience programs would be beneficial.

The second area of concern was in critiquing lesson plans prior to teaching. It was the student teachers' opinion that this was very important and was not being done as much as it should. The major reason was lack of time and that it was easier not to do it. The student teachers felt for the most part cooperating teachers knew how to evaluate but many times their views were not consistent with the views of the Agricultural Education Department. The major example given was what should be in a lesson plan.

The last area of concern was giving the student teacher the opportunity to plan and conduct an adult and/or continuing education program. This has been discussed previously and in summary, the student teachers felt that adult education was important and was an appropriate
expectation of the cooperating teacher. There was some concern as to how important cooperating teachers see adult education. If adult education is to be considered important then student teachers should have some type of undergraduate training in adult education during their preservice program.

**Strengths of the Student Teaching Program**

The following strengths of the student teaching program were identified during the interviews by at least three of the 23 respondents.

1. Student teachers are adequately prepared to teach in the classroom.
2. The whole quarter is used entirely and solely for student teaching.
3. There is a structure created for the student teaching program so that it can be highly organized.
4. University faculty supervision is good.
5. The total system for selecting cooperating teachers is sound.
6. Student teaching allows for the "learning by doing" portion of teacher education.
7. The AGREDUC 530 - student teaching link is excellent.
Weaknesses of the Student Teaching Program

The following weaknesses of the student teaching program were identified during the interviews by at least three of the 23 respondents.

1. Cooperating teacher training is inadequate.
2. More experiences should be available for prospective teachers in FFA, supervised occupational experience programs, record books and adult education prior to student teaching.
3. University supervisors need to be more aware of what is really happening in the schools.
4. Student teachers and cooperating teachers do not always know what is expected of them.
5. Seminars for student teachers need to be improved.
6. Assignments expected during student teaching need to be improved.
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT

The purpose of this study was to evaluate the student teaching program in Agricultural Education at The Ohio State University. The following research questions provided focus for the study:

1. To what extent are the experiences and assignments a student teacher is expected to have in Agricultural Education at The Ohio State University needed in preparing a prospective teacher for successful teaching in vocational agriculture as perceived by university supervisors, cooperating teachers and student teachers?

2. To what extent are these experiences and assignments accomplished by the student teaching program as perceived by university supervisors, cooperating teachers and student teachers?

3. How do cooperating teachers and student teachers rate the performance of university supervisors in their supervision of student teachers in Agricultural Education at The Ohio State University?

4. How do university supervisors and student teachers rate the performance of cooperating teachers in their supervision of student teachers in Agricultural Education at The Ohio State University?

5. What suggested changes can be made by the researcher to improve the student teaching program in Agricultural Education at The Ohio State University concerning expected experiences and assignments during student
teaching and the performance of university supervisors and cooperating teachers?

Procedure

Three populations were involved in the study. The population of university supervisors included all the full-time regular faculty members of the Department of Agricultural Education at The Ohio State University who were responsible for the supervision of student teachers for the school years 1979, 1980 and 1981 (N = 14). The second population consisted of all cooperating teachers with whom agricultural education student teachers were placed over the same three year period. The department records were used to identify the cooperating teachers and the 1981-82 Ohio Agricultural Education Directory was used to locate addresses (N = 88). The last population was comprised of undergraduates who student taught in agricultural education during the school years 1979, 1980 and 1981. Department records were used to identify the student teachers and the College of Agriculture Alumni Association records and the 1981-82 Ohio Agricultural Education Directory were used to locate addresses (N = 141).

The experiences and assignments during student teaching and the responsibilities of university supervisors and cooperating teachers were identified through several processes. First, an extensive literature review was performed and a number of experiences, assignments and responsibilities were identified. Next the Handbook for
Student Teachers in agricultural education at The Ohio State University was used to identify what experiences, assignments and responsibilities were expected from the Agricultural Education Department. Then three separate mailed questionnaires, one for each population, were developed. A panel of experts consisting of seven university supervisors, two cooperating teachers and three student teachers reviewed and critiqued the questionnaires for content validation. The suggestions of the panel of experts were used to modify and clarify the items. One item was deleted. A pilot study was then completed with three past university supervisors, six past cooperating teachers and six past student teachers not included in the study. Reliability values were calculated from this preliminary data and were found to be very high for internal consistency. Based on the reliabilities and suggestions from the respondents, a few changes were made to make the questions clearer but none were deleted for the final questionnaires.

The three separate mailed questionnaires were then sent to the three separate populations. Instrument distribution to respondents included the initial mailing containing an instrument and a cover letter, a post card follow-up reminder, and one additional follow-up letter containing a replacement questionnaire. A ten percent random sample was drawn from the non-respondents of the cooperating teacher
and student teacher groups for the purpose of examining possible differences between respondent and non-respondent groups. Results showed no difference between the two groups.

Descriptive statistics were used to summarize and analyze the data. In addition, for the need and accomplishment of the experiences and assignments, a Kendall coefficient of concordance W was calculated to determine the strength of agreement on the rankings.

After the analysis of the questionnaire, a stratified random sample of each population was selected to participate in either a face to face interview or telephone interview. The purpose of the interviews was to follow-up the mail questionnaires so that the researcher could probe deeper into the responses of the participants to find out why respondents answered the items in the questionnaire the way they did and how they perceived why others responded the way they did. The end product of this triangulation technique was the development of a procedure for improving the experiences and assignments during student teaching and the performance of both the university supervisor and cooperating teacher.
Summary of Findings

Characteristics of University Supervisors

Fifty percent of the faculty members had been supervising student teachers for less than ten years. The average number of years supervising was approximately 15. Fifty percent of these same faculty members supervised 20 or fewer student teachers.

Characteristics of Cooperating Teachers

The cooperating teachers in this study had supervised student teachers from one year to twenty years with a mean of approximately six years. The range was from one to thirty-two student teachers supervised. However, 50% of the cooperating teachers had worked with one to three student teachers.

Characteristics of Student Teachers

Fifty-seven percent of the student teachers indicated they went into full-time teaching directly after graduation. At the time of this study, 46% were teaching. This indicates that 13 of the student teachers who entered teaching after graduation have left the teaching profession.

About three quarters of the student teachers indicated they student taught in a comprehensive high school, while approximately one quarter taught in a joint vocational school. Of those student teachers currently teaching, 64%
were in a comprehensive high school while 36% were in a joint vocational school.

Of those student teachers who were not teaching at the time of this study, approximately 14% were in occupations that were not agriculturally related. Of the agriculturally related occupations, farming was the most frequent. Occupations involving sales, field, or service representatives for the agriculture industry were next most frequent.

Level of Need for Experiences

Each population reported the extent to which each of the 23 experiences expected during student teaching were needed in preparing prospective teachers for successful teaching in vocational agriculture. The four choices were not needed, optional, desirable and essential. The resulting mean levels of need were discussed using the scheme of interpretation illustrated below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not Needed</th>
<th>Optional</th>
<th>Desirable</th>
<th>Essential</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.599</td>
<td>2.599</td>
<td>3.599</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The university supervisors rated 11 of the 23 experiences as essential. One experience was considered optional. Cooperating teachers rated ten experiences as essential and two were identified as optional. Student teachers rated seven experiences as essential. Two
experiences were considered optional. All three groups rated advising the FFA Alumni affiliate as optional. Also, all three groups rated experiences involving adult education and supervised occupational experience programs as desirable.

As a result of the interviews, the researcher found the university supervisors in conflict with each other as to whether adult education was an integral part of vocational agriculture. Yet, a majority of the university supervisor sample reported the profession was paying lip service to adult education by saying it was important, but not doing anything about it.

The cooperating teacher sample felt adult education was important, but depending on the quarter, student teachers may not get any experience with adult education. They too felt the profession was paying lip service to adult education.

As for the issue of supervised occupational experience programs, the sample of university supervisors and cooperating teachers felt it was the core of the vocational program, but that student teachers in agricultural education at The Ohio State University were not prepared to plan and supervise occupational experience programs. It was their feeling that student teachers must have the attitude that supervised occupational experience programs are important. However, the cooperating teacher sample reported that
The student teacher sample reported they never really learned the importance or purpose of supervised occupational experience programs, let alone how to plan or conduct a program or visit.

Differences in ratings between the three populations occurred in the following experiences. A discussion follows each experience summarizing the results of the interviews.

1. University supervisors rated opportunities to advise the FFA as essential while cooperating teachers and student teachers rated it desirable. The sample of cooperating teachers and student teachers felt for the most part that FFA was an integral part of vocational agriculture. However, the cooperating teacher sample felt that classroom teaching was the most important part of student teaching and ten weeks of student teaching was not long enough to get good experiences in classroom teaching as well as FFA. Also, it was the feeling of both cooperating teacher and student teacher samples that the cooperating teacher was not prepared to turn the FFA over to a student teacher.

2. Both university supervisors and cooperating teachers felt it was essential for student teachers to be able to use, summarize and analyze the record books of supervised occupational experience programs. The student teacher group
felt this was a desirable experience. It was the feeling of the student teacher sample that record books were not emphasized during their undergraduate study and they received no training in record books so why should it be emphasized during student teaching. Those student teachers with a good vocational agriculture background could deal with record books but those with no vocational agriculture background could not relate to record books and really struggled with them if they were exposed to them.

3. Using instructional media and resource materials was considered an essential part of student teaching by cooperating teachers and university supervisors however, student teachers felt it was a desirable experience. After discussing this finding with the student teachers their feeling was they did not have the time to determine what all the school had to offer. It was easier to use what they had available from their undergraduate course work.

Level of Accomplishment for Experiences

University supervisors, cooperating teachers and student teachers were then asked to identify the extent to which each of the same 23 experiences were accomplished during student teaching. The mean levels of accomplishment were interpreted using the scale below.
University supervisors indicated that nine of the twenty-three experiences were satisfactorily accomplished, thirteen were partially accomplished and one was not accomplished. Of the ten experiences identified as essential, three experiences were not satisfactorily accomplished. These three experiences follow with a discussion as to why they were only partially accomplished which resulted from the interviews.

1. Advises the FFA - Reasons generated by the university supervisor sample as to why this was only partially accomplished were the cooperating teacher was reluctant to turn over very much responsibility to the student teacher, student teacher doesn't always get very much experience depending on the quarter and there were no assignments to cause the student teacher to advise the FFA.

2. Teaches students to use, summarize and analyze the record books of supervised occupational experience programs - The six university supervisors identified the following reasons for this only partially occurring: nothing was going on in the high schools with record books and the university was not stressing the importance of the record books so as a result neither were the cooperating teachers or student teachers.
3. Can plan and conduct a summer program of activities - It is difficult to be able to plan and conduct a summer program of activities without being in the school during the summer. The best a student teacher could do was review the plan and this was not really occurring as perceived by the university supervisor sample.

Cooperating teachers reported that 15 of the 23 experiences were accomplished satisfactorily, seven were partially accomplished and one was not accomplished. All ten experiences identified as essential were satisfactorily accomplished, but six experiences rated as desirable were partially accomplished.

The student teacher group rated 16 of the 23 experiences as satisfactorily accomplished. The seven remaining experiences were reported as partially accomplished. The lowest three experiences were: 1) prepares and conducts group instruction in adult education, 2) conducts visits concerning individual problems of adults, and 3) advises the FFA Alumni Affiliate. These same three experiences were rated lowest by cooperating teachers and the last two were rated lowest by university supervisors. There is no question why "prepares and conducts group instruction in adult education and conducts visits concerning individual problems of adults" was rated partially accomplished. Student teachers reported that approximately two thirds of them did not do any adult
instruction and the average number of hours of adult instruction was 1.4.

All three groups rated experiences in planning and supervising occupational experience programs as partially accomplished. In support of this finding, 46% of the student teachers reported that two or less visits were completed where the cooperating teacher taught the procedures to follow when conducting supervised occupational experience visits. Also, approximately 11% of the student teachers reported they completed no such visits. Thirty percent of the student teachers reported zero visits were conducted where the cooperating teacher supervised the student teacher's ability to conduct supervised occupational experience visits.

In contrast to the weaknesses discussed above, it was very apparent that the student teachers were adequately prepared to teach in the classroom. The pedagogical areas such as evaluation of student performance, applies basic teaching procedures, develops a weekly schedule of teaching, uses instructional media and resources, identifies and outlines unit topics and develops behavioral objectives, writes lesson plans and directs student learning activities were rated essential by all three groups and at least satisfactorily accomplished if not accomplished well. During the interviews, the cooperating teachers emphasized that the student teachers were prepared for classroom
teaching upon entering into the student teaching experience.

**Level of Need for Assignments**

Student teachers were to complete a set of assignments to enhance the experiences during student teaching. The student teacher group indicated that on the average, 20.5 productive hours were spent discussing the assignments with the cooperating teacher. Then university supervisors, cooperating teachers and student teachers reported the extent to which each of the 20 assignments were needed during student teaching for preparing a prospective teacher for successful teaching in vocational agriculture. The resulting mean levels of need were interpreted using the following scale.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not Needed</th>
<th>Optional</th>
<th>Desirable</th>
<th>Essential</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-----------</td>
<td>1.599</td>
<td>2.599</td>
<td>3.599</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All the assignments were rated as desirable except two. First, university supervisors rated the preparation of an objective self-evaluation with strengths and limitations as a vocational agriculture teacher as essential. Second, cooperating teachers rated planning and conducting a field trip as essential. It was the general feeling of all three samples interviewed that the assignments were important and most were beneficial. Those interviewed emphasized that the assignments should enhance the student teaching experiences.
If the Department could determine what assignments would benefit the student teacher then the assignments could be more effective. It was also suggested by the cooperating teacher and student teacher samples that the department should rely more on the cooperating teacher to be sure all experiences are completed so less written assignments would be required.

**Level of Accomplishment for Assignments**

Just as for the experiences, all three populations were asked to report the extent to which the 20 assignments were accomplished during student teaching. The resulting mean levels of accomplishment were interpreted using the following scale.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not Accomplished</th>
<th>Partially Accomplished</th>
<th>Satisfactorily Accomplished</th>
<th>Well</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-----------------</td>
<td>1-----------------------</td>
<td>1-----------------------------</td>
<td>1----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 1.599 2.599 3.599 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All three groups rated the assignment participate in planning and conducting a meeting for adult students as partially accomplished. University supervisors and cooperating teachers rated prepare a brief report after interviewing suggested persons concerning the adult and/or continuing education program as partially accomplished. The reason for these being partially accomplished was that approximately 67% of the student teachers reported they
experienced no adult and/or continuing education instruction. The average number of hours of instruction was 1.4.

University supervisors and cooperating teachers rated the assignment determine the grade level of reading materials used in agriculture classes as partially accomplished. The cooperating teachers and student teachers rated review with guidance personnel the reading levels of students in agriculture classes as partially accomplished. The reasons identified by the sample of cooperating teachers was that these assignments were new and need time to develop. The cooperating teacher sample felt the reading assignments were appropriate.

The only assignment that was rated as not accomplished was have the cooperating teacher evaluate the student teacher's lesson plan using the lesson plan check sheet. The university supervisors felt this was not being accomplished. When the sample of cooperating teachers was asked their feelings they replied the university supervisor probably is correct. It probably only occurred if the student teacher asked for it because evaluation after teaching is much more important.
Performance of the University Supervisor

Cooperating teachers and student teachers were asked to rate how well university supervisors performed those activities identified as responsibilities of university supervisors. Cooperating teachers rated twelve activities while student teachers rated eight activities. The resulting mean levels of performance were interpreted using the following scale.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Below Average</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Above Average</th>
<th>Superior</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.999</td>
<td>3.999</td>
<td>5.999</td>
<td>7.999</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cooperating teachers rated the performance of university supervisors as superior in conducting formal conferences. For all other activities the university supervisor group was rated above average. The lowest rated activity was the university supervisor serves as a resource person for the cooperating teacher. When asked how can the university supervisor serve the cooperating teacher better, the suggestions of the sample were better training as to the role of the cooperating teacher and feedback on performance as a cooperating teacher.

The student teacher group rated the university supervisor above average on seven of the eight activities. The one activity rated as average was evaluates each lesson plan before observing the student teacher teach in varying teaching situations. Cooperating teachers and student
teachers interviewed felt this could be done more often.

Performance of the Cooperating Teacher

University supervisors and student teachers were asked to rate how well the cooperating teacher performed those activities identified as responsibilities of cooperating teachers. University supervisors rated 30 activities while student teachers rated 27 activities. The same scale was used for the interpretation of the performance of cooperating teachers as was used for the performance of university supervisors.

University supervisors rated the performance of cooperating teachers as above average for 19 of the 30 activities. Three activities were rated as below average.

Student teachers rated the cooperating teacher group above average for 21 of the 27 activities and superior for one activity. The three activities rated as below average by the university supervisor group were three of the four lowest as rated by the student teacher group. These three activities were: 1) critiques each lesson prepared by the student teacher prior to the lesson being taught, 2) has the student teacher plan each unit of instruction at least two weeks prior to actual teaching, and 3) gives the student
teacher opportunities to plan and conduct and adult an/or continuing education program. To further support the data on critiquing lesson plans, the student teachers were asked to indicate the percent of their lesson plans critiqued either verbally or in writing by the cooperating teacher. The mean was 58% with a range of zero to one hundred percent. Eighteen student teachers indicated 10% or fewer of their lesson plans were critiqued. Student teachers were also asked to report the number of formal evaluations which occurred. Approximately nine percent reported no formal evaluation occurred. The average number of formal evaluations conducted excluding those when the university supervisor was present was five.

Having the student teacher plan each unit of instruction at least two weeks prior to actual teaching was considered an unrealistic expectation by all three of the samples interviewed. A more realistic expectation might be to plan three or four days ahead and then have the cooperating teacher evaluate the lesson plan one or two days prior to the lesson being taught so that changes can be made if need be.

The cooperating teacher group was rated superior by the student teacher group for allowing the student teacher to assume full teaching responsibilities near the end of the student teaching quarter. Student teachers reported that on the average they assumed full teaching responsibilities
during the fifth week of the quarter. The range was from the first week to the tenth week.

Student teachers rated the performance of the cooperating teacher above average for identifies the necessary procedures to follow in conducting supervised occupational experience visits and takes the student teacher on many occupational experience visits during the first three days of student teaching. University supervisors rated cooperating teachers average on these two activities. To gather more information, the student teachers were asked to indicate the number of visits completed where the cooperating teacher taught the procedures to follow when conducting supervised occupational experience visits and the number of visits completed where the cooperating teacher supervised the student teachers ability to conduct occupational experience visits. It should be noted that data regarding these issues were inconsistent. The average number of visits where the cooperating teacher taught the procedures to follow was five. Approximately 11% reported no such visits conducted while 35% indicated two or three visits were completed. Also, on the average, three visits were completed where the student teacher's ability was supervised by the cooperating teacher. Approximately 30% reported no such visits were completed and 23% experienced one such visit.
The student teachers were also asked to indicate the number of hours they observed the cooperating teacher and the percent of the observations that resulted in discussion. The average number of hours spent observing the cooperating teacher teach was 51. Approximately half the respondents spent 25 or fewer hours observing the cooperating teacher teach. Of these observations, student teachers reported a mean of 52% resulted in discussion.

The last question asked of the student teachers was of the classes the student teacher taught, for what percent of them did the cooperating teacher remain in the classroom. Twenty percent reported that the cooperating teacher remained in the classroom less than 20% of the time. On the average, the cooperating teacher remained in the classroom 52% of the time while the student teacher was teaching.

Conclusions

1. All experiences expected during student teaching in Agricultural Education at The Ohio State University should continue to be expected except two:

   A. Experience with the FFA Alumni affiliate should be eliminated since university supervisors, cooperating teachers and student teachers rated it optional and not accomplished.
B. Experiences with conducting visits concerning individual problems of adults should be eliminated since cooperating teachers and student teachers rated it optional and all three groups rated it partially accomplished.

2. The current level of preparation of student teachers in the pedagogical areas such as methods of teaching, evaluation of students, lesson planning and use of media and resources should be maintained.

3. The Department of Agricultural Education at The Ohio State University should not continue to graduate students with their current level of competency in adult education, supervised occupational experience programs, record books and FFA.

4. All major areas of weakness for experiences during student teaching (adult education, supervised occupational experience programs, record books and FFA) were areas in which student teachers had no preservice training.

5. To be better prepared for student teaching, students should have an increased amount of experiences and training in adult education, supervised occupational experience programs, adult education and FFA.

6. Assignments added structure to student teaching and were an important part of student teaching. However, for the assignments to be most effective they should enhance the experiences. Their importance and purpose should be clearly
defined and more attention should be given to the assignments by the agricultural education faculty.

7. University supervisors and cooperating teachers should clearly understand their role as a member of the student teaching triad.

A. For the university supervisors, activities needing greatest emphasis were: 1) evaluating student teacher's lesson plan prior to observing the student teacher teach and 2) serving as a resource person for the cooperating teacher.

B. For cooperating teachers, activities needing greatest emphasis were: 1) feedback on lesson plans prior to teaching, 2) evaluating student teacher's performance after teaching, 3) allowing student teacher opportunity to conduct an adult and/or continuing education program and 4) demonstrating how to make supervised occupational experience visits and being sure student teacher has the ability to make visits.

8. Student teachers were not observing the cooperating teacher enough before having full teaching responsibilities.

9. Student teachers did not take time to use instructional media and resources available to them at the high school including the use of video equipment for self-improvement.

10. Most areas of weakness for experiences during student teaching were in areas where student teachers had little or no training prior to student teaching. Most areas of
weakness in the performance of the cooperating teacher were in areas where the cooperating teacher was to provide instruction of some type. One could conclude that the Department of Agricultural Education and the cooperating teachers are incongruent in their expectations of student teaching. The Department sees student teaching as practice teaching but also a place to learn new knowledge. The cooperating teachers see student teaching primarily as practice teaching.

**Recommendations for Improving the Student Teaching Program**

1. Faculty must come together and decide if adult education is a responsibility of the vocational agriculture teacher. If it is then the Department should stand firm in making student teachers gain experiences in adult education. If it is not a responsibility then student teachers should not be expected to gain experiences in adult education.

3. Experiences in FFA, supervised occupational experience programs, record books and adult education should be made available to students both prior to and during student teaching.

   A. Offer a five credit required course prior to student teaching exposing the student to the importance, purpose and procedures of the four areas. Allow for hands on experiences.
B. Develop a list of suggested experiences a student should have prior to student teaching in these four areas. Allow students to select three or four areas in which they are weak and the Department should periodically offer workshops in the most popular areas so students can gain experiences (i.e., working with adults is weak so have a group of students plan an adult program for a high school or joint vocational school in the Columbus area).

C. Offer two-day intensive workshops prior to classes starting each quarter when students are on campus in those areas in which the Department feels students are weakest (i.e., Autumn quarter when they arrive on campus early - use of record books).

D. Insist that all students attend the FFA state convention, state FFA judging contests, at least one chapter banquet and other appropriate activities held in Columbus and surrounding areas. These activities enable prospective teachers to see how the FFA works and what the FFA can do for high school students. The prospective teacher can also see what the role of the vocational agriculture teacher is regarding FFA. The best way to do this is to tie these activities
to the assignments of current courses.

E. Allow opportunities for experiences at student teacher seminars. Have seminars held at three or four different cooperative training centers. Select students with strengths in each area to present a lesson to the group of student teachers about the area (ie. someone strong in making occupational experience visits has opportunity to present a lesson on the procedure of making a visit. Student also includes what he or she has seen as easy or difficult about the visits completed so far during student teaching).

F. Use the Agricultural Education Society as a vehicle for creating experiences in adult education, FFA, supervised occupational experience programs and record books. Have one meeting a quarter designated for preservice training and have faculty, vocational agriculture teachers and students prepare the presentations.

4. Better preparation of cooperating teachers is essential. Three different opportunities should be available for their training.

   A. The first opportunity should be a required course for all approved teachers interested in being a cooperating teacher. As in the past, the course should be
offered in the summer. The recommended content of the course follows:

1. Introduction of teacher education at Ohio State University
2. Purpose of student teaching
3. Philosophy of Department toward student teaching
4. Activities the Department sees as essential
5. Expectations of cooperating teacher, student teacher and university supervisor
6. Assignments for student teaching and how cooperating teacher can assist student teacher in completing the assignments
7. Make available concrete techniques for cooperating teachers to use dealing with observation, lesson planning, evaluation and feedback

a. Observation of cooperating teacher by student teacher

The cooperating teacher is a model of excellence in the use of instructional techniques.

Through careful observation of the cooperating teacher's abilities student teachers become familiar with the use of good instructional techniques. The Department should create a list of instructional techniques for student
teachers to observe during the first week of student teaching and require an assignment regarding observation. The student teacher and cooperating teacher should select four instructional techniques for observation.

Role play with cooperating teachers what should occur before, during and after the observation.

1. Pre-demonstration conference
   a. Importance of technique
   b. Why it is used
   c. What student teacher should look for during observation

2. Demonstration of instructional technique
   a. Used proper tools and equipment
   b. Made elements, steps, or procedures clear
   c. Performed technique at high level of proficiency

3. Follow-up conference
   a. Reviewed lesson and technique
   b. Encourage clarifying questions from student teacher
   c. Discussed ways student teacher could employ technique
b. Develop understanding of what exactly should be in a lesson plan and why. Each part of the lesson plan should be explained in depth with appropriate examples. Explain how students have been trained.

c. Discuss importance and procedures for evaluation and feedback of lesson plans. (role play)

1. Prior to teaching
2. After teaching

d. Video taping of student teacher

A student teacher should be videotaped at least twice a quarter with an evaluation conference afterwards between cooperating teacher and student teacher. The third week and ninth week would be appropriate for the minimum. A videotaping session with cooperating teachers should be conducted so they know exactly what to do with the student teacher. Student teacher's self-evaluation assignment should include among other things what they learned from the videotaping.

8. Walk through a week by week ideal student teaching experience
9. Have a panel come in with two expert cooperating teachers, two students fresh out of student teaching (possibly one who had a good experience and one who had a difficult experience) and two university supervisors. Have them discuss what they see as important aspects of student teaching including what usually goes well and what could be improved. Much planning must be done for this experience to be successful.

B. The second opportunity for training should come during Tech Update. A workshop should be offered for the update of cooperating teachers. This should be offered for those who will be cooperating teachers for that school year. It should update the cooperating teachers on their roles and responsibilities, stress the importance and purposes of the assignments and incorporate more techniques in dealing with the student teacher.

C. The last training session should be a one day seminar at the beginning of the third week of the quarter in which the cooperating teacher has a student teacher. The purpose of this seminar is to address the immediate concerns of the cooperating teacher. He or she has had the student teacher for at least two weeks and should have a feeling for how things are progressing. The cooperating teacher should be told where
they should be in the quarter as far as completed experiences and assignments. It may also be appropriate to send weekly reminders to cooperating teachers with a list of what should be occurring during student teaching that week. Any questions on the assignments should be cleared up at this time. The current idea of having a session on some teaching resource is good. This resource should be related to making the student teaching experience better.

5. The Agricultural Education faculty must insist that those experiences deemed essential for student teaching be accomplished during student teaching.

6. Obtain evaluations of the cooperating teachers based on their responsibilities (similar to what has been done here) each quarter from university supervisors and student teachers. Consistent negative feedback from the university supervisor and student teacher is important for assisting in improving cooperating teachers or weeding out those cooperating teachers who are not as effective as they should be.

7. Select a set of assignments which enhance the student teaching experiences. Of the current assignments delete: survey of each student's reading habits in classes taught, maintain diary, prepare an article about student teacher for local or school newspaper, and adult education assignments if adult education is considered not important. Add the
following assignments:

A. Student teacher is videotaped at least twice during the quarter (third week and ninth week). Have the cooperating teacher and student teacher evaluate performance. What was learned through this experience should be included in student teacher's self-evaluation report.

B. Student teacher must observe four instructional techniques demonstrated by the cooperating teacher. Use a checklist to show assignment was completed.

C. Keep a calendar of activities much the same as a vocational agriculture teacher would. Prepare student teacher beforehand as to what should be on calendar.

D. Include an assignment that student teacher is to take complete control of one FFA activity (judging team, committee event, picnic) and follow through on it during student teaching.
APPENDIX A

SUMMARY OF DESIRABLE EXPERIENCES
Desirable Student Teaching Experiences
Chambliss, 1963

1. The student teaching experience should provide practice in recognizing individual differences and provide for the individual needs of pupils.
2. The student teacher should be given practice in gathering personal data about students and in planning educational experiences based upon implications of this data.
3. The student teacher should be brought into contact with pupils at various stages of development and under various types of actual school situations.
4. The student teacher should be given practical experience in establishing proper rapport in child guidance and in managing and controlling pupils in various types of teaching-learning situations.
5. The student teaching experience should help the student teacher develop greater knowledge and ability to use scientific and educational principles in the selection and organization of subject matter.
6. Student teaching should provide an opportunity for the student teacher to develop a greater knowledge of the place and use of a library in relation to his teaching field.
7. Student teaching should provide experiences that help the student teacher acquire a more adequate working knowledge of instructional materials.
8. Student teaching should provide experiences that help the student teacher develop greater mastery of subject matter and teaching techniques in his particular major area.
9. Student teaching should provide opportunities for the student teacher to become acquainted with the community in which he was working and to participate in school-community activities.
10. The student teaching experience should provide opportunity for the student teacher to become acquainted with policies, regulations, committees, records, reports, and other mechanical aspects of the school.
11. Student teaching should provide experiences that help the student teacher gain confidence and assurance in the teaching situation.
12. Student teaching should provide experiences that help the student teacher further develop and maintain high ethical standards in personal and professional relations.
13. Student teaching should provide experiences to help the student teacher integrate previous training into the total function of teaching.
14. Student teaching should provide experiences to help the student teacher to increase his understanding and skill in practical learning situations.
15. Student teaching should provide experiences to help the student teacher to gain fresh insight into the
inter-relationships of all aspects of the teaching-learning process.

16. Student teaching should provide experiences to help the student teacher to further develop a spirit of inquiry and investigation toward problems in teaching.

17. The student teacher's performance should be evaluated by pupils, supervisors, and administrators.

18. Student teaching should serve the School of Education as a testing point for work in the teacher education program and to determine the student's readiness to do successful teaching in the field.

19. The student teaching experience should provide a sufficiently wide range of experience to enable the School of Education to discover the needs of student teachers and to plan activities to meet those needs.

20. Student teaching should provide experiences that progressively increase the student teacher's understanding and skill in applying the best modern methods of education.

21. The student teacher should be given opportunities to use his originality in the planning and direction of teaching-learning activities.

22. The student teacher should be encouraged to become more self-directive in planning for instruction and directing classroom activities.

23. The student teacher should be provided needed help by his supervising teacher, college supervisor, and other resource people.

24. The student teacher should be provided experience in using personal and professional resources in the solution of educational problems.

25. Student teaching should provide the student teacher an opportunity to gain insight into the contributions of the many resource people involved in curriculum development and instruction.

26. The student teacher should be provided an opportunity to help plan his student teaching assignment.

27. There should be a cooperative working relationship between the student teacher and the supervising teacher and other resource personnel.

28. There should be a cooperating working relationship between the student teacher and the administration and faculty of the entire school.

29. Student teaching should foster understanding the cooperative contributions of various personnel for the improvement of the total school program.

30. The student teacher should begin his student teaching experience with a period of orientation and observation.

31. The student teacher should be provided a period of full-time teaching responsibility.

32. Observation, participation, and teaching should be integrated into a well planned program of student teaching.

33. Student teaching should provide ever-widening
opportunities for the student teacher to observe, participate in, and direct children's extra-class activities.

34. Student teaching should provide experiences that help the student teacher to further formulate and build a sound, workable philosophy of education.

35. Student teaching should provide experiences that help the student teacher develop constructive professional interests and a desire for professional growth.

36. Student teaching should provide experiences that help the student teacher develop a professional attitude toward supervision designed to assist in improving his teaching.

37. Student teaching should provide experiences that help the student teacher become acquainted with and interested in using all available means and sources of professional improvement.

38. Student teaching should provide practice in planning, guidance, and evaluating learning activities.

39. Student teaching should provide opportunities for the student teacher to assume increasingly greater responsibility for the development and progress of both individuals and groups of children.

40. Student teaching should provide experiences that help the student teacher gain some skill in setting up classroom conditions which are conducive to worthwhile pupil activity.

41. The student teacher should be provided opportunities to develop increasingly greater skill in planning, selecting, organizing, adapting, and applying materials of instruction.

42. Student teaching should provide experiences that contribute to the student teacher's growth in self-analysis.

43. Student teaching should provide experiences that help student teachers develop intelligent self-criticism.

44. Student teaching should provide experiences that help the student teacher to realize his abilities and needs.

45. The student teacher should be provided opportunities to evaluate the results of his teaching in terms of pupil achievement.

46. The student teacher should be provided an opportunity to discuss actual teaching problems with his college supervisor during his student teaching experience.

47. The college supervisor and supervising teacher should work cooperatively in supervising the student teaching experience.

48. The student teacher should be provided an opportunity to discuss the total school program with the public school administrator.

49. The student teacher should be viewed by the administrator and teachers as a co-worker assuming privileges and responsibilities as a regular faculty member in the school.

50. Student teaching should provide an opportunity for the student teacher to work with supervising teachers who were
competent personally and professionally.
51. Adequate, on-the-spot supervision and guidance should be provided for the student teacher during the student teaching experience.
52. There should be a congenial and helpful attitude toward the student teacher as a person and as a teacher (p. 60-67).
APPENDIX B

COVER LETTERS MAILED WITH SURVEY INSTRUMENTS
Dear Name,

Student teaching is the most important "learning by doing" portion of the pre-service teacher education program. For this reason a continuing objective of the Department of Agricultural Education at Ohio State University is the improvement of the student teaching program. This means that periodically a formal evaluation of the program should be completed to determine its strengths and weaknesses.

The Department is currently undergoing a self-study and has identified a list of concerns about student teaching which need exploring. One concern is whether the experiences and assignments expected during student teaching are needed in preparing a prospective teacher for successful teaching in vocational agriculture and the extent to which the experiences and assignments are accomplished during student teaching. Another concern relates to the supervision of student teachers. Student teaching is a result of a triadic relationship between the student teacher, cooperating teacher and university supervisor. What actually happens in this triadic relationship during student teaching needs exploring.

Jill Pfister, currently working on her Ph.D. in Agricultural Education, has worked closely with the Department in developing three questionnaires related to these concerns. A different questionnaire has been developed for each of the three components of the student teaching triad (student teacher, cooperating teacher and university supervisor). We ask each group to evaluate the experiences and assignments expected during student teaching. Then the student teachers are to rate how well their cooperating teacher and university supervisor performed their responsibilities during student teaching; the cooperating teachers are to rate their university supervisor(s) on a list of responsibilities; and the university supervisors are to rate their cooperating teachers on a list of responsibilities.

It is very important that a response be received from all persons selected. You have been selected because you have participated in the triadic relationship during student teaching in the past three years either as a student teacher, cooperating teacher or university supervisor.

A random sample of the student teachers, cooperating teachers and university supervisors will be asked to participate in a follow-up telephone survey so it is imperative that you include your name on the questionnaire. However, the information on the questionnaire will be confidential and published only as a summary of the study which of course will provide no indication of names or schools. Completion of the questionnaire and its return by October 6, 1982 in the enclosed envelope will be greatly appreciated. As the address on the enclosed envelope indicates, the questionnaire will be returned directly to Jill Pfister. Thank you for your time and concern.

Sincerely,

J. Robert Warmbrod, Professor and Chairman
Department of Agricultural Education
October 8, 1982

Last week a questionnaire seeking your evaluation of the student teaching program in Agricultural Education at Ohio State University was mailed to you. Your name was selected because you have either been a student teacher, cooperating teacher or university supervisor in the last three years.

It is extremely important that we receive your response so the results accurately represent the opinions of all student teachers, cooperating teachers and university supervisors toward student teaching.

If by some chance you did not receive the questionnaire, or it got misplaced, please call me immediately at (513) 882-1325 in the evening and I will send another questionnaire to you.

Thank you for your time and concern.

Sincerely,

Jill A. Pfister
Project Director
Name
Address

Dear Name,

About three weeks ago Dr. J. Robert Warmbrod wrote to you seeking your evaluation of the student teaching program in Agricultural Education at Ohio State University. As of today we have not yet received your completed questionnaire.

Student teaching is the most important "learning by doing" portion of the preservice teacher education program. Without your evaluation the Department of Agricultural Education can not improve the student teaching program reflecting the concerns of those directly involved.

I am writing to you again because of the significance each questionnaire has to the usefulness of this study. Your name was selected because you have either been a student teacher, cooperating teacher or university supervisor in the past three years. In order for the results of this study to be truly representative it is essential that each person selected return the questionnaire.

In the event that your questionnaire has been misplaced, a replacement is enclosed.

Your cooperation is greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

Jill A. Pfister
Project Director
APPENDIX C

SURVEY INSTRUMENT MAILED TO UNIVERSITY SUPERVISORS
AN EVALUATION OF STUDENT TEACHING

Part I

Listed below are expected experiences and the assignments which enhance the experiences for student teachers in Agricultural Education at Ohio State University. Indicate with a checkmark (✓) the extent to which each experience and assignment is needed in preparing a prospective teacher for successful teaching in vocational agriculture. Then indicate with a checkmark (✓) the extent to which each experience and assignment is accomplished during student teaching. If you have any comments about the item, space is available to the right of the checklist and at the end of the section. Please be sure to answer all questions. Note that both sides of the paper is used.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXPERIENCES</th>
<th>NEED</th>
<th>ACCOMPLISHMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The student teacher develops a weekly schedule of teaching.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The student teacher identifies and outlines a unit topic and develops</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>behavioral objectives for classes taught.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The student teacher writes lesson plans which include specific</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>objectives, introduction, content, techniques for delivering content,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>summary and appropriate instructional materials.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The student teacher directs student learning activities such as</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>student presentations, supervised study, laboratory experiences, problem-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>solving techniques, brainstorming, demonstrations and field trips.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. The student teacher applies basic teaching procedures such as</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>introducing a day's lesson, employing oral questioning techniques,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>acknowledging student verbal and non-verbal cues and summarizing a day's</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lesson.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. The student teacher uses instructional media and resources.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. The student teacher evaluates the performance of students.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. The student teacher teaches students to use, summarize and analyze</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the record books of occupational experience programs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. The student teacher plans and supervises long time occupational</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>experience programs in agriculture with students, their parents, and/or</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>their cooperating employer.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. The student teacher develops a procedure to insure students' safety</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and protection.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. The student teacher develops a plan for teacher and/or employer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>supervision of the occupational experience program.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. The student teacher uses the high school guidance program to obtain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and interpret background information concerning students.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. The student teacher counsels students.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. The student teacher advises the FFA as part of the total vocational</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>agriculture program.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(over)
15. The student teacher advises the FFA Alumni affiliate as part of the local program of vocational agriculture.

16. The student teacher administers and maintains the physical facilities.

17. The student teacher identifies appropriate topics for an adult education program.

18. The student teacher prepares and conducts group instruction in adult education.

19. The student teacher conducts visits concerning individual problems of adults.

20. The student teacher conducts activities which aid in developing good school and community relations.

21. The student teacher can plan and develop a vocational agriculture program.

22. The student teacher participates in teacher's meetings and professional conferences.

23. The student teacher can plan and conduct a summer program of activities.

ASSIGNMENTS

1. Establish a notebook for student teaching to be reviewed by the Agricultural Education Department at the end of student teaching.

2. Maintain a notebook containing all lesson plans with teaching objectives, an interest approach, content, techniques for delivering content, learning activities, conclusions and application.

3. Have cooperating teacher evaluate each lesson plan using a lesson plan check sheet.

4. Maintain a diary of daily activities.

5. Maintain a mileage report.

6. Plan and conduct a field trip.

7. Have cooperating teacher evaluate the field trip and include the evaluation form in the notebook.

8. Prepare two brief reports describing satisfactory occupational experience visits including evaluations of the visits and any suggestions made.

9. With assistance of cooperating teacher, select a student for a case study and prepare a three to four page report.

10. Complete a survey of each student's reading habits in classes taught.
11. Review with guidance personnel the reading levels of students in agriculture classes.

12. Determine grade level of reading materials used in supervised study in the agriculture classes.

13. Evaluate the FFA program of activities with the FFA officers.

14. Write a brief description of the chapter noting areas which are strong and weak as suggested by officers.

15. Review the chapter budget, and discuss with the cooperating teacher how finances are handled with the school office.

16. Interview the cooperating teacher, principal, and some adult class members. Prepare a brief report concerning the program of continuing education, the attitudes encountered and issues raised, along with conclusions.

17. Participate in planning and conducting a meeting for adult students and include the agenda or lesson plan in the notebook.

18. Prepare a brief article for the school or local newspaper concerning the student teacher in the vocational agriculture department.

19. Prepare a brief and objective evaluation of student teacher's strengths and limitations as a teacher of vocational agriculture.

20. Prepare a brief and objective evaluation of the cooperative training center with suggestions for improving the student teaching experience in that school.

General comments and suggestions for improving the experiences and assignments for student teaching:
The following activities have been identified as responsibilities for the cooperating teacher to ensure a successful student teaching experience. Please rate how well the cooperating teachers you work with perform the activities listed below. Circle one number, from "9" indicating Superior to "1" indicating Poor. Comments and suggestions for improving the performance of the cooperating teacher can be made at the end of the section.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Finds housing for the student teacher.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superior: 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Becomes familiar with the background of the student teacher.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superior: 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Prepares the class for the arrival of the student teacher.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superior: 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Involves the student teacher as part of the faculty.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superior: 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Reviews the student and faculty handbook with the student teacher.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superior: 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Orients the student teacher to the school and community.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superior: 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Provides the student teacher with accessibility to instructional materials, an area for work and personal belongings, student records, audio-visual equipment and other resource materials.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superior: 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Reviews the plan of activities and responsibilities for student teaching in agricultural education.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superior: 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Has the student teacher plan each unit of instruction at least two weeks prior to actual teaching.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superior: 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Critiques each lesson plan prepared by the student teacher prior to the lesson being taught.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superior: 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Provides opportunities for various teaching experiences with some freedom to experiment with teaching strategies.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superior: 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Provides the student teacher the opportunity to assume full teaching responsibilities near the end of the student teaching quarter, according to the student teacher's ability.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superior: 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Demonstrates good teaching techniques.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superior: 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Encourages the student teacher to observe teaching and ask questions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superior: 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Provides the student teacher with an understanding of the extent of teacher authority and responsibilities.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superior: 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(over)
16. Gives the student teacher every possible opportunity to serve as an FFA advisor.
   Superior  9  7  6  5  4  3  2  1
   Average  6  4  3  2  1
   Poor  1

17. Gives the student teacher opportunities to plan and conduct an adult and/or continuing education program.
   Superior  9  7  6  5  4  3  2  1
   Average  6  4  3  2  1
   Poor  1

   Superior  9  7  6  5  4  3  2  1
   Average  6  4  3  2  1
   Poor  1

19. Evaluates the student teacher's progress and experiences and gives daily feedback.
   Superior  9  7  6  5  4  3  2  1
   Average  6  4  3  2  1
   Poor  1

20. Conducts a formal evaluation at the end of the third, sixth and tenth weeks of student teaching where the student teacher can express concerns, anxieties and satisfactions; the cooperating teacher elicits ideas for self-improvement from the student teacher; and then assists the student teacher in suggesting possible courses of action.
   Superior  9  7  6  5  4  3  2  1
   Average  6  4  3  2  1
   Poor  1

21. Is able to evaluate his or her own strengths and weaknesses as a cooperating teacher.
   Superior  9  7  6  5  4  3  2  1
   Average  6  4  3  2  1
   Poor  1

22. Reviews the PRIDE report with the student teacher.
   Superior  9  7  6  5  4  3  2  1
   Average  6  4  3  2  1
   Poor  1

23. Provides an enthusiastic and professional example for the student teacher.
   Superior  9  7  6  5  4  3  2  1
   Average  6  4  3  2  1
   Poor  1

24. Has the high school students' occupational goals summarized for the student teacher and reviews them with the student teacher.
   Superior  9  7  6  5  4  3  2  1
   Average  6  4  3  2  1
   Poor  1

25. Takes the student teacher on many occupational experience visits during the first three days of the student teaching experience.
   Superior  9  7  6  5  4  3  2  1
   Average  6  4  3  2  1
   Poor  1

26. Identifies the necessary procedures to follow in conducting and supervising an occupational experience program.
   Superior  9  7  6  5  4  3  2  1
   Average  6  4  3  2  1
   Poor  1

27. Does not expect the student teacher to teach exactly as the cooperating teacher does and tries not to let biases show and influence the student teacher.
   Superior  9  7  6  5  4  3  2  1
   Average  6  4  3  2  1
   Poor  1

28. Keeps records and writes evaluative reports about the student teacher's progress and general promise as a teacher including: training evaluation reports, letters of recommendation, inventory of student traits and confidential statement.
   Superior  9  7  6  5  4  3  2  1
   Average  6  4  3  2  1
   Poor  1

29. Discusses and evaluates the student teacher's performance with the university supervisor.
   Superior  9  7  6  5  4  3  2  1
   Average  6  4  3  2  1
   Poor  1

   Superior  9  7  6  5  4  3  2  1
   Average  6  4  3  2  1
   Poor  1

(over)
### General Comments and Suggestions for Improving the Performance of the Cooperating Teacher:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Number of years as a university supervisor</th>
<th>Approximate number of student teachers you have supervised</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX D

SURVEY INSTRUMENT MAILED TO COOPERATING TEACHERS
### AN EVALUATION OF STUDENT TEACHING

#### Part I

Listed below are expected experiences and the assignments which enhance the experiences for student teachers in Agricultural Education at Ohio State University. Indicate with a checkmark (✓) the extent to which each experience and assignment is needed in preparing a prospective teacher for successful teaching in vocational agriculture. Then indicate with a checkmark (✓) the extent to which each experience and assignment is accomplished during student teaching. If you have any comments about the item, space is available to the right of the checklist and at the end of the section. Please be sure to answer all questions. Note that both sides of the paper is used.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXPERIENCES</th>
<th>NEED</th>
<th>ACCOMPLISHMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The student teacher develops a weekly schedule of teaching.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The student teacher identifies and outlines a unit topic and develops</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>behavioral objectives for classes taught.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The student teacher writes lesson plans which include specific</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>objectives, introduction, content, techniques for delivering content,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>summary and appropriate instructional materials.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The student teacher directs student learning activities such as</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>student presentations, supervised study, laboratory experiences,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>problem-solving techniques, brainstorming, demonstrations and field trips.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. The student teacher applies basic teaching procedures such as</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>introducing a day's lesson, employing oral questioning techniques,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>acknowledging student verbal and non-verbal cues and summarizing a day's</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lesson.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. The student teacher uses instructional media and resources.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. The student teacher evaluates the performance of students.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. The student teacher teaches students to use, summarize and analyze the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>record books of occupational experience programs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. The student teacher plans and supervises long time occupational</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>experience programs in agriculture with students, their parents, and/or</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>their cooperating employer.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. The student teacher develops a procedure to insure students' safety</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and protection.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. The student teacher develops a plan for teacher and/or employer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>supervision of the occupational experience program.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. The student teacher uses the high school guidance program to obtain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and interpret background information concerning students.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. The student teacher counsels students.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. The student teacher advises the PPA as part of the total vocational</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>agriculture program.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(over)
15. The student teacher advises the FFA Alumni affiliate as part of the local program of vocational agriculture.

16. The student teacher administers and maintains the physical facilities.

17. The student teacher identifies appropriate topics for an adult education program.

18. The student teacher prepares and conducts group instruction in adult education.

19. The student teacher conducts visits concerning individual problems of adults.

20. The student teacher conducts activities which aid in developing good school and community relations.

21. The student teacher can plan and develop a vocational agriculture program.

22. The student teacher participates in teacher's meetings and professional conferences.

23. The student teacher can plan and conduct a summer program of activities.

**ASSIGNMENTS**

1. Establish a notebook for student teaching to be reviewed by the Agricultural Education Department at the end of student teaching.

2. Maintain a notebook containing all lesson plans with teaching objectives, an interest approach, content, techniques for delivering content, learning activities, conclusions and application.

3. Have cooperating teacher evaluate each lesson plan using a lesson plan check sheet.

4. Maintain a diary of daily activities.

5. Maintain a mileage report.

6. Plan and conduct a field trip.

7. Have cooperating teacher evaluate the field trip and include the evaluation form in the notebook.

8. Prepare two brief reports describing satisfactory occupational experience visits including evaluations of the visits and any suggestions made.

9. With assistance of cooperating teacher, select a student for a case study and prepare a three to four page report.

10. Complete a survey of each student's reading habits in classes taught.
11. Review with guidance personnel the reading levels of students in agriculture classes.

12. Determine grade level of reading materials used in supervised study in the agriculture classes.

13. Evaluate the FFA program of activities with the FFA officers.

14. Write a brief description of the chapter noting areas which are strong and weak as suggested by officers.

15. Review the chapter budget, and discuss with the cooperating teacher how finances are handled with the school office.

16. Interview the cooperating teacher, principal, and some adult class members. Prepare a brief report concerning the program of continuing education, the attitudes encountered and issues raised, along with conclusions.

17. Participate in planning and conducting a meeting for adult students and include the agenda or lesson plan in the notebook.

18. Prepare a brief article for the school or local newspaper concerning the student teacher in the vocational agriculture department.

19. Prepare a brief and objective evaluation of student teacher's strengths and limitations as a teacher of vocational agriculture.

20. Prepare a brief and objective evaluation of the cooperative training center with suggestions for improving the student teaching experience in that school.

General comments and suggestions for improving the experiences and assignments for student teaching:

(over)
The following activities have been identified as responsibilities for the university supervisor to ensure a successful student teaching experience. Please rate how well the university supervisor(s) you work with perform the activities listed below. Circle one number, "9" indicating Superior to "1" indicating Poor. Comments and suggestions for improving the performance of the university supervisor can be made at the end of the section.

1. Explains the student teaching program to local administration and cooperating teachers, and provides them with necessary materials.

   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
   | 9 | 8 | 7 | 6 | 5 | 4 |
   | Superior | Average | Poor |

2. Works cooperatively with school administration, cooperating teacher, and student teacher to provide the best possible student teaching experience.

   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
   | 9 | 8 | 7 | 6 | 5 | 4 |
   | Superior | Average | Poor |

3. Visits the cooperative training center early in the quarter.

   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
   | 9 | 8 | 7 | 6 | 5 | 4 |
   | Superior | Average | Poor |

4. Reviews with the cooperating teacher and student teacher the plan of activities and responsibilities for the student teaching experience early in the quarter.

   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
   | 9 | 8 | 7 | 6 | 5 | 4 |
   | Superior | Average | Poor |

5. Visits the school at least three times during the quarter and observes the student teacher in varying teaching situations (i.e. classroom and laboratory).

   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
   | 9 | 8 | 7 | 6 | 5 | 4 |
   | Superior | Average | Poor |

6. Evaluates each lesson plan before observing the student teacher in varying teaching situations.

   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
   | 9 | 8 | 7 | 6 | 5 | 4 |
   | Superior | Average | Poor |

7. Conferences with the cooperating teacher during visits regarding the student teacher's progress.

   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
   | 9 | 8 | 7 | 6 | 5 | 4 |
   | Superior | Average | Poor |

8. Conducts conferences with both cooperating teacher and student teacher to provide encouragement, constructive criticism and recognition of success.

   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
   | 9 | 8 | 7 | 6 | 5 | 4 |
   | Superior | Average | Poor |

9. Conducts conferences where the student teacher is encouraged to express concerns, anxieties and satisfactions, the university supervisor elicits ideas for self-improvement from the student teacher, and the university supervisor assists the student teacher in suggesting alternative solutions to teaching problems.

   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
   | 9 | 8 | 7 | 6 | 5 | 4 |
   | Superior | Average | Poor |

10. Serves as a resource person for the cooperating teacher in terms of helping secure current reference materials, utilizing new methods and techniques for teaching, and examining evaluation techniques to be used with student teachers and/or pupils.

    |   |   |   |   |   |   |
    | 9 | 8 | 7 | 6 | 5 | 4 |
    | Superior | Average | Poor |

11. Assists the cooperating teacher in planning and carrying through a program of evaluation of the student teacher.

    |   |   |   |   |   |   |
    | 9 | 8 | 7 | 6 | 5 | 4 |
    | Superior | Average | Poor |

12. Prepares a written recommendation for the student teacher.

    |   |   |   |   |   |   |
    | 9 | 8 | 7 | 6 | 5 | 4 |
    | Superior | Average | Poor |

General comments and suggestions for improving the performance of the university supervisor:

---

**Name**  
School  
Number of years as cooperating teacher  
Number of student teachers  
Telephone number
APPENDIX E

SURVEY INSTRUMENT MAILED TO STUDENT TEACHERS
AN EVALUATION OF STUDENT TEACHING

Part I

Listed below are expected experiences and the assignments which enhance the experiences for student teachers in Agricultural Education at Ohio State University. Indicate with a checkmark (✓) the extent to which each experience and assignment is needed in preparing a prospective teacher for successful teaching in vocational agriculture. Then indicate with a checkmark (✓) the extent to which each experience and assignment is accomplished during student teaching. If you have any comments about the item, space is available to the right of the checklist and at the end of the section. Please be sure to answer all questions. Note that both sides of the paper is used.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXPERIENCES</th>
<th>NEED</th>
<th>ACCOMPLISHMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The student teacher develops a weekly schedule of teaching.</td>
<td>Essential</td>
<td>Desirable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The student teacher identifies and outlines a unit topic and develops behavioral objectives for classes taught.</td>
<td>Essential</td>
<td>Desirable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The student teacher writes lesson plans which include specific objectives, introduction, content, techniques for delivering content, summary and appropriate instructional materials.</td>
<td>Essential</td>
<td>Desirable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The student teacher directs student learning activities such as student presentations, supervised study, laboratory experiences, problem-solving techniques, brain-storming, demonstrations and field trips.</td>
<td>Essential</td>
<td>Desirable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. The student teacher applies basic teaching procedures such as introducing a day's lesson, employing oral questioning techniques, acknowledging student verbal and non-verbal cues and summarizing a day's lesson.</td>
<td>Essential</td>
<td>Desirable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. The student teacher uses instructional media and resources.</td>
<td>Essential</td>
<td>Desirable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. The student teacher evaluates the performance of students.</td>
<td>Essential</td>
<td>Desirable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. The student teacher teaches students to use, summarize and analyze the record books of occupational experience programs.</td>
<td>Essential</td>
<td>Desirable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. The student teacher plans and supervises long time occupational experience programs in agriculture with students, their parents, and/or their cooperating employer.</td>
<td>Essential</td>
<td>Desirable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. The student teacher develops a procedure to insure students' safety and protection.</td>
<td>Essential</td>
<td>Desirable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. The student teacher develops a plan for teacher and/or employer supervision of the occupational experience program.</td>
<td>Essential</td>
<td>Desirable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. The student teacher uses the high school guidance program to obtain and interpret background information concerning students.</td>
<td>Essential</td>
<td>Desirable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. The student teacher counsels students.</td>
<td>Essential</td>
<td>Desirable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. The student teacher advises the FFA as part of the total vocational agriculture program.</td>
<td>Essential</td>
<td>Desirable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASSIGNMENTS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Establish a notebook for student teaching to be reviewed by the Agricultural Education Department at the end of student teaching.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Maintain a notebook containing all lesson plans with teaching objectives, an interest approach, content, techniques for delivering content, learning activities, conclusions and application.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Have cooperating teacher evaluate each lesson plan using a lesson plan check sheet.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Maintain a diary of daily activities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Maintain a mileage report.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Plan and conduct a field trip.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Have cooperating teacher evaluate the field trip and include the evaluation form in the notebook.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Prepare two brief reports describing satisfactory occupational experience visits including evaluations of the visits and any suggestions made.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. With assistance of cooperating teacher, select a student for a case study and prepare a three to four page report.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Complete a survey of each student’s reading habits in classes taught.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>169</td>
<td>The student teacher advises the FFA Alumni affiliate as part of the local program of vocational agriculture.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>The student teacher administers and maintains the physical facilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>The student teacher identifies appropriate topics for an adult education program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>The student teacher prepares and conducts group instruction in adult education.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>The student teacher conducts visits concerning individual problems of adults.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>The student teacher conducts activities which aid in developing good school and community relations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>The student teacher can plan and develop a vocational agriculture program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>The student teacher participates in teacher’s meetings and professional conferences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>The student teacher can plan and conduct a summer program of activities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Essential</th>
<th>Desirable</th>
<th>Optional</th>
<th>Not Needed</th>
<th>Accomplished</th>
<th>Partially Accomplished</th>
<th>Not Accomplished</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
11. Review with guidance personnel the reading levels of students in agriculture classes.

12. Determine grade level of reading materials used in supervised study in the agriculture classes.

13. Evaluate the FFA program of activities with the FFA officers.

14. Write a brief description of the chapter noting areas which are strong and weak as suggested by officers.

15. Review the chapter budget, and discuss with the cooperating teacher how finances are handled with the school office.

16. Interview the cooperating teacher, principal, and some adult class members. Prepare a brief report concerning the program of continuing education, the attitudes encountered and issues raised, along with conclusions.

17. Participate in planning and conducting a meeting for adult students and include the agenda or lesson plan in the notebook.

18. Prepare a brief article for the school or local newspaper concerning the student teacher in the vocational agriculture department.

19. Prepare a brief and objective evaluation of student teacher's strengths and limitations as a teacher of vocational agriculture.

20. Prepare a brief and objective evaluation of the cooperative training center with suggestions for improving the student teaching experience in that school.

General comments and suggestions for improving the experiences and assignments for student teaching:

(over)
The following activities have been identified as responsibilities for the university supervisor and cooperating teacher to ensure a successful student teaching experience. Please rate how well the faculty member from the Agricultural Education Department at Ohio State University who supervised your student teaching experience performed the activities listed below. Rate on a scale from "9" indicating Superior to "1" indicating Poor. Comments and suggestions for improving the performance of the university supervisor can be made at the end of the section.

1. Explains the student teaching program to local administration and cooperating teachers, and provides them with necessary materials.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>9</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Superior</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Works cooperatively with school administration, cooperating teacher, and student teacher to provide the best possible student teaching experience.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>9</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Superior</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Visits the cooperative training center early in the quarter.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>9</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Superior</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Reviews with the cooperating teacher and student teacher the plan of activities and responsibilities for the student teaching experience early in the quarter.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>9</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Superior</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Visits the school at least three times during the quarter and observes the student teacher in varying teaching situations (i.e., classroom and laboratory).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>9</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Superior</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. Evaluates each lesson plan before observing the student teacher in varying teaching situations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>9</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Superior</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. Conducts conferences with both cooperating teacher and student teacher to provide encouragement, constructive criticism and recognition of success.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>9</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Superior</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. Conducts conferences where, the student teacher is encouraged to express concerns, anxieties and satisfactions; the university supervisor solicits ideas for self-improvement from the student teacher; and the university supervisor assists the student teacher in suggesting alternative solutions to teaching problems.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>9</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Superior</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

General comments and suggestions for improving the performance of the university supervisor:
now please rate how well your cooperating teacher performed the activities listed below. Circle one number, "9" indicating Superior to "1" indicating Poor. After some of the ratings there are quantitative questions relating to the subject of the rating. Please fill in the blank with your best estimate of the answer. Comments and suggestions for improving the performance of the cooperating teacher can be made at the end of the section.

1. Finds housing for the student teacher.
   - Superior
   - Average
   - Poor

2. Becomes familiar with the background of the student teacher.
   - Superior
   - Average
   - Poor

3. Prepares the class for the arrival of the student teacher.
   - Superior
   - Average
   - Poor

4. Involves the student teacher as part of the faculty.
   - Superior
   - Average
   - Poor

5. Reviews the student and faculty handbooks with the student teacher.
   - Superior
   - Average
   - Poor

6. Oriented the student teacher to the school and community.
   - Superior
   - Average
   - Poor

7. Provides the student teacher with accessibility to instructional materials, an area for work and personal belongings, student records, audio-visual equipment and other resource materials.
   - Superior
   - Average
   - Poor

8. Reviews the plan of activities and responsibilities for student teaching in agricultural education.
   - Superior
   - Average
   - Poor

** How many productive hours were spent with the cooperating teacher during the quarter discussing the assignments for student teaching? ______

9. Has the student teacher plan each unit of instruction at least two weeks prior to actual teaching.
   - Superior
   - Average
   - Poor

10. Critiques each lesson plan prepared by the student teacher prior to the lesson being taught.
    - Superior
    - Average
    - Poor

** What percent of your lesson plans were critiqued either verbally or in writing by the cooperating teacher? ______

11. Provides opportunities for various teaching experiences with some freedom to experiment with teaching strategies.
    - Superior
    - Average
    - Poor

** How many times were you videotaped during student teaching? ______

12. Provides the student teacher the opportunity to assume full teaching responsibilities near the end of the student teaching quarter, according to the student's ability.
    - Superior
    - Average
    - Poor

** What week during the quarter did you assume full teaching responsibilities? ______

13. Demonstrates good teaching techniques.
    - Superior
    - Average
    - Poor

(over)
14. Encourages the student teacher to observe teaching and ask questions.
   9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1
   Superior Average Poor
   ** How many hours did you spend observing the cooperating teacher teaching? _____
   ** What percent of the observations resulted in discussion afterwards? _____

15. Provides the student teacher with an understanding of the extent of teacher authority and responsibilities.
   9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1
   Superior Average Poor

16. Gives the student teacher every possible opportunity to serve as an FFA adviser.
   9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1
   Superior Average Poor

17. Gives the student teacher opportunities to plan and conduct an adult and/or continuing education program.
   9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1
   Superior Average Poor
   ** How many hours of adult and/or continuing education instruction did you teach? _____

   9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1
   Superior Average Poor

19. Evaluates the student teacher's progress and experiences and gives daily feedback.
   9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1
   Superior Average Poor
   ** Of the classes you taught, what percent did the cooperating teacher remain in the classroom and observe? _____

20. Conducts a formal evaluation at the end of the third, sixth and tenth weeks of student teaching where the student teacher can express concerns, anxieties and satisfactions; the cooperating teacher elicits ideas for self-improvement from the student teacher, and then assists the student teacher in suggesting courses of action.
   9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1
   Superior Average Poor
   ** How many evaluations of your teaching (as described in item 20) were conducted by the cooperating teacher other than when the university supervisor was present? _____

21. Is able to evaluate his or her own strengths and weaknesses as a cooperating teacher.
   9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1
   Superior Average Poor

22. Reviews the PRIDE report with the student teacher.
   9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1
   Superior Average Poor

23. Provides an enthusiastic and professional example for the student teacher.
   9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1
   Superior Average Poor

24. Has the high school students' occupational goals summarized for the student teacher and reviewed them with the student teacher.
   9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1
   Superior Average Poor

25. Takes the student teacher on many occupational experience visits during the first three days of the student teaching experience.
   9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1
   Superior Average Poor

26. Identifies the necessary procedures to follow in conducting and supervising an occupational experience program.
   9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1
   Superior Average Poor
   ** How many visits were completed where the cooperating teacher taught you the procedures to follow in conducting an occupational experience program? _____
   ** How many times did the cooperating teacher supervise your ability to conduct occupational experience visits? _____

(over)
27. Does not expect the student teacher to teach exactly as the cooperating teacher does and tries not to let biases show and influence the student teacher.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Superior</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>Poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

General comments and suggestions for improving the performance of the cooperating teacher:

Name ___________________________  Student teaching location _________________________
Telephone number __________________________  Name of cooperating teacher _________________________
Did you teach after graduation? __________________________  Name of university supervisor _________________________
Current Occupation __________________________  Quarter and year of student teaching _________________________
APPENDIX F

FACE TO FACE INTERVIEW SCHEDULE FOR UNIVERSITY SUPERVISORS
TELEPHONE SURVEY
University Supervisors

Hello. Is this ____________________________?

This is Jill Pfister from the Agricultural Education Department at The Ohio State University. Recently you completed a questionnaire evaluating the student teaching program in Agricultural Education regarding the experiences and assignments during student teaching and the performance of cooperating teachers. I am calling you to probe deeper into your responses to the questionnaire so that I may gain a set of strengths and weaknesses and a procedure for improving the student teaching program.

This interview should take about a half hour. Is this an appropriate time or should we make plans for another more convenient time?

I would like you to think back to the questionnaire if you will. You were asked to rate the need of a set of experiences and assignments in preparing a prospective teacher for successful teaching in vocational agriculture and then you were asked to indicate the extent to which the experiences and assignments are being accomplished.

Let's start with the experiences. As a group, the university supervisors identified 10 experiences as essential, 12 experiences as desirable and one experience as optional. None were identified as not needed. All of the experiences identified as essential were rated as satisfactorily accomplished except three. I would like to discuss these three experiences with you to probe deeper into your feelings.

Advises the FFA was rated as essential but as partially accomplished.

1. Can you think of any reasons for this?

2. How can we be sure that advising the FFA can be at least satisfactorily accomplished?

The university supervisor group also identified teaches students to use, summarize, and analyze the record books of SOEP as essential but only partially accomplished.

1. Why?

2. What can we do to improve the situation?
The last experience identified as essential but only partially accomplished is the student teacher can plan and conduct a summer program of activities.

1. Why is this only partially accomplished?

2. How can we be sure all students accomplish this and do it at least satisfactorily?

It seems that all three groups rated experiences involving adult education and SOEP as low desirable or optional in a few cases. Also, these experiences were only partially accomplished.

1. Is adult education an important part of vocational agriculture?

2. Is SOEP an important part of vocational agriculture?

3. Are we just giving lip service to these two areas or should prospective teachers really have experiences in these areas?

4. How can we improve these two areas to be sure experiences are available
   A. Adult education
   B. SOEP

Now let's look at the assignments during student teaching. Only one assignment was rated as essential and that was the assignment where the student teachers complete a self-evaluation. All the rest of the assignments were rated as desirable by the university supervisor group.

1. Does this mean that student teachers should not be expected to do assignments as they have in the past?

2. If so, how can we be sure the student teachers experience what they are suppose to experience?

3. Do you get any feedback on the assignments from cooperating teachers or student teachers?
Three of the assignments were identified as partially accomplished and one was identified as not accomplished. Let's talk about the one that was identified as not accomplished first. The assignment was have cooperating teacher evaluate each lesson plan using the lesson plan check sheet.

1. Why do you think this was rated as not being accomplished by the university supervisors?

2. Is this an appropriate assignment for student teaching?

3. Should the lesson plan check sheet be improved?

4. How can we be sure the cooperating teacher does this?

Two of the three assignments being partially accomplished dealt with adult education and we discussed this previously.

1. Do you have anything else to add about adult education?

The other assignment that was rated as desirable but partially accomplished was determining the grade level of reading material used in the agriculture classes.

1. Why do you think this is only partially accomplished?

In the last section of the questionnaire you were asked to evaluate the performance of the cooperating teacher on a set of activities. For 19 of the 30 activities the university supervisor group rated the cooperating teacher above average. For 8 of the activities the cooperating teacher was rated average and below average in 3 activities. The three activities where the university supervisors rated the cooperating teachers below average were:

- critiques each lesson plan prior to it being taught
- has student teacher plan each unit of instruction at least to weeks prior to actual teaching
- gives student teacher opportunity to plan and conduct adult education and/or continuing education program
1. Are these activities realistic expectations of the cooperating teacher?

2. If not why?

3. Does the cooperating teacher know how to effectively critique?

For your information these same three activities were rated as average by the student teaching group but they were a low average. The student teachers did not rate any of the activities below average and these three activities were at the bottom of their ratings.

1. How can we be sure the cooperating teacher critiques each lesson plan prior to it being taught?

2. How can we be sure the cooperating teacher has student teacher plan each unit of instruction two weeks prior to it being taught?

3. How can we be sure the student teacher is given the opportunity to plan and conduct adult education and/or continuing education program?

Now that you have done some thinking about student teaching could you please list for me 5 strengths of the student teaching program?

1. 

2. 

3. 

4. 

5. 

Now how about 5 weaknesses that definitely need improving and suggestions on how we could improve them?

1. 
IF UNIVERSITY SUPERVISORS DID NOT SPEAK TO ISSUE OF TRAINING COOPERATING TEACHERS THEN TALK ABOUT IT NOW!

This is the conclusion of the interview. Can you think of anything to add which I have not covered which may be used to improve the student teaching program?

Thank you very much for your time and concern.
APPENDIX G

TELEPHONE INTERVIEW SCHEDULE FOR COOPERATING TEACHERS
Hello. Is this _______________________?

This is Jill Pfister from the Agricultural Education Department at The Ohio State University. Recently you completed a questionnaire evaluating the student teaching program in Agricultural Education regarding the experiences and assignments during student teaching and the performance of university supervisors. I am calling you to probe deeper into your responses to the questionnaire so that I may gain a set of strengths and weaknesses and a procedure for improving the student teaching program.

This interview should take about a half hour. Is this an appropriate time or should we make plans for another more convenient time?

I would like you to think back to the questionnaire if you will. You were asked to rate the need of a set of experiences and assignments in preparing a prospective teacher for successful teaching in vocational agriculture and then you were asked to indicate the extent to which the experiences and assignments are being accomplished.

Let's start with the experiences. As a group, the cooperating teachers rated 10 experiences as essential, 11 experiences as desirable and 2 as optional. All 10 of the essential experiences were rated as satisfactorily accomplished. Not so with the desirable experiences. Let's look at some of the experiences that were rated desirable and partially accomplished.

Experiences involving SOEP which includes planning and supervision, use of long time goals and record books.

1. Is this an integral part of vocational agriculture?

2. Should we be sure our students are experiencing this?

3. Are we paying lip service to SOEP and saying it is important but doing nothing to show it?

4. How can we be sure they get experiences in SOEP?

Experiences in adult education
1. Is this an integral part of vocational agriculture?

2. Should we be sure our students are experiencing this?

3. Are we just giving lip service to adult education and saying it is important but doing nothing about it?

4. How can we be sure they do?

Can plan and develop a summer program of activities?

1. How can we be sure all students accomplish this and do it at least satisfactorily?

There were a few discrepancies between the way your group rated some of the experiences and the way the university supervisors rated the experiences. Both groups felt experiences with record books are essential. But, your group felt this was being satisfactorily accomplished while the university supervisors felt this was being partially accomplished.

1. Why is this inconsistency occurring?

2. Can and do student teachers assist students with their record books?

University supervisors rated opportunities to advise the FFA as essential. Cooperating teachers rated this as desirable.

1. Is FFA an integral part of vocational agriculture?

2. Why do cooperating teachers see this as a desirable experience instead of an essential experience?

University supervisors rated planning and conducting a summer program as essential and partially accomplished while your group rated it desirable and partially accomplished.

1. Why do you think it was rated desirable and not essential?

Now let's look at the assignments during student teaching. Only one assignment was rated as being essential by the
cooperating teachers and that was planning and conducting a **field trip**.

1. Can you think of any reasons why this was rated as **essential**?

By the way, it was the only assignment that was rated as accomplished **well**. All other assignments were rated as desirable by the cooperating teacher.

1. Does this mean that student teachers should not be expected to do assignments as they have in the past?

2. If so, how can we be sure the student teachers experience what they are suppose to experience?

3. Do you get any feedback on the assignments from the student teachers?

Four assignments were rated as partially accomplished. Three of these assignments dealt with reading levels of students. These three assignments are new to student teaching in the last year and that could be why they were rated low. The three assignments were:

- complete a reading survey of all students reading habits
- review reading levels of students in agriculture classes with high school guidance personnel
- determine grade level of reading materials used in agriculture classes

1. Do you feel these are appropriate assignments for student teaching?

The university supervisor group rated the experience have the cooperating teacher evaluate each lesson plan using the lesson plan check sheet as not occurring.

1. Can you think of any reasons why university supervisors feel this way?

2. Is this an appropriate assignment for student teaching?

3. Should the lesson plan check sheet be improved?

4. How can we be sure that you do this?
In the last section of the questionnaire you were asked to evaluate the performance of the university supervisor on a set of 12 activities. Your group rated the university supervisors superior in conducting formal conferences. The other eleven activities were rated above average by your group. Even though they are rated above average I would like to discuss the lowest activity. The lowest activity was serving as a resource person for the cooperating teacher. Examples of this would be securing current reference materials, explaining new methods and techniques for teaching and evaluation with you and sharing evaluation techniques for student teachers with you.

1. What do you expect from the university supervisor in this area?

2. How can university supervisors meet your needs better?

Now that you have done some thinking about student teaching could you please list for me 5 strengths of the student teaching program?

1.

2.

3.

4.

5.

Now how about 5 weaknesses that definitely need improving and suggestions on how we could improve them?

1.
3.

4.

5.

IF COOPERATING TEACHER DID NOT SPEAK TO ISSUE OF TRAINING COOPERATING TEACHERS THEN TALK ABOUT IT NOW!

This is the conclusion of the interview. Can you think of anything to add which I have not covered which may be used to improve the student teaching program?

Thank you very much for your time and concern.
APPENDIX H

TELEPHONE INTERVIEW SCHEDULE FOR STUDENT TEACHERS
Hello. Is this __________________________ ?

This is Jill Pfister from the Agricultural Education Department at The Ohio State University. Recently you completed a questionnaire evaluating the student teaching program in Agricultural Education regarding the experiences and assignments during student teaching and the performance of university supervisors and cooperating teachers. I am calling you to probe deeper into your responses to the questionnaire so that I may gain a set of strengths and weaknesses and a procedure for improving the student teaching program.

This interview should take about a half hour. Is this an appropriate time or should we make plans for another more convenient time?

I would like you to think back to the questionnaire if you will. You were asked to rate the need of a set of experiences and assignments in preparing a prospective teacher for successful teaching in vocational agriculture and then you were asked to indicate the extent to which the experiences and assignments are being accomplished.

Let's start with the experiences. As a group, the student teachers identified 7 experiences as essential, 11 experiences as desirable and two experiences as optional. All seven of the experiences identified as essential were also identified as being satisfactorily accomplished. Not so with the desirable experiences. Some of those are partially accomplished. Let's look at these experiences to probe deeper into your feelings.

Experiences involving SOEP which include planning and supervision, use of long time goals and record books.

1. Is SOEP an integral part of vocational agriculture?

2. Should we be sure our students are experiencing this?

3. How can we be sure they do?

Experiences in adult education.

1. Is adult education an integral part of vocational agriculture?
2. Should we be sure our students are experiencing this?

3. How can we be sure they do?

There were a few discrepancies between the way each of the three groups rated some of these experiences. Let's look at a few of these. Both cooperating teachers and university supervisors felt being able to use record books was an essential experience. Student teachers felt this was desirable.

1. Why is this inconsistency occurring?

2. Did you feel you could teach how to use, analyze and summarize record books to students as a result of student teaching?

University supervisors rated advising FFA as an essential experience while student teachers and cooperating teachers rated it desirable.

1. Is FFA an integral part of vocational agriculture?

2. Why this difference between groups?

Using instructional media and resource materials was considered an essential part of student teaching by university supervisors and cooperating teachers. Student teachers felt it was desirable.

1. Why this difference?

Can plan and conduct a summer program of activities was identified as essential by university supervisors but desirable by cooperating teachers and student teachers.

1. Why this difference?

Now let's look at the assignments during student teaching. All assignments were rated as desirable by student teachers. None were essential.

1. Does this mean that student teachers should not be expected to do assignments as in the past?
2. If so, how can we be sure the student teachers experience what they are suppose to experience?

3. How do you feel about the assignments?

Three assignments were rated as partially accomplished. The three assignments were:
- review with guidance personnel the reading levels of students in agriculture classes
- prepare a brief report after interviewing suggested persons concerning the adult and continuing education program
- participate in planning and conducting a meeting for adult students

1. Do you feel these are appropriate assignments for student teaching?

2. If so, how can we be sure it occurs?

Another assignment, having cooperating teacher evaluate each lesson plan using the lesson plan check sheet, was rated as not accomplished by the university supervisor group. Your group perceived it as being satisfactorily accomplished.

1. Can you think of any reasons why the university supervisors perceive it like this?

2. Is this an appropriate assignment for student teaching?

3. Should the lesson plan check sheet be improved?

4. How can we be sure the cooperating teacher does this?

In the last section of the questionnaire you were asked to evaluate the performance of both the university supervisor and the cooperating teacher on a set of activities. Let's begin with the university supervisor. As a group, university supervisors were rated above average on all activities but one. The one activity, evaluates each lesson plan before observing the student teacher teach was rated as average.

1. Why do you think this was rated as average?
2. Is this an appropriate activity for the university supervisor?

The cooperating teacher rated the university supervisors performance as superior in conducting formal conferences.

1. Do you agree with this?

Now for your evaluation of the performance of the cooperating teacher. One activity was rated as superior. That activity was providing you the opportunity to assume full teaching responsibilities near the end of the quarter. Twenty activities were rated above average and six were rated average. Let's look at the six activities that were rated as average and see how we can improve them because these same six activities were rated average or below average by the university supervisors.

Has high school students occupational goals summarized for student teacher and reviews them with student teacher and takes student teacher on many occupational experience visits.

1. Are these appropriate expectations of the cooperating teacher?

2. Are we as a profession just paying lip service to SOEP and not really doing it?

3. Should student teachers have opportunity to take an undergraduate course on SOEP and record books?

4. Do cooperating teachers believe SOEP is important?

Critiques each lesson plan prepared by student teacher prior to lesson being taught and has student teacher plan each unit of instruction at least two weeks prior to actual teaching.

1. Are these appropriate expectations?

2. Why are they not being done better?

3. Do cooperating teachers know how to critique student teachers effectively?
4. How can this be improved?

Gives student teacher the opportunity to plan and conduct an adult and/or continuing education program.
1. Is this an appropriate expectation of the cooperating teacher?

2. Are we just paying lip service to adult education and not really doing it?

3. Should students have opportunity to take a undergraduate course in adult education?

4. Do cooperating teachers believe adult education is important?

Now that you have done some thinking about student teaching could you please list for me 5 strengths of the student teaching program?

1. 

2. 

3. 

4. 

5. 

Now how about 5 weaknesses that definitely need improving and suggestions on how we could improve them?

1. 

2. 

3. 
4.

5.

IF THE STUDENT TEACHER DID NOT SPEAK TO THE ISSUE OF TRAINING COOPERATING TEACHERS THEN TALK ABOUT IT NOW!

This is the conclusion of the interview. Can you think of anything to add which I have not covered which may be used to improve the student teaching program?

Thank you very much for your time and concern.
APPENDIX I

SUMMARY OF RESPONSES TO INTERVIEWS
EXPERIENCES IN FFA AS PERCEIVED BY UNIVERSITY SUPERVISORS

Advises the FFA was rated essential but partially accomplished by university supervisors

1. Can you think of any reasons why it was rated this way?

Cooperating teacher reluctant to turn over much responsibility, hard for student teacher to come in and do a good job in ten weeks, joint vocational school a problem for getting experiences
Timing, student teacher does not get overview of program of activities, FFA is sacred and cooperating teachers may not be willing to give it up
Seasonal, do not get good experiences because the activities at the schools are not good
There are no real assignments to address this issue so we really can not be sure of what is occurring
Joint vocational schools are doing almost nothing with FFA
Cooperating teachers find it easier to do themselves so they neglect chance to give student teacher the opportunity to advise FFA

2. How can we be sure that this is at least satisfactorily accomplished?

Emphasize to the cooperating teacher that activities and committees of the FFA must be given to the student teacher
Better preparation in FFA during preservice program
Selection of cooperating teacher is questionable, offer undergraduate course in FFA (not required)
Demand that student teachers get these experiences (3)
EXPERIENCES IN FFA AS PERCEIVED BY COOPERATING TEACHER AND STUDENT TEACHERS

Advises the FFA was rated essential by university supervisors and desirable by cooperating teachers and student teachers.

1. Is FFA an integral part of vocational agriculture?

**Cooperating Teachers**

Yes, it is integral (6)
As a motivational tool, yes
Somewhat (2)

**Student Teachers**

Yes (4)
Extremely essential, can not have one without the other
Yes, but a desirable experience during student teaching, not essential (3)

2. Why this difference in rating between groups?

**Cooperating teachers**

Because it is difficult for the cooperating teacher to be sure the student teacher synthesizes what FFA is and does.
If student teacher has FFA background the cooperating teacher may tend to emphasize other areas.
It is a good motivational tool but classroom teaching is much more important. Student should be getting FFA experience only if there is time.
Only if there is time should this occur.
Difficult to give the reign to student teachers.
Yes it is important but, it is second fiddle to classroom teaching.
I do not agree at all with this finding, there should be no inconsistency.
Priority is classroom teaching.
I do not know why this inconsistency, student should advise something but not whole thing.
Student Teachers

University supervisor can see overall value the FFA has for the local department
Cooperating teacher not ready to turn much responsibility over to the student teacher (2)
Student teacher there too short a time, if a good FFA program cooperating teacher will not give it up
University supervisor more experienced and knows purposes and benefits of the FFA
University supervisors see it as more important
I do not know why there is this inconsistency
Students do not see a need for the FFA
Student teachers do not see how it can help teaching as much as the university supervisors do
Teaches students to use, summarize and analyze the record books of supervised occupational experience programs was rated as essential but, only partially accomplished by university supervisors.

1. Why do you think this was rated this way?

Nothing going on in the high schools regarding record books
It is an add on, we at the university do not pay enough attention to it so neither do cooperating teachers and student teachers
It is too seasonal (2)
Cooperating teachers are not putting enough emphasis on supervised occupational experience programs and visits
Student teachers are not prepared, they get no background in record books here and during fall quarter student teaching they get nothing in the schools

2. How can we be sure this is at least satisfactorily accomplished?

More time spent in the classroom here with record books
We need to communicate the need, purpose and procedures of record books better to student teachers and cooperating teachers
Better formal undergraduate training (3)
Demand that it be done, better undergraduate training
EXPERIENCES IN RECORD BOOK AS PERCEIVED
BY COOPERATING TEACHERS

Teaches students to use, summarize and analyze record books of supervised occupational experience programs was rated essential by university supervisors and cooperating teachers, but cooperating teachers rated it satisfactorily accomplished while university supervisors rated it partially accomplished.

1. Why this inconsistency?

University supervisors put greater emphasis on record books and how they are filled out than cooperating teachers do.

Maybe cooperating teacher takes for granted that student teacher knows how to use record books.

Record books and supervised occupational experience programs are different now and university supervisors have production agriculture background. The use of record books is completely different in non-production areas.

It is something cooperating teachers do when they have time rather than a priority.

Cooperating teachers do not see the importance like university supervisors do.

Cooperating teacher not doing a good job with them, but also cooperating teachers have an entirely different idea of what record books are and should be.

Timing of the year.

Cooperating teacher feels teaching in classroom and laboratory is more important.

2. Can and do student teachers assist students with their record books?

Depends on the background of the student teacher. If no vocational agriculture background they have no idea where to start (2).

Depends on the quarter whether they are able to assist students.

Not enough (3).

Not as well as they should (2).

Not really.
Both cooperating teachers and university supervisors rated the use of record books as an essential experience, but student teachers felt it was desirable.

1. Why this inconsistency?

Record books are a new experience to student teachers, they have no background in it (2)
Was not important at college, no training (2)
Not stressed at university, students must be pushed to work with record books (2)
Not stressed at university, we do not know about it until we get into a school
Student teachers have bad feelings toward record books, they tend to be confusing

2. Did you feel you could teach students how to use, summarize and analyze record books?

Not really (3)
Those with a good vocational agriculture background could, but those with no background could not
Yes, I had the background in vocational agriculture (3)
No
EXPERIENCES IN SUMMER PROGRAMS AS PERCEIVED BY UNIVERSITY SUPERVISORS

Student teacher can plan and conduct a summer program of activities was rated essential but partially accomplished by university supervisors.

1. Can you give any reasons why?

Students do not get any experiences with it
Seasonal, we do not do anything with it and neither does cooperating teacher
All that is done is reviewing one, there is no way to get experience in summer programs without being in the school during the summer
Timing of student teaching
Timing of student teaching and many cooperating teachers do not do a summer program of activities

2. How can we be sure this is at least satisfactorily accomplished?

Be sure student teachers know what it is and what it is for (2)
More emphasis (2)
Nothing really can be done, they will learn on the job (2)
EXPERIENCES USING INSTRUCTIONAL MEDIA AS PERCEIVED
BY STUDENT TEACHERS

Using instructional media and resource materials was rated essential by university supervisors and cooperating teachers but desirable by student teachers.

1. Why this difference in rating?

I do not know (2)
Student teachers feel they have competency already
Student teachers do not know what is at the school and do not have time to dig it out (4)
I did not use the resources to the extent I should because I used the material I had from previous undergraduate courses. It was too much hassle and took too much time to plan ahead for equipment.
EXPERIENCES IN ADULT EDUCATION AS PERCEIVED UNIVERSITY SUPERVISORS, COOPERATING TEACHERS AND STUDENT TEACHERS

All three groups rated experiences in adult education as desirable or optional and partially accomplished

1. Is adult education an integral part of vocational agriculture?

University Supervisors

If in a taxonomy area at a joint vocational school, no it is not important. If just a booking agent then experiences in adult education are not needed. Important but not essential; tough to mandate in some schools

Yes, in the past I would have said no, but with secondary students decreasing focus must be put on adult education

Yes, and even more so with numbers in secondary schools decreasing; should not have an agriculture program without an adult program because: 1) keeps teacher up to date, 2) recruitment tool, 3) adults need help

Important, but farther down on priority list because no one emphasizes it including superintendents

Important, but we have been saying vocational agriculture teacher is overburdened so here is the area that could be deleted

Cooperating Teachers

Only in the sense of a coordinator of adult education

Generally speaking adult education is desirable, but not essential (4)

Yes (4)

Student Teachers

No (2)

Yes (3)

Important but not essential (2)

Can be a valuable experience
2. Are we just giving lip service to adult education or should prospective teachers really have experiences in this area?

**University Supervisors**

If we are going to teach adult education then the department needs to do something about it. If we just assist with planning then it should be least on our priority list.

Yes, emphasis must be increased because of decreasing number of secondary students (2)

In too many cases we are just paying lip service (2)

Yes, we are talking out both sides of our mouths

**Cooperating Teachers**

In too many cases yes, timing for adult education experiences is crucial (3)

Student teachers should have experiences if available, but not essential (2)

Yes, students do not see it as a vital part of the program

Student teachers should have access to an adult education program

Yes, some students need it others do not

Yes, students should experience it as a coordinator

**Student Teachers**

Students should have experience if there is an adult education program

Yes (4)

Students should be exposed

Desirable but not essential (3)

No not a priority, depends on importance

3. How can we be sure experiences are available in adult education?

**University Supervisors**

Preservice course work, maybe a course that is part adult education (2)

We can not be sure as it stands now (4)

**Cooperating Teachers**

Additional experience before student teaching (2)

Have student teacher go to another school if their school does not offer adult education

Emphasize importance in preservice course work (2)
Additional course work
We need to educate superintendents, cooperating teachers and student teachers but, our hole is probably dug too deep already

**Student Teachers**

Have experience before student teaching, do at university (5)
Hold special meetings if need be (2)

4. Do cooperating teachers feel adult education is important?

**Student Teachers**

No (4)
Majority do (4)
EXPERIENCES IN SUPERVISED OCCUPATIONAL EXPERIENCE PROGRAMS
AS PERCEIVED BY UNIVERSITY SUPERVISORS, COOPERATING
TEACHERS AND STUDENT TEACHERS

All three groups rated experiences in supervised occupational experience programs as desirable and partially accomplished.

1. Are supervised occupational experience programs an integral part of vocational agriculture?

University Supervisors

Yes, we need a great deal of emphasis for our programs to be vocational
Yes it is important; we are hurting because that is what makes us vocational
Yes, it is the core of the program (4)

Cooperating Teachers

Yes, skills are needed by the prospective teacher when he or she starts teaching
Definately
Yes, but the philosophy has changed since inception
Yes, but teachers do not enjoy doing it because of the time, number of diversified projects and it is hard to teach to all students (2)
Yes (2)
Of course it is
Yes, but we must emphasize students goals

Student Teachers

Yes, but it is not emphasized by the university so why should we emphasize it during student teaching (3)
Yes, it is the core of the program
Yes (5)
Definitely

2. Are we just giving lip service to this area or should prospective teachers have experiences in supervised occupational experience programs?

University Supervisors

Yes, students do not know how to visit and do not get any course work explaining how to in any detail
Yes, it is just an after thought; better if we spent more time on FFA, supervised occupational experience and record books than program planning (2)
Yes, must be emphasized in preservice training (3)

Cooperating Teachers

Yes, student teachers should be experiencing this especially those with no vocational agriculture background (2)
Yes, but winter quarter bad quarter to get experience (2)
Yes, student's attitude toward supervised occupational experience is bad - do not know importance (2)
Yes, but students should not visit just to visit, builds poor attitude
Yes, students should get experiences
Students should have experience, but classroom teaching a priority

Student Teachers

Yes, it is not emphasized by the university (3)
Maybe we are (2)
Sometimes (3)

3. How can we be sure experiences are available?

University Supervisors

It is the responsibility of the cooperating teacher to show student teacher how to visit and cooperating teacher is not doing this, we must clearly communicate this as an expectation of cooperating teacher (2)
Everything that is taught in preservice program and during student teaching should be around the supervised experience program
Additional preservice course work (4)

Cooperating Teachers

Additional experiences before student teaching (3)
Have students prepared to make visits better, especially employer visits
New record books and good inservice program will help (2)
Training not good, students need attitude that this is important and this attitude is built at university, additional course work
Schools should only be selected as a training center if have good FFA and supervised occupational experience program (2)

Student Teachers
Additional experiences before student teaching (3)
Must require it of the cooperative training center (2)
Discuss importance with cooperating teacher and
additional course work
Enforce with cooperating teacher, student teacher will
not approach cooperating teacher to go on visits (2)
ASSIGNMENTS AS PERCEIVED BY UNIVERSITY SUPERVISORS
COOPERATING TEACHERS AND STUDENT TEACHERS

All assignments were rated as desirable by all three groups except two.

1. Does this mean that student teachers should not be expected to do assignments as they have in the past?

**University Supervisors**

No, assignments should enhance the experiences and are essential
No (2)
Many of the assignments are perceived as busy work by student teachers and cooperating teachers (2)
If we do not use them, why make student teachers do them. Many cooperating teachers do not pay attention to assignments.
No, need structure, but assignments are inadequate

**Cooperating Teachers**

No, but need better communication on purpose of assignments and more feedback on assignments
No, it is sufficient to say desirable means important (2)
No (2)
No, but university supervisors do not pay close enough attention to assignments
Many are busy work (2)
Some may feel assignments are not worthwhile, they need to be looked at

**Student Teachers**

No
No, but some of them were a waste of time. Should have some assignments, but more related and realistic. Give cooperating teacher authority to determine if experiences are being accomplished
No, but re-evaluate assignments (3)
Busy work when I started, but as I did them I saw the need
No, but give feedback. If no feedback a waste of time.
No, assignments add structure, but maybe checklist would suffice. Just doing it for report sake is not good. More feedback is needed
READING ASSIGNMENTS AS PERCEIVED BY COOPERATING TEACHERS
AND STUDENT TEACHERS

The three assignments regarding reading in the high school were rated as partially accomplished by cooperating teachers and student teachers.

1. Are these appropriate assignments?

**Cooperating Teachers**

- Yes, but not high on priority list (4)
- Yes, a real eye opener, benefits cooperating teacher because would not ordinarily look at reading levels of students
- Yes (4)

**Student Teachers**

- Some are, reading habit survey of no value (2)
- Yes (2)
- Reading assignments not realistic
- No, not really sure of purpose
- Guidance one good, value of survey questionable
- Most current reference materials have been evaluated for reading level so not really realistic
FIELD TRIP ASSIGNMENT AS PERCEIVED BY COOPERATING TEACHERS

Planning and conducting a field trip was rated as essential by cooperating teachers.

1. Why?

Because of the amount of work done outside of class, many procedural things a teacher needs to know (3)
It reflects the school
Motivation tool, adds interest
No reasons
Not as simple as some people think, part of vocational agriculture where students get hands-on experiences
Many things can go wrong and you are out in the public
I see other assignments as more important
COOPERATING TEACHER EVALUATES EACH LESSON PLAN AS PERCEIVED BY UNIVERSITY SUPERVISORS, COOPERATING TEACHERS AND STUDENT TEACHERS

The assignment have the cooperating teacher evaluate each lesson plan using the lesson plan check sheet was rated as not accomplished by the university supervisors.

1. Why do you think it was rated this way

University supervisors

Have trouble getting cooperating teacher to look at lesson plans because they do not feel competent in evaluating lesson plans
Cooperating teacher sees it as busy work, he or she looks to see if it is logical and gets to the point but does not use the lesson plan check sheet
Does not fit mode of thinking, looks for layout and motivation
Takes too much time
Time, attitude of cooperating teacher and quality of lesson plans; cooperating teacher not looking for same things
Too many other things to do so do not take the time

Cooperating Teachers

It is true, the time element, I really work close the first couple of weeks (2)
I would rather see student attempt lesson, then if it does not work out I have more to stand on - critique after is more important
If student teacher is doing well, this evaluation usually does not happen
Hard to evaluate because student teacher may teach lesson completely different than cooperating teacher
It is not being done, student teacher not asking for it
It only occurs if student teacher says it needs to
I look at lesson plan and feel a majority do (2)

Student Teachers

It was done for me (2)
Because they are not doing it (3)
Cooperating teacher did not think it was important
Not enough time to be done (2)

2. Is this an appropriate assignment for student teaching?

University Supervisors
Yes
Maybe really busy work for cooperating teacher
Yes, enlightens cooperating teacher as to what university wants in a lesson plan (2)
Yes, at least for the first half of the quarter (2)

Cooperating Teachers

Yes, in the beginning but not all the time
Yes (5)
Better to critique afterward (2)
Yes, in the beginning

Student Teachers

Yes, as long as student teacher and cooperating teacher are on the same wavelength
No
Yes
Yes, feedback is essential
Yes, definitely (2)
Not as important as critique after teaching (2)

3. Should the lesson plan check sheet be improved?

University Supervisors

No (4)
Possibly too much detail
Make simpler (objectives, motivation, items to teach, summary and evaluation)

Cooperating Teachers

Could be less detailed (3)
Too detailed, do not pay much attention to it
No (2)
Do not know (3)

Student Teachers

No (5)
Busy work (2)
Clearer in definition (1)

4. How can we be sure the cooperating teacher does this?

University Supervisors

Emphasizes importance of critiquing with cooperating teacher (3)
Emphasize the expectations of cooperating teacher with cooperating teacher
Demand it (2)

Cooperating Teachers

Emphasize importance, really did not realize it was that important (4)
University supervisor must enforce that it be done
Explain what a lesson plan should be
I do it (3)

Student Teachers

Be sure cooperating teacher knows how to critique (3)
It is an expectation of cooperating teacher (2)
Demand it (2)
Spell it out to cooperating teacher
PERFORMANCE OF COOPERATING TEACHER AS PERCEIVED BY UNIVERSITY SUPERVISORS

Three activities of the cooperating teacher were rated below average:
- critiques each lesson plan prior to it being taught
- has student teacher plan each unit of instruction at least two weeks prior to actual teaching
- gives student teacher opportunity to plan and conduct adult and/or continuing education program

1. Are these activities appropriate expectations of the cooperating teacher, if not why?

   Two weeks before teaching is unrealistic, should be 3-4 days prior to teaching and then cooperating teacher can evaluate so student teacher has time to change plan (6)
   We have not demanded adult education so why should student teacher be required to do it

2. Does cooperating teacher know how to effectively evaluate?

   No (3)
   Yes
   In their own mind yes, they look at things they want to see taught but not style and theory
   I do not think they do

3. How can we be sure these activities occur?

   Clear communication of expectations of cooperating teachers, be sure they read the handbook (2)
   Visit the first week and sit down with cooperating teacher and student teacher and go over all expectations, assignments and experiences (2)
   Demand it (2)
PERFORMANCE OF COOPERATING TEACHER AS PERCEIVED BY STUDENT TEACHERS

Has the high school students' occupational goals summarized for student teacher and reviews them with student teacher and takes student teacher on many occupational experience visits were rated as average.

1. Are these appropriate expectations of the cooperating teacher?

   Yes (5)
   Yes, but having goals of students summarized and in writing may be unrealistic
   Yes, has the students' goals summarized was not completed
   Yes, push the issue of occupational experiences

2. Should students have the opportunity for an undergraduate course on supervised occupational experience programs and record books?

   Yes, but not necessarily a full quarter (2)
   Yes (2)
   Can not really learn what is needed in a class
   Not really (2)
   Yes, possibly have a course with all weak areas (adult education, supervised occupational experience programs, record books and FFA

3. Do cooperating teachers believe supervised occupational experience programs are important?

   Some (3)
   75% do
   I do not know, mine felt it was important
   Yes (2)
   Most
PERFORMANCE OF COOPERATING TEACHER AS PERCEIVED BY STUDENT TEACHERS

Critiques each lesson plan prepared by student teacher prior to lesson being taught and has student teacher plan each unit of instruction at least two weeks prior to actual teaching were rated as average.

1. Are these appropriate expectations of the cooperating teacher?

   Yes, but two weeks ahead of time is unrealistic, should be two or three days with a critique at least a day prior to teaching
   Yes, for at least the first major lesson, then freedom to experiment should be given
   Yes, but two weeks is unrealistic (3)
   Yes (3)

2. Why are these not being done better?

   Time (2)
   Time and lessons have already been graded at the university
   Had to make time to do it, may not want to be bothered (2)
   Time consuming, cooperating teacher not willing to give criticism
   Cooperating teacher did it (2)

3. Do cooperating teachers know how to critique student teachers effectively?

   Majority do, the new cooperating teacher may need better skills
   Yes (3)
   In their own eyes, but inconsistent with university's eyes (3)
   I do not really know
PERFORMANCE OF COOPERATING TEACHER AS PERCEIVED BY STUDENT TEACHERS

Gives student teacher the opportunity to plan and conduct an adult and/or continuing education program was rated as average.

1. Is this an appropriate expectation of the cooperating teacher?
   
   Yes (2)
   Yes, but sometimes all the cooperating teacher does is arrange for the resource person
   Yes, we must push more
   Yes, but not essential (2)
   Yes, but not always possible (2)

2. Should student teacher have the opportunity to take an undergraduate course in adult education?
   
   Yes (5)
   Yes, if we will be teaching in a high school vocational agriculture program
   Yes, but not a full quarter (2)

3. Do cooperating teachers believe adult education is important?
   
   Some (6)
   Not always
   Majority
PERFORMANCE OF UNIVERSITY SUPERVISOR AS PERCEIVED BY COOPERATING TEACHER

Even though the university supervisor was rated above average as a resource person for the cooperating teacher it was the lowest of the activities.

1. What do cooperating teachers expect from the university supervisor?

   Keeping me up to date on what is expected during student teaching and feedback on my performance (2)
   Help me improve the department by seeing weaknesses
   Get out in the schools for a quarter to see what really goes on (3)
   Cooperative effort in critiquing student teacher
   Nothing more than they do
   Look at what university supervisor sees with an open mind, one on one with student teacher, and feedback regarding the job I am doing as cooperating teacher

2. How can university supervisor be of better service to the cooperating teacher?

   They are doing a very good job (3)
   One day workshop on things we should be looking for, ideas and suggestions for role as cooperating teacher
   Do it excellently
   Can not think of anything off hand
   Get out into the schools and teach (2)
PERFORMANCE OF UNIVERSITY SUPERVISOR AS PERCEIVED BY
STUDENT TEACHER

University supervisor evaluates each lesson plan before 
observing the student teacher teach was rated as average by 
student teacher.

1. Why was this rated average?
   Because it really was not being done
   Because it was not done in my case, university supervisor did not pay attention to it
   Never really went over it
   Was not looked at
   University supervisor did critique my lesson plan (3)
   University supervisor usually came in the middle of a lesson and it was not appropriate to look then

2. Is this an appropriate activity for the university supervisor?
   If timing is good yes
   Not as important as the conference after teaching (2)
   Yes (4)
   Depends when they come
STRENGTHS OF THE STUDENT TEACHING PROGRAM

University Supervisors

We have generally strong cooperating teachers, we have an established checklist of expected experiences, generally the same university supervisor works with the same cooperating teachers and the AGREDUC 530 - student teaching link is excellent.

Student teachers are adequately prepared to teach in the classroom, it is a whole quarter long, structure is there for student teaching to be highly organized and AGREDUC 530 - student teaching link is good.

Full quarter is spent student teaching, AGREDUC 530 - student teaching link excellent, good set of cooperating teachers for classroom teaching, student teacher - university supervisor ratio good, we select our own sites (but this could get cleaned up) and it has worked.

Operates according to guidelines and standards for certification, very selective according to which schools and teachers are utilized, a full quarter in length, has handbook describing duties and expectations of all three components and student teachers are placed two quarters ahead of time.

Out in community whole quarter, total system of selecting cooperating teachers is sound, training of cooperating teacher and seminars are a good chance for student teachers to see how others are doing.

Full quarter of teaching, varied experiences, and AGREDUC 530 - student teaching link is good.

Cooperating Teachers

Visits from university supervisor excellent, structure for experiences and assignments, student teacher knows exactly what is expected of him or her and students know how to use resources and instructional media in lesson plans.

Students exposed to a lot of different aspects of teaching, being a cooperative training center helps improve the department, keeps facilities and cooperating teacher up to date, visits from university supervisor great, AGREDUC 530 - student teaching link good and having student teacher once a year instead of twice is good.

Selection of student teachers so far is good and preservice education course up to date.
AGREDUC 530 - student teaching link good, close supervision by university staff excellent, one day workshop good for cooperating teachers in that it stresses one area for half the day, seminars for student teachers good in that the student teacher sees what others are doing and student teacher better prepared in agriculture mechanics than in the past

Pattern of supervision good, student teacher seminars good, realistic expectations and assignments good

Getting experience to teach in the classroom, well-rounded experiences and student teachers use a variety of ideas as a result of the seminars

Hands on experience in classroom and lab, gets to see what agriculture teacher does and sees school as a whole

Practice teaching in AGREDUC 530 good and videotaping great, assistance by university supervisor good, generally good group of cooperating teachers and lesson planning experience good

AGREDUC 530 - student teaching link good, student teaching is organized, university supervision is good and wide variety of activities

Student Teachers

Practical experience, one on one with cooperating teacher, see how all the preservice course work fits together, gives student teacher a chance to experiment, can see the real world and has structure to be highly organized

Excellent cooperating teachers and schools, good support from university, getting into other classes and observing teachers good

AGREDUC 530 good, most assignments are good, exposed to the role of the agriculture teacher and early experience good to be sure teaching is what you want

AGREDUC 530 good, student teacher knows what to expect, agricultural education staff tremendous and student teachers are adequately prepared

Schools strong, cooperating teachers good, AGREDUC 530 - student teaching link is good and university supervision is good

Actual hands on experience and AGREDUC 530 - student
teaching link good

Practical experience, AGREDC 530 good and see role of agriculture teacher
WEAKNESSES OF THE STUDENT TEACHING PROGRAM

University Supervisors

In certain cases very weak cooperating teachers (stick to standards of selection more closely), expectation of student teacher different from one university supervisor to another, expectations of cooperating needs to be emphasized and feedback from students regarding seminars is they are not too exciting.

We do not train cooperating teachers, we are not totally sure of what a student teacher ought to be able to do as a result of student teaching and seminars for student teaching a waste of time (need more structure)

Cooperating teacher training sessions inadequate, because of diversity in programs and how they operate should all students come through the same hoop, no follow-up or debriefing of student teachers, no preparation of student teacher for a job (credentials, interviewing) and major aspects of vocational agriculture (FFA, adult education, supervised occupational experience programs) lacking.

Student teacher assignments and professional performance activities do not mesh 100%, too much consideration is given to student teacher's request for placement in a specific school, cooperating teacher does not always provide desired experiences, not all faculty have time or interest in supervising student teachers and not enough funding to provide some of the experiences deemed desirable.

Assignments need improving; more visits by university supervisor; not getting experiences in FFA, adult education and supervised occupational experience programs; and two student teachers at a training center would be better.

Need two student teachers per center, assignments not adequate, selection of cooperating teachers and facilities not always best, supervised occupational experience area is weak, Ageduc 280.01 is sloppy nd cooperating teacher does not always agree with what is taught at the university.

Cooperating Teachers

Student teachers do not include in their lessons what the student should know as a result of the lesson, too many assignments and student teachers apprehensive that students are out to mess them up.

Student teachers would do more if they had more travel money, technical agriculture preparation is weak and more
skills in supervised occupational experience programs and FFA are needed

Student teachers not quite sure of what to expect from students, university supervisor could visit more, need better cooperating teacher training, student teachers need work experience prior to student teaching and more skills in FFA, adult education and supervised occupational experience programs are needed

Attitude of student teachers who have already decided not to teach is bad, cooperating teachers need more feedback as to the job they are doing as a cooperating teacher and seminars for student teachers take too much time

Lack of technical training and cooperating teachers need better training,

Students lack knowledge in FFA, supervised occupational experience programs and adult education and they are not getting what they need during student teaching; university supervisors need to get into schools and teach to see reality; student teachers and cooperating teachers do not always know what is expected and place student teachers to compliment their background and experiences

Some work experience is weak; preparation in FFA, supervised occupational experience and adult education is inadequate especially for the non-vocational agriculture students; assignments inadequate and three hour course for training cooperating teachers leaves something to be desired

Too many assignments and do not get experience for all seasons in which a vocational agriculture teacher teaches

Assignments need good looking at; more skills in supervised occupational experience programs, adult education and FFA and student teachers do not get to see everything

Student Teachers

University faculty need to get out and teach so they know how the real world is, need better technical preparation, some assignments were busy work and need better training in adult education, FFA and supervised occupational experience programs

More preparation in the parts of the vocational agriculture program

Critiquing of lesson plans, more relevant assignments, discipline needs more emphasis, stress occupational
experience programs and adult education more and select only those programs with the three major components

Student teaching is not long enough, be sure administration is settled at the cooperative training center, cooperating teacher training inadequate and be more realistic as to the jobs and role of the agriculture teacher

Ten weeks not long enough, cooperating teacher should stick to the lesson plans identified before student teaching and additional course work in FFA, adult education and supervised occupational experience programs is needed

Assignments inadequate, seminars (good idea, but not done well), make sure classes taught are realistic and be sure to have support of administration

More feed back on teaching, better preparation in parts of the vocational agriculture program and seminars need improving

Some assignments have little or no value, seminars need improving and cooperating teacher did not always know what to do
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