

THE STATUS OF THE COOPERATING TEACHER  
IN THE ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY  
SCHOOLS OF OKLAHOMA

By

ROBERT ZANE BERGEN

Bachelor of Arts  
Southwestern State College  
Weatherford, Oklahoma  
1950

Master of Science  
Oklahoma State University  
Stillwater, Oklahoma  
1957

Submitted to the faculty of the Graduate College  
of the Oklahoma State University  
in partial fulfillment of the requirements  
for the degree of  
DOCTOR OF EDUCATION  
May, 1970

Thesis  
19700  
B4955  
cop 2

OKLAHOMA  
STATE UNIVERSITY  
LIBRARY  
OCT 12 1970

THE STATUS OF THE COOPERATING TEACHER  
IN THE ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY  
SCHOOLS OF OKLAHOMA

Thesis Approved:

*Kenneth E. Wiggins*

Thesis Adviser

*L. Herbert Bruneau*

*Gayton A. Morgan*

*Roy W. Jones*

*D. Durham*

Dean of the Graduate College

762262

## PREFACE

The purpose of this study was to determine the status of the co-operating teachers in the State of Oklahoma. This was accomplished by the questionnaire technique of research. In the opinion of the cooperating teachers, a special certification for working with student teachers is needed with the basic requirements being a Master of the Science degree and five years teaching experience and training in supervision.

I am especially grateful for the encouragement and advice given by Dr. Kenneth E. Wiggins, Chairman of the Advisory Committee, and Dr. Jacob W. Blankenship. Special thanks are due the other members of the advisory committee: Dr. Roy W. Jones, Dr. L. Herbert Bruneau, and Dr. Clayton Morgan.

I am thankful to the National Science Foundation for a one year grant to attend the Oklahoma State University to begin the doctoral study.

I am very grateful for the continual encouragement of my family and friends. A special thanks to my wife, VerNell, and to my sons, Mark, Brent, and Myron for their patience during this study.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. INTRODUCTION . . . . .	1
Nature of the Problem . . . . .	3
Limitations of the Study. . . . .	4
Definition of terms . . . . .	4
Significance of the Study . . . . .	6
II. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE . . . . .	8
The Cooperating Teacher and His Selection . . . . .	9
Certification of Supervising Teachers . . . . .	18
III. DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY . . . . .	34
Description of the Sample . . . . .	34
Method of Selecting the Sample. . . . .	34
Experimental Design . . . . .	35
The Instrument. . . . .	36
Statistical Treatment of Data . . . . .	36
IV. PRESENTATION OF THE DATA FROM THE QUESTIONNAIRE. . . . .	38
Introduction. . . . .	38
The Cooperating Teacher . . . . .	38
Opinions Expressed by the Cooperating Teachers. . . . .	57
V. SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS. . . . .	67
Summary . . . . .	67
Conclusions and Implications. . . . .	68
Recommendation. . . . .	69
SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY . . . . .	71
APPENDIX. . . . .	76

## LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
I. The Age of the Cooperating Teachers. . . . .	39
II. The Number of Male and Female Cooperating Teachers at Various Age Levels. . . . .	40
III. The Number of Colleges and Universities with Whom the Teacher Cooperates . . . . .	41
IV. The Number of Years Teaching Experience of the Cooperating Teacher. . . . .	42
V. The Kind of Degree Held by the Cooperating Teacher . . . . .	43
VI. The Number of Years the Cooperating Teacher has been in Their Present Teaching Position. . . . .	44
VII. The Number of Years as a Cooperating Teacher . . . . .	45
VIII. The Number of Classes Taught Outside the Major Field . . . . .	46
IX. The Number of Student Teachers Supervised in 1967-68 . . . . .	47
X. The Number of Professional Organizations to Which the Cooperating Teachers Belong and Offices They Hold. . . . .	48
XI. By Whom the Cooperating Teacher was Selected . . . . .	49
XII. Reasons Given for Being Selected a Cooperating Teacher . . . . .	50
XIII. Supervision Courses Taken by Cooperating Teachers. . . . .	51
XIV. Number of Workshops Attended by the Cooperating Teacher. . . . .	52
XV. Length of Workshop Attended by Cooperating Teacher . . . . .	52
XVI. The Number of Cooperating Teachers Reading the Literature of the Association for Student Teaching. . . . .	53
XVII. The Number of Cooperating Teachers Planning to Supervise Student Teachers in 1968-69 School Year. . . . .	54

Table	Page
XVIII. Reasons Given for not Supervising Student Teachers in 1968-69 School Year . . . . .	55
XIX. Reasons for Supervising Student Teachers in the 1968-69 School Year . . . . .	56
XX. The Type and Amount of Compensation Received by Cooperating Teachers in 1967-68 School Year . . . . .	57
XXI. Opinion of Cooperating Teachers Relative to the Professional Degree Cooperating Teachers Should Have. . .	58
XXII. Opinions of Cooperating Teachers Relative to Specialized Training for Cooperating Teachers . . . . .	59
XXIII. Opinions of Cooperating Teachers Relative to Number of Years Teaching Experience Needed by Cooperating Teachers.	60
XXIV. Opinions of Cooperating Teachers Relative to Who Should Determine Who Works with Student Teachers . . . . .	61
XXV. Opinions of Cooperating Teachers Relative to Who Should Compensate the Cooperating Teacher. . . . .	62
XXVI. Opinions of Cooperating Teachers Relative to the Type and Amount of Compensation for Supervising Student Teachers .	63
XXVII. Opinions of Cooperating Teachers Relative to the Number of Student Teachers per Semester . . . . .	64
XXVIII. Opinions of Cooperating Teachers Relative to Special Certification of Cooperating Teachers . . . . .	65
XXIX. Opinions of Cooperating Teachers Relative to Who Should do the Special Certification. . . . .	65
XXX. Opinions of Cooperating Teachers Relative to Basic Requirements for Certification. . . . .	66

## CHAPTER I

### INTRODUCTION

The capstone of the teacher education program, regardless of the type of program involved, is that period of time when the student teacher is actively engaged in extensive direct experience situations in a school. It is that period of time when the student teacher learns, while actually in a school setting, the dimensions of the profession of teaching and acquires competencies required for entering the profession (1).

The student teaching period may terminate the formal portion of the teacher education program for the student with the next step, that of entering the profession as a teacher. In looking at the various teacher education programs of the colleges and universities over the state of Oklahoma, one finds a variety of practices. There is one constant thought in all the programs--the provision of some type of student teaching experience. This experience ranges from one and a half hours per day for 36 weeks to full time student teaching for a period of 20 weeks (2).

The 17 institutions in Oklahoma with teacher training programs offer credit for student teaching in a variety of ways. Hasskarl (2), in his investigation, tabulated the time allotment and hours of credit as shown in the chart on page 2. The general average for student teaching in Oklahoma institutions appears to average about eight hours credit.



Student teachers are placed in ever increasing numbers in the public schools. All of the institutions in Oklahoma report the use of off-campus cooperating schools in their programs (2). Some schools follow the practice of using cooperating schools within short commuting distance of the institution while some of the institutions have teaching stations scattered over the state (3). This use of the public school is a consequence of the increasingly large numbers of student teachers and a shortage of money in the teacher education program budgets for maintenance of laboratory schools on the campus. However, it is the thinking of many educators that the experience in the public school is more realistic and practical (4).

During the student teaching period the student teacher most frequently names the cooperating teacher as the most important person. The cooperating teacher is seen by the student and increasingly by teacher educators as the most important single influence on the student teacher (2).

#### DAILY TIME ALLOTMENT FOR STUDENT TEACHING

Daily Time Allotment	No. of Institutions
Full time, 6 weeks	3
Full time, 7 weeks	1
Full time, 8 weeks	6
Full time, 9 weeks	5
Full time, 10 weeks	1
4 hour block, 12 weeks	2
3 hour block, 16 weeks	1
2 hour block, 18 weeks	4
1½ hour block, 36 weeks	1

Some institutions use a combination of plans.

## HOURS OF CREDIT AWARDED FOR STUDENT TEACHING

Hours of Credit	No. of Institutions
6	7
7	1
8	8
9	4
10	0
11	0
12	1

## Nature of the Problem

A survey made by the State Department of Education of Oklahoma shows that 4,732 student teachers were enrolled in the 17 Oklahoma colleges and universities during the 1968-69 school year and the estimated number for the school year 1969-70 will be 4,968. Using a one to one correspondence of student teacher to supervising teacher, this would imply a potential need of the same number of supervising teachers (5).

The primary purpose of this study is to find the current status of the supervising teacher in the teacher education programs of the colleges and universities of Oklahoma.

In the status study of the supervising teacher these factors will be considered:

1. Age
2. Total number of years teaching experience
3. Number of years as a cooperating teacher
4. Number of years in his present teaching position
5. Professional degree
6. The type of teaching certificate held
7. Teaching responsibilities outside the major area of preparation
8. The number of student teachers supervised
9. The number of cooperating colleges
10. Professional organizations
11. Offices held in these professional organizations

12. Supervisory training
13. Professional reading
14. Supervisory plans
15. Supervisory compensation

Contingent with this objective research of the supervising teacher in Oklahoma will be their recommendations with respect to:

1. The professional degree of the supervising teacher
2. The specialized training of the supervising teacher
3. The experience of the supervising teacher
4. The election of the supervising teacher to his supervising role
5. The compensation of the supervising teacher
6. The supervisory load of the supervising teacher
7. The certification of the supervising teacher

#### Limitations of the Study

This study is limited to the supervising teacher cooperating with the colleges and universities in the State of Oklahoma with the exception of Northeastern State College of Talequah, Oklahoma.

It is assumed in this study that the sample of supervising teachers used by the investigator will be representative of the population since there is a geographical overlap of cooperating schools by the University of Tulsa and Oklahoma State University in the northeastern area of Oklahoma.

Also the study is limited by the responses obtained from the supervising teachers from the questionnaire developed by the investigator.

#### Definition of Terms

A cooperating teacher is an experienced teacher employed in the local school system to work with elementary and secondary students and to supervise college students during their student teaching experiences.

Other synonyms include: resident teacher, critic teacher, and supervising teacher (6).

The supervising teacher identifies the teacher who teaches pupils in an elementary or secondary school and who also supervises college students during student teaching or other professional experiences. The supervising teacher may be in a cooperating public school, a laboratory school, or a private school controlled by some agency other than the college. Interchangeable terms include cooperating teacher when the supervising teacher is located in any type of cooperating school. Supervisory teacher is preferred to cooperating teacher because the former term is more functional and accurate. The supervising teacher teaches pupils and supervises college students in teacher education; therefore, he is a supervising teacher, a term which is exact and accurate in terms of the function he performs (7). However, references in the literature use cooperating teacher and supervising teacher interchangeably.

The cooperating school is an off-campus school whose facilities are used for student teaching in the teacher education program. It is not an integral part of the teacher education institution itself (a laboratory school is an integral part of the institution) but by agreement provides opportunities for student teaching (6).

Student teaching is the observation, participation, and actual teaching done by a student teacher preparing for teaching under the direction of a supervising teacher. It is part of the preservice program offered by a teacher education institution (6).

A student teacher is any college student engaged in the specific experience defined as student teaching (8).

## Significance of the Study

Much has been written about the teacher education program in the nation. Most of the literature deals with the administration of the programs. The cooperating teacher has been the object of very little serious study. Frank Steeves (9) made a thorough study and search of the literature and says, " . . . literature since 1929 is almost barren with respect to the off-campus cooperating teacher."

The Oklahoma Division of Teacher of Education directed by Mr. . . . Ronald Carpenter has no basic information about the cooperating teacher. This is no great surprise; for in visiting with Mr. Carpenter, he envisioned several studies that must be done in the near future if the teacher training program in Oklahoma is to be coordinated throughout the state. One of these studies must involve the cooperating teachers, but it would be necessary to determine the present status of the cooperating teacher before these other studies can be made. Good and Scates (10) state, "The results of descriptive survey status investigations will have particular interest and importance for . . . state departments of education . . ."

A Proposal for Legislation to Provide State Support for the Program of Student Teaching in Oklahoma was initiated by the Teacher Education and Professional Standards Committee for Oklahoma in 1966. This proposal was submitted to the Education Committee of the House of Representatives and/or the Education Committee of the Senate of the 31st Session of the Oklahoma Legislature. It is the hope of the investigator that this study provides information that will be used to improve the teacher education programs for the State of Oklahoma, particularly in

the area of supervision of the student teacher. The State of Oklahoma has long been recognized for the superior quality of the teachers trained in the schools of the state (5).

## CHAPTER II

### REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

With the rising population of this country and the large number of pre-teens and teenagers in American schools, more teachers will be needed for the near future. At the present time there are approximately 200,000 prospective teachers being initiated into the teaching profession (11).

Philanthropic foundations recognize the need for teachers. Grants totaling about 600 million dollars are given annually and most of these grants are in the area of education. The Ford Foundation, for example, has given in excess of 15.6 million dollars in the form of grants for projects in teacher education (12).

Even with the availability of money for scholarships and grants in teacher education, the key to the kind of teacher that is wanted and needed is the supervising teacher in the teacher education program. (9, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23).

Because of the increasing number of student teachers and the increased cost to maintain a college controlled or college owned laboratory school, the public schools are used for the student teaching experience. Cox (4) gives as the major reasons for the exodus from campus laboratory schools for the student teaching experience: (1) laboratory schools are expensive, (2) laboratory schools are overloaded with student teachers, and (3) public schools provide a more realistic

teaching situation.

Much has been written about the teacher education programs throughout the nation. However, very little is mentioned concerning the cooperating teacher in the public school.

Frank L. Steeves (9) writes " . . . teachers into whose classrooms these novices are placed have been the object of little serious study. The characteristics of teachers best qualified to introduce others into the complexities of teaching would seem to be a subject around which considerable literature could be located. On the contrary, the cooperating teacher has been almost completely overlooked as a subject of objective research." He continues with a summary of the literature of the off-campus cooperating teacher. " . . . some 30 bulletins, pamphlets, and yearbooks published by the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education and by The Association for Student Teaching (under their several names) were searched and I found no publication of either of these groups devoted to this problem."

The Thirty-Eighth Yearbook of The Association for Student Teaching finally took a look at the supervising teacher. The yearbook is entitled The Supervising Teacher. This yearbook treats in detail the work of the supervising teacher but really never gets around to qualifying the supervising teacher in anyway.

#### The Cooperating Teacher and His Selection

Rabin (23) writes concerning the professional characteristics of supervising teachers " . . . cooperating school teachers who work with student teachers as supervisors are found either to have earned the Master's Degree or to be in the process of earning one through course



work at colleges and universities. Cooperating school supervisors of student teachers are being offered professional courses and workshops, as well, to prepare them better for their additional work with student teachers."

Flowers (24) writes in the First Yearbook of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education: "Each laboratory teacher qualifies as a child specialist, a master teacher of children, and a master teacher in guiding another into the art of teaching through studying and participating in teaching-learning situations. It is not enough that the laboratory teacher is responsible for guiding the experiences of the college student to be a master teacher in working with children. He must be equally competent in his understanding of the college student and in his ability to guide that student in working with children. His is a dual role of working directly with children and with the college student; of working in the best interests of children through guiding the activities of the college student." This a fine statement of what a cooperating teacher should be, yet it is rather nebulous.

Two studies, one conducted by Bowden (3) and one by Hertzler (25), are objective in nature. Steeves (9) states that objective research pertaining to the cooperating teacher is needed.

Bowden's study surveyed the cooperating teachers working with the colleges and universities that were members of The American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education. He found the average number of years teaching experience of the cooperating teachers to be 8.3 years. Thirty percent of the cooperating teachers had less than six years of teaching experience; thirty-nine percent had from six to ten years of teaching experience; and thirty-one percent had more than ten years of

teaching experience. He also noted only three percent had taken courses for supervising work.

Hertzler's study, also rather limited in scope, surveyed the cooperating teachers of the state of Indiana. He found 31% of the cooperating teachers have a Master's Degree and an additional twenty percent has had graduate training, making a total of fifty-one percent of the cooperating teachers that has done university work beyond the Bachelor Degree. Hertzler also noted that sixty-four percent of the cooperating teachers teach their college major and twenty-one teach their college minor. He found many of the cooperating teachers teach in at least two major fields and those in the smaller schools are teaching in three major fields. The average number of years of teaching experience before becoming a cooperating teacher was 13 years, with the median number of years experience at eight years. The average number of years as a cooperating teacher was four years and the median number of years was four years. When the cooperating teachers were asked about training for supervision, fifty-six percent said they have had a course in some kind of supervision. These were enumerated in some 19 different courses; however, only nine percent has had a course specifically for supervising student teachers.

In the literature are found many criteria and requisites for selecting the cooperating teacher. Most of the literature alludes to very general and qualitative criteria that are difficult for human judgment. For example, Stratemeyer and Lindsey (26) say that a cooperating teacher must: (1) be a master in his profession, (2) have a genuine interest in teacher education, (3) must be able to deal with theoretical concepts--principles and generalizations-- which are the

fundamental bases for their decisions from day to day, and (4) must be able to continue to teach--through another adult who is assuming leadership.

Caskey (27) states that the teacher who agrees to work with a student teacher commits himself to the role of "master teacher". He must work side by side with another adult in the classroom. Veselak (28) simply notes that being pleasant, friendly, and enjoyable to work with is one of the best ways of guaranteeing more teachers for the profession.

In selecting teachers for specialized training in student teacher supervision, Wiggins (29) gives these factors major consideration:

(1) willingness to take the job of supervising as a serious professional responsibility, (2) effectiveness as a classroom teacher in terms of factors generally agreed upon as constituting successful teaching, (3) breadth of view of the function of the public school; ability to think of a given teaching field as a part of the total school curriculum, (4) open mindedness, and receptivity to ideas of others, and a student of teaching, (5) probability of continuing to supervise student teachers for at least three to five years, and (6) teaching in a field in which in which the college program is likely to need supervisory services regularly. It is needless to say these characteristics are difficult to objectify--even more, difficult to find in high degree.

Beaty (30) conducted a study at Florida State University to attempt to focus on the qualities needed by a cooperating teacher. He summarizes his findings: (1) the personal qualities desired are largely the qualities desired for a successful teacher in our day and time, (2) the cooperating teacher should show (a) emotional warmth,

friendliness, and congeniality; (b) a cooperative helpful attitude; (c) facility in putting other people at ease; (d) willingness to accept fellow workers as co-workers; (e) ability to treat situations factually; (f) understanding of the frailties of others; (g) effective utilization of a variety of teaching materials and methods; and (h) the desire to induct a neophyte into the profession. Again, these qualities as predictors for desirable supervisory situations have not been established.

Hanson (31) feels that certain guiding principles should be observed in the selection of cooperating teachers. He says that: (1) the cooperating teacher should be selected in relation to the situation in which the training institution operates, (2) the cooperating teacher should be selected in relation to the placement objective, (3) the cooperating teachers should be chosen for the student, rather than the student for the cooperating teacher.

Bennie (32) states these criteria for cooperating teachers: (1) a minimum of three years teaching experience, (2) a master's degree, (3) evidence of genuine professional interest toward working with student teachers, (4) be able to demonstrate the elements of good teaching, and (5) be willing to give the necessary time and energy in working with the student teacher to insure a maximum learning opportunity.

The Oklahoma Commission on Teacher Education and Professional Standards in the bulletin, Guide for Organizing and Administering Student Teaching published in 1963, states, "The selection of appropriately qualified cooperating teachers . . . is dependent upon the acceptance . . . of certain basic criteria." The Commission enumerates the following criteria for selecting the cooperating teacher:

Criteria which should be fully met:

1. The cooperating teacher should hold a standard certificate in the subject matter area in which he works with student teachers.

2. The cooperating teacher should have had at least three years of successful teaching experience. The use of older, more mature people now entering the teaching field who possess qualities which will make them excellent cooperating teachers after only one or two years of experience may constitute an exception.

3. The cooperating teacher should demonstrate a willingness to devote the necessary time and effort to working with student teachers. He perceives the opportunity to work with future teachers as a professional responsibility.

4. The cooperating teacher should have demonstrated a special capacity for conveying both theory and practice ideas to the student teacher.

Additional desirable criteria:

5. The cooperating teacher should possess a master's degree appropriate for the teaching situation involved.

6. The cooperating teacher should have a positive professional attitude toward research and experimentation. He considers himself a learner and strives to improve his knowledge and instructional techniques.

7. The cooperating teacher should demonstrate willingness to help student teachers profit from their mistakes. Teachers who are reluctant to turn the class over to the student teacher, once he has established rapport and is prepared, should not be selected.

8. The cooperating teacher should have an obvious liking for people, possess a wide scope of interest, display a zest for living,

and be able to communicate ideas to the student teacher in an effective manner.

9. The cooperating teacher should be able to evaluate the work of the student teacher objectively. He should be adept at conferring with the student teacher.

10. The cooperating teacher should be skilled at demonstrating ways that learning can be stimulated and ways in which the democratic process can function in the classroom.

11. The cooperating teacher should support existing school policies, should make constructive suggestions for improving such policies and/or the curriculum, and should possess the ability to interpret the school program and policies to others.

12. The cooperating teacher should meet difficult and unexpected situations with firmness and without prejudice.

13. The cooperating teacher should participate in in-service training programs, in professional organizations, and in cultural and recreational activities. He should demonstrate willingness to assume responsibility for improving the status of the profession.

14. The cooperating teacher should maintain a friendly, cooperative, harmonious relationship with other employees. He should be willing to share professional knowledge and techniques with other faculty members and should demonstrate respect and appreciation for the unique contribution of each to the total school program. (33).

Likewise, the Commission on Standards for Supervising Teachers and College Supervisors of the Association for Student Teaching has prepared An AST Position Paper on the selection and function of the supervising teacher. The Commission writes, "In the development of a

sound student teaching program, the selection of supervising teachers is a significant concern. While no simple solution to the problem of selection is possible, the Commission, nevertheless, recommends certain criteria . . . ." A supervising teacher should reflect the following qualifications:

1. Possesses the level of academic preparation recommended by the profession as desirable for one in his teaching position: A masters degree should be a minimum.
2. Has completed a minimum of three years teaching experience with at least the most recent year being in the present teaching position.
3. Possesses full certification for the area in which he is teaching.
4. Teaches in the area of his major preparation.
5. Consistently demonstrates high quality teaching performance.
6. Demonstrates personal-professional attitudes desirable for one in a leadership role in teacher education.
7. Demonstrates evidence of continuous professional growth.
8. Participates in the program willingly and looks upon supervising the growth of student teachers as a contribution to his profession.
9. Is recommended by his administrators and by the administrators of the teacher education institution.
10. Has knowledge of the basic principles of supervising student teachers or is willing to accept such an academic learning experience to prepare himself better for this responsibility.
11. Is an effective team member.

12. Exhibits professional and ethical behavior.

13. Participates actively as a member of selected professional and educational organizations.

14. Has knowledge of the literature which is appropriate for use in general, professional, and field of specialization areas and has the disposition to use these materials in teaching (34).

Virgil E. Schooler (35) of Indiana University, asks these questions in applying criteria in the selection of cooperating teachers: (1) is the teacher eager and willing to assume the responsibility of guiding the student teacher? (2) is the teacher an effective teacher who has a thorough knowledge of his field as well as a teacher who demonstrates good methods of teaching? (3) does the teacher practice good human relationships in his contacts with faculty, children and parents? (4) does the teacher possess good physical and mental health?

In spite of all that is recommended, Bradley and Earp (10) found that criteria for selection of cooperating teachers very lax when application was attempted.

Several investigators, Milanovich (14), Merton (36), Osmon (37), and Crosby (38) found that many times the cooperating teacher was basically not a good teacher. He was seldom prepared to supervise by any form of training or instruction. Merton found in a nation wide study that there was an excessive amount of poor supervision by both the university and public school supervisors. Milanovich contended that the cooperating teacher did not assume the responsibility for the student teacher seriously; too often teachers accept student teachers because they expected relief from their jobs.



From all appearances the selection of supervising teachers in a teacher education program is a complicated business requiring much skill in human relations (39).

#### Certification of Supervising Teachers

Taylor (40) states that it is generally agreed that the supervising teacher is the most significant single factor in the quality of the student teaching experience.

Shuck (41) writes, "I would like to advance the argument that the key person in the whole field experience is the cooperating teacher, and we need to place intensive effort upon bettering her preparation, her status, and her rewards. I would insist that a permanently certified cooperating teacher be a master teacher with graduate study in the fields of learning he or she is teaching, and then, beyond the master's degree, be provided with concentrated graduate work in supervising, learning, and personality study. I would ask that the state provide not only certification status but also salary recognition comparable to that of school administrators for the cooperating teacher. This is a basic educational problem of society, of which the state, and not the local community or the college, is the most logical representative. So long as we continue to try to squeeze the program out of limited college budgets or local school systems, we will inevitably do the job piecemeal, lefthandedly, perhaps grudgingly, and certainly less effectively than it needs to be done." In this quote Shuck states a good case for the responsibility of the state to assume certification criteria and compensation for the cooperating teachers in the training program.

Schooler (42) relates, "Student teaching is regarded by these (students from University of Indiana) young people as the most important single experience in the teacher education program because it is real, practical, and a challenging experience. The amount of satisfaction he receives depends primarily upon the guidance and assistance of the cooperating teacher. Cooperating teachers are the master teachers in our public schools who, because of their education and professional competencies, have been selected by the school administrator and the teacher education institutions to assist in the student teaching program."

The cooperating teacher in any program of student teaching serves as one of the links in the professional chain which steadies the prospective teacher during his initial period of responsible classroom experience. If this link is weak and breaks, the other links as represented by the university supervisor, the director of student teaching, the instructors in methods of teaching, and other professors of education and subject matter will be unable to function properly. Therefore, the selection of these cooperating teachers is critical and deserves more attention than is often given to this facet of the program (43).

Knapp and Bray (44) report that despite the crucial role of such supervisors (cooperating teachers), it is also evident that they have widely varying perceptions of their training responsibilities. Some see themselves as proud participants in a partnership entrusted with the professional growth of eager but unseasoned novices, but there are others to whom the student teachers constitute an unwelcome imposition. It has been obvious for sometime that not all "good" teachers can

function effectively in the supervisory role. Some have worked out a system or "philosophy" of instruction through a rigorous but personally satisfying trial and error procedure and now hope to mold the inexperienced novice in their own image. Others are uncertain of their authority and retreat behind a laissez-faire screen, rationalizing that the student teacher who relies on himself will, of necessity, establish status and, with it, skill and self-confidence. Still others are reluctant to relinquish their central positions and hover nervously over their new charges. Criticism of supervision and supervising teachers must be tempered with reality. It is unfortunately true that in the great majority of cases supervising teachers have not received any formal preparation for their responsibilities.

Bradley and Earp (45) also point out that student teaching has come to be accepted as the most important phase of the professional training for teachers. Not only do those involved in working with student teachers testify to this, but some of the most disparaging critics of the education of American teachers concede the importance of this training. Even James B. Conant has specified the importance of the public school's role in teacher training.

Woodruff (46) gives several factors that he considers serious problems of the student teaching phase of teacher preparation. He enumerates these factors as: (1) the large increase in the number of students preparing for teaching; this has placed a strain on public schools and on teachers who serve as cooperating teachers in the student teaching program, (2) the prolonged criticism of school teachers; this creates resentment about rendering some of those heretofore unnoticed services, (3) the continuing battle for adequate salaries; this has

definitely caused teachers to look for rewards in other fields, (4) the competition between colleges for student teaching space in the public schools; this has led to extremely varied policies of operation, (5) the lack of coordination between colleges; this has permitted the development of almost unlimited varieties of programs and of arrangements with public schools, (6) the lack of action by state departments of education to implement any requirements; this has left the leadership for responsibility in doubt and colleges have assumed some of it by default.

J. T. Kelley, Director of the Division of Teacher Education, Certification and Accreditation of the Department of Education of Florida (1958), has said that the training and the development of teachers for schools is the responsibility of teacher education institutions, elementary and secondary schools of the state, local and county officials, and the State Department of Education (46).

Dr. L. D. Haskew of the University of Texas wrote in 1949 that the necessary and desirable expansion of the student teaching program will be far beyond the present capacity of the colleges to administer and to finance. He proposed that student teaching should become an integral part of the state's public school system. He further suggests that the cost should be borne in the state public school budget, as a legitimate means for assuring the people their money's worth for what they invest in salaries of public school teachers.

Woodruff (46) has summed the problems very well when he said, "What is needed is the development of some guide lines based on the real purposes and values of the public schools, the profession, and the process of preparing new teachers. The most promising avenue seems

to be recognition of a new status in the profession, with state support for both certification and adequate salaries for cooperating teachers."

Andrews (47) also sums up the problems when he suggests four definite tasks for the teaching profession: (1) securing acceptance of the principle of state responsibility, (2) developing a plan for special certification of cooperating teachers, (3) developing a plan for compensation, and (4) securing more adequate recognition for the cooperating teacher. His own statement on the first tasks may be worth noting in full.

It is as much the responsibility of the state to provide excellent schools as laboratories for teacher education as for the state to provide hospitals to serve as clinics in the education in the health professions.

A Joint Committee on State Responsibility for Student Teaching sponsored by the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, American Association of School Administration, Association for Student Teaching, Council of Chief State School Officers, Department of Classroom Teachers of N.E.A., National Association of State Directors of Teacher Education and Certification, and National Commission on Teacher Education and Professional Standards recommends for action these responsibilities for state departments of education:

1. Facilitating statewide planning for policy and organization in student teaching and other field and clinical experiences in teacher education.

2. Setting minimum standards for the professional education of personnel involved in joint teacher education enterprises and for state approval of collaborative programs in local cooperative teaching centers.

3. Encouraging experimentation and diversity of programs beyond the minimal standards.

4. Preparing enabling legislation where required.

5. Arranging statewide financial support for the accredited cooperative programs.

The same Joint Committee utilizing the accepted truism in America that a school and its educational program are as good as the community wishes them to be, says the same concept can be applied to a state and national community as well. Therefore, the Joint Committee makes the following recommendations to establish a professional setting for the supervision of student teaching:

1. Those institutions of higher education in a state which are responsible to the public for advancing the objective study of education and for preparing teachers in certification programs should now exert new and vigorous leadership in bringing together representative school systems, professional organizations, and appropriate state agencies.

2. Unified practices should be established on a statewide basis to guide the operation of student teaching programs.

3. State boards of education should approve the setting and conditions within which student teaching programs shall operate.

4. State boards of education should support elementary and secondary schools financially in the development of student teaching programs.

5. Federal funds should be sought and utilized for financing student teaching programs.

6. State departments of public instruction should cooperate with

teacher education institutions and with the elementary and secondary schools in the selection of supervising teachers.

7. Supervising the growth of student teachers should be a part of the normal professional load of a supervising teacher.

8. The supervising teacher should participate with professional colleagues on campus in the planning and implementation of the teacher education curriculum.

9. A supervising teacher needs to have from one-fifth to one-half of his time for supervision and supporting teacher education activities.

10. The significant role of the supervising teacher should be acknowledged by additional monetary compensation.

11. Time and job studies need to be conducted to determine effective ways for supervising teachers to work with several student teachers concurrently.

Bennie (29) states that the trend, as more and more of the responsibility for student teaching is being assumed by the public school, is to look at state certification for cooperating teachers. This is meeting varied success throughout the nation. It appears that more states are attempting to improve their programs by this method (48). For example, the state of Indiana through its Teacher Training Licensing Commission says that a cooperating teacher must have completed a master's degree and have had at least five years of successful teaching experience. From these requirements, the educational institution, with the advice of the local school administration, selects the cooperating teachers (42).

Probably the most intensive efforts have been in the state of Georgia even though their Certification Officer in the State Department of Education reports that they do not as yet have a certification program (48). Dr. Alex Perrodin, Associate Professor of Education, University of Georgia, describes their program and the results of a study growing out of work done there. The state of Georgia has encouraged specialized education for supervising teachers since 1950. The supervising teacher education program consists of three types of experiences, each of which carries five quarter hours of graduate-college-level credit: first, a workshop for beginning supervising teachers; next, a year of internship; and finally, a follow-up workshop on supervisory problems. To be eligible to participate in the educational program, a prospective teacher must be invited by the institution which plans to use the teacher as a supervisor of student teachers; must hold a professional teaching certificate in the teaching area in which he is currently teaching; and must have a minimum of one, but preferably three, years of teaching experience in the teaching area for which he is certificated. Numerous other criteria are considered, including the recommendation of the school principal and the college personnel concerned. The overall plan for this program was developed cooperatively by the State Department of Education, the teacher education institutions through committees of the Georgia Council on Teacher Education, and the Georgia Committee on Cooperation in Teacher Education.

The State Department of Education of Georgia further encourages this program through a series of supplemental payments to supervising teachers. These payments, though small, are intended to apply to



travel and other expenses incurred by the supervising teachers in performing or in qualifying to perform the supervisory service. The amount of the honorarium is related to the amount of preparation the supervising teacher has completed. Supervising teachers with no specialized education receive \$20 per student teacher from state funds. Those who complete the first workshop and enroll for the internship receive \$30 for each student supervised. The present maximum payment is \$50 per quarter for supervising teachers who have completed the 15 quarter hour program of preparation. Those who have worked with participants in the program assume that the careful selection procedures, the cooperative planning involved, the close relationship between formal educational experiences and the teacher's on-the-job experiences, and the enthusiasm of the teachers who volunteer for the program, contribute to a higher quality of teaching experiences for prospective teachers.

A study recently completed at the University of Georgia lends some support to this assumption. The Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory was administered to 113 elementary-education majors prior to and following the student-teaching experience. In conclusion, in terms of changes on MTAI raw scores during the student-teaching quarter, student teachers tended to make greater increases when placed with supervising teachers who had completed the supervising teacher preparation program (49).

Ingren (43) conducted a nation-wide survey of certification departments of each state department of education in regard to special certification requirements for cooperating teachers. A reply was received from every state in the union. Forty indicated that they did

not have certification requirements of this type. Georgia, Illinois, Indiana, Kentucky, Louisiana, North Carolina, Oregon, and Rhode Island have specific certification requirements and/or state controlled criteria for the approval of cooperating teachers. (Most of these states had state controlled criteria in 1957 when this survey was made.)

Bradley and Earp (45) gathered data from the certification divisions of all the State Departments of Education in 1964. It was found that eight states have already recognized the need for state level certification of cooperating teachers. Most of these programs of certification are recent innovations and are not yet in full operation. The states which have taken steps toward certification are Georgia, Hawii, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, North Carolina, Rhode Island, and West Virginia.

West Virginia (50) is at the present time implementing the Enabling Act of 1963 which contains the requirements for licensure of supervising teachers. The requirements are:

1. To qualify for the Teacher Education Associate Endorsement the applicant:
  - a. Shall hold a standard professional certificate based on an approved program of teacher preparation and endorsed for the area(s) of specialization and at the grade levels in which he supervises student teachers.
  - b. Shall hold a master's degree based on a program which includes:
    - (1) Fifteen (15) or more semester hours of course work in each area of specialization in which he supervises student teachers (elementary or secondary).
    - (2) Three (3) or more semester hours in the principles of supervision and/or curriculum development.
    - (3) Three (3) or more semester hours in the supervision

of student teachers. (To be eligible to enroll for this course one must have served, be serving, or be nominated to serve as a supervising teacher.)

- c. Shall have five years of successful teaching experience, two of which shall be in the area(s) of specialization and/or at the grade levels in which he supervises student teachers.
- d. Shall have supervised successfully two student teachers.
- e. Shall be recommended by the institution where he has completed a minimum of six semester hours including supervision of student teaching.

In case a position cannot be filled by a teacher holding the Teacher Education Associate Endorsement, permission to supervise student teachers may be granted annually to an apprenticed supervisor. To qualify for a Class A Listing the apprenticed supervising teacher shall have completed a minimum of:

- a. Twelve semester hours on the graduate level to consist of:
  - (1) A course in principles of supervision and/or curriculum development.
  - (2) Courses in the area of specialization in which he supervises student teachers (elementary or secondary).
- b. Four or more years of successful teaching experience, two of which shall be in the area(s) of specialization or the grade levels in which he will be supervising student teachers.

To qualify for a Class B Listing:

The apprenticed supervising teacher shall have two or more years of successful teaching experience, one of which shall be in the area(s) of specialization or at the grade levels in which supervision takes place.

The proposed minimum compensation to be paid each supervising teacher for full time supervision was as follows: Teacher Education Associate \$150, Class A Supervisor \$75, and Class B Supervisor \$50. However, this salary scale has not been funded and colleges are paying a token amount for the services of the cooperating teachers.

Rhode Island has for its requirement for the Supervising Certificate in addition to the teaching certificate:

1. Minimum of three years teaching experience.
2. Recommendation of the college requesting service as supervisor teacher.
3. Completion of a program for service as a cooperating teacher approved by State Board of Education.

Brown University offers the course, Preparing for the Role of Critic Teacher; Providence College offers, Education 423: The Critic Teacher; Rhode Island College offers Education 507: Functions of the Cooperating Teacher; Salve Regina College offers Education 416: The Functions of the Supervising Teacher; and the University of Rhode Island offers Education 232: Cooperative Supervision (48).

North Carolina enumerates their requirements for supervisor of student teachers in the State Department of Public Instruction's Publication No. 382. These requirements for certification are:

1. Hold or be qualified to hold the Graduate Teacher's Certificate.
2. In addition to the requirements for the Graduate Teacher's Certificate, have graduate credit for six semester hours in Education, emphasizing:
  - a. General Supervision
  - b. Methods and Techniques of Supervising Student Teaching
  - c. Student teacher relationships to the college, local school administration unit, cooperating school, and community.
3. Recommendation of the local administration (superintendent, supervisor, or principal) and the college supervisor.

Kentucky (48) has a Commission for Supervised Student Teaching for elementary and high school. Since the requirements are identical except for the wording of elementary and high school, the Commission

for Supervised Student Teaching for high school requirements will be given. These are as follows:

1. The requirements for the Provisional High School Certificate shall be met.
2. The applicant shall have two years experience teaching in the secondary schools.
3. The applicant shall have completed one course in the supervision of instruction in the secondary grades or a course in supervision of student teaching.
4. The applicant shall have completed requirements for a master's degree with a major in secondary education or in a teaching field.

Kentucky at present does not have a state compensation program.

Illinois (48) has a "new" set of standards for their entire student teaching program. It was to be effective not later than September 1, 1967. The supervising teacher in the Illinois program should:

1. Hold the highest type of professional certificate applicable to his position.
2. Hold a master's degree or have completed 30 semester hours of graduate work beyond the bachelor's degree.
3. Have at least three years of teaching experience.
4. Be recognized as a superior teacher in his own school system.

Louisiana (48) has a state salary scale for supervising but it is not financed by the state. Louisiana's requirements for supervisor of student teaching are:

- a. The applicant must hold a valid Louisiana certificate based upon a college degree authorizing him to teach in the field of his supervisory assignment.
- b. He must have had at least three years of successful teaching experience at the level or in the field of his supervisory assignment.
- c. He must hold a master's degree from a regionally-accredited

institution, including at least 12 semester hours of professional education at the graduate level, 6 semester hours of which must be at the level or in the field of his supervisory assignment, and 3 semester hours of which must be in supervision appropriate to the level or the field of his supervisory assignment.

Indiana's director of Teacher Training and Licensing Division, Carl F. Scott, responds with this excerpt from Bulletin 400, page 47, item 9: "Any person who held or was qualified to hold a certificate to teach, to supervise, to administer in the schools of Indiana and who is now or has been engaged in Military Service may count not to exceed four years of the time so engaged toward fulfilling the requirement for consecutive years of teaching experience for converting the first grade certificate to life certificate" (48).

The State of California does not require special certification of cooperating or master teachers. Such teachers are certified in a normal way. For instance, a master teacher teaching on the elementary level would have to hold a credential authorizing her to teach in elementary grades but would not have to hold a special credential authorizing her to serve as a cooperating or master teacher. Mr. Edward G. Price, Supervising Certification Analyst, further states that there have been several attempts made through legislation to establish both a credential and extra pay for cooperating teachers but as yet such legislation has not been passed (48).

The State Department of Education in Tennessee does not require certification of cooperating teachers (48).

Mr. Leonard T. Murayama of the Department of Education of Hawaii writes concerning the selection of cooperating teachers and their certification:

#### A. EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUND

1. Must have a B.Ed. or its equivalent in the area of certification to which the pre-service teachers are assigned.
2. Should hold a Hawaii Department of Education Professional Certificate in the area to which the pre-service teachers are assigned.
3. Should have successfully completed at least one university course in supervision in which the major emphasis is on supervision of pre-service teachers.

#### B. PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE

1. A minimum of three years of successful teaching experience at the level of certification.
2. Five years of successful teaching experience at the level of certification might be considered in lieu of having met the requirements for Professional Certification.

#### C. RECOMMENDATIONS

1. From the principal under whom he has worked.
2. From the program assistants, if possible.
3. From a university faculty member who will visit informally for a short period and explain the program to the teacher.

#### D. PERSONAL AND PROFESSIONAL QUALIFICATIONS

1. Adjust easily to new situations.
2. Good personality traits (especially human relations).
3. Ability to effectively communicate ideas, both written and oral.
4. A professional attitude.

The State Department of Education Personnel Office sends a letter to all principals requesting nominations of teachers for supervisory work. This letter includes a complete statement of policies and procedures to be used in this selection. This list of nominees is evaluated by the curriculum staff and these evaluations are sent to the University of Hawaii department chairmen. Assignments are made for

visitation of the nominees by a member of the university staff. After visitations are completed, the University of Hawaii Department Chairmen and coordinating staff make decisions as to which nominees are qualified as cooperating teachers, taking into consideration both their own evaluation of the individual teachers and that of the curriculum staff. Teachers not accepted are invited to a conference in which reasons for non-qualification are given and suggestions for improvement are made.

Each teacher accepted is issued a certificate valid for three years. These certificates are issued by the Personnel Office of the Department of Education upon recommendation by the University of Hawaii. To renew the certificate the cooperating teacher must go through the same procedure as at the beginning. Possession of a certificate does not guarantee appointment as a cooperating teacher but merely signifies eligibility. Appointment of cooperating teachers and assignment of student teachers is done by the University of Hawaii department chairmen (48).

If the profession of teacher education is to continue to progress toward higher standards of excellence, more and more cooperating teachers with a wholesome professional orientation to these tasks must be recruited. Experience has shown that increased standards in teacher certification have resulted in an increased supply of teachers. Perhaps adding greater prestige to the services rendered by cooperating teachers by means of establishing certification standards, or at least criteria, would increase the supply of professional workers willing and able to serve in this area of teacher education (43).



## CHAPTER III

### DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

#### Description of the Sample

The population for this study included the public school teachers who were serving as cooperating teachers for the colleges and universities with teacher education programs in Oklahoma during the second semester of the school year 1967-68.

To secure the names of the cooperating teachers each of the directors of student teaching was contacted by letter. Each of the directors responded to the contact. All but two of the teacher training institutions sent their list of cooperating teachers who were being used in the spring semester of the 1967-68 school year. The director of the student teaching program at the University of Oklahoma and the director of student teaching at Northeastern State College at Talequah did not have a list of their cooperating teachers available. However, the list of names of the cooperating teachers working with the University of Oklahoma was secured by writing to the principals of the Oklahoma City School System.

#### Method of Selecting the Sample

To secure the sample for this study the technique of systematic sampling was used. In systematic sampling every "nth" name from a

list may be used (51). This method precludes any chance of drawing a poor random sample. Selecting the sample cases at evenly spaced intervals guarantees that a cross-section of the entire population will be secured. These intervals can be determined by counting a number of cases passed over between each one selected (51). The names at the end of each page were carried over when counting cases for the intervals. If the carry-over system is used, it is not necessary to draw by lot the first sample case on each page (51).

Random sampling could not be used in this study because a complete listing of the names of the individual cooperating teachers was not available to the researcher.

Anticipating a return of fifty per cent of the questionnaires mailed to the cooperating teachers, every fifth name on the list was selected. This would give a return of 120 cases which was ten per cent of the population.

### Experimental Design

The design of this study employed the descriptive survey status approach to research. Descriptive survey status research is directed toward ascertaining the prevailing conditions (the facts that prevail in a group of cases chosen for study). This method is essentially a technique of quantitative description of the general characteristics of the group. The descriptive survey status approach has not characteristically delved deeply into interrelationships or causal factors (10). Good and Scates (10) state ". . . descriptive survey status studies are research when they create or ascertain: (1) new categories that are revealing, or more useful than those already in use . . ."

### The Instrument

The search of the literature revealed no significant instrument for this study; however, Bowden's study and Hertzler's study served as a background. A questionnaire designed by the investigator was used to obtain the data for this study.

The questionnaire usually has been defined as a form distributed through the mail or filled out by the respondent under the supervision of the investigator. The use of the questionnaire in descriptive survey status studies extends the investigator's powers of observation by reminding the respondent of each item. Also, it helps insure responses to the same item from all cases, and to keep the investigator from collecting only unique or unusual facts (51).

The questionnaire is a form prepared and distributed to secure responses to certain questions. These questions are intended to obtain information about conditions or practices of which the respondent is presumed to have knowledge. In addition, the questionnaire is used increasingly to inquire into the attitudes and opinions of the group about whom the investigator is concerned (51). The questionnaire is especially useful when one cannot personally see or contact all of the people from whom he desires responses. The questionnaire is very versatile and the freshness of its returns make it an almost indispensable instrument for securing current information (51).

### Statistical Treatment of Data

Parten (52) defines an optimum sample as one which fulfills the requirements of efficiency and the most efficient sample is commonly

considered to be the one which provides the most useful information per dollar rather than per case. The emphasis should be placed not on the number of cases in the population, but on the number in the sample. Percentages or averages are the most commonly desired statistics for summarizing data or predicting population characteristics.

To calculate the optimum sample size the following formula may be used:

$$N_s = \frac{P. C. (100 - P.C.) Z^2}{T^2}$$

In this formula P.C. is the preliminary estimate of the percentage which is set at ten per cent (the expected return). Z is the number of standard error units which are found from a normal probability table and has a value of 1.9. This is at the .05 significance level. T is the required tolerance or precision which is set at 5 per cent. This calculation gave a sample size of 129 which is fairly significant for the population.

Some of the data of this study lends itself to finding the central tendency. Measures of central tendency in common use are the arithmetic mean, the median, and the mode (53).

The arithmetic mean is the sum of the separate measures divided by their number. The median by definition is the 50 per cent point in the distribution of measures and may be computed by counting off one-half of the scores from the top down in a frequency distribution. The mode is that single measure which occurs most frequently and is usually employed to indicate in a rough way the center of concentration in a distribution (53).

## CHAPTER IV

### PRESENTATION OF THE DATA FROM THE QUESTIONNAIRES

#### Introduction

The major problem of this study is to describe the cooperating teacher in the teacher education programs of the colleges and universities of Oklahoma. In addition, the opinions of the cooperating teachers are presented with respect to the professional training, certification, and compensation of the cooperating teacher.

This chapter presents the results of the questionnaire responses. Tables have been prepared showing the number of responses and the percent of the total for each question. Also, where practicable, the mean, the median, and mode are calculated. In some cases the number of responses was less than the number of questionnaires returned. This is due to the respondent not answering that particular question.

Although the number of responses in some cases is less than 129, the level of significance for the sample is not appreciably lowered from the .05 level. By interpolation from the sample size table the level of significance is still at about the .054 level for the least number of responses (52).

#### The Cooperating Teacher

The cooperating teacher and their opinions described in this study includes 42 elementary and 88 secondary cooperating teachers. Their

geographical distribution is from all the regions of the State of Oklahoma, from the panhandle region to the southeast and from the southwest to the northeast. These teachers teach in school systems with as few as eleven teachers in the system to systems having two thousand plus teachers.

The age of the cooperating teachers ranges from 21 years of age to 65 years of age. One teacher considered her age as "very mature". Dividing the age groups into five year intervals, the age groups 26-30, 41-45, and 46-50 were the most prominent age groups for the cooperating teacher. This may be recognized by examining Table I.

TABLE I  
THE AGE OF THE COOPERATING TEACHERS

Age in Years	Number of Teachers	Percent of Teachers
21 - 25	8	6.3
26 - 30	18	14.1
31 - 35	15	11.8
36 - 40	15	11.8
41 - 45	18	14.1
46 - 50	18	14.1
51 - 55	14	10.8
56 - 60	11	8.5
61 - 65	<u>11</u>	<u>8.5</u>
TOTAL	128	100.0

MEAN 41.5 years

MEDIAN 42.3 years

MODE 50.0 years

The male cooperating teacher proportionately out-numbered the female cooperating teacher in the age groups below 35 years of age. The mean of the age of the cooperating teacher was 41.5 years, the median 42.3 years, and the mode 50.0 years. It appeared the cooperating teacher was a more mature person.

Noting Table II the ratio of male to female cooperating teachers is approximately 2 to 1 in favor of the female. The per cent of male cooperating teachers was 32.8 and the per cent of female cooperating teachers was 67.2. It may also be noted that the ratio of elementary to secondary cooperating teachers responding in the sample is approximately 1 to 2 in favor of the secondary. The actual count was 42 elementary and 88 secondary cooperating teachers.

TABLE II  
THE NUMBER OF MALE AND FEMALE COOPERATING TEACHERS  
AT VARIOUS AGE LEVELS

Age in Years	Male	Percent	Female	Percent
21 - 25	5		3	
26 - 30	9		9	
31 - 35	8		7	
36 - 40	3		12	
41 - 45	7		11	
46 - 50	2		16	
51 - 55	3		11	
56 - 60	3		8	
61 - 65	<u>2</u>		<u>9</u>	
TOTAL	42	32.8	86	67.2

Cooperating teachers work with the different colleges and universities over the state but 60.5 percent work with only one college at a time. Twenty-two and two-tenths percent work with 2 different institutions while 2 teachers said they worked with 6 different institutions during the same school year. The mean number of colleges per cooperating teachers was 1.6 colleges and the median was 1.7 colleges. This may be noted in Table III.

TABLE III  
THE NUMBER OF COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES WITH  
WHOM THE TEACHER COOPERATES

Number of Colleges	Number of Teachers	Percent of Teachers
1	75	60.5
2	30	24.2
3	8	6.4
4	8	6.4
5	1	.8
6	<u>2</u>	<u>1.7</u>
TOTAL	124	100.0

MEAN      1.6 colleges

MEDIAN   1.7 colleges

MODE      1.0 colleges



The teaching experience of the cooperating teacher ranged from one year to 47 years. In Table IV the number of years of teaching experience has been grouped as shown, that is, in units of 6 years. The 6-11 years of experience group makes up 30.6 percent of cooperating teachers. However, it may be noted from the table that approximately half (48.3 percent) have less than 11 years of experience and that 17.7 per cent have five or fewer years of teaching experience.

TABLE IV  
THE NUMBER OF YEARS TEACHING EXPERIENCE OF THE  
COOPERATING TEACHER

Number of Years	Number of Teachers	Percent of Teachers
0 - 5	23	17.7
6 - 11	40	30.6
12 - 17	18	13.8
18 - 23	24	18.4
24 - 29	8	6.7
30 - 35	11	8.4
36 - 41	5	3.7
42 - 47	<u>1</u>	<u>.7</u>
TOTAL	130	100.0

Almost sixty percent of the cooperating teachers in the sample possess a Master's degree. The Master of Science degree makes up 29.5 per cent of the total Master's degrees. The Bachelor degree is held by 40.1 per cent of the cooperating teachers. The various degrees within the Bachelors and Masters degrees possessed by the cooperating teachers may be seen in Table V.

The majority of cooperating teachers have been in their present teaching positions for a period of time of six or less years. However, it should be noted that three teachers have been in their present positions for more than 26 years. The mean number of years is 9.8 years, the median 6.5 years, and the mode is three years. This information is categorized in Table VI.

TABLE V  
THE KIND OF DEGREE HELD BY THE  
COOPERATING TEACHER

Kind of Degree	Number of Teachers	Percent
Bachelor of Arts	22	18.0
Bachelor of Science	27	22.2
Master of Arts	17	13.9
Master of Teaching	14	11.5
Master of Science	36	29.5
Master of Education	6	4.9
TOTAL	122	100.0
Master	73	59.9
Bachelor	49	40.1

TABLE VI

THE NUMBER OF YEARS THE COOPERATING TEACHER  
HAS BEEN IN THEIR PRESENT TEACHING POSITION

Number of Years	Number of Teachers	Percent
1	7	5.6
2	13	10.2
3	16	12.5
4	13	10.3
5	10	7.8
6	7	5.6
7-10	19	14.8
11-15	18	14.1
16-20	13	10.2
21-25	9	7.0
26-31	3	1.8
TOTAL	128	100.0

MEAN 9.8 years

MEDIAN 6.5 years

MODE 3.0 years

Approximately 65% of the cooperating teachers have been working with student teachers for fewer than six years. The modal number of years is two. The mean number of years is 6.4 years and the median number of years is 4.5 years.

TABLE VII  
THE NUMBER OF YEARS AS A COOPERATING TEACHER

Number of Years	Number of Teachers	Percent
1-3	45	37.8
4-6	32	26.9
7-9	8	6.7
10-12	16	13.5
13-15	10	8.4
16-18	4	3.4
19-21	3	2.5
22-25	<u>1</u>	<u>0.8</u>
TOTAL	119	100.0

  

MEAN	6.4 years
MEDIAN	4.5 years
MODE	2.0 years

A very good teaching assignment is held by the cooperating teachers when about 80 percent of them do not teach more than one class outside their major field of study. Only one teacher indicated teaching outside his major field for a six-class day.

TABLE VIII  
THE NUMBER OF CLASSES TAUGHT  
OUTSIDE THE MAJOR FIELD

Number of Classes	Number of Teachers	Percent
0	69	62.1
1	20	18.0
2	6	5.4
3	7	6.4
4	4	3.6
5	4	3.6
6	<u>1</u>	<u>.9</u>
TOTAL	111	100.0

The mean number of student teachers supervised in the school year 1967-68 was 2.3 student teachers. The median number was 2.5 student teachers per year and the modal number was 2. Seven cooperating teachers did not supervise during the school year. One teacher said she had 16 student teachers during the school year. About 61% of the cooperating teachers had only one or two during the school year.

TABLE IX

## THE NUMBER OF STUDENT TEACHERS SUPERVISED IN 1967-1968

Number of Student Teachers	Number of Cooperating Teachers	Percent
0	7	5.4
1	38	29.2
2	42	32.3
3	16	12.3
4	16	12.3
5	7	5.4
6	2	1.5
8	1	.8
16	<u>1</u>	<u>.8</u>
TOTAL	130	100.0

Holding offices and having membership in professional organizations would be an important aspect of sustained growth of a teacher. Most of the cooperating teachers have membership in the state and national education associations and with their respective subject matter areas. Eighty-one do not or have not held an office in any of the organizations to which they belong.

TABLE X

THE NUMBER OF PROFESSIONAL ORGANIZATIONS TO WHICH THE  
COOPERATING TEACHERS BELONG AND OFFICES THEY HOLD

Number of Organizations	Number of Cooperating Teachers	Number of Office Holders	Number of Post-Office Holders
0	3	45	3
1	2		
2	17		
3	38		
4	29		
5	18		
6	16		
7	5		
11	<u>1</u>	<u>Hold No Office</u>	
TOTAL	129	TOTAL	81

MEAN	3.9 organizations	Percent holding office	34.7
MEDIAN	3.7 organizations	Percent holding no office	62.8
MODE	3.0 organizations	Percent post-office holders	3.5

In Table XI are listed the persons or agency responsible for the selection of the cooperating teacher who works with the student teacher in the schools. Thirty-seven percent of the cooperating teachers were selected by their principals. Nineteen per cent said they did not know who selected them to work with student teachers. In many cases (12 percent) the school administration makes the assignment.

TABLE XI  
BY WHOM THE COOPERATING TEACHER WAS SELECTED

By Whom	Number of Teachers	Percent
Administration of school assigns	12	12.0
Director of Student teaching and principal	7	7.0
Principal	37	37.0
Principal and supervisor	8	8.0
Mutual agreement of teacher and college	4	4.0
Department head of college	4	4.0
Superintendent, principal, and college director	3	3.0
Superintendent	6	6.0
Don't know	<u>19</u>	<u>19.0</u>
TOTAL	100	100.0

In conjunction with the person or agency responsible for the selection of the cooperating teacher several reasons are also given by the cooperating teacher for their selection. The most prevalent reason was being selected by the college as a possible candidate for a cooperating teacher. (Table XII).

Of the cooperating teachers included in the sample for study, 101 of the cooperating teachers have not had any type of supervision courses in their educational background. This is 78% of the sample. Eleven



percent have had one course in supervision. Table XIII shows the breakdown of supervision courses taken by the cooperating teachers.

TABLE XII  
REASONS GIVEN FOR BEING SELECTED  
A COOPERATING TEACHER

How	Number of Teachers	Percent
Student teacher	3	9.4
Attitude and experience	2	6.3
College	18	56.1
Master teacher	1	3.1
Word of mouth	1	3.1
Location of school	2	6.3
Teacher training	2	6.3
Volunteer	1	3.1
State supervisor	1	3.1
All teachers in our school cooperate	<u>1</u>	<u>3.1</u>
TOTAL	32	99.9

TABLE XIII  
SUPERVISION COURSES TAKEN BY COOPERATING TEACHERS

Number of Courses	Number of Teachers	Percent of Teachers
0	101	78.2
1	14	11.4
2	7	5.0
3	5	4.0
4	1	.7
9	<u>1</u>	<u>.7</u>
TOTAL	129	100.0

In Tables XIV and XV are noted the workshops and the length of the workshops attended by the cooperating teachers in the study. Seventeen teachers had attended workshops for student teaching. This is 13% of the teachers. Eighty-seven percent of the cooperating teachers had not attended a workshop for student teaching. Those attending the workshops spent from one day to two weeks at the workshops. Fifty percent of the cooperating teachers attended workshops of one week duration, while 31% attended one day workshops.

TABLE XIV

## NUMBER OF WORKSHOPS ATTENDED BY THE COOPERATING TEACHER

Number Attending Workshop	Percent
17	13.0
Number Not Attending 113	87.0
TOTAL	
130	100.0

TABLE XV

## LENGTH OF WORKSHOP ATTENDED BY COOPERATING TEACHER

Length of Workshop	Number Attending	Percent
1 day	5	31.3
2 days	2	12.5
1 week	8	50.0
2 weeks	<u>1</u>	<u>6.2</u>
TOTAL	16	100.0

Reading professional literature published by the Association of Student Teaching is done by 21% of the cooperating teachers during the school year. Seventy-one percent has not read any of the materials published by the Association of Student Teaching. One teacher replied

to this question with the remark, "Why doesn't someone tell us about these things?"

TABLE XVI

THE NUMBER OF COÖPERATING TEACHERS READING THE  
LITERATURE OF THE ASSOCIATION FOR STUDENT TEACHING

	Number of Teachers	Percent
Yes	28	21.1
No	91	71.9
Some	<u>9</u>	<u>7.0</u>
TOTAL	128	100.0

When the cooperating teachers were asked if they planned to supervise a student teacher the next school year, 15.6% said no, 54% said yes, and 30% did not know or thought they probably would supervise the next year.

TABLE XVII

THE NUMBER OF COOPERATING TEACHERS  
PLANNING TO SUPERVISE STUDENT TEACHERS IN 1968-69 SCHOOL YEAR

	Number of Cooperating Teachers	Percent
No	20	15.6
Yes	69	53.9
Probably	26	20.3
Don't know	<u>13</u>	<u>10.2</u>
TOTAL	128	100.0

The cooperating teachers responding "no" gave several reasons for not supervising a student teacher the following year. Thirty percent said they did not plan to teach and 25 percent said they were changing positions for the next year. Twenty-five percent of those replying "no" stated they were not assigned a student teacher for the next year. Ten percent said it was too much extra work to have a student teacher.

TABLE XVIII  
REASONS GIVEN FOR NOT SUPERVISING  
STUDENT TEACHERS IN 1968-69 SCHOOL YEAR

Reason	Number of Cooperating Teachers	Percent
Do not plan to teach	6	30.0
Change of position	5	25.0
Let younger teacher earn tuition	1	5.0
Don't want to share with student teacher	1	5.0
Not assigned	5	25.0
Too much extra work	<u>2</u>	<u>10.0</u>
TOTAL	20	100.0

In Table XIX are the reasons given by the cooperating teachers who answered "yes" and "probably" to the question of supervising a student teacher the following year. Thirty percent said they would supervise a student teacher if the student teacher was assigned to them. Seventeen percent felt it necessary to fulfill an obligation to the profession when they worked with student teachers. Thirteen percent felt it was a joy to guide future teachers and thirteen percent said the student teacher was mutually helpful to them and the cooperating teacher was mutually helpful to the student teacher.

TABLE XIX

## REASONS FOR SUPERVISING STUDENT TEACHERS IN THE 1968-69 SCHOOL YEAR

Reason	Number of Teachers	Percent
Joy to guide future teachers	14	13.6
Keeps me up with new ideas	9	8.4
Student requested me	1	1.0
Mutual help	14	13.6
If student teacher is assigned	31	30.1
Student teacher needs experience	6	5.8
Willing to do it	2	2.0
As part of my job	6	5.8
To fulfill obligation to the profession	18	17.4
Interested in better education	2	2.0
To cooperate with college	<u>1</u>	<u>1.0</u>
TOTAL	103	100.0

The type of compensation received by the cooperating teachers in the sample of the study was varied. Fifty percent of the cooperating teachers reported they receive no compensation for their supervisory work. The remaining 50 percent receive compensation by monetary means, by tuition at the institution being reduced to half for further study, and by recognition in several ways. This recognition includes being an honorary faculty member, having a scholarship given to the cooperating school, and receiving an appreciation dinner. The amount of monetary reward may be noted in Table XX.

TABLE XX

THE TYPE AND AMOUNT OF COMPENSATION RECEIVED  
BY COOPERATING TEACHERS IN 1967-68 SCHOOL YEAR

Kind of Compensation	Number of Teachers	Percent
None	64	50.0
\$25.00	15	11.7
\$60.00	2	1.5
College library card	2	1.5
Tuition at 50% rate	14	10.9
\$100.00 per year	1	.8
\$24.00	1	.8
\$50.00	2	1.5
\$8.00	1	.8
\$12.00 per class	2	1.5
Scholarship given to school	3	2.3
Sport activity ticket	11	8.7
Honorary faculty member	2	1.5
Appreciation dinner	8	6.3
Three hours credit free	5	4.0
Less class load	<u>1</u>	<u>.8</u>
Total	128	100.0

Opinions Expressed by the Cooperating Teachers

In the opinion of 57.7 percent of the cooperating teachers in this study it is noted that the bachelor degree is sufficient for the work of supervising student teachers. Thirty-three per cent expressed the opinion that the master's degree is needed. Nine percent of the sample stated the degree is not as important as experience in teaching. (Table XXI).

When the cooperating teacher was asked about specialized training for supervision of student teachers, 35 percent said workshops should



be conducted by the college with whom they cooperate. Again, 12 per cent said simply that experience in teaching is sufficient training for the supervising student teachers. Fifteen per cent said there should be no specialized training at all for the cooperating teacher.

TABLE XXI

OPINION OF COOPERATING TEACHERS RELATIVE TO  
THE PROFESSIONAL DEGREE COOPERATING TEACHERS SHOULD HAVE

Professional Degree	Number of Teachers	Percent
Bachelor's degree	71	57.7
Master's degree	41	33.3
Experience in teaching	<u>11</u>	<u>9.0</u>
TOTAL	123	100.0

TABLE XXII

OPINIONS OF COOPERATING TEACHERS RELATIVE TO  
SPECIALIZED TRAINING FOR COOPERATING TEACHERS

Kind of Training	Number of Respondents	Percent
Workshop at college	40	35.1
Coursework in supervising student teacher	10	8.8
In-service workshop by college	22	19.2
None	17	14.9
Literature from state department	1	.8
Experience in teaching	14	12.3
Coursework in psychology and methodology	2	1.6
Degree in subject matter field	<u>8</u>	<u>7.3</u>
TOTAL	114	100.0

In the opinion of the respondents to the questionnaire concerning the number of years of teaching experience needed by the cooperating teacher, 37.7 per cent said five years should be a minimum. Thirty-four per cent said three years of experience is needed. Two teachers said ten years should be the minimum while 18.4 per cent said two years teaching experience is sufficient.

TABLE XXIII

OPINIONS OF COOPERATING TEACHERS RELATIVE TO  
NUMBER OF YEARS TEACHING EXPERIENCE NEEDED BY COOPERATING TEACHERS

Number of Years	Number of Respondents	Percent
0	0	0
1	9	7.9
2	21	18.4
3	39	34.3
4	0	0.0
5	43	37.7
10	<u>2</u>	<u>1.7</u>
TOTAL	114	100.0

In response to the question of who should determine who works with student teachers, several combinations of administrator, college director, and cooperating teacher are given. The prevalent combinations of principal-college director of student teaching at 22.8 percent, cooperating teacher-principal combination at 18.1 percent and cooperating teacher-college staff-principal combination at 17.2 percent are given by the cooperating teachers. Other combinations are given in Table XXIV.

TABLE XXIV

OPINIONS OF COOPERATING TEACHERS RELATIVE TO  
WHO SHOULD DETERMINE WHO WORKS WITH STUDENT TEACHERS

Person	Number	Percent
Principal-Coordinator	6	4.7
Principal-College director	29	22.8
Cooperating teacher-Superintendent	3	2.9
Cooperating teacher-Principal	23	18.1
Cooperating teacher-College staff-Principal	22	17.2
Principal-College staff-Superintendent	2	1.5
Principal	17	13.4
Cooperating teacher	13	10.4
Superintendent-Principal	4	3.0
College director	2	1.5
Superintendent-College director	2	1.5
Principal-Superintendent-Cooperating teacher-College director	<u>4</u>	<u>3.0</u>
TOTAL	127	100.0

In the opinion of 71 per cent of the sample the college should be responsible for the monetary compensation of the cooperating teacher. According to 12.5 percent of the cooperating teachers the State Department of Education should be responsible for the compensation received. However, 10.9 percent said that the cooperating teacher should not receive any compensation. Five percent of the sample was undecided. (Table XXV).

In expressing their opinion concerning the type of compensation,

50 percent simply said money; but if the exact monetary amounts are included, this percentage becomes 65.3 percent. The monetary amounts ranged from \$50 per student to \$5 per day during the student teaching experience to \$500 per student teacher per semester to regular college staff salary. The breakdown of the types of compensation is given in Table XXVI.

TABLE XXV

OPINIONS OF COOPERATING TEACHERS RELATIVE TO  
WHO SHOULD COMPENSATE THE COOPERATING TEACHER

Payment By	Number	Percent
College	91	71.1
State Department of Education	16	12.5
School District	1	.8
Undecided	6	4.7
None	<u>14</u>	<u>10.9</u>
TOTAL	128	100.0

TABLE XXVI

OPINIONS OF COOPERATING TEACHERS RELATIVE TO THE  
TYPE AND AMOUNT OF COMPENSATION FOR SUPERVISING STUDENT TEACHERS

Type of Compensation	Number	Percent
\$50 per student	4	3.3
Free credit for college work	13	10.9
Fringe benefits	28	23.4
Money	60	50.0
\$100 per student	8	6.6
\$300-\$500	4	3.3
\$5 per day	1	.8
College staff salary	<u>2</u>	<u>1.7</u>
TOTAL	120	100.0

In Table XXVII are the recommendations of the cooperating teachers relative to the number of student teachers per semester. Sixty and six tenths per cent recommend only one student teacher per semester while 34.6 per cent recommend no more than two student teachers per semester. These two groups total 95.2 percent of the total number of cooperating teachers in the sample.

TABLE XXVII  
OPINIONS OF COOPERATING TEACHERS RELATIVE TO THE  
NUMBER OF STUDENT TEACHERS PER SEMESTER

Number of Student Teachers	Number	Percent
1	77	60.6
2	44	34.6
3	2	1.6
4	1	.8
5	2	1.6
10	<u>1</u>	<u>.8</u>
TOTAL	127	100.0

When asked their opinion for special certification for the cooperating teacher, the cooperating teachers responses were 54.1 percent in favor of such certification and 45.9 percent said no. One can say this is a majority but certainly not an overwhelming majority. In Table XXIX the cooperating teachers in favor of certification said the State Department of Education (73.1 percent) should be responsible for this special certification, 12 percent thinks the college should be responsible, and 14.9 percent are undecided who should be responsible for special certification of the cooperating teacher.

TABLE XXVIII  
 OPINIONS OF COOPERATING TEACHERS RELATIVE TO  
 SPECIAL CERTIFICATION OF COOPERATING TEACHERS

	Number	Percent
Yes	67	54.1
No	<u>55</u>	<u>45.9</u>
TOTAL	122	100.0

TABLE XXIX  
 OPINIONS OF COOPERATING TEACHERS RELATIVE TO  
 WHO SHOULD DO THE SPECIAL CERTIFICATION

	Number	Percent
State Department of Education	49	73.1
Undecided	10	14.9
College	<u>8</u>	<u>12.0</u>
TOTAL	67	100.0

Forty-one teachers responding "yes" to certification question gave their opinions for basic certification requirements. Of this group of cooperating teachers, 41.4 percent thinks the basic requirements should include the Master of Science degree, five years teaching experience, and training in supervision; 26.9 percent believes the



basic requirements should include the Bachelor of Science degree and five years of teaching experience; and 17.7 percent think the basic requirements should include the Bachelor of Science degree, five years teaching experience, and training in supervision.

TABLE XXX  
OPINIONS OF COOPERATING TEACHERS RELATIVE TO  
BASIC REQUIREMENTS FOR CERTIFICATION

	Number	Percent
Master of Science degree, 5 years experience, training in supervision	17	41.4
Bachelor of Science degree, 5 years experience, training in supervision	7	17.7
Master of Science degree, 2 years in present position	3	7.3
Bachelor of Science degree, 5 years of experience	11	26.9
Five years experience, 2 years in present position, training in supervision	<u>3</u>	<u>7.3</u>
TOTAL	41	100.0

## CHAPTER V

### SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

#### Summary

The primary purpose of this study was to ascertain the current status of the cooperating teacher in the teacher education programs of colleges and universities of Oklahoma. No attempt was made to delve into the personal characteristics of the cooperating teacher. This aspect would be another study in itself. Certainly a study of this nature should be made and perhaps a "model" constructed for the ideal cooperating teacher.

The State of Oklahoma has long been recognized for the superior quality of the teachers trained in its schools. However, past laurels can not be rested upon and constant improvement is necessary. Many educators recognize the cooperating teacher as the key to the kind of beginning teacher that is needed and wanted in the public school classroom. Intensive efforts should be made to better the cooperating teacher's preparation, his status and his rewards. The selection of cooperating teachers is critical and deserves more attention than is often given to this facet of the teacher training program.

It is unfortunately true that in a great majority of cases cooperating teachers have not received any formal preparation for their responsibilities. Due to lack of coordination between colleges there has

developed an almost unlimited variety of programs. The lack of action by state departments of education to implement requirements and standards has left the leadership for responsibility in doubt and the colleges have had to assume it. Experience has shown that increased standards in teacher certification have resulted in an increased supply of teachers. Perhaps, adding greater prestige to the services rendered by cooperating teachers with the establishment of certification standards would increase the supply of professional workers willing and able to serve in this area of teacher education. Certainly the acceptance by the state of the responsibility of establishing standards, compensation and recognition for the cooperating teacher must be established if we are to improve the teacher education program. This responsibility must be assumed by the state departments of education with the cooperation of the teacher training institutions, public schools and its teachers.

### Conclusions and Implications

The basic purpose of this study as initiated by the investigator was to describe the cooperating teacher working with the colleges and universities of Oklahoma. The data for this study were obtained by use of a questionnaire designed by the writer.

The results of this study are given in Chapter IV and will not be restated here. The reader may get a mental picture of the cooperating teacher situation by reading Chapter IV.

This study corroborates several statements made in the literature concerning the cooperating teacher. These are:

- (1) the cooperating teacher has no formal training for supervisory work,
- (2) the cooperating teacher has not been compensated monetarily for his services,
- (3) the cooperating teacher works under a variety of practices when working with different teacher training institutions,
- (4) the cooperating teacher does not receive in-service orientation to the philosophy and objectives of the teacher training program, and
- (5) the cooperating teacher has not been exposed to or made aware of the publications of professional organizations related to teacher training and supervision of student teachers.

These conclusions imply to the writer that the cooperating teacher is the forgotten person in the teacher education program. The cooperating teachers have no standards for consistency at the state level, receive no compensation for services rendered, have no special training for supervision, have no released school time for planning, and have very little orientation to the task. Yet they are called upon to successfully guide the student teacher into the teaching profession.

#### Recommendations

The investigator makes the following recommendations to improve the cooperating teacher facet of the teacher education program of the State of Oklahoma.

1. The State Department of Education must assume the responsibility and authority for standardization of cooperating teacher selection. (Present criteria for selection are listed in Chapter II.) This may be accomplished by reorganization with a coordinator at the state office. The coordinator in

cooperation with the State Department of Education, the college, and public school must establish standards of training, supervision, and compensation for the cooperating teacher.

This standardization may be in the form of special certification requirements. (Keep in mind that the cooperating teacher must be recommended by his principal or supervisor and the director of teacher education of the college.) In Chapter II several existing programs in use throughout the various states are reviewed. The writer suggests a study of these programs for possible use in Oklahoma.

2. Funds from the state level are needed to compensate the cooperating teacher and finance a real program at the state department.
3. Released time is needed for the cooperating teacher from the class room. This time is to be used to plan and confer with the student teacher.
4. Status for the cooperating teacher is needed. This could be faculty recognition with the teacher training institution and partial salary payment according to time spent teaching in the public school versus the time spent in the teacher training program.

It is the investigator's belief the cooperating teacher need not be the forgotten but rather the key in teacher education programs provided the people of the State of Oklahoma want the best teachers to teach their children.

#### SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

- (1) The Supervising Teacher, Thirty-eighth Yearbook, The Association for Student Teaching, 1959, p. 1-2.
- (2) Hasskarl, Robert A. Jr., "An analysis of the Student Teaching Programs in Oklahoma" (unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Oklahoma, 1963), p. 3.
- (3) Bowden, A. O., "The Training of Critic Teachers in the United States," Journal of Educational Research, Vol. 15 (February 1927), p. 118-125.
- (4) Cox, Dan. "Why Should Public Schools Accept Student Teachers?" Educational Administration and Supervision, Vol. 45, p. 275-279.
- (5) A Proposal for Legislation to Provide State Support of the Program of Student Teaching in Oklahoma. The Oklahoma Commission on Teacher Education and Professional Standards, Spring, 1967.
- (6) Good, Carter V. Dictionary of Education, Second Edition, New York, McGraw-Hill, 1959.
- (7) Steeves, Frank L. Issues in Student Teaching, The Odyssey Press, Inc., New York, 1963, p. 294.
- (8) Curtis, Dwight E. and Andrews, L. O. Guiding Your Student Teacher, New York, Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1954, p. 4.
- (9) Steeves, Frank L. "Summary of Literature on the Off-Campus Cooperating Teachers," Educational Administration and Supervision, Vol. 38 (March 1952), p. 129-135.
- (10) Good, Carter V. and Scates, Douglas E. Methods of Research: Educational, Psychological, Sociological, New York, Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1954, pp. 548-559.
- (11) A New Order in Student Teaching: Fixing Responsibilities for Student Teaching, National Commission on Teacher Education and Professional Standards, National Education Association, Washington, D. C., 1966, p. 4.
- (12) Teacher Education and the Public Schools, Fortieth Yearbook, The Association for Student Teaching, 1961, p. 68.

- (13) Knapp, Dale L. and Bray, Kathleen. "Don't Underestimate the Importance of the Supervising Teacher." The Clearing House, Vol. 40 (October, 1965), pp. 105-107.
- (14) Milanovich, A. "Wanted: More Good Supervising Teachers." Elementary School Journal, Vol. 67 (October, 1966), pp. 22-27.
- (15) Bradley, R. C. and Earp, N. W. "Study and Proposal to Improve the Professional Training of Supervisors of Student Teachers Through the Establishment of Standards for Certification." Teachers College Journal, Vol. 36 (December, 1964), pp. 95-97.
- (16) Taylor, Gem Kate. "Factors in the Decision to Become a Supervising Teacher." Peabody Journal of Education, Vol. 38 (May, 1961), pp. 351-352.
- (17) Hruska, Jack L. "A Student Teacher's Views on Supervision." National Business Education Quarterly, Vol. 29 (Summer, 1961), pp. 47-52.
- (18) Hunter, Elizabeth. The Cooperating Teacher At Work: Case Studies of Critical Incidents, New York: Bureau of Publication, Teacher College, Columbia University, 1962.
- (19) Little, Harry H. Handbook for Supervisors of Student Teachers. Georgia State College for Women, Milledgeville, Georgia, 1947.
- (20) Durrance, Charles L. and Garth K. Blake. "Selecting Directing Teachers." Florida Education, Vol. 38 (May, 1961), pp. 17-18.
- (21) Shruck, Emerson. "Field or Laboratory Experience in Teacher Education." Journal of Teacher Education, Vol. 12 (September, 1961), pp. 271-274.
- (22) Cornish, Jane. "Overcoming the First-Year Teacher Dilemma." Education, Vol. 80 (October, 1959), pp. 115-117.
- (23) Rabin, Bernard. "Who are Supervising Teachers?" Thirty-eighth Yearbook, (Chapter I) The Association for Student Teaching, 1959, p. 5.
- (24) Flowers, John G. "Recommended Standards Governing Professional Laboratory Experiences and Student Teaching." First Yearbook, American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1948, pp. 88-98.
- (25) Hertzler, Silas. "Preparation and Experience of the Critic Teachers of the Secondary Schools of Indiana, 1929." Educational Administration and Supervision, Vol. 16 (December, 1930), pp. 693-704.

- (26) Stratemeyer, Florence B. and Lindsey, Margaret. Working With Student Teachers, Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York, 1958, pp. 4-11.
- (27) Caskey, S. R. "Supervision of Student Teachers: A Challenge." School and Community, Vol. 52 (May, 1966), p. 7.
- (28) Veselak, Kenneth E. "Supervising Student Teachers." High Points, Vol. 43 (December, 1961), pp. 56-59.
- (29) Wiggins, Sam P. "Improving Off-Campus Student Teaching." Education, Vol. 73 (June, 1953), pp. 622-629.
- (30) Beaty, Edgar. "Qualities Desired in Off-Campus Supervising Teachers." Educational Administration and Supervision, Vol. 41 (February, 1959) pp. 75-82.
- (31) Hanson, Carl W. "Principles and Criteria for the Selection of Critic Teachers." Educational Administration and Supervision, Vol. 34 (October, 1948), pp. 379-381.
- (32) Bennie, William A. Cooperation for Better Student Teaching, Burgess Publishing Company, Minneapolis, Minnesota, 1966.
- (33) Guide for Organizing and Administering Student Teaching. Oklahoma State Department of Education, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma, 1963, pp. 10-11.
- (34) An AST Position Paper: The Supervising Teacher, Commission on Standards for Supervising Teachers and College Supervision, The Association for Student Teaching, Cedar Falls, Iowa, 1966, pp. 1-4.
- (35) Schooler, Virgil E. "You and Your Student Teacher." The Indiana Teacher, Vol. 102 (September, 1957), pp. 8-9.
- (36) Merton, Joseph Merring. "The Nature of the Supervision of Student Teaching." Dissertation Abstracts, XVI (February, 1956), p. 291.
- (37) Osmon, Robert V. "Associative Factors in Changes of Student Teachers Attitudes during Student Teaching." Dissertation Abstracts, XX (October, 1959), p. 1281.
- (38) Crosby, Richard C. "A Study of the Status of the Critic Teacher of Science in the Cooperating Public Secondary Schools of the Eastern United States." Science Education, Vol. 22 (April, 1938), pp. 171-175.
- (39) Barter, Alice K. "How the College Can Take the Initiative in Recruiting Supervising Teachers." Peabody Journal of Education, Vol. 37 (March, 1960), pp. 281-284.



- (40) Taylor, Gem Kate. "Factors in the Decision to Become a Supervising Teacher." Peabody Journal of Education, Vol. 38 (May, 1961), pp. 351-352.
- (41) Shuck, Emerson, "Field or Laboratory Experience in Teacher Education." Journal of Teacher Education, Vol. 12 (September, 1961), pp. 271-274.
- (42) Schooler, Virgil E. "You and Your Student Teacher." The Indiana Teacher, Vol. 102 (September, 1957), pp. 8-9.
- (43) Lingren, Vernon C. "The Certification of Cooperating Teachers in Student Teaching Programs." Journal of Teacher Education, Vol. 7 (November, 1957), pp. 403-407.
- (44) Knapp, Dale L. and Kathleen Bray. "Don't Underestimate the Importance of the Supervising Teacher." The Clearing House, Vol. 40 (October, 1965), pp. 105-107.
- (45) Bradley, R. C. and N. W. Earp. "Study and Proposal to Improve the Professional Training of Supervisors of Student Teachers Through the Establishment of Standards for Certification." Teachers College Journal, Vol. 36 (December, 1964), pp. 95-97.
- (46). Woodruff, Asahel D. Student Teaching Today: A Survey Report of Selected Aspects of Student Teaching. Washington, D. C.: The American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1960.
- (47) Association for Student Teaching. "The Supervising Teacher." Thirty-eighth Yearbook, Cedar Fall, Iowa: Association for Student Teaching, 1959.
- (48) Bergen, Zane. "A Report Concerning the Certification of Cooperating Teachers." (Unpublished survey report) Spring, 1966.
- (49) Perrodin, A. F. "In Support of Supervising Teacher Education Programs." Journal of Teacher Education, Vol. 12 (March, 1961), pp. 36-38.
- (50) Standards for Student Teaching, Code of West Virginia, Chapter 18, Article 2, Section 6, pp. 3-6.
- (51) Good, Carter V. and Scates, Douglas E. Methods of Research: Educational, Psychological, Sociological, New York, Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1954, pp. 601-606.

- (52) Parten, Mildred. Surveys, Polls, and Samples: Practical Procedures, Cooper Square Publishers, Inc., New York, 1966, pp. 290-329.
- (53) Garrett, Henry E. and Woodworth, R. S. Statistics in Psychology and Education, David McKay Company, Inc., New York, 1964, pp. 27-39.

## QUESTIONNAIRE FOR COOPERATING TEACHER

Dear Cooperating Teacher,

Your help is needed in an objective study of the cooperating teachers of the State of Oklahoma. This study is being conducted under the direction of Dr. Kenneth Wiggins and the cooperation of the Teacher Education Division of the State Department of Education.

Would you answer the questionnaire as accurately as possible as you view your role as a supervisor of student teachers. Your prompt and accurate reply is appreciated. (Do not write your name on the questionnaire.)

Thank you,

Zane Bergen

Please answer as accurately as possible these questions concerning your role as a supervisor of a student teacher in the teacher education program of the college with whom you are cooperating.

1. Sex:\_\_\_\_\_ 2. Age:\_\_\_\_\_ 3. Grade level taught:\_\_\_\_\_
4. Total Number of Years teaching experience:\_\_\_\_\_
5. Number of teachers in your school system:\_\_\_\_\_
6. Number of years you have served as a cooperating teacher: \_\_\_\_\_
7. Number of years in your present teaching position:\_\_\_\_\_
8. Highest degree held:\_\_\_\_\_ 9. Teaching certificate held:\_\_\_\_\_
10. Undergraduate major:\_\_\_\_\_ 11. Undergraduate minor:\_\_\_\_\_
12. Number of classes/day taught outside your major:\_\_\_\_\_
13. Number of student teachers supervised in 1966-67:\_\_\_\_\_
14. Name of college(s) with whom you cooperate:\_\_\_\_\_

15. Names of professional organizations in which you have membership: \_\_\_\_\_
16. List any offices you hold in these organizations: \_\_\_\_\_
17. By whom were you selected for your role of a cooperating teacher: \_\_\_\_\_
18. Names of supervision courses you have taken: \_\_\_\_\_
19. Have you attended a workshop designed for supervising student teachers \_\_\_\_\_ If so, how long was the workshop: \_\_\_\_\_
20. Do you regularly read the literature published by the Association for Student Teaching: \_\_\_\_\_
21. Do you plan to supervise a student teacher next year? \_\_\_\_\_ Why? \_\_\_\_\_
22. What kind of compensation did you receive for your services in supervising student teachers? \_\_\_\_\_

Would you respond to these questions as to your recommendations for a teacher to work as a cooperating teacher in the teacher education program of the college or university.

1. What professional degree do you feel the cooperating teacher should have to be considered for this work? \_\_\_\_\_
2. What specialized training should the cooperating teacher have? (hours of course work? what kinds of courses? should these be at the graduate level? in-service training by the college? workshop at the college?) \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_
3. How many years of experience in the classroom should the cooperating teacher have before accepting student teachers? \_\_\_\_\_
4. Who do you feel should determine if you should be elected to work with student teachers? (yourself? your building principal? your superintendent? the director of teacher education in the college? State Department of Education? some combination of the above?) \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

5. What compensation do you feel the cooperating teacher should receive for his services? (Should this be furnished by the school district in which you work? The college with whom you cooperate? The State Department of Education? Should the compensation be in terms of money, special recognition, fringe benefits at the college? How much?) \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_
6. What would you recommend as the maximum number of full time student teachers under your supervision at the same time? \_\_\_\_\_
7. Do you feel that a cooperating teacher should be certified just as you are certified to hold your present teaching position? Should this certification be through the State Department of Education? \_\_\_\_\_  
What do you think the minimum requirements should be if such certification should be required? \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

VITA 3

Robert Zane Bergen

Candidate for the Degree of

Doctor of Education

Thesis: THE STATUS OF THE COOPERATING TEACHER IN THE ELEMENTARY AND  
SECONDARY SCHOOLS OF OKLAHOMA

Major Field: Higher Education

Biographical:

Personal Data: Born at Weatherford, Oklahoma, July 16, 1928,  
the son of John and Goldie Bergen.

Education: Graduated from Weatherford High School, Weatherford, Oklahoma, in 1946; received the Bachelor of Arts in Education degree from Southwestern State College, Weatherford, Oklahoma, in 1950 with a major in mathematics; was a grantee of the National Science Foundation at the Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, Oklahoma, receiving the Master of Science in Natural Science in 1957. Attended summer institutes of the National Science Foundation at Fresno State College, Fresno, California, in 1959; Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, Oklahoma, in 1962; University of Oklahoma, Norman, Oklahoma, 1964. Attended the Oklahoma State University during the 1965-66 school year as a grantee of the National Science Foundation; completed requirements for the Doctor of Education degree in May, 1970.

Professional Experience: Taught mathematics and science at Alfalfa High School, Alfalfa, Oklahoma, from 1950-53; taught mathematics and science at Weatherford Junior High School, Weatherford, Oklahoma, from 1953-56; taught all the sciences Weatherford High School, Weatherford, Oklahoma, and was assistant principal, 1957-62; principal of Junior and Senior High School, Weatherford, Oklahoma, 1962-63. Taught science classes from 1963-65, Weatherford, Oklahoma, and acted as assistant principal. Principal of Thompson Junior High School, Weatherford, Oklahoma, 1966-69. Taught extension class in 1965-66 for Oklahoma State University.

Member of National Education Association, Oklahoma Education Association, National Science Teachers Association, Oklahoma Science Teachers Association and Phi Delta Kappa.