

71-27,615

HIBLER, Joe Anna, 1939-

CURRENT AND PREFERRED POLICIES IN THE SUPERVISION  
AND THE EVALUATION OF BUSINESS STUDENT TEACHERS:  
AN ANALYSIS OF THE OPINIONS OF COLLEGIATE  
BUSINESS EDUCATION TEACHERS, COOPERATING HIGH  
SCHOOL BUSINESS TEACHERS, AND BUSINESS EDUCATION  
GRADUATES.

The University of Oklahoma, Ed.D., 1971  
Education, teacher training

University Microfilms, A XEROX Company, Ann Arbor, Michigan

THE UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA  
GRADUATE COLLEGE

CURRENT AND PREFERRED POLICIES IN THE SUPERVISION  
AND THE EVALUATION OF BUSINESS STUDENT TEACHERS:

An Analysis of the Opinions of Collegiate  
Business Education Teachers, Cooperating  
High School Business Teachers, and  
Business Education Graduates

A DISSERTATION  
SUBMITTED TO THE GRADUATE FACULTY  
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the  
degree of  
DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

BY  
JOE ANNA HIBLER  
Norman, Oklahoma  
1971

CURRENT AND PREFERRED POLICIES IN THE SUPERVISION  
AND THE EVALUATION OF BUSINESS STUDENT TEACHERS:

An Analysis of the Opinions of Collegiate  
Business Education Teachers, Cooperating  
High School Business Teachers, and  
Business Education Graduates

APPROVED BY

Raymond R. White

Anthony C. Liss

John D. Pulliam

Wendell L. McQuitt

DISSERTATION COMMITTEE

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The writer wishes to express her appreciation to her advisory committee: Dr. Raymond R. White, Chairman, Dr. Anthony S. Lis, Dr. John D. Pulliam, and Dr. Wandella L. McNutt.

The writer also wishes to acknowledge her sincere gratitude to The Delta Kappa Gamma Society International for their financial assistance through the following scholarships: Lois and Marguerite Morse, International, 1969-70; Gamma State, Short-Term, 1970; and Gamma State, Long-Term, 1970-71.

Special gratitude is extended to Miss Laura Switzer for her patience and friendship and to Dr. Albert H. Gabriel for his assistance in proofreading and editing copy.

Special recognition is given to the writer's parents, Mr. and Mrs. W. D. Hibler, for their encouragement and understanding throughout this study.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

|  | Page |
|--|------|
| ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS. . . . .  | iii  |
| LIST OF TABLES. . . . .  | vi   |
| <br>Chapter  |      |
| I. THE PROBLEM. . . . .  | 1    |
| Introduction. . . . .  | 1    |
| Statement of Problem. . . . .  | 3    |
| Statement of Purpose. . . . .  | 3    |
| Theoretical Framework . . . . .  | 3    |
| Operational Definitions . . . . .  | 5    |
| Population and Sample . . . . .  | 6    |
| Hypotheses To Be Tested . . . . .  | 6    |
| Assumptions . . . . .  | 7    |
| Delimitations . . . . .  | 8    |
| Limitation. . . . .  | 9    |
| Nature and Sources of Data. . . . .  | 9    |
| Organization of Report. . . . .  | 10   |
| II. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE . . . . .   | 11   |
| Published Literature. . . . .  | 11   |
| Supervision of Student Teaching. . . . .   | 12   |
| Evaluation of Student Teaching . . . . .   | 35   |
| Unpublished Doctoral Research Studies . . . . .  | 42   |
| Research Studies Concerned with<br>General Student Teaching Programs . . . .                 | 43   |
| Research Studies Concerned with<br>Business Education Student<br>Teaching Programs . . . . . | 55   |
| Summary . . . . .  | 65   |

| Chapter   | Page |
|---|------|
| III. METHODS AND PROCEDURES . . . . .                   | 67   |
| Pre-Experimental Procedures . . . . .                   | 67   |
| Choice of Research Design. . . . .                      | 68   |
| Choice of Statistical Test . . . . .                    | 70   |
| Experimental Procedures . . . . .                       | 71   |
| Selection of Subjects. . . . .                          | 71   |
| Data Collection Procedures . . . . .                    | 73   |
| Dissemination of Questionnaires. . . . .                | 74   |
| Analysis of the Data . . . . .                          | 75   |
| IV. RESULTS. . . . .                                    | 77   |
| Results of Testing the Hypotheses . . . . .             | 78   |
| Item Analysis of Questionnaires . . . . .               | 82   |
| Analysis of the Supervision Policies . . . . .          | 83   |
| Summary of the Supervision Policies. . . . .            | 130  |
| Qualifications of the Supervisors. . . . .              | 132  |
| Nature of the Supervision. . . . .                      | 137  |
| Analysis of the Evaluation Policies. . . . .            | 147  |
| Summary of the Evaluation Policies . . . . .            | 168  |
| Personnel Involved in Evaluation . . . . .              | 169  |
| Methods Used in Evaluation . . . . .                    | 171  |
| V. SUMMARY, IMPLICATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS . . . . . | 175  |
| Summary . . . . .                                       | 175  |
| Purpose. . . . .  | 175  |
| Procedures . . . . .                                    | 175  |
| Results. . . . .  | 176  |
| Implications. . . . .                                   | 178  |
| Recommendations . . . . .                               | 181  |
| BIBLIOGRAPHY. . . . .                                   | 186  |
| APPENDIX. . . . .                                       | 196  |

## LIST OF TABLES

| Table  | Page |
|--|------|
| 1. Schemata of Multiple-Group, Comparison-Study Design. . . . .  | 69   |
| 2. Correlations Implied by Hypotheses 1 to 6 . . .   | 70   |
| 3. Item Correlates from All Three Questionnaires. . . . .  | 79   |
| 4. Correlation Matrix of All Possible Combinations. . . . .  | 81   |
| 5. Position of the College Supervisor as Reported by Business Education Graduates (Item Number 1) . . . . .  | 84   |
| 6. Minimum Professional Preparation Required of the College Supervisor as Reported by Business Education Graduates (Item Number 2) . . . . .             | 85   |
| 7. Academic Level of Teaching Experience Required of the College Supervisor as Reported by Business Education Graduates (Item Number 3) . . . . .        | 86   |
| 8. Minimum Number of Years' Teaching Experience Required of the College Supervisor as Reported by Business Education Graduates (Item Number 4) . . . . . | 86   |
| 9. Position of the Cooperating Teacher as Reported by Business Education Graduates (Item Number 5) . . . . .   | 87   |
| 10. Minimum Professional Preparation Required of the Cooperating Teacher as Reported by Business Education Graduates (Item Number 6) . . . . .           | 88   |

| Table   | Page |
|---|------|
| 11. Academic Level of Teaching Experience<br>Required of the Cooperating Teacher<br>as Reported by Business Education<br>Graduates (Item Number 7) . . . . .                            | 89   |
| 12. Minimum Number of Years' Teaching Experience<br>Required of the Cooperating Teacher as<br>Reported by Business Education Graduates<br>(Item Number 8) . . . . .                     | 89   |
| 13. Number of Student Teachers Assigned to a<br>College Supervisor at One Time as Reported<br>by Business Education Graduates<br>(Item Number 9) . . . . .                              | 90   |
| 14. Number of Student Teachers Assigned to the<br>Cooperating Teacher at One Time as<br>Reported by Business Education Graduates<br>(Item Number 10). . . . .                           | 91   |
| 15. Number of Cooperating Teachers Supervising<br>the Student Teacher During Student<br>Teaching Assignment as Reported by<br>Business Education Graduates<br>(Item Number 11). . . . . | 91   |
| 16. Orientation Conference Held for the Student<br>Teachers Prior to Student Teaching as<br>Reported by Business Education Graduates<br>(Item Number 12). . . . .                       | 92   |
| 17. Number of Observational Visits by the College<br>Supervisor as Reported by Business Education<br>Graduates (Item Number 13). . . . .  | 93   |
| 18. Individual Conference(s) that a College<br>Supervisor Holds with a Student Teacher as<br>Reported by Business Education Graduates<br>(Item Number 14). . . . .                      | 94   |
| 19. Individual Conference(s) that a Cooperating<br>Teacher Holds with a Student Teacher as<br>Reported by Business Education Graduates<br>(Item Number 15). . . . .                     | 95   |
| 20. Campus Seminar(s) Held for Student Teachers<br>as Reported by Business Education<br>Graduates (Item Number 16). . . . .   | 96   |



|     |   |     |
|-----|---|-----|
| 21. | Individuals Participating in Conference<br>Following Observational Visit as Reported<br>by Business Education Graduates<br>(Item Number 17) . . . . .   | 97  |
| 22. | Cooperating Teacher Did Most of the Observation<br>During the Following Part of Student<br>Teaching as Reported by Business Education<br>Graduates (Item Number 18) . . . . .                 | 97  |
| 23. | Position of the College Supervisor as<br>Reported by Collegiate Business Education<br>Teachers (Item Number 1) . . . . .  | 99  |
| 24. | Minimum Professional Preparation Required of<br>the College Supervisor as Reported by<br>Collegiate Business Education Teachers<br>(Item Number 2) . . . . .                                  | 100 |
| 25. | Academic Level of Teaching Experience<br>Required of the College Supervisor as<br>Reported by Collegiate Business Education<br>Teachers (Item Number 3) . . . . .                             | 100 |
| 26. | Minimum Number of Years' Teaching Experience<br>Required of the College Supervisor as<br>Reported by Collegiate Business Education<br>Teachers (Item Number 4) . . . . .                      | 101 |
| 27. | Credit-Load Reduction Allotted to the College<br>Supervisor for Supervisory Duties as<br>Reported by Collegiate Business Education<br>Teachers (Item Number 5) . . . . .                      | 102 |
| 28. | Number of Student Teachers Assigned to a<br>College Supervisor at One Time as Reported<br>by Collegiate Business Education Teachers<br>(Item Number 6) . . . . .                              | 103 |
| 29. | Number of Student Teachers Assigned to the<br>Cooperating Teacher at One Time as<br>Reported by Collegiate Business Education<br>Teachers (Item Number 7) . . . . .                           | 103 |
| 30. | Number of Cooperating Teachers Supervising<br>the Student Teacher During Student<br>Teaching Assignment as Reported by<br>Collegiate Business Education Teachers<br>(Item Number 8) . . . . . | 104 |

|     |  |     |
|-----|--|-----|
| 31. | Percentage of Student Teachers Assigned<br>Outside the Supervisory Radius of the<br>College as Reported by Collegiate Business<br>Education Teachers (Item Number 9) . . . . .       | 105 |
| 32. | College Compensation to the Cooperating<br>Teacher as Reported by Collegiate Business<br>Education Teachers (Item Number 10) . . . . .   | 106 |
| 33. | College Benefits Provided the Cooperating<br>Teacher as Reported by Collegiate Business<br>Education Teachers (Item Number 11) . . . . .   | 106 |
| 34. | Orientation Conference(s) Held for the<br>Student Teachers Prior to Student Teaching<br>as Reported by Collegiate Business<br>Education Teachers (Item Number 12) . . . . .          | 108 |
| 35. | Orientation Conference(s) for the<br>Cooperating Teachers Prior to Student<br>Teaching as Reported by Collegiate<br>Business Education Teachers<br>(Item Number 13) . . . . .        | 108 |
| 36. | Number of Observational Visits by the<br>College Supervisor as Reported by<br>Collegiate Business Education Teachers<br>(Item Number 14) . . . . .                                   | 109 |
| 37. | Individual Conference(s) that a College<br>Supervisor Holds with a Student Teacher<br>as Reported by Collegiate Business<br>Education Teachers (Item Number 15) . . . . .            | 110 |
| 38. | Individual Conference(s) that the College<br>Supervisor Holds with the Cooperating<br>Teacher as Reported by Collegiate<br>Business Education Teachers<br>(Item Number 16) . . . . . | 111 |
| 39. | Campus Seminar(s) Held for Student Teachers<br>as Reported by Collegiate Business<br>Education Teachers (Item Number 17) . . . . .   | 112 |
| 40. | Campus Seminar(s) Held for Cooperating<br>Teachers as Reported by Collegiate<br>Business Education Teachers<br>(Item Number 18) . . . . .  | 113 |

|     |   |     |
|-----|---|-----|
| 41. | Individuals Participating in Conference<br>Following Observational Visit as Reported<br>by Collegiate Business Education Teachers<br>(Item Number 19) . . . . .                                   | 114 |
| 42. | Position of the Cooperating Teacher as<br>Reported by Cooperating High School<br>Business Teachers (Item Number 1) . . . . .  | 115 |
| 43. | Minimum Professional Preparation Required of<br>the Cooperating Teacher as Reported by<br>Cooperating High School Business Teachers<br>(Item Number 2) . . . . .                                  | 116 |
| 44. | Academic Level of Teaching Experience<br>Required of the Cooperating Teacher as<br>Reported by Cooperating High School<br>Business Teachers (Item Number 3) . . . . .                             | 117 |
| 45. | Minimum Number of Years' Teaching<br>Experience Required of the Cooperating<br>Teacher as Reported by Cooperating High<br>School Business Teachers (Item Number 4) . . . . .                      | 117 |
| 46. | Credit-Load Reduction Allotted the<br>Cooperating Teacher for Supervisory<br>Duties as Reported by Cooperating High<br>School Business Teachers (Item Number 5) . . . . .                         | 118 |
| 47. | Final Approval of the Selection of a<br>Cooperating Teacher as Reported by<br>Cooperating High School Business<br>Teachers (Item Number 6) . . . . .  | 119 |
| 48. | Requirement to Qualify as a Cooperating<br>Teacher as Reported by Cooperating High<br>School Business Teachers (Item Number 7) . . . . .  | 120 |
| 49. | Assignment as a Cooperating Teacher as<br>Reported by Cooperating High School<br>Business Teachers (Item Number 8) . . . . .  | 120 |
| 50. | Number of Student Teachers Assigned to the<br>Cooperating Teacher at One Time as<br>Reported by Cooperating High School<br>Business Teachers (Item Number 9) . . . . .                            | 121 |
| 51. | Number of Cooperating Teachers Supervising<br>The Student Teacher During Student<br>Teaching Assignment as Reported by<br>Cooperating High School Business<br>Teachers (Item Number 10) . . . . . | 122 |

|     |  |     |
|-----|--|-----|
| 52. | College Compensation to the Cooperating<br>Teacher as Reported by Cooperating High<br>School Business Teachers (Item Number 11) . .  | 122 |
| 53. | Local School District Compensation to<br>Cooperating Teacher as Reported by<br>Cooperating High School Business<br>Teachers (Item Number 12) . . . . .   | 124 |
| 54. | College Benefits Provided the Cooperating<br>Teacher as Reported by Cooperating High<br>School Business Teachers (Item Number 13) . .  | 124 |
| 55. | Orientation Conference Held for the<br>Cooperating Teacher Prior to Student<br>Teaching as Reported by Cooperating High<br>School Business Teachers (Item Number 14) . .                                   | 125 |
| 56. | Orientation Conference the Cooperating<br>Teacher Holds with the Student Teacher(s)<br>Prior to Student Teaching as Reported by<br>Cooperating High School Business<br>Teachers (Item Number 15) . . . . . | 126 |
| 57. | Number of Observational Visits by the<br>College Supervisor as Reported by<br>Cooperating High School Business<br>Teachers (Item Number 16) . . . . .  | 127 |
| 58. | Individual Conference(s) that the<br>Cooperating Teacher Holds with the<br>Student Teacher as Reported by<br>Cooperating High School Business<br>Teachers (Item Number 17) . . . . .                       | 128 |
| 59. | Individual Conference(s) that the College<br>Supervisor Holds with the Cooperating<br>Teacher as Reported by Cooperating High<br>School Business Teachers (Item Number 18) . .                             | 129 |
| 60. | Individuals Participating in Conference<br>Following Observational Visit as Reported<br>by Cooperating High School Business<br>Teachers (Item Number 19) . . . . .   | 130 |
| 61. | Campus Seminar(s) Held for Student Teachers<br>as Reported by Cooperating High School<br>Business Teachers (Item Number 20). . . . .   | 131 |

|     |  |     |
|-----|--|-----|
| 62. | Campus Seminar(s) Held for Cooperating Teachers as Reported by Cooperating High School Business Teachers (Item Number 21) . .                        | 132 |
| 63. | Method Used to Convey Evaluation Criteria to the Student Teacher as Reported by Business Education Graduates (Item Number 19). . . . .               | 148 |
| 64. | Written Evaluation Submitted by the College Supervisor as Reported by Business Education Graduates (Item Number 20). . . . .                         | 149 |
| 65. | Written Evaluation Submitted by the Cooperating Teacher as Reported by Business Education Graduates (Item Number 21). . . . .                        | 150 |
| 66. | Type of Evaluation Form Used During Observational Visit as Reported by Business Education Graduates (Item Number 22). . . . .                        | 150 |
| 67. | Type of Form Used for the Final Evaluation as Reported by Business Education Graduates (Item Number 23). . . . .                                     | 151 |
| 68. | Person Responsible for Assigning the Final Grade as Reported by Business Education Graduates (Item Number 24). . . . .                               | 152 |
| 69. | College Supervisor's Role in Final Evaluation as Reported by Business Education Graduates (Item Number 25). . . . .                                  | 152 |
| 70. | Cooperating Teacher's Role in Final Evaluation as Reported by Business Education Graduates (Item Number 26). . . . .                                 | 153 |
| 71. | Grading Scheme Used as Reported by Business Education Graduates (Item Number 27). . . . .  | 154 |
| 72. | Method Used to Convey Evaluation Criteria to the Cooperating Teacher as Reported by Collegiate Business Education Teachers (Item Number 20). . . . . | 155 |
| 73. | Written Evaluation Submitted by the College Supervisor as Reported by Collegiate Business Education Teachers (Item Number 21). . . . .               | 156 |

|     |   |     |
|-----|---|-----|
| 74. | Written Evaluation Submitted by the<br>Cooperating Teacher as Reported by<br>Collegiate Business Education Teachers<br>(Item Number 22) . . . . .                 | 157 |
| 75. | Type of Evaluation Form Used During<br>Observational Visits as Reported by<br>Collegiate Business Education Teachers<br>(Item Number 23) . . . . .                | 158 |
| 76. | Type of Form Used for the Final Evaluation<br>as Reported by Collegiate Business<br>Education Teachers (Item Number 24) . . . . .                                 | 159 |
| 77. | Person Responsible for Assigning the Final<br>Grade as Reported by Collegiate<br>Business Education Teachers<br>(Item Number 25) . . . . .                        | 159 |
| 78. | College Supervisor's Role in Final<br>Evaluation as Reported by Collegiate<br>Business Education Teachers<br>(Item Number 26) . . . . .                           | 161 |
| 79. | Cooperating Teacher's Role in Final<br>Evaluation as Reported by Collegiate<br>Business Education Teachers<br>(Item Number 27) . . . . .                          | 161 |
| 80. | Grading Scheme Used as Reported by<br>Collegiate Business Education<br>Teachers (Item Number 28) . . . . .  | 162 |
| 81. | Method Used to Convey Evaluation Criteria<br>to the Cooperating Teacher as Reported<br>by Cooperating High School Business<br>Teachers (Item Number 22) . . . . . | 163 |
| 82. | Written Evaluation Submitted by the<br>Cooperating Teacher as Reported by<br>Cooperating High School Business<br>Teachers (Item Number 23) . . . . .              | 164 |
| 83. | Type of Evaluation Form Used During<br>Observational Visits as Reported by<br>Cooperating High School Business<br>Teachers (Item Number 24) . . . . .             | 165 |
| 84. | Type of Form Used for the Final Evaluation<br>as Reported by Cooperating High School<br>Business Teachers (Item Number 25) . . . . .                              | 166 |

|     |   |     |
|-----|---|-----|
| 85. | Cooperating Teacher's Role in Final<br>Evaluation as Reported by Cooperating<br>High School Business Teachers<br>(Item Number 26) . . . . . | 167 |
| 86. | Person Responsible for Assigning the Final<br>Grade as Reported by Cooperating High<br>School Business Teachers (Item Number 27) . .        | 167 |
| 87. | Grading Scheme Used as Reported by<br>Cooperating High School Business<br>Teachers (Item Number 28) . . . . .                               | 168 |

CURRENT AND PREFERRED POLICIES IN THE SUPERVISION  
AND THE EVALUATION OF BUSINESS STUDENT TEACHERS:

An Analysis of the Opinions of Collegiate  
Business Education Teachers, Cooperating  
High School Business Teachers, and  
Business Education Graduates

CHAPTER I

THE PROBLEM

Introduction

Historically, the professional preparation of prospective teachers has varied greatly throughout the various colleges and universities. Despite the variation, educators have agreed that "the one indisputably essential element in professional education is practice teaching."<sup>1</sup> Furthermore, educators have agreed that the primary purposes of student teaching have been to provide a "supervised classroom experience" and "to provide a relatively valid way of predicting teacher success."<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>James Bryant Conant, The Education of American Teachers (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1963), p. 142.

<sup>2</sup>William E. Stradley, Supervising Student Teachers (Danville, Ill.: The Interstate Printers and Publishers, Inc., 1968), pp. 9-10.



Recently, however, "the student teaching phase of teacher education has come into sharp focus as a serious problem."<sup>1</sup> Educators are discussing the relevancy and the effectiveness of current policies and practices in the student teaching phase of teacher education.

Although all aspects of student teaching are being questioned, much of the educators' concern centers around the supervision and the evaluation of student teaching. Andrews considers the supervision aspect of student teaching a major issue: "Any major change in student teaching will be greatly affected by the adequacy of the classroom supervision or the lack of it."<sup>2</sup> The Association for Student Teaching focuses on the importance of the evaluation of student teaching as follows:

Whenever critical minds turned to the question of how teacher education was to be improved, inevitably consideration was given to the inadequacy of existing procedures and techniques for evaluating student teaching.<sup>3</sup>

Most of the available literature and research pertain to student teaching in general whereas the investigations

---

<sup>1</sup>Asahel D. Woodruff, Student Teaching Today (Washington, D. C.: The American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education, 1960), p. v.

<sup>2</sup>L. O. Andrews, Student Teaching (New York: The Center for Applied Research in Education, 1964), p. 3.

<sup>3</sup>Leander L. Boykin, "Principles of Evaluating in Student Teaching," Evaluating Student Teaching, Thirty-Ninth Yearbook of the Association for Student Teaching (Cedar Falls, Iowa: The Association for Student Teaching, 1960), p. 8.

dealing primarily with the supervision and the evaluation of student teaching are somewhat limited. Specifically, the research concerning the supervision and the evaluation of student teaching for prospective business teachers is even more limited.

#### Statement of Problem

This study investigated the following questions:

1. What policies and procedures are currently being used by the state colleges of Oklahoma in the supervision and the evaluation of business student teachers?
2. What policies and procedures are preferred for the state colleges of Oklahoma in the supervision and the evaluation of business student teachers?
3. What is the nature and amount of discrepancy between the current and the preferred policies and procedures of the state colleges of Oklahoma in the supervision and the evaluation of business student teachers?

#### Statement of Purpose

The purpose of this study was to analyze the current and the preferred policies in the supervision and the evaluation of business student teachers on the basis of the opinions of collegiate business education teachers, cooperating high school business teachers, and business education graduates.

#### Theoretical Framework

The framework of this study was built on the theory that educators and concerned patrons have advocated practice

as an effective technique for training teachers. In 1838, while establishing the first normal school, the Massachusetts Board of Education authored the following statement:

No one can entertain a doubt that there is a mastery in teaching as in every art. Nor is it less obvious that within reasonable limits this skill and this mastery may themselves be made the subject of instruction and be communicated to others.<sup>1</sup>

Further evidence of the theory of practice as a resultant teacher-training tool was John Dewey's statement made in 1904:

I shall assume without argument that adequate professional instruction of teachers is not exclusively theoretical, but involves a certain amount of practical work.<sup>2</sup>

In 1961, leading educators continued to stress the significance of practice as an essential part of teacher education programs. For example, the task force report on teacher education indicated the importance of practice in training teachers: "On the new horizon, the college must include demonstrations of competence as an integral part of the program of professional preparation."<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Conant, American Teachers, p. 113.

<sup>2</sup>John Dewey, The Relation of Theory to Practice in Education, No. 16: Association for Student Teaching Bulletin (Cedar Falls, Iowa: The Association for Student Teaching, 1961), p. 1.

<sup>3</sup>Margaret Lindsey, ed., New Horizons for the Teaching Profession (Washington, D. C.: Education Association of the United States, 1961), p. 83.

Today, the theory of practice as a beneficial element of teacher training is still evident. As a result of an extensive study of education commissioned by the Carnegie Corporation, Silberman, in his 1970 publication, Crisis in the Classroom, made the following statement:

To the extent to which they value any aspect of their professional education, teachers generally cite practice teaching as the most valuable--sometimes the only valuable--part. Critics of teacher education, too, all agree that whatever else might be dispensable, practice teaching is not.<sup>1</sup>

There is little question that the format for providing practice for prospective teachers varies greatly among the institutions. But, the framework for this study appears to be well established--practice has been and is currently a vital part of a teacher education program.

#### Operational Definitions

Terminology used in this study was defined as follows:

1. Student Teaching.--A period of supervised teaching when a business education student assumes increased responsibility for guiding the learning of a group of students over a specified period of time.
2. Collegiate Business Education Teachers.--Those collegiate business faculty members involved in the professional preparation of prospective business teachers.
3. Cooperating High School Business Teachers.--Those faculty members teaching business subjects in the

---

<sup>1</sup>Charles E. Silberman, "Even Student Teaching Is Dismal," Today's Education, LX (January, 1971), 22.

secondary schools and supervising the business education students during student teaching.

4. Business Education Graduates.--Those business education majors graduating during the 1968-69 academic year.
5. Prospective Business Teachers.--Those undergraduate business education students who have been admitted to the teacher education program.
6. Cooperating High Schools.--Those public schools, controlled by local school districts, cooperating with the institutions of higher education by providing laboratory facilities for prospective business teachers.
7. Supervision Policies.--Those policies that relate to the qualifications of the supervisors, the nature of the supervision, and the methods used in the supervision of business student teachers.
8. Evaluation Policies.--Those policies that relate to the nature of the evaluation, the persons involved in the evaluation, and the methods used in the evaluation of business student teachers.

#### Population and Sample

The population for this study was comprised of these three groups: (1) collegiate business education teachers, (2) cooperating high school business teachers, and (3) business education graduates. Because of the large number available, a random sample was drawn from the group of cooperating high school business teachers.

#### Hypotheses To Be Tested

In this study, the following hypotheses were tested:

- Ho<sub>1</sub>: There is no significant relationship between the current policies stated by the collegiate business education teachers and the business education graduates concerning the supervision

and the evaluation of business student teachers.

- Ho<sub>2</sub>: There is no significant relationship between the current policies stated by the collegiate business education teachers and the cooperating high school business teachers concerning the supervision and the evaluation of business student teachers.
- Ho<sub>3</sub>: There is no significant relationship between the current policies stated by the business education graduates and the cooperating high school business teachers concerning the supervision and the evaluation of business student teachers.
- Ho<sub>4</sub>: There is no significant relationship between the preferred policies stated by the collegiate business education teachers and the business education graduates concerning the supervision and the evaluation of business student teachers.
- Ho<sub>5</sub>: There is no significant relationship between the preferred policies stated by the collegiate business education teachers and the cooperating high school business teachers concerning the supervision and the evaluation of business student teachers.
- Ho<sub>6</sub>: There is no significant relationship between the preferred policies stated by the business education graduates and the cooperating high school business teachers concerning the supervision and the evaluation of business student teachers.

#### Assumptions

The following assumptions were made during this investigation:

1. Collegiate business education teachers can assess the supervision and the evaluation policies of the student teaching phase of their college.

2. Cooperating high school business teachers can assess the supervision and the evaluation policies of the student teaching phase of their cooperating college.
3. Business education graduates can assess the supervision and the evaluation policies of the student teaching phase of the college from which they are graduated.

### Delimitations

The focus of this study was concerned with the supervision and the evaluation of the student teaching phase in the preparation of prospective business teachers.

Further delimitations included:

1. The departments of business education in the six state colleges in Oklahoma, whose primary objective as normal schools is to train teachers. These six state colleges are Central State College, East Central State College, Northeastern State College, Northwestern State College, Southeastern State College, and Southwestern State College.
2. The collegiate business education teachers responsible for the professional preparation of prospective business teachers in the six state colleges in Oklahoma.
3. The 1969 business education graduates from the state colleges in Oklahoma who are teaching business subjects in the Oklahoma public secondary schools during the 1970-71 academic year.
4. The cooperating high school business teachers who are teaching in high schools that cooperate with the state colleges in Oklahoma by providing laboratory facilities for the business student teachers. A further delimitation is that the cooperating high school business teachers must have supervised a business student teacher assigned by one of the state colleges in Oklahoma during either the 1968-69, the 1969-70, or the 1970-71 academic years.

### Limitations

To interpret the findings of this study correctly, the following limitations were considered:

First, because of changes in marital status following graduation, certain 1969 business education graduates may have been omitted from the study. The researcher had no way of verifying name changes.

Second, certain cooperating high school business teachers were eliminated from the study because they were teaching in out-of-state schools. For example, Southeastern State College had two cooperating schools in Texas, and Northwestern State College used six cooperating schools in Kansas.

Third, the results of this study may not be applicable to all teacher training institutions, inasmuch as the study was limited to the six state colleges in Oklahoma, which are designated as teacher training institutions.

### Nature and Sources of Data

This study encompassed the following two areas for the collection of data:

- Area I: The current policies at the state colleges in Oklahoma concerning the supervision and the evaluation of business student teachers.
- Area II: The preferred policies at the state colleges in Oklahoma concerning the supervision and the evaluation of business student teachers.



Sources of data were (1) the collegiate business education teachers, (2) the cooperating high school business teachers, and (3) the business education graduates.

#### Organization of Report

Chapter I includes statement of the problem, statement of the purpose, theoretical framework, operational definitions, population and sample, hypotheses, assumptions, delimitations, limitations, nature and sources of data, and organization. Chapter II provides a review of related literature. Chapter III provides methodology and procedures. Chapter IV explains the collection and analyses of data. Chapter V consists of the summary, the implications, and the recommendations.

## CHAPTER II

### REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

A review of the literature revealed that a substantial, if not almost endless, amount of research has been done in the field of student teaching. Furthermore, the scope of coverage was extensive. Therefore, to present only relevant material, the review was divided into two sections: (1) published literature and (2) unpublished doctoral research studies. The basis for this division was twofold. First, a review of the published literature would present the theories, opinions, and recommendations of authorities in the area of student teaching. Secondly, a review of selected research studies would lend support to the published literature.

#### Published Literature

The published literature reviewed in this section included textual materials, handbooks, articles, reports, and surveys. Many of the writers are authorities in the student teaching phase of teacher education, while a few are noted for their contributions to the area of business teacher preparation. The specific sources used for the review were selected on the basis of their relevancy to the problem being

investigated. In particular, these two topics were discussed: (1) supervision of student teaching and (2) evaluation of student teaching.

### Supervision of Student Teaching

Based upon the theoretical framework that practical experience is an essential component of teacher training, educators have written profusely about the supervision of student teachers. These writings covered a wide gamut--from such issues as the nature of the supervision of student teachers, the personnel involved in the supervision of student teachers to the factors contributing to the successful supervision of student teachers.

As a point of departure, an examination of the various types of supervision used in educational literature seemed applicable to the general area of the supervision of student teachers. Bartkey presented the following seven types of educational supervision:

1. Autocratic--Implies that the highest official in chain of command knows the answers and that it is his obligation to pass these "absolutes" on to his subordinates.

2. Inspectional--The teacher is observed and, if found wanting in any respect, punished or dismissed. No constructive action is taken.

3. Representative--Interests itself primarily with the way the individual responsible for supervision is chosen. Therefore, those who perform supervision should be elected and subject to recall by the faculty.

4. Cooperative-Democratic--Teachers and those engaged in supervision are regarded as a closely knit society of co-workers participating together in determining the objectives for, devising the

methodology of, and evaluating the instruction which they themselves do.

5. Invitational--Under the invitational type of supervision the person invited by the teacher to supervise her evaluates her only upon her request.

6. Scientific--Strives for the improvement of teaching through classroom observation and through the objective measurement of teaching results.

7. Creative--The agent of supervision stands permissively by to act as a sort of catalytic agent, assisting without directing, while the teacher strives to develop new ideas about her teaching.<sup>1</sup>

From this compilation of the seven types of supervision, Bartky derived a definition of supervision that summarizes the crux of the literature reviewed in this study:

Supervision . . . is teaching teachers on the job to improve their instruction employing whatever agent, whatever force, and whatever method consistent with our total democratic pattern is best designed to achieve this goal.<sup>2</sup>

In essence, the majority of the writings followed two basic thoughts. First, educators indicated great diversity in the manner in which the various colleges and universities managed the supervision of student teachers. Secondly, though diversity was great, educators recognized certain elements of supervision as being continually present in the various student teaching programs, but constantly changing in form. Critics of the constant change in the supervision of student teachers pointed to this aspect as the major

---

<sup>1</sup> John A. Bartky, Supervision As Human Relations (Boston: D. C. Heath and Company, 1953), pp. 14-20.

<sup>2</sup> Ibid., p. 28.

weakness in the student teaching programs, whereas other writers viewed the changing factor as a sign of healthy innovation.<sup>1</sup>

Regardless of their view, there was a consensus among the educators as to the various elements that were constantly present in the function of supervising student teachers even though the nature of the elements was changing periodically. Therefore, a closer examination of the common elements contributing to the successful supervision of a program of student teaching was relevant in this research project. These common elements were (1) philosophy of supervision, (2) responsibility for supervision, (3) personnel involved in supervision, and (4) observations and conferences.

#### Philosophy of Supervision

The basic philosophy of supervised student teaching has remained fairly constant from the time of the first normal school--". . . the best way of learning to teach is through actual contact with real teaching."<sup>2</sup> However, over the years, there has been a shift in the nature of the supervision.

---

<sup>1</sup>James A. Johnson, A National Survey of Student Teaching Programs--Final Report, Report to the Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D. C., July, 1968 (DeKalb: Northern Illinois University, 1968), p. 85.

<sup>2</sup>Helen Richards and Elizabeth Robinson, "The Supervising Teacher in Teacher Education," The Supervising Teacher, Thirty-Eighth Yearbook of The Association for Student Teaching (Cedar Falls, Iowa: The Association for Student Teaching, 1959), p. 24.

In 1839, as the initial principal of the first state normal school, Cyrus Pierce's philosophy was that the prospective teacher should have the opportunity to practice teach and to learn to govern a class or school.<sup>1</sup> In the years since, the philosophy of the supervision of student teaching shifted to a concern for the total development of the individual student teacher, or as Richards and Robinson suggested, "guidance of the young student teacher involves attention to the principles underlying effective teaching rather than upon techniques alone."<sup>2</sup>

Lindsey,<sup>3</sup> Rabin,<sup>4</sup> and Reed<sup>5</sup> gave strength to the new approach to supervising student teachers. They advocated the direction of professional growth through the encouragement of the student teacher's strong points and the suggestion of ways to improve weaknesses observed in the student's teaching

---

<sup>1</sup>Nicholas Troisi, "A Brief Historical Look at Evaluation of Student Teaching," Evaluating Student Teaching, Thirty-Ninth Yearbook of The Association of Student Teaching (Cedar Falls, Iowa: The Association for Student Teaching, 1960), p. 1.

<sup>2</sup>Richards and Robinson, "The Supervising Teacher," p. 25.

<sup>3</sup>Lindsey, New Horizons, pp. 83-84.

<sup>4</sup>Bernard Rabin, "Who Are Supervising Teachers?," The Supervising Teacher, Thirty-Eighth Yearbook of The Association for Student Teaching (Cedar Falls, Iowa: The Association for Student Teaching, 1959), p. 9.

<sup>5</sup>Helen M. Reed, "The College Supervisor in a Multi-Purpose University in a Rural Setting," The College Supervisor, Conflict and Challenges, Forty-Third Yearbook of The Association for Student Teaching (Cedar Falls, Iowa: The Association for Student Teaching, 1964), p. 24.

practices. Stratemeyer described the current philosophy of the supervision of student teachers in stating the purposes of student teaching:

. . . to help the student gain understanding in the meaning of theory in action, develop ability to function effectively as a teacher and as a member of the teaching profession, and become sensitive to needs for further study.<sup>1</sup>

Thus, the philosophy of supervised student teaching has changed in nature. The move has been to develop the individual student teacher to his highest potential as a teacher and a worthy member of society rather than to fit all student teachers into the image of the supervising teacher.

#### Responsibility for Supervision

Most of the educators agreed that one aspect contributing to a quality program of teacher training is that the responsibility of supervising student teachers should be a cooperative function of the college and the cooperating high school. Lindsey<sup>2</sup> and Andrews<sup>3</sup> emphasized that the success of training quality teachers was dependent on the joint efforts of the college staff and the cooperating high school personnel. Rabin's statement was indicative of other

---

<sup>1</sup>Florence B. Stratemeyer, "The College Supervisor: Guidelines for Action," The College Supervisor, Conflict and Challenges, Forty-Third Yearbook of The Association for Student Teaching (Cedar Falls, Iowa: The Association for Student Teaching, 1964), p. 149.

<sup>2</sup>Lindsey, New Horizons, p. 70.

<sup>3</sup>Andrews, Student Teaching, p. 55.

educators in respect to a team or cooperative approach to the supervision of student teachers:

The level and degree of cooperative effort in each student teaching situation determines how well and fully the student teacher builds the wide range of understandings and competencies needed.<sup>1</sup>

Stradley also emphasized the need for cooperative supervision by stating:

The plea here is only for closer contact, understanding, and coordination of a single program, a practice teaching program, that involves two levels of teachers and<sup>2</sup> instruction--the college and the cooperating school.

In summary, the responsibility of supervising the student teacher should be shared by both the college and the cooperating high school.

#### Personnel Involved in Supervision

The key personnel involved in the cooperative effort of the supervision of student teachers are the college supervisor and the cooperating high school teacher. The degree of responsibility of each in the supervision of student teachers is not totally agreed upon; however, Andrews expressed a position similar to other writers :

The anomaly is that the college supervisor has authority over the student teacher and evaluates his work, but the public school teacher has authority over the

---

<sup>1</sup>Rabin, "Who Are Supervising Teachers?," p. 6.

<sup>2</sup>Stradley, Supervising, p. 17.



teaching-learning situation and can and should decide what can be delegated to the student teacher.<sup>1</sup>

Regardless of how the responsibility is divided, the success of the college supervisor and the cooperating teacher as members of the supervisory team is dependent on several factors. The factors in relation to the college supervisor are: (1) academic area, (2) professional qualifications, and (3) teaching assignment and credit load. The factors relating to the cooperating teacher are: (1) position of the cooperating teacher, (2) professional qualifications, (3) teaching assignment and credit load, and (4) remuneration.

Academic Area of College Supervisor.--Of prime concern to the educators was whether the college supervisor should be from either a professional education area or a specific academic area such as business education. Van Antwerp<sup>2</sup> saw strength in the general approach in which the general supervisor would more likely guide the overall effectiveness of the student teacher rather than emphasize specific

---

<sup>1</sup> Andrews, Student Teaching, p. 64.

<sup>2</sup> Chiles Van Antwerp, "The Evaluation and Measurement of Student Teaching From the Point of View of the College Supervisor," in How To Teach Business Subjects, ed. by Harry Huffman (Washington, D. C.: National Association for Business Teacher Education, 1959), p. 103.

techniques. Conversely, Andrews,<sup>1</sup> Junge,<sup>2</sup> and Pogue<sup>3</sup> expressed the need for specialized supervisors who would supervise only those students teaching in that particular area of specialization. In agreement, Conant, in his critical analysis of teacher education, endorsed the utilization of specialized supervisors by stating, ". . . what happens all too often today in even the best institutions is that the practice teaching is supervised by someone from the college who has never taught the subject in a secondary school."<sup>4</sup>

Recently, the trend has been toward the utilization of group supervision, and Cogan's question was similar to other educators who were concerned with the quality of student teaching supervision: ". . . why is supervision as it is practiced today almost always and inevitably a matter of the supervision of groups, and never of supervision by groups?"<sup>5</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Andrews, Student Teaching, p. 84.

<sup>2</sup> Charlotte W. Junge, "Redefinition and Guidelines," Section 3, "Resources, Human and Material: Essentials of a Good Program," The Outlook in Student Teaching, Forty-First Yearbook of The Association for Student Teaching (Cedar Falls, Iowa: The Association for Student Teaching, 1962), p. 150.

<sup>3</sup> Graham Pogue, "Student Teaching: The State of the Art," paper presented, n.d., p. 7 (ERIC Microfiche, EDO30-587).

<sup>4</sup> Conant, American Teachers, p. 178.

<sup>5</sup> Maurice L. Cogan, "Clinical Supervision By Groups," The College Supervisor, Conflict and Challenges, Forty-Third Yearbook of The Association for Student Teaching (Cedar Falls, Iowa: The Association for Student Teaching, 1964), p. 114.

Andrews<sup>1</sup> and Stratemeyer and Lindsey<sup>2</sup> also advocated group supervision of student teachers. In particular, Pogue included in his team of specialists needed to supervise student teachers adequately ". . . representatives from the field of methodology and teaching, education foundations, the subject disciplines, and psychology."<sup>3</sup>

Accordingly, diversity was evident in the academic area of the college supervisor of student teachers. Nevertheless, the majority of the writers tended to endorse the specialist approach or the team effort of both a general college supervisor and a specialized college supervisor.

Professional Qualifications of College Supervisor.--

As Conant<sup>4</sup> and others have written, teaching experience and advanced degrees do not guarantee that an individual is qualified to serve as a college supervisor. However, Silberman's analysis of student teaching resulted in his stating, ". . . the most common complaint being that supervisors either have never taught the subject in question or have been out of the public school classroom so long that they've forgotten what it is like to teach."<sup>5</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Andrews, Student Teaching, p. 84.

<sup>2</sup>Florence B. Stratemeyer and Margaret Lindsey, Working With Student Teachers (New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1958), p. 48.

<sup>3</sup>Pogue, "State of the Art," p. 7.

<sup>4</sup>Conant, American Teachers, p. 63.

<sup>5</sup>Silberman, "Dismal," p. 22.

In general statements, Junge,<sup>1</sup> Andrews,<sup>2</sup> and Conant<sup>3</sup> advocated the use of standards or credentials in the appointment of college supervisors. In addition, the writers endorsed teaching experience at the level that the college supervisor would be expected to work. Another suggestion offered by Schunk,<sup>4</sup> in respect to professional qualifications, was the need for college supervisors to have completed special courses in the area of the supervision of student teaching. However, as Andrews stated, ". . . training programs for this special function are very rare."<sup>5</sup>

In the literature reviewed, one of the most comprehensive attempts to determine the preferred professional qualifications of the college supervisor was Johnson's study sponsored by the United States Office of Education. Based upon a 76 per cent return, or 847 institutions, Johnson<sup>6</sup> reported the following characteristics, listed in order of importance, necessary for a qualified college supervisor:

---

<sup>1</sup>Junge, "Redefinition," p. 150.

<sup>2</sup>Andrews, Student Teaching, p. 84.

<sup>3</sup>Conant, American Teachers, p. 178.

<sup>4</sup>Bernadene Schunk, ed., The Outlook in Student Teaching, Forty-First Yearbook of The Association for Student Teaching (Cedar Falls, Iowa: The Association for Student Teaching, 1962), p. xii.

<sup>5</sup>Andrews, Student Teaching, p. 63.

<sup>6</sup>J. Johnson, Final Report, p. 87.

1. Good human relations skills
2. Knowledge of teaching methodology
3. Commitment to supervision
4. Subject matter competency
5. Doctor's degree

The professional qualifications of the college supervisor varied from institution to institution. Nevertheless, most colleges and universities followed the recommendations of the noted educators by requiring the college supervisors of student teaching programs to possess both theoretical and practical experience.

Teaching Assignment and Credit Load.--The adequacy of the supervision of student teachers is definitely linked to the philosophy and the professional preparation of the college supervisor, but as Pfeiffer mentioned, the college supervisor's effectiveness can be limited by the "professional environment in which he works."<sup>1</sup> Staderman<sup>2</sup> identified the professional environment of the college supervisor to include financial support, institutional traditions, departmental biases, geographical location, and administrative concept of supervision of student teaching.

---

<sup>1</sup>Robert T. Pfeiffer, "Common Concerns of College Supervisors," The College Supervisor, Conflict and Challenges, Forty-Third Yearbook of The Association for Student Teaching (Cedar Falls, Iowa: The Association for Student Teaching, 1964), p. 64.

<sup>2</sup>Helen E. Staderman, "The College Supervisor in a State-Supported Institution in a Metropolitan Area," The College Supervisor, Conflict and Challenges, Forty-Third Yearbook of The Association for Student Teaching (Cedar Falls, Iowa: The Association for Student Teaching, 1964), p. 64.

Within the professional environment, of primary concern to many writers was the student load assigned to the college supervisor. Some, such as Pogue<sup>1</sup> and Junge<sup>2</sup> approached the problem from a general standpoint and merely pointed out the advisability of keeping the student load to a workable number. In this way, the college supervisor would have time to adequately supervise and consult with each student teacher. In particular, Johnson<sup>3</sup> reported that while the majority of the participating 847 institutions advocated a desirable load for the college supervisor to be approximately sixteen student teachers, the majority did not follow this criterion. Instead, the results showed the following distribution:

| <u>Number Assigned</u> | <u>Percentage</u> |
|------------------------|-------------------|
| 1- 5                   | 4%                |
| 6-10                   | 17%               |
| 11-15                  | 21%               |
| 16-20                  | 28%               |
| 21-25                  | 14%               |
| 26-30                  | 8%                |
| 31-35                  | 4%                |
| 36-40                  | 1%                |

Thus, the success of the college supervisor in the guidance of student teachers appears heavily dependent on the professional environment of the student teaching program. In particular, writers are concerned with the quantity of

---

<sup>1</sup>Pogue, "State of the Art," p. 7.

<sup>2</sup>Junge, "Redefinition," p. 105.

<sup>3</sup>J. Johnson, Final Report, pp. 86-87.

student teachers assigned to a college supervisor for a particular period of supervision.

Position of Cooperating Teacher.--The importance of a well-qualified cooperating high school teacher cannot be disputed. Authorities in the supervision of student teachers constantly referred to the valuable contribution that a competent cooperating teacher makes in the development of the student teacher. But, these same authorities placed great emphasis on the ability and the competence of the cooperating teacher.

Richards and Robinson related, "These teachers must exemplify the qualities which they encourage in student teachers."<sup>1</sup> Conant gave support to the importance of a qualified cooperating teacher in his statement:

The regular teacher in whose classroom the future teacher works should be one known to his own school officials, the collegiate faculty, and the state Department as a highly competent teacher both of classroom pupils and of student teachers.<sup>2</sup>

Further emphasis was given by Junge's comment:

Only those teachers possessing a high degree of competence and a willingness to assume responsibility for those who are entering the profession should be selected.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Richards and Robinson, "The Supervising Teacher," pp. 25-26.

<sup>2</sup>Conant, American Teachers, pp. 61-62.

<sup>3</sup>Junge, "Redefinition," p. 150.

However, a few authorities were critical of the co-operating teacher. Andrews, for example, made the following general critical analysis:

Over the years, many have contended that any really competent teacher can be a good cooperating teacher, but long experience proves that for a surprising percentage of teachers this just isn't the case.<sup>1</sup>

Moreover, Silberman was far more critical when he stated, "Perhaps the weakest link in the chain of practice teaching, and the one that is most difficult to correct is the public school teacher . . ."<sup>2</sup> He commented further, "the student naturally and inevitably tends to imitate him and all too often, the classroom teacher affords anything but a proper model of how to teach."<sup>3</sup>

In summary, the valuable contribution made by the co-operating teacher was recognized throughout the literature. Nevertheless, authorities did question the personal and the professional qualifications necessary for an effective co-operating teacher.

#### Professional Qualifications of Cooperating Teacher.--

Throughout the literature reviewed, the term "competent" was used to describe the quality desired in a cooperating teacher. Batchelder, Lawrence, and Myers defined competence as being "measured in terms of professional preparation, years of experience, and excellence of teaching, as well as an interest

---

<sup>1</sup> Andrews, Student Teaching, p. 57.

<sup>2</sup> Silberman, "Dismal," p. 46.

<sup>3</sup> Ibid., p. 63.



in and ability to work with student teachers."<sup>1</sup> The latter two measurements are subjective in nature; however, Batchelder, Lawrence, and Myers<sup>2</sup> recognized the first two measurements by recommending that the cooperating teacher have at least three years of teaching experience. Furthermore, Junge<sup>3</sup> listed a bachelor's degree and certification as suitable qualifications for a cooperating teacher.

In general, Schunk<sup>4</sup> and Fauser<sup>5</sup> discussed that far too many cooperating teachers felt either incompetent or inadequately prepared professionally to serve in a supervisory capacity. As a possible solution, Ruman and Curtis<sup>6</sup> expressed the importance of the cooperating teacher's participation in local, state, regional, and national meetings as a way of

---

<sup>1</sup>Howard T. Batchelder, Richard E. Lawrence, and George R. Myers, A Guide to Planning for Off-Campus Student Teaching, No. 11: Association for Student Teaching Bulletin (Cedar Falls, Iowa: The Association for Student Teaching, 1959), p. 23.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid.

<sup>3</sup>Junge, "Redefinition," p. 150.

<sup>4</sup>Schunk, Outlook, p. xii.

<sup>5</sup>Charles E. Fauser, "Current Practices," Section 2, "Case Study: A College in Transition," The Outlook in Student Teaching, Forty-First Yearbook of the Association for Student Teaching (Cedar Falls, Iowa: The Association for Student teaching, 1962), pp. 56-57.

<sup>6</sup>Edward L. Ruman and Dwight K. Curtis, "The Supervising Teacher in Future Teacher Education Programs," The Supervising Teacher, Thirty-Eighth Yearbook of The Association for Student Teaching (Cedar Falls, Iowa: The Association for Student Teaching, 1959), p. 105.

keeping abreast with changing educational patterns. Batchelder, Lawrence, and Myers,<sup>1</sup> Rabin,<sup>2</sup> and Andrews<sup>3</sup> stressed that the college could do much to alleviate the cooperating teacher's feeling of inadequacy by offering planned and directed in-service assistance. In particular, Carroll<sup>4</sup> subscribed to the utilization of summer courses and workshops to train cooperating teachers in the area of supervision. In respect to the additional course work, Rabin stated:

Increasingly, 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.<sup>5</sup>

Collectively, the writers recognized the importance of and the difficulty involved in the measurement of the behavioral characteristics of the cooperating teacher. However, in considering the professional qualifications of the cooperating teacher, the emphasis centers around the more objective theoretical and practical factors.

---

<sup>1</sup>Batchelder, Lawrence, and Myers, Guide to Planning, p. 23.

<sup>2</sup>Rabin, "Who Are Supervising Teachers?," p. 6.

<sup>3</sup>Andrews, Student Teaching, p. 64.

<sup>4</sup>Margaret Carroll, "A Student Teaching Program for Experienced Teachers," The Outlook in Student Teaching, Forty-First Yearbook of The Association for Student Teaching (Cedar Falls, Iowa: The Association for Student Teaching, 1962), p. 78.

<sup>5</sup>Rabin, "Who Are Supervising Teachers?," p. 3.

Teaching Assignment and Credit Load of Cooperating Teacher.--As many writers indicated, too often the assignment of a student teacher was made with no consideration for either the cooperating teacher or the student teacher. In some cases, the cooperating teacher has no choice in the matter, and the student teacher is superimposed upon the cooperating teacher's regular teaching load. In other cases, the student teaching assignment is passed around so that all of the faculty members share in the student teaching program. Further, there are even a few cases where the cooperating teacher is eager to accept an assignment, but with the negative motive of securing a substitute teacher.

Regardless of the circumstances, authorities were concerned about the arrangements made with the cooperating teachers in the assignment of student teachers. Andrews<sup>1</sup> stated that cooperating teachers must be given the choice of accepting or refusing the responsibility of a student teacher. Stradley stipulated that, in addition to voluntary acceptance of a student teacher, the cooperating teacher "should be as carefully selected by the school administration as are new personnel added to the staff."<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Andrews, Student Teaching, p. 58.

<sup>2</sup> Stradley, Supervising, p. 14.

Conant<sup>1</sup> and Andrews<sup>2</sup> agreed that the responsibility for supervising student teachers should be considered in figuring the teaching load of the cooperating teachers. Specifically, Ruman and Curtis subscribed to the following time allotment:

It would seem reasonable to assume that a supervising teacher needs to devote from one-fifth to one-fourth of his professional time to supervision and supporting activities.<sup>3</sup>

Furthermore, Andrews in his "A Bill of Rights for Supervising Teachers" upheld the cooperating teacher's right as follows:

To have all professional, teacher-education services computed as a part of the regular daily load and equalized in relation to the total loads of other staff members.<sup>4</sup>

The number of student teachers assigned at a particular time is directly related to the teaching load of the cooperating teacher. College and school administrators should realize the assignment of a large number of student teachers to the cooperating teacher will limit his effectiveness. Batchelder, Lawrence, and Myers proposed that a ratio of "no more than two student teachers should be assigned each supervising teacher per quarter or semester," and, "a more

---

<sup>1</sup>Conant, American Teachers, p. 212.

<sup>2</sup>Andrews, Student Teaching, p. 55.

<sup>3</sup>Ruman and Curtis, "Future," p. 106.

<sup>4</sup>L. O. Andrews, "The Task Ahead," The Supervising Teacher, Thirty-Eighth Yearbook of The Association for Student Teaching (Cedar Falls, Iowa: The Association for Student Teaching, 1959), p. 117.

ideal arrangement appeared in the practice of assigning a single student teacher to each supervising teacher.<sup>1</sup> Andrews, again in his "A Bill of Rights for Supervising Teachers," stated that the colleges should assure the cooperating teacher the following right: "To have a maximum at any given time, of no more than one or two college students for whom major supervisory responsibility is assumed."<sup>2</sup>

In summary, the cooperating teacher should have a choice as to the responsibility of a student teacher. Furthermore, the number of student teachers assigned at one time, plus the teaching-load allocation, are factors to be considered in the quality of supervision that will be done by the cooperating teacher.

Remuneration for Cooperating Teacher.--Authorities of student teaching defended the importance of compensating cooperating teachers; however, many also recognized that a number of teacher education programs did not actually provide such a remuneration. Batchelder, Lawrence, and Myers stated, "Although many colleges at present do compensate teachers directly for their services, many successful programs make no such provision."<sup>3</sup> Expressing a somewhat stronger opinion, Ruman and Curtis warned against the misuse of compensation by

---

<sup>1</sup>Batchelder, Lawrence, and Myers, Guide to Planning, pp. 16-17.

<sup>2</sup>Andrews, "The Task Ahead," p. 116.

<sup>3</sup>Batchelder, Lawrence, and Myers, p. 26.

stating, "The assumption seems to be that because of a payment to the supervising teacher the desired quality of supervision will be forthcoming."<sup>1</sup>

However, the writers reviewed indicated more concern for the type of reimbursement given rather than whether the cooperating teacher should receive compensation for supervisory duties. Conant<sup>2</sup> and Rabin<sup>3</sup> favored a direct increase in the cooperating teacher's salary. Batchelder, Lawrence, and Myers were more specific and suggested that compensation "be offered directly on a per-student basis, or as a yearly payment regardless of the number of students served."<sup>4</sup> In addition to direct compensation, Batchelder, Lawrence, and Myers recommended the following forms of indirect compensation:

1. Tuition-free courses
2. Free use of college instructional materials
3. Free use of college library materials
4. Payment of memberships
5. Recognition in college catalog
6. Recognition as member of college faculty<sup>5</sup>

In summary, many student teaching programs do not provide the cooperating teacher with any form of remuneration.

---

<sup>1</sup>Ruman and Curtis, "Future," p. 106.

<sup>2</sup>Conant, American Teachers, p. 212.

<sup>3</sup>Rabin, "Who Are Supervising Teachers?," p. 3.

<sup>4</sup>Batchelder, Lawrence, and Myers, Guide to Planning, p. 27.

<sup>5</sup>Ibid.

Nevertheless, the consensus of the writers was that both direct and indirect compensation would make a favorable contribution to the teacher education program.

### Observations and Conferences

Educators agreed that the actual supervision of student teachers revolved around observations and conferences. Representative of the majority of the writers was Conant's statement, ". . . I believe that the ultimate test should be how the teacher actually performs in a classroom, as judged by experienced teachers."<sup>1</sup> Naturally, to direct the student's teaching, the supervisory personnel of both the college and the cooperating high school must observe and confer periodically. Stradley advocated the necessity of visitations and conferences as follows:

The colleges and the cooperating school should have close, consistent contact so that there can be continuous evaluation, understanding, and exchange of information concerning the practice teaching programs at both levels.<sup>2</sup>

Observations.--As various authorities pointed out, the observations on the part of the cooperating teacher were on a day-to-day basis, whereas the college supervisor's visitations occurred periodically. Andrews<sup>3</sup> suggested that the college supervisor should visit each school early in the

---

<sup>1</sup> Conant, American Teachers, p. 58.

<sup>2</sup> Stradley, Supervising, p. 17.

<sup>3</sup> Andrews, Student Teaching, pp. 66-67.

semester and conduct several observations throughout the period of student teaching. Andrews' comments were in agreement with Van Antwerp's suggestion, "Three to five observations of each student teacher . . . is sufficient if everything goes smoothly."<sup>1</sup> Van Antwerp defended his position of the use of multiple observations by stating, "Continuity of observation is essential to good supervision. The single teaching period is a poor basis for constructive observation."<sup>2</sup>

Conferences.--The various educators were more in agreement concerning the significance of the conference than of any other component of the student teaching program. Van Antwerp,<sup>3</sup> Andrews,<sup>4</sup> and Hilliard and Durrance<sup>5</sup> represented the majority in subscribing to the three-way conference among the college supervisor, the cooperating teacher, and the student teacher as the ideal arrangement. Moreover, Stratemeyer and Lindsey referred to the effectiveness of the three-way conference as:

. . . an integral part of assigning the student teacher, becoming acquainted, planning learning experiences, discussing what is observed, evaluating

---

<sup>1</sup>Van Antwerp, "Evaluation and Measurement," p. 103.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., p. 102.      <sup>3</sup>Ibid.

<sup>4</sup>Andrews, Student Teaching, p. 60.

<sup>5</sup>Pauline Hilliard and Charles L. Durrance, Guiding Student Teaching Experiences (Washington, D. C.: The Association for Student Teaching, 1968), p. 17.



the guidance of learning, noting growth of the student, and planning next steps.<sup>1</sup>

However, recognizing the difficulties in arranging three-way conferences, many writers stressed the need for ample individual conferences. Ruman and Curtis<sup>2</sup> recommended a conference between the college supervisor and the cooperating teacher as a means of supplementing and complementing the objectives of the student teaching program. More specifically, Staderman<sup>3</sup> endorsed a scheduled monthly meeting of the cooperating teachers as a means of discussing common problems or interests. Hilliard and Durrance<sup>4</sup> and Batchelder, Lawrence, and Myers<sup>5</sup> indicated the need for a conference between the college supervisor and the student teacher following each visitation. Andrews stated that the cooperating school should assure the cooperating teacher the following: "To have time within the total school day for the scheduling of regular and individual conferences with teacher-education students."<sup>6</sup> Hilliard and Durrance were more precise by advising the use of "daily conferences of short duration [and] planned

---

<sup>1</sup>Stratemeyer and Lindsey, Working with Student Teachers, p. 396.

<sup>2</sup>Ruman and Curtis, "Future," p. 108.

<sup>3</sup>Staderman, "State-Supported Institutions," p. 73.

<sup>4</sup>Hilliard and Durrance, Guiding Experiences, p. 17.

<sup>5</sup>Batchelder, Lawrence, and Myers, Guide to Planning, p. 18.

<sup>6</sup>Andrews, "The Task Ahead," p. 117.

conferences on at least a weekly basis"<sup>1</sup> between the cooperating teacher and the student teacher.

In summary, the observation and the conference contribute invaluablely to the supervision of student teachers. These visitations and conferences should include the college supervisor, the cooperating teacher, and the student teacher on both an individual and a group basis.

### Evaluation of Student Teaching

In the literature reviewed, the evaluation of student teachers was considered from two major standpoints. First, some educators viewed evaluation as a part of supervision, whereas other authorities discussed evaluation as a separate or distinct element of a student teaching program. Perhaps this manifold approach resulted from the conflict in the interpretation of the term "evaluation." To some writers, evaluation merely referred to the final grade assigned at the completion of student teaching. For other writers, evaluation of student teachers closely followed the definition presented by McAllister: "Burr, Harding, and Jacobs define evaluation as the process of determining the extent to which values are achieved, purposes carried out and goals reached."<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Hilliard and Durrance, p. 17.

<sup>2</sup>Jane Ellen McAllister, "Glimpses from the Past," The Outlook in Student Teaching, Forty-First Yearbook of The Association for Student Teaching (Cedar Falls, Iowa: The Association for Student Teaching, 1962), p. 44.

Regardless of the interpretation, certain factors concerning the evaluation of student teachers are pertinent to this research project. These factors are (1) philosophy of evaluation, (2) responsibility for evaluation, and (3) mechanics of evaluation.

### Philosophy of Evaluation

Ideally, the philosophy of effectively evaluating student teachers is closely related to the psychology of judgment. Johnson stated the following:

. . . improvement in interjudge agreement is obtained by getting judges to agree on the definition of the variables to be judged, and training them to attend to these and to avoid the distraction of other, more obvious, variables.<sup>1</sup>

However, the adherence to such a structured evaluation was doubtful, "because the human element is involved."<sup>2</sup>

From a practical standpoint, the philosophy of evaluation reflects "the implementation of basic principles rather than merely the appraisal of specific techniques . . ."<sup>3</sup> In 1839, Cyrus Pierce wrote the first principle in evaluation: "One who evaluates should understand the purposes of the

---

<sup>1</sup> Donald M. Johnson, The Psychology of Thought and Judgment (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1955), p. 299.

<sup>2</sup> Gladys E. Johnson, "Evaluation and Measurement of Student Teaching from the Point of View of the Cooperating Teacher, Part I," in How to Teach Business Subjects, ed. by Harry Huffman (Washington, D. C.: National Association for Business Teacher Education, 1959), p. 111.

<sup>3</sup> Boykin, "Principles," p. 8.

learning or experience to be evaluated."<sup>1</sup> Later in 1945, a subcommittee of the Standards and Surveys Committee of the American Association of Teachers Colleges composed the following principle: "Evaluation of professional laboratory experiences should be in terms of growth in understandings and abilities needed in the situations faced by the teacher working in our democracy."<sup>2</sup> More recently, in the Thirty-Ninth Yearbook of The Association for Student Teaching, Boykin submitted the following principles as a foundation for the evaluation of student teachers:

1. The evaluation of student teaching must be based upon and function within a democratic philosophy of education.
2. The evaluation of student teaching should be made within a behavioral frame of reference.
3. In evaluating student teaching the objectives should be defined and stated in terms of the kinds of behavior expected to be realized.
4. The methods, procedures and techniques used in appraising the work of the student teacher should be sufficiently diagnostic to enable the student teacher to identify the various stages of growth and progress involved in learning to teach.
5. Evaluation of student teaching should be conceived as an integral part of all learning, to be engaged in cooperatively by the student teacher, the supervising teacher, and the pupils.
6. The evaluation of student teaching should lead to a better understanding of growth and development and its relationship to developmental tasks and learning.
7. The evaluation of the student teacher's performance should lead to a more realistic understanding and acceptance of "self" and to the development of a positive emotional approach to teaching, learning, and living.

---

<sup>1</sup>Troisi, "Historical Look," p. 2.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., p. 6.

8. The evaluation of the student teacher can be educative only to the extent that it recognizes and reconstructs the group experiences which the student teacher brings with him to the student teaching situation.

9. The evaluation of student teaching is broader than measurement and requires the use of both quantitative and qualitative data.

10. The mere description of the characteristics of a "good teacher" is insufficient for evaluating teaching competencies needed in a democratic social order.

11. The evaluation of student teaching is comprehensive, continuous, and leads to improvement in the total program of teacher education.<sup>1</sup>

In summary, because of the human element involved, the philosophy of evaluation of student teaching is built on a foundation of principles rather than objective criteria. Measurement of the student teacher's growth is a continuous process directed by teachers who understand the objectives of the learning situation.

#### Responsibility for Evaluation

As Andrews stated, "Nearly all persons involved with student teaching tend either to dislike or to feel inadequate (or both) in the evaluation of student-teacher performance."<sup>2</sup> Nonetheless, the consensus of the writers was that the responsibility for evaluating student teachers should be shared by all the personnel involved with the student teaching

---

<sup>1</sup> Boykin, "Principles," pp. 9-22.

<sup>2</sup> Andrews, Student Teaching, p. 85.

program. Ruman and Curtis exemplified the opinions of others, such as Conant<sup>1</sup> and Van Antwerp,<sup>2</sup> in stating:

It is inconsistent to expect an effective evaluation of a teacher education program unless those who guide the products of college and university classrooms in laboratory experiences have a share in developing<sup>3</sup> the procedures of evaluation and in judging results.

More specifically, in a 1969 handbook, the Maryland State Department of Education assigned the responsibility for the evaluation of student teachers in the following manner:

Evaluation of student teachers should be a cooperative enterprise shared by the college supervisor, supervising teacher, student teacher and/or other designated personnel from the colleges and the local school.<sup>4</sup>

Rabin<sup>5</sup> agreed with Stratemeyer's statement, "The college supervisor cannot rightfully transfer these responsibilities to the supervising teacher, nor should he be the only person involved in evaluation."<sup>6</sup> Furthermore, Andrews<sup>7</sup> indicated that the colleges should delegate the cooperating teacher a share in the evaluation of the student teacher's

<sup>1</sup>Conant, American Teachers, p. 65.

<sup>2</sup>Van Antwerp, "Evaluation and Measurement," p. 103.

<sup>3</sup>Ruman and Curtis, "Future," p. 113.

<sup>4</sup>Guidelines for Student Teaching: An Experimental Handbook, Multi-State Teacher Education Project (Baltimore: Maryland State Department of Education, 1969), p. 9.

<sup>5</sup>Rabin, "Who Are Supervising Teachers?," p. 6.

<sup>6</sup>Stratemeyer, "Guidelines for Action," p. 159.

<sup>7</sup>Andrews, "The Task Ahead," p. 116.

progress. From an administrative standpoint, however, Andrews,<sup>1</sup> Batchelder, Lawrence, and Myers,<sup>2</sup> Staderman,<sup>3</sup> and the Maryland State Department of Education<sup>4</sup> charged the college supervisor with the responsibility of arbitrating any conflicts in the evaluation of the student teacher and actually submitting the final evaluation to the college officials.

Andrews<sup>5</sup> endorsed the inclusion of self-evaluation as being beneficial to the professional growth of the student teacher. Also, Stratemeyer and Lindsey supported the use of self-evaluation by the student teacher in their statement: "Equally limiting is the situation in which the teacher blindly accepts evaluation of his work by others without testing their reactions and proposals against his own study of the situation."<sup>6</sup>

In summary, the responsibility for the evaluation of student teachers should be shared by the college supervisor, the cooperating teacher, and the student teacher. In case of

---

<sup>1</sup> Andrews, Student Teaching, pp. 66-67.

<sup>2</sup> Batchelder, Lawrence, and Myers, Guide to Planning, p. 20.

<sup>3</sup> Staderman, "State-Supported Institutions," p. 79.

<sup>4</sup> Handbook, p. 9.

<sup>5</sup> Andrews, Student Teaching, pp. 59, 66.

<sup>6</sup> Stratemeyer and Lindsey, Working with Student Teachers, p. 44.

conflict, evaluation reports should be the sole responsibility of the college supervisor.

### Mechanics of Evaluation

In the literature, the mechanics of evaluating student teachers centered around two schools of thought. These were the grading system used at the completion of the student teaching period and the nature of the information used in evaluating student teachers.

With respect to the grade assigned at the completion of student teaching, the writings indicated diversity in the forms of grading used at the various institutions. For example, some institutions used a letter grade, while others used a qualifying grade, such as "pass-fail" or "satisfactory-unsatisfactory." Johnson's study of 847 institutions provided the most thorough investigation of the type of grade recommended for use in the final evaluation of student teachers. Results of Johnson's questionnaire indicated that "the preponderance of institutions still use the traditional letter grade in student teaching--82% to be exact. Six per cent use pass-fail, 8% use satisfactory-unsatisfactory, and 4% use some other grading system."<sup>1</sup>

Several writers referred to the need for a new kind of data to identify and report the competence of the student

---

<sup>1</sup>J. Johnson, Final Report, p. 87.



teachers. For example, Lindsey stated that, "Descriptive records must replace the usual assignment of grades."<sup>1</sup>

Barber<sup>2</sup> suggested the use of an objective check-list for periodic evaluations, whereas a summary statement was recommended by Stratemeyer and Lindsey<sup>3</sup> as suitable for the final form of evaluation. Similarly, Hilliard and Durrance<sup>4</sup> and Andrews<sup>5</sup> advised the submission of letters of recommendation written to the college placement office by both the college supervisor and the cooperating teacher.

In summary, the use of the traditional grading system is still the most frequently used method of evaluating student teachers. However, authorities are stressing the need for more qualitative rather than quantitative evaluation of student teaching.

#### Unpublished Doctoral Research Studies

The thirteen doctoral research studies reviewed in this section are pertinent to the present study and support the literature reviewed in the preceding section of this

---

<sup>1</sup> Lindsey, New Horizons, p. 82.

<sup>2</sup> Shirley Barber, "Supervision of Student Teachers," The National Business Education Quarterly, XXIX (Summer, 1961), 46.

<sup>3</sup> Stratemeyer and Lindsey, Working with Student Teachers, p. 467.

<sup>4</sup> Hilliard and Durrance, Guiding Experiences, p. 20.

<sup>5</sup> Andrews, Student Teaching, p. 67.

chapter. The doctoral research studies are presented in these two sections: (1) research studies concerned with general student teaching programs and (2) research studies concerned with business education student teaching programs.

#### Research Studies Concerned with General Student Teaching Programs

##### Studies Conducted in Oklahoma

##### The Hasskarl Study - 1963

Hasskarl's<sup>1</sup> study determined the essential characteristics of the student teaching program in the colleges and the universities in Oklahoma. Using a combination of questionnaires, personal interviews, and various printed materials furnished by the institutions, Hasskarl collected data from the seventeen colleges and universities in Oklahoma.

As a result of the data collected, Hasskarl reported the following findings pertinent to the supervision and the evaluation of student teaching in Oklahoma:

##### College Supervisor:

1. The number of student teachers supervised by the college supervisor averages from 10 to 15 each semester.

2. Two of the institutions required a doctorate as the minimum degree held by the college supervisor; while the remaining 15 require the master's degree as a minimum. However, the majority do hold a doctorate degree.

---

<sup>1</sup>Robert Albert Hasskarl, Jr., "An Analysis of the Student Teaching Programs in Oklahoma," (unpublished doctoral dissertation, The University of Oklahoma, 1963), p. 6.

3. All of the supervisors in ten, or 59 per cent, of the teacher training institutions are in the department of education.

Cooperating Teacher:

1. Two years of teaching experience was the minimum requirement most reported, and the selection was primarily done by the principal or superintendent and the director of student teaching.

2. Eight institutions do not compensate cooperating teachers, while the remaining institutions offer compensation ranging from \$22.50 to \$60.00 per student teacher.

3. Eight-two per cent of the institutions assigned only one student teacher to a cooperating teacher, while 18 per cent observed a ratio of two to one.

Supervision:

1. The average number of individual consultations by the college supervisor and the cooperating teacher was three or four each semester.

2. Forty-seven per cent of the institutions hold campus seminars during student teaching. The range of frequency of the seminars was from once a week to twice each semester. The seminars were conducted by the college supervisor.

Evaluation:

1. One hundred per cent of the institutions consider the evaluation of a student teacher to be a cooperative effort of the college supervisor and the cooperating teacher.

2. One hundred per cent of the institutions require the cooperating teacher to submit an evaluation form at the end of the student teaching period. Several institutions require periodic evaluations.

3. No uniform state-wide evaluation form was used. However, each institution did utilize a form prepared by each institution.

4. In a majority of the institutions the college supervisor held the responsibility for the determination of the final grade. In three institutions the director of student teaching, upon the college supervisor's recommendations, assigned the final grade.

5. A letter grade was used by 13 of the institutions, while the other four colleges used either "Satisfactory" or "Unsatisfactory."<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Ibid., pp. 26-54, passim.

## The Bergen Study - 1970

The purpose of Bergen's<sup>1</sup> study was to identify the current status of the public school supervising teacher in the state of Oklahoma. The population of the study included the supervising teachers serving all of the four-year colleges and universities in Oklahoma, with the exception of Northeastern State College.

To collect data, a questionnaire was mailed to a group of supervising teachers selected by the use of a systematic sampling technique. Of those responding, 42 were elementary teachers and 88 were secondary teachers.<sup>2</sup>

In his identification of the supervising teacher in Oklahoma, Bergen presented the following findings that related to the supervision and the evaluation of student teachers:

1. Seventeen percent have fewer than five years experience.
2. Almost 60 percent of the sample possess a Master's degree.
3. Eighty percent do not teach more than one class outside their major field.
4. The mean number of student teachers supervised in 1967-68 was 2.3 student teachers.
5. Most (37 percent) cooperating teachers are selected by their principals . . .
6. Seventy-eight percent . . . have not taken any course work in supervision.

---

<sup>1</sup>Robert Zane Bergen, "The Status of the Cooperating Teachers in the Elementary and Secondary Schools of Oklahoma," (unpublished doctoral dissertation, Oklahoma State University, 1970), pp. 3-4.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., pp. 34-38.

7. Fifty percent of the cooperating teachers reported they received no compensation.<sup>1</sup>

In the opinions expressed by the supervising teachers, Bergen reported the following:

1. According to 57.7 percent, the bachelor degree is sufficient for the work of supervising student teachers.

2. Thirty-five percent said workshops should be conducted by the college with whom they cooperate.

3. Sixty and six tenths percent recommend only one student teacher per semester while 34.6 percent recommend no more than two student teachers per semester.<sup>2</sup>

#### Studies Conducted in States Other Than Oklahoma

##### The Swaim Study - 1962

The purpose of Swaim's study<sup>3</sup> was to identify criteria for evaluating programs in student teaching. The twenty-one criteria presented in Swaim's study were derived from an investigation of several experts in teacher education as to what they thought comprised a "good" program of student teaching. In addition to identifying evaluative criteria, Swaim also offered suggestions for their use in evaluating programs of student teaching.

---

<sup>1</sup> Ibid., pp. 42-57, passim.

<sup>2</sup> Ibid., pp. 57-63, passim.

<sup>3</sup> Roland Quinn Swaim, "Criteria for Evaluating Programs in Professional Laboratory Experiences in Teacher Education," (unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Kansas, 1962), p. 127.

In relation to the study being done, Swaim proposed the following criteria concerning the supervision of student teachers:

1. The program should provide adequate supervision by at least three qualified educators. These should include the college supervisor, supervising teacher, and the school principal.

2. The college supervisor's instructional load should be adjusted to allow him adequate time for supervision of his student teachers.

3. Not more than one student teacher should be assigned to a supervising teacher at any one period of time.

4. The student teaching program should be planned cooperatively by college personnel, school personnel, and students.

5. The college supervisor should have had the equivalent of the minimum professional preparation required for the highest-ranking, permanent, professional certificate available for his field or level in the state and, in addition, should have had at least one year of full-time teaching experience in the elementary or secondary schools.

6. The supervising teacher should be qualified by preparation for the highest-ranking, permanent, professional certificate available for his field or level in the state and, in addition, should possess personal qualities which are essential to good supervision, such as practical insight into interpersonal relationships, deep understanding of social structure, and a wide and varied cultural background.<sup>1</sup>

#### The Cornett Study - 1966

The purpose of Cornett's<sup>2</sup> study was to organize and classify the published and the unpublished material since 1950 concerning the supervision of student teachers at the

---

<sup>1</sup> Ibid., pp. 126-27.

<sup>2</sup> Joe DeLayne Cornett, "A Survey of Research Relative to Supervision of Student Teachers at the Secondary Level," (unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Arkansas, 1966), p. 117.

secondary level. Through the interpretation of the materials, Cornett also compiled the status of the supervision of student teachers at the secondary level.

Cornett drew the following conclusions from his thorough review of the literature written since 1950:

1. The supervising teacher should perform the following functions: . . . be an intermediary between the cooperating teacher and the student teacher, . . . counsel student teachers, lead seminars related to student teachers, . . .

2. The cooperating teacher should perform the following functions: . . . provide continuing evaluation, . . . conduct individual and group conferences, observe and offer constructive criticism, plan and guide observations, . . .

3. Few institutions offer courses designed to aid the cooperating teacher, although research has shown this to be a desirable practice.

4. There appear to be only a few institutions that select cooperating teachers on the basis of sound selection criteria.

5. In general, the recognition of cooperating teachers has not been in keeping with the duties and responsibilities of this type of position. The need has been identified, and some institutions are correcting this deficiency.

6. The individual conference appears to be the most effective technique in supervising student teachers.

7. An overall interpretation of the findings in this study indicate that there is an excessive amount of poor supervision by both supervising teachers and cooperating teachers.<sup>1</sup>

Cornett recognized the following trends in the supervision of student teaching at the secondary level:

1. There is a trend toward the improvement of the general status of supervising teachers. This is evidenced by the increasing demand for advanced degrees for those who perform this task.

---

<sup>1</sup>Ibid., pp. 117-19.

2. There is a trend toward institutions offering courses dealing specifically with the problems of cooperating teachers.

3. The master's degree is increasingly important as a criterion for selection of cooperating teachers.

4. There is a trend toward more nonmonetary recognition of cooperating teachers.<sup>1</sup>

Cornett presented the following recommendations concerning the supervision of student teachers at the secondary level:

1. Teacher training institutions should offer a course specifically designed to aid cooperating teachers in the task of supervising student teachers.

2. . . . cooperating teachers should be selected on the basis of sound criteria. Availability and willingness to serve should not be the only ones used.<sup>2</sup>

#### The Alexander Study - 1967

Through the use of questionnaires and interviews, Alexander<sup>3</sup> studied the organizational patterns and the operational procedures of student teachers. In Kentucky, Alexander collected data by interviewing the administrative head of student teaching at 24 four-year teacher training institutions and by sending questionnaires to the cooperating teachers, principals, and superintendents of selected public schools.

From the data studied, Alexander recommended the following for the improvement of the student teaching program in the state of Kentucky:

---

<sup>1</sup>Ibid., p. 119.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., p. 120.

<sup>3</sup>Ray Alexander, Jr., "A Study of the Organizational Patterns and Operational Procedures of the Student Teaching Programs in Kentucky," (unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Kentucky, 1967), pp. 8-15, *passim*.



1. . . . theoretical orientation provided by formal preparation in teacher education and practical experience in the supervision of student teachers should be prerequisites to the appointment of the administrator of student teaching.

2. . . . administrators in public schools and teacher education institutions should be cognizant of the special competencies required and the loads assumed by college and public school personnel in supervising student teachers and provide reasonable load and adequate compensation commensurate with the responsibility.

3. . . . policies and procedures of the program, as well as the role expectations of each participant, should be developed cooperatively, placed in written form, distributed to all parties, and evaluated cooperatively at regular intervals.

4. . . . channels of communication between college and public school personnel should not only utilize the informal and usually irregular contacts but planned and regularly scheduled discussion and feedback opportunities.<sup>1</sup>

#### The Barber Study - 1967

Barber's<sup>2</sup> study resulted from an assignment given to a statewide committee appointed by the Kansas Advisory Council on Education. In lieu of the committee effort, Barber volunteered to conduct the survey.

Barber's survey attempted to collect and to analyze the existing and the preferred professional laboratory experiences from both the institutions of higher education and the cooperating school systems in the state of Kansas. Based upon the data collected and analyzed, Barber compiled a

---

<sup>1</sup>Ibid., pp. 168-71.

<sup>2</sup>Donald Russell Barber, "A Comprehensive Survey Concerning Professional Laboratory Experiences in Teacher Education in Kansas," (unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Kansas, 1967), p. 212.

recommended list of standards that, if implemented, would provide a better program of student teaching and better interrelations among colleges and universities in the state of Kansas.

Data were collected by sending a questionnaire to the 24 four-year colleges and universities and to the 169 cooperating school systems for the 1964-65 academic year. The questionnaires were directed to the administrative personnel responsible for the student teaching assignments. Of the 24 colleges and universities, 100 per cent responded, while 76 per cent of the cooperating school systems answered the questionnaire.

Based upon the results of the study, Barber proposed to the committee the following recommended guidelines for their consideration:

1. All Kansas colleges and universities should adopt the four-point system of compiling grade averages.
2. A teacher should meet the following requirements before qualifying as a cooperating teacher:
  - a. Hold a bachelor's degree or better
  - b. Have had two or more years of successful teaching experience
  - c. Have been in the present school system one or more years
  - d. Have consented to be a cooperating teacher
  - e. Have had his principal's approval and recommendation
3. Cooperating teachers should be urged to enroll in special supervisory courses, . . . to improve their ability to work with student teachers.
4. The request for assignment of student teachers should be a cooperative effort on the part of the student, college supervisor, and the cooperating school . . .

5. The fee for student teaching should be uniform and this fee should be paid by the State Department of Public Instruction from General State Funds, through the school administrator, to the cooperating teacher.

6. Colleges and universities should equate the college supervisor's load on the following basis: supervising two student teachers to be considered as equal to one hour of college teaching but that distance be taken into consideration in applying this equation.

7. The college supervisor should make a minimum of three supervisory visits in which he is able to observe the student teacher and confer with both the student teacher and the cooperating teacher.

8. The responsibility for determining the grade in student teaching should be shared by the cooperating teacher and the college supervisor, but the college supervisor should have the final authority for giving the grade.<sup>1</sup>

#### The Kaplan Study - 1967

Using the student teaching program at the State University College in Buffalo, New York, Kaplan's<sup>2</sup> study was concerned with the role expectations of the college supervisor. The participants responding to the role expectation instrument included student teachers, supervising teachers, and college supervisors. In addition, Kaplan used interviews to secure information from the respondents that would be used to determine reasons for different expectations among the three groups.

---

<sup>1</sup>Ibid., pp. 218-21.

<sup>2</sup>Leonard Kaplan, "An Investigation of the Role Expectations for College Supervisors of Student Teaching as Viewed by Student Teachers, Supervising Teachers and College Supervisors," (unpublished doctoral dissertation, The University of Rochester, 1967), p. v.

In Kaplan's findings, the topic that evoked the most agreement among the three groups was evaluation. In respect to the evaluation of student teachers, Kaplan's study included the following:

All groups agreed that the evaluation of student teachers should be a shared responsibility. The concept of self-evaluation was considered to be one of the highest priority. . . . For evaluation to be truly meaningful, the sharing of philosophies, concepts, purposes, and procedures must be discussed by the members of the student teaching triad, with all participating as equals. Many of the student teachers indicated in the interview, that the ability to evaluate their own strengths and weaknesses is essential to their success as a classroom teacher.<sup>1</sup>

#### The Ploeger Study - 1967

Ploeger's<sup>2</sup> study consisted of a survey of college directors to secure recommendations for the improvement of secondary student teaching programs. Using seven Midwestern states, Ploeger compiled a list of thirty-four colleges and universities to be used in the project. The data were collected from 28 of the 34 directors of secondary student teaching programs by using a questionnaire and a follow-up telephone interview for the purpose of clarification.

Ploeger's findings included the following concerning the supervision and the evaluation of student teaching:

---

<sup>1</sup>Ibid., p. 91.

<sup>2</sup>Richard Arthur Ploeger, "A Survey of Secondary Student Teaching Programs in Selected Midwestern States," (unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of South Dakota, 1967), pp. 102-04.

1. All but four of the participating institutions paid cooperating teachers for their services. Amounts ranged from a low of ten dollars to a high of one hundred dollars. . . . Only 47 per cent of the institutions extended recognition or college privileges to the cooperating teachers in addition to the cash payment.

2. The duties assigned to directors of secondary student teaching most often mentioned included: . . . (3) conducting seminars before, during and after student teaching sessions.

3. Special training sessions for cooperating classroom teachers were used by 64 per cent of the institutions, with the remaining 36 per cent indicating that they would prefer to have such a session.

4. The criteria used most often by colleges and universities in selecting cooperating teachers included: (1) the holding of a bachelor's degree; (2) the recommendation of the cooperating school's administration; and (3) the minimum of two years of successful teaching experience.

5. A "generalist" on the college staff was the most common practice in selecting supervisors for secondary student teachers. This individual was required to have the minimum of a master's degree and successful public school teaching experience . . .

6. The supervisory load of the college supervisor varied from a low of twelve to a high of over thirty students. The majority tended to assign twenty or more students to each full-time college supervisor during each student teaching session.

7. In the majority of cases the college supervisors were able to visit student teachers from three to five times during their teaching assignment. . . . and were usually followed by a conference with the students.

8. Evaluation and assignment of the student teacher's grade was most commonly compiled jointly<sup>1</sup> by the cooperating teacher and college supervisor.

---

<sup>1</sup>Ibid., pp. 110-13.

Research Studies Concerned with Business  
Education Student Teaching Programs

Studies Conducted in Oklahoma

The Bast Study - 1952

Bast<sup>1</sup> studied the collegiate programs for preparing business teachers in states other than Oklahoma. His intention was to apply the reported findings to the teacher education programs as they existed at the six state-supported colleges in Oklahoma.

Through a questionnaire sent to the chairmen of the business departments, data were secured for 90 colleges in 35 states, comparable to the six state-supported schools in Oklahoma.

Bast reported the following with respect to the evaluation and the supervision of business student teachers:

The grades and evaluative reports which the student teacher received are frequently used by administrators in predicting the student's success as a regular teacher.<sup>2</sup>

Also, Bast's study found that the supervision of the business student teachers was considered the responsibility of the college rather than the cooperating high school. In addition, there were three plans found to be used in the

---

<sup>1</sup>Milton L. Bast, "A Comparative Study of the Preparation of Business Teachers with Specific Implications for the State of Oklahoma," (unpublished doctoral dissertation, The University of Oklahoma, 1952), pp. 8-9.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., p. 83.

supervision of business student teachers. The plans included supervision by: "(1) the education department, (2) the business department, and (3) both departments collectively."<sup>1</sup>

#### The Prickett Study - 1959

The purpose of Prickett's<sup>2</sup> study was twofold. First, he identified seven criteria necessary to evaluate the effectiveness of the student teaching phase in business teacher preparation. Secondly, Prickett developed an evaluative instrument for each of the seven criteria.

In identifying the seven criteria, Prickett segregated the basic principles applicable to each criterion. In particular, two criteria--supervision and evaluation--and their basic principles were relevant to the current study being conducted.

Supervision.--Prickett<sup>3</sup> identified the twofold function of supervision as follows: (1) the teacher education institutions, and (2) the cooperating school. In reference to the teacher education institution, the following basic principle was stated:

Principle XII: Supervision of student teaching by personnel in the teacher education institution should be of the nature and extent required to

---

<sup>1</sup>Ibid., p. 95.

<sup>2</sup>Loy E. Prickett, "Evaluation of the Student Teaching Phase of Business Teacher Preparation," (unpublished doctoral dissertation, The University of Oklahoma, 1959), p. 11.

<sup>3</sup>Ibid., p. 111.

maintain appropriate academic standards on which the granting of college credit may be based.<sup>1</sup>

To adhere to the fundamental principle concerning the supervision of business student teachers from the standpoint of the teacher education institutions, Prickett suggested the following:

1. Primary responsibility for the supervision . . . must rest with the college supervisor in the subject-matter area with which the student teacher is involved.
2. Observations, conferences, and seminars are the most commonly used media for guiding student teachers in pre-planning . . .
3. Conferences for each student may be scheduled weekly, or they may be arranged at the request of the college supervisor, the cooperating teacher, or the student teacher.
4. Seminars conducted by the supervisor are effective for discussing the teaching problems common to most student teachers in a particular subject-matter area.<sup>2</sup>

Prickett's second basic principle concerning the supervision of business student teachers from the standpoint of the cooperating school was:

Principle XIII: Supervision of student teachers by personnel in the cooperating schools should facilitate maximum scholastic achievement among the pupils with whom the student teacher makes contact while at the same time enabling the student teacher himself to achieve teaching competence.

Again, Prickett commented on the implementation of the basic principle concerning supervision on the part of the cooperating school:

---

<sup>1</sup> Ibid., p. 112.

<sup>2</sup> Ibid., pp. 112-14.

<sup>3</sup> Ibid., p. 118.



1. The cooperating teacher is the person most actively involved in the supervision of the work of a student teacher.

2. The cooperating teacher should frequently, in conferences after class, explain to the student teacher what he observed and offer constructive criticism.

3. In conferences, evaluations of activities should be discussed so that the student teacher may himself develop skill in self-evaluation and grow in self-directiveness.

4. It is necessary for the cooperating teacher to not only work closely and harmoniously with the student teacher, but he should work in the same manner with the college supervisor.<sup>1</sup>

Evaluation.--Prickett identified evaluation as consisting of "continuous self-analysis by the student teacher and periodic analysis on what that student teacher does by the college supervisor and the cooperating teacher."<sup>2</sup> In line with his definition, Prickett presented a basic principle concerning the evaluation of business student teachers:

Principle XIV: Growth in teaching competence, the ultimate goal in student teaching, should be evaluated both subjectively and objectively in terms of the characteristics and competencies desired in a beginning teacher.<sup>3</sup>

To comply with the fundamental principle concerning the evaluation of business student teachers, Prickett suggested the following:

1. One major purpose of the measurement procedure is to provide for assigning a grade at the completion of the student teaching course.

2. It is significant to note that evaluation of student teachers should be based on the premise that the student teacher will be frequently informed about his progress.

---

<sup>1</sup> Ibid., pp. 118-21.

<sup>2</sup> Ibid., p. 122.

<sup>3</sup> Ibid.

3. To effectively evaluate the teaching competence of the student teacher, the college supervisor and the cooperating teacher must utilize rating scales and other measuring sticks involving both objective and subjective elements.

4. It is the college supervisor who should have final authority in evaluating the student teacher and determining the grade to be recorded for completion of the work . . .<sup>1</sup>

### Studies Conducted in States Other Than Oklahoma

#### The Hoskinson Study - 1961

One of the purposes of Hoskinson's<sup>2</sup> study was to compile a group of principles as a guide for the effective supervision of business student teachers. From a search of related literature, Hoskinson identified a list of common principles concerning the effective supervision of student teachers and a list of related activities performed by the supervising teachers. Based upon the principles and the activities identified, a checklist was devised to determine the activities needed to improve the effectiveness of the supervising teacher. Data were collected from these four groups:

(1) business education supervising teachers, (2) business education student teachers, (3) full-time teachers who were

---

<sup>1</sup> Ibid., pp. 116-26, passim.

<sup>2</sup> Robert Everett Hoskinson, "The In-Service Education Needs of the Business Education Supervising Teachers in the Indiana State Teachers College Student Teaching Program," (unpublished doctoral dissertation, The Ohio State University, 1961), pp. 365-67.

former business education student teachers, and (4) college supervisors.

Hoskinson presented the following guiding principle for the effective supervision of student teachers:

The supervising teacher should participate actively in the evaluation process throughout the student teaching experience providing his student teacher with experiences which will enable the latter to develop skill in self-evaluation.<sup>1</sup>

Included in the "general areas of the supervisory teacher's work which needed some improvement [was] evaluating student teacher progress."<sup>2</sup> More specifically, in connection with the evaluation of student teachers, Hoskinson identified the related activities of the supervising teachers that needed "much," "some," and "probable" improvement. Results indicated that the activity of evaluating the student teacher's progress could be "much" improved by the supervising teacher "participating in three-way evaluation conferences with the student teacher and the college supervisor."<sup>3</sup> Furthermore, the evaluative activity could be "some" improved by the following:

1. Determining when to evaluate the student teacher
2. Determining what procedures to use in evaluating the student teacher
3. Developing a system of continuous evaluation of the student teacher
4. Giving the student teacher practice in self-analysis and self-evaluation.<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Ibid., p. 368.

<sup>2</sup> Ibid., p. 369.

<sup>3</sup> Ibid., p. 373.

<sup>4</sup> Ibid., p. 376.

Finally, the activities of the evaluative process in "probable" need of improvement were:

1. Observing the student teacher in action as a basis for evaluation activities
2. Conducting evaluation conferences with the student teacher
3. Giving constructive criticism which will not destroy self-confidence nor foster insecurity
4. Helping the student teacher face the facts which the evaluation activities bring forth
5. Making out required evaluation reports on student teacher's progress.<sup>1</sup>

#### The Black Study - 1969

Black's<sup>2</sup> study surveyed selected business educators to identify and to analyze the current practices and recent trends in the specific areas of the professional laboratory experiences. These three areas were the student teaching program, the work experience program, and the utilization of laboratories and equipment.

The instruments used to collect data were three questionnaires developed by the researcher. In developing the questionnaires, Black,<sup>3</sup> held a conference with several noted educators in business to secure their opinions and recommendations concerning the three areas of the professional

---

<sup>1</sup> Ibid., pp. 379-80.

<sup>2</sup> Grace Allen Curry Black, "An Analysis of Current Trends in Professional Laboratory Experiences in Business Education in Selected Colleges and Universities," (unpublished doctoral dissertation, The Ohio State University, 1969), pp. 1-2.

<sup>3</sup> Ibid., pp. 41-42.

laboratory experiences. The final questionnaires were mailed to 102 institutions, who were members of the National Association for Business Teacher Education. Of those institutions contacted, 82 participated in the study.

In the portion of the study that dealt specifically with the student teaching program for business education students, Black summarized the following findings in reference to the supervision and the evaluation practices:

1. Seventy-nine percent of the institutions held a seminar in conjunction with the student teaching course. Fifty-seven percent of those institutions providing for the seminar indicated that seminars were a weekly occurrence.

2. Following the student teaching course, 56 percent of the institutions had no further program of laboratory experiences. Twenty-eight percent of the colleges provided for educational seminars . . .

3. In presenting the major changes which have occurred in the student teaching program . . . during the past five years, four or more institutions listed the following changes; . . . and supervision of the student teacher by the business education specialist.<sup>1</sup>

#### The Drennan Study - 1969

Using a questionnaire mailed to 305 member institutions of the National Association of Business Teacher Education, Drennan<sup>2</sup> collected data for three purposes. First, he compared and analyzed the current trends in the organization and

---

<sup>1</sup> Ibid., pp. 130-32.

<sup>2</sup> Henry Dalton Drennan, "Comparative Analyses of Student Teaching Programs in Business Education in NABTE-Approved Colleges and Universities," (unpublished doctoral dissertation, The University of Mississippi, 1969), pp. 109-10.

administration of the student teaching programs for business students. Secondly, Drennan analyzed the strong and weak points reported. Thirdly, he obtained and made recommendations for the improvement of student teaching programs in business education.

Of the 305 institutions receiving questionnaires, 281 or 92.13 per cent responded. From these responses, Drennan reported the following information pertinent to the supervision and the evaluation of business student teachers:

College Supervisor:

1. Approximately one-third (34.88 per cent) of the student teachers are supervised by a special college supervisor and the supervising teacher.

2. Approximately two-thirds (63.70 per cent) of the college supervisors make some announced and some unannounced visits in the supervision of student teachers.

3. Approximately one-third (30.96 per cent) of the college supervisors make four visits to observe each student teacher.

4. In 40.21 per cent of the institutions, the college supervisor holds a conference with the student teacher and another with the supervising teacher after each supervisory visit.

5. Approximately one-third (34.17 per cent) reduce the teaching load of the college supervisor one credit hour for each two student teachers supervised up to three.

Evaluation:

1. In approximately one-fifth (19.93 per cent) of the institutions, the special college supervisor does the final evaluation of the student teacher.

2. In approximately one-third (33.81 per cent) of the institutions, the special college supervisor assigns the final grade.

3. In one-half (50.89 per cent) of the institutions, both the checksheet and letter of evaluation are used as the evaluative instruments in evaluating the student teacher.

Student Teaching Assignments:

1. In 60.50 per cent of the cooperating public schools, only one student teacher was assigned at any one time to a supervising teacher.

2. One-half (45.55 per cent) indicated that a student teacher is not assigned to more than two supervising teachers in the secondary school.

Supervising Teachers:

1. Approximately one-half (53.38 per cent) indicated that student teaching seminars are held during the student teaching period.

2. Ninety-six institutions (34.15 per cent) reported holding special<sup>1</sup> seminars for business education student teachers.

In analyzing the reported changes and the anticipated changes in the student teaching programs, Drennan<sup>2</sup> found that of the 62.99 per cent indicating changes within the past three years, the second most-mentioned change was that the business student teachers were now supervised by a college business teacher. In reporting the anticipated changes within the next three years, Drennan reported that of the 55.87 per cent indicating possible change, the most frequently anticipated change was that the business student teachers would be supervised by a business education supervisor.

In analyzing the strengths and the weaknesses of the student teaching programs, Drennan reported that of the 77.94 per cent responding the most-mentioned strength was the effectiveness of the supervising teachers. Of the 76.51 per cent reporting weaknesses, the three weaknesses receiving the most mention were:

---

<sup>1</sup>Ibid., pp. 109-13, passim.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., p. 114.

(1) the lack of a business education supervisor for business student teachers, (2) the ineffectiveness of the cooperating high school teacher, and (3) the college supervisor's inability to supervise adequately because of an overload of student teachers.<sup>1</sup>

### Summary

The purpose of this chapter was to review the literature pertinent to the present study. The available literature in student teaching was extensive; and, although the aspects of the supervision and the evaluation of student teachers were widely reported, no source related directly to the present study.

The review of the literature was divided into these two main sections: (1) published literature and (2) unpublished doctoral research studies. The published literature was classified into these two sections: (1) supervision of student teaching and (2) evaluation of student teaching. The unpublished doctoral research studies were classified into the following two groups: (1) general student teaching programs and (2) business education student teaching programs.

The review of the published literature concentrated primarily on the theories and the recommendations of various authorities in the general area of the supervision and the evaluation of student teachers. The specific consideration of the supervision and the evaluation of business student teachers was minor because of a limited supply of quality

---

<sup>1</sup>Ibid., pp. 114-15.



material. However, the few business educators reviewed were basically in agreement with the general comments made with respect to the supervision and the evaluation of student teachers. Furthermore, the unpublished doctoral research studies reviewed gave support to the suggestions of both the general and the business education writers.

## CHAPTER III

### METHODS AND PROCEDURES

The major part of this study was concerned with determining the magnitude and the direction of the relationship between the current and the preferred policies concerning the supervision and the evaluation of prospective business teachers in the six state colleges of Oklahoma. The relationship was determined by analyzing the responses of participating subjects from three survey questionnaires. (See Appendix Exhibits 1, 2, and 3)

#### Pre-Experimental Procedures

The pre-experimental procedures for this study were divided into these three parts: (1) design of the experiment, (2) selection of the instrument, and (3) the choice of a proper statistical test for analyzing the data collected. However, the order of presentation does not imply the manner in which decisions were made concerning these three parts. In planning and conducting a good experimentation, Kerlinger<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Fred N. Kerlinger, Foundations of Behavioral Research (New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1964), pp. 275-89.

and Edwards<sup>1</sup> relate that it is of ultimate importance that a proper design and statistical test be taken into consideration before the data are collected.

#### Choice of Research Design

In this study, the words "research design" refer to the plan or overall scheme of the research problem. Furthermore, the two basic purposes of the research design are (1) to provide the answers to research questions and (2) to control variance. In other words, Kerlinger<sup>2</sup> stated that research is made effective through the design of the study. Kerlinger further stated:

. . . How does design accomplish this? Research designs set up the framework for "adequate" tests of the relations among variables. The design tells us, in a sense, what observations to make, how to make them, and how to analyze the quantitative representations of the observations. Strictly speaking, design does not "tell" us precisely what to do, but rather suggests the directions of observation-making and analysis. An adequate design "suggests," for example, how many observations should be made, and which variables are active variables and which are assigned. We can then act to manipulate the active variables and to dichotomize or trichotomize or otherwise categorize the assigned variables. A design tells us what type of statistical analysis to use. Finally an adequate design outlines possible conclusions to be drawn from the statistical analysis.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>A. L. Edwards, Statistical Analysis (New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1969), pp. 186-96.

<sup>2</sup>Kerlinger, Foundations, pp. 275-89.

<sup>3</sup>Ibid., p. 276.

The design chosen for this study was a multiple-group comparison study with contrasting observations being recorded for each participant. This design was chosen for the following three reasons: (1) the nature of the study demanded the design, (2) the unequal size of the groups was controlled by the design, and (3) the hypotheses stated could only be tested with data collected from the type of design chosen. For illustrative purposes, Table 1 presents the schematic construction of the design.

TABLE 1.--Schemata of Multiple-Group, Comparison-Study Design

---



---

|  |           |                |                |
|--|-----------|----------------|----------------|
| Cooperating High School Business Teachers* | . . . .   | O <sub>1</sub> | O <sub>2</sub> |
| Collegiate Business Education Teachers.    | . . . . . | O <sub>1</sub> | O <sub>2</sub> |
| Business Education Graduates.              | . . . . . | O <sub>1</sub> | O <sub>2</sub> |

---

\* Random Selection of Subjects

O<sub>1</sub>--First Observation Taken

O<sub>2</sub>--Second Observation Taken

The design shows a random selection of the cooperating high school business teachers only. A sample was used because of the large number of cooperating high school business teachers available and the small number of collegiate business education teachers and business education graduates available. A random sample of 100 subjects was chosen from the available population of cooperating high school business

teachers. This number made the sample size somewhat commensurate and, therefore, aided the assumptions of the ensuing correlations.<sup>1</sup>

### Choice of Statistical Test

The choice of statistical tests used to analyze the data was made in connection with the hypotheses stated and the level of measurement of the two observations taken on each subject. The hypotheses to be tested indicate several correlations. Table 2 illustrates the three groups used in the study and the correlations implied by the different hypotheses.

TABLE 2.--Correlations Implied by Hypotheses 1 to 6

| Collegiate<br>Business Education<br>Teachers                | Business<br>Education<br>Graduates | Cooperating<br>High School<br>Business Teachers |
|---|------------------------------------|---|
| 1a--Current<br>Policies                                     | 2a--Current<br>Policies            | 3a--Current<br>Policies                         |
| 1b--Preferred<br>Policies                                   | 2b--Preferred<br>Policies          | 3b--Preferred<br>Policies                       |
| Ho <sub>1</sub> : Implies a correlation between measures 1a | ←--→ 2a                            |   |
| Ho <sub>2</sub> : Implies a correlation between measures 1a | ←--→ 3a                            |   |
| Ho <sub>3</sub> : Implies a correlation between measures 2a | ←--→ 3a                            |   |
| Ho <sub>4</sub> : Implies a correlation between measures 1b | ←--→ 2b                            |   |
| Ho <sub>5</sub> : Implies a correlation between measures 1b | ←--→ 3b                            |   |
| Ho <sub>6</sub> : Implies a correlation between measures 2b | ←--→ 3b                            |   |

<sup>1</sup>W. L. Hays, Statistics (New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1963), pp. 427-29.

While there are several other correlations possible among the groups used, their implications and ramifications are beyond the scope of this study.

### Experimental Procedures

#### Selection of Subjects

There were three groups of subjects chosen for this study: (1) collegiate business education teachers, (2) business education graduates, and (3) cooperating high school business teachers.

#### Selection of Collegiate Business Education Teachers

The collegiate business education teachers were chosen from the catalog listings of the six state colleges of Oklahoma. While some of the collegiate business education teachers were more active than others in the actual teaching of the business education students, and some were more knowledgeable of the policies and the procedures of the college concerning teacher training, none were excluded from the study, inasmuch as the purpose of the study was not to distinguish between the two groups.

#### Selection of Business Education Graduates

The business education graduates were selected according to the following criteria given in Chapter I:

1. Graduates must be graduated from one of the six state teachers colleges of Oklahoma.

2. Graduates must be teaching in one of the public secondary schools of Oklahoma during the academic year of 1970-71.

Selection of Cooperating High School  
Business Teachers

The high school business teachers were chosen from the faculties of high schools who cooperate with the six state colleges of Oklahoma in providing facilities for the training of prospective business teachers. Because of the large number of business teachers who qualified for the study, a random sample of 100 subjects was drawn from the total population of the cooperating high school business teachers. The two major criteria used in selecting the participants from among the cooperating high school business teachers were as follows:

1. The cooperating high school business teacher must be teaching in high schools that are cooperating with one of the six state colleges of Oklahoma by providing laboratory facilities for the training of business student teachers.
2. The cooperating high school business teachers must have supervised an assigned business student teacher from one of the six state colleges of Oklahoma during the academic year of either 1968-69, 1969-70, or 1970-71.

These two qualifying criteria narrowed the field of prospective participants considerably, but the use of a table of random numbers<sup>1</sup> was still necessary to choose only 100 of the cooperating high school business teachers.

---

<sup>1</sup>N. M. Downie and R. W. Heath, Basic Statistical Methods (New York: Harper and Row, 1965), pp. 316-17.

### Data Collection Procedures

A search of the available literature failed to yield a questionnaire that was appropriate for this study. Therefore, the researcher developed three questionnaires suitable for recording the responses of the three groups of participants. In connection with the graduate committee, the instruments presented in Appendix A (Exhibits 1, 2, and 3) were developed as the final product.

During the time that the questionnaires were being developed, several conferences were being conducted to facilitate the data collection. These conferences included the following:

1. A conference with the academic dean of each of the six state colleges to explain the purpose of the study and to request permission to include the college's personnel in the investigation.
2. A conference with the chairman of the business department of each college to explain the purpose of the study and to request the participation of the business education teachers in the investigation. (If the chairman consented, he was further requested to furnish a list of the names of the business education teachers of this department.)
3. A conference with the director of the student teaching program of each of the colleges to explain the purpose of the study, to ask his cooperation, and to request a list of the names of the cooperating high schools.
4. A conference with the registrar of each of the colleges to explain the purpose of the study, to ask his cooperation in the investigation, and to request a list of the names and permanent addresses of the 1969 business education graduates.
5. A conference with the State Superintendent of Public Instruction, Dr. Scott Tuxhorn, to explain



the purpose of the study and to request a list of the names and school addresses of all business teachers who were employed in the Oklahoma Public School System (secondary schools) during the 1970-71 academic year. (The list was compiled by Mr. Joe Bill Godfrey, the director of the Statistical Services Department of the State Department of Education.)

#### Dissemination of Questionnaires

A master mailing list was compiled that included the names and addresses of the collegiate business education teachers, the cooperating high school business teachers, and the business education graduates. The participants of the study were chosen from this master list. Each participant was mailed the appropriate questionnaire, an addressed, stamped envelope, and a letter (Exhibits 4, 5, and 6 of the Appendix) explaining the purpose of the study. In addition, the letter encouraged the cooperation of the recipient and offered an abstract of the completed study results.

Two follow-up letters were mailed to the participants to encourage their return of the questionnaires. The first follow-up letters (Appendix Exhibits 7, 8, and 9) were sent approximately three weeks following the initial mailing. The second follow-up letters (Appendix Exhibits 7, 8, and 9) were mailed approximately two weeks after the first follow-up letters had been sent to the participants.

## Analysis of the Data

The data received from the questionnaires were punched on IBM cards and processed through the Merrick Computer Center on the campus of The University of Oklahoma at Norman, Oklahoma. The Merrick Center has an IBM 360-50 computer and accompanying configuration.

The statistic used to determine the correlation between the various responses was a Canonical Correlation.<sup>1</sup> This statistic is especially suitable for determining the magnitude and direction of the relationship between two vectors or matrices.<sup>2</sup>

A computer-based program capable of computing a canonical correlation is available at the Merrick Computer Center. This program is part of a series of programs developed by The University of California (Berkley Campus) and published by the California Press, W. J. Dixon, editor.<sup>3</sup> This series of programs is called the Biomedical Series (BMD). The particular program used in the analysis of the data was BMD 02r: A Canonical Correlation for Multiple Measures.

After the correlations had been computed, they were tested for significance at the .05 level. Significance

---

<sup>1</sup>W. J. Dixon, ed., BMD: Biomedical Computer Programs. (Berkley: University of California Press, 1970), pp. 207-14.

<sup>2</sup>J. B. Hotelling, "Studies in the Phenomenology of Emotions," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, LIV (1957), pp. 358-63.

<sup>3</sup>Dixon, BMD, pp. 207-14.

tables published by Hotelling and Scott<sup>1</sup> were used to determine the correlations that were significant.

---

<sup>1</sup>J. B. Hotelling and S. Scott, "Hierarchical Linkage Analysis," Educational and Psychological Measurement, XX (1960), pp. 55-67.

## CHAPTER IV

### RESULTS

One hundred and forty-six subjects were used to compare the current and the preferred policies in the supervision and the evaluation of business student teachers in the six state colleges of Oklahoma.

One hundred and seventy-three questionnaires were mailed; 39 to the business education graduates, 34 to the collegiate business education teachers, and 100 to the cooperating high school business teachers. Of the 173 questionnaires mailed, 146 were returned. The business education graduates returned 32 of 39 questionnaires for a total of 82.3 per cent. The collegiate business education teachers returned 28 of 34 questionnaires for a total of 82.4 per cent. The cooperating high school business teachers returned 86 of 100 questionnaires for a total of 86 per cent.

Two of the questionnaires contained 28 items; the remaining questionnaire contained 27 items. The number of possible responses on the individual items ranged from five to eight. The participants were encouraged to make these two responses to each item: (1) the current policy concerning the supervision and the evaluation of business student

teachers and (2) the preferred policy concerning the supervision and the evaluation of business student teachers.

The responses of the participants were tabulated for both choices on each item. These totals were used in computing the canonical correlations needed to test the hypotheses stated in Chapter I and in computing the percentages for each of the responses on the individual items.

### Results of Testing the Hypotheses

To test the results of the hypotheses stated in Chapter I, canonical correlations were computed among certain responses of the participants. However, because of the differences that existed among the three questionnaires, the items on each questionnaire were matched with their correlates or counterparts on the other questionnaires. While most of the items had correlates on all three instruments, some items were unique and could be used only for descriptive purposes. Table 3 illustrates the patterns of items and their correlates.

As mentioned, there were items on each questionnaire that were unique to each particular group and could not be used in the correlations. These items were 18 and 19 for the business education graduates; 5 and 9 for the collegiate business education teachers; and, 5, 6, 7, 8, 12, and 15 for the cooperating high school business teachers.

TABLE 3.--Item Correlates from All Three Questionnaires

|   | Cooperating<br>High School<br>Business Teachers | Collegiate<br>Business Education<br>Teachers | Business<br>Education<br>Graduates |
|---|---|--|------------------------------------|
| S<br>U<br>P<br>E<br>R<br>V<br>I<br>S<br>I<br>O<br>N | -   | 1  | 1                                  |
|   | -   | 2  | 2                                  |
|   | -   | 3  | 3                                  |
|   | -   | 4  | 4                                  |
|   | 1   | -  | 5                                  |
|   | 2   | -  | 6                                  |
|   | 3   | -  | 7                                  |
|   | 4   | -  | 8                                  |
|   | -   | 6  | 9                                  |
|   | 9   | 7  | 10                                 |
|   | 10  | 8  | 11                                 |
|   | 11  | 10   | --                                 |
|   | 13  | 11   | --                                 |
|   | --  | 12   | 12                                 |
|   | 14  | 13   | --                                 |
|   | 16  | 14   | 13                                 |
|   | --  | 15   | 14                                 |
|   | 17  | --   | 15                                 |
|   | 18  | 16   | --                                 |
|   | 19  | 19   | 17                                 |
|   | 20  | 17   | 16                                 |
|   | 21  | 18   | --                                 |
| E<br>V<br>A<br>L<br>U<br>A<br>T<br>I<br>O<br>N      | 22  | 20   | --                                 |
|   | --  | 21   | 20                                 |
|   | 23  | 22   | 21                                 |
|   | 24  | 23   | 22                                 |
|   | 25  | 24   | 23                                 |
|   | 27  | 25   | 24                                 |
|   | 26  | 27   | 26                                 |
|   | --  | 26   | 25                                 |
|   | 28  | 28   | 27                                 |

Results of Testing Hypothesis One (1)

Hypothesis one was stated as follows:

There is no significant relationship between the current policies as stated by the collegiate business education teachers and the current policies as stated by the business education graduates concerning the supervision and the evaluation of business student teachers.

This hypothesis was not supported ( $r = .226$ ;  $P < .05$ ).

Results of Testing Hypothesis Two (2)

Hypothesis two was stated as follows:

There is no significant relationship between the current policies as stated by the collegiate business education teachers and the current policies as stated by the cooperating high school business teachers concerning the supervision and the evaluation of business student teachers.

This hypothesis was not supported ( $r = .382$ ;  $P < .01$ ).

Results of Testing Hypothesis Three (3)

Hypothesis three was stated as follows:

There is no significant relationship between the current policies as stated by the business education graduates and the current policies as stated by the cooperating high school business teachers concerning the supervision and the evaluation of business student teachers.

This hypothesis was not supported ( $r = .268$ ;  $P < .01$ ).

Results of Testing Hypothesis Four (4)

Hypothesis four was stated as follows:

There is no significant relationship between the preferred policies as stated by the collegiate business education teachers and the preferred policies as stated by the business education graduates concerning

the supervision and the evaluation of business student teachers.

This hypothesis was not supported ( $r = .422$ ;  $P < .01$ ).

#### Results of Testing Hypothesis Five (5)

Hypothesis five was stated as follows:

There is no significant relationship between the preferred policies as stated by the collegiate business education teachers and the preferred policies as stated by the cooperating high school business teachers concerning the supervision and the evaluation of business student teachers.

This hypothesis was not supported ( $r = .212$ ;  $P < .05$ ).

#### Results of Testing Hypothesis Six (6)

Hypothesis six was stated as follows:

There is no significant relationship between the preferred policies as stated by the business education graduates and the preferred policies as stated by the cooperating high school business teachers concerning the supervision and the evaluation of business student teachers.

This hypothesis was not supported ( $r = .311$   $P < .01$ ).

Following the computation of the relationships necessary to test hypotheses 1 to 6, the investigator made further comparisons among the remaining groups of the study. A matrix showing the possible correlations and their computed values is presented in Table 4.

Of particular significance, in relation to Table 4, was the high correlation ( $r = .361$ ;  $P < .01$ ) between the current policies as reported by the collegiate business education teachers and the preferred policies as reported by the cooperating high school teachers.



TABLE 4.--Correlation Matrix of All Possible Combinations

| Groups *** | 1a   | 1b   | 2a    | 2b     | 3a     | 3b     |
|------------|------|------|-------|--------|--------|--------|
| 1a         | 1.00 | .083 | .226* | .191   | .382** | .361** |
| 1b         |      | 1.00 | .073  | .422** | .093   | .212*  |
| 2a         |      |      | 1.00  | .044   | .268** | .022   |
| 2b         |      |      |       | 1.00   | .126   | .311** |
| 3a         |      |      |       |        | 1.00   | .212*  |
| 3b         |      |      |       |        |        | 1.00   |

\* Significant;  $P < .05$

\*\* Significant;  $P < .01$

\*\*\*  
 1a -- Collegiate business education teachers, current policies  
 1b -- Collegiate business education teachers, preferred policies  
 2a -- Business education graduates, current policies  
 2b -- Business education graduates, preferred policies  
 3a -- Cooperating high school business teachers, current policies  
 3b -- Cooperating high school business teachers, preferred policies

#### Item Analysis of Questionnaires

Following the computation of the correlations among the three groups, the results of the responses to the individual items of the questionnaires were analyzed in an attempt to locate specific differences and similarities not available through the overall correlation coefficient. The

analyses were divided into these two sections: (1) analysis of the supervision policies and (2) analysis of the evaluation policies. These two sections were further divided into three groups: (1) the analysis of the questionnaire mailed to the business education graduates, (2) the analysis of the questionnaire mailed to the collegiate business education teachers, and (3) the analysis of the questionnaire mailed to the cooperating high school business teachers.

### Analysis of the Supervision Policies

#### Analysis of Questionnaire Mailed to Business Education Graduates

The results of the questionnaires returned by 82.3 per cent of the business education graduates were tabulated for each individual item. Of those items pertaining to the supervision policies, the percentage of responses for both the current and the preferred policies were presented in tabular form. With respect to each table, observations were made concerning particular differences and similarities in the current and the preferred supervision policies as reported by the business education graduates.

Whereas only four per cent of the business education graduates (Table 5) reported the current use of a business education supervisor, 40 per cent preferred the use of a business education supervisor. Furthermore, 36 per cent of the business education graduates preferred the use of both a

professional education supervisor and a business education supervisor.

TABLE 5.--Position of the College Supervisor as Reported by Business Education Graduates (Item Number 1)

| Choices  | % Current Policies | % Preferred Policies |
|--|--------------------|----------------------|
| a. Director of student teaching                              | 12                 | 0                    |
| b. Professional education supervisor                         | 68                 | 12                   |
| c. Business education supervisor                             | 4                  | 40                   |
| d. Professional education and business education supervisors | 8                  | 36                   |
| e. Other (please specify)                                    | 4                  | 4                    |
| f. Unknown   | 4                  | 8                    |

Although more than one third (36 per cent) of the business education graduates reported the current minimum professional preparation required of the college supervisor to be a doctorate degree, 36 per cent also reported no knowledge of the current requirement. Forty-eight per cent of the business education graduates (Table 6) preferred requiring a master's degree in business, while 28 per cent preferred requiring a doctorate degree.

As presented in Table 7, fifty-two per cent of the business education graduates responded "unknown" to the

TABLE 6.--Minimum Professional Preparation Required of the College Supervisor as Reported by Business Education Graduates (Item Number 2)

| Choices                                 | % Current Policies | % Preferred Policies |
|---|--------------------|----------------------|
| a. Bachelor                             | 0                  | 0                    |
| b. Master of teaching                   | 20                 | 1                    |
| c. Master in field                      | 8                  | 48                   |
| d. Specialist (60 hours above bachelor) | 0                  | 12                   |
| e. Doctorate                            | 36                 | 28                   |
| f. Other (please specify)               | 0                  | 0                    |
| g. Unknown                              | 36                 | 8                    |

current policy concerning the academic level of teaching experience required of the college supervisor. Forty per cent of the respondents preferred that the college supervisor have teaching experience on either the college or the university level. Other preferences indicated by 28 per cent of the business education graduates included such policies as "all levels" and "both secondary and college or university."

Seventy-six per cent of the business education graduates (Table 8) indicated no knowledge of the minimum number of years' teaching experience currently required of the college supervisor. Also, 76 per cent preferred requiring a minimum of five or more years' teaching experience of the college supervisor.

TABLE 7.--Academic Level of Teaching Experience Required of the College Supervisor as Reported by Business Education Graduates (Item Number 3)

| Choices                   | % Current Policies | % Preferred Policies |
|---------------------------|--------------------|----------------------|
| a. None                   | 0                  | 0                    |
| b. College or university  | 36                 | 40                   |
| c. Secondary              | 4                  | 20                   |
| d. Junior high            | 0                  | 8                    |
| e. Elementary             | 0                  | 0                    |
| f. Other (please specify) | 8                  | 28                   |
| g. Unknown                | 52                 | 4                    |

TABLE 8.--Minimum Number of Years' Teaching Experience Required of the College Supervisor as Reported by Business Education Graduates (Item Number 4)

| Choices      | % Current Policies | % Preferred Policies |
|--------------|--------------------|----------------------|
| a. None      | 8                  | 0                    |
| b. 1 to 2    | 4                  | 12                   |
| c. 3 to 4    | 0                  | 8                    |
| d. 5 or more | 12                 | 76                   |
| e. Unknown   | 76                 | 4                    |

In Table 9, sixty-four per cent of the business education graduates indicated the current position of the cooperating teacher as teaching only business subjects. Of the business education graduates reporting, 80 per cent preferred a policy of the cooperating teacher teaching only business subjects.

TABLE 9.--Position of the Cooperating Teacher as Reported by Business Education Graduates (Item Number 5)

| Choices                                     | % Current Policies | % Preferred Policies |
|---|--------------------|----------------------|
| a. Department chairman and teaches business | 8                  | 8                    |
| b. Teaches only business subjects           | 64                 | 80                   |
| c. Teaches both business and other subjects | 20                 | 8                    |
| d. Other (please specify)                   | 4                  | 0                    |
| e. Unknown                                  | 4                  | 4                    |

As presented in Table 10, sixty-eight per cent of the business education graduates reported the bachelor's degree as the current minimum professional preparation required of the cooperating teacher. In comparing the percentages reported, however, the business education graduates preferred that the cooperating teacher be required to have a master's

degree in business (24 per cent) or a master of teaching degree (12 per cent).

TABLE 10.--Minimum Professional Preparation Required of the Cooperation Teacher as Reported by Business Education Graduates (Item Number 6)

| Choices                                 | % Current Policies | % Preferred Policies |
|---|--------------------|----------------------|
| a. Bachelor                             | 68                 | 44                   |
| b. Master of teaching                   | 8                  | 12                   |
| c. Master in field                      | 12                 | 24                   |
| d. Specialist (60 hours above bachelor) | 0                  | 0                    |
| e. Other (please specify)               | 0                  | 12                   |
| f. Unknown                              | 12                 | 8                    |

Eighty per cent of the business education graduates (Table 11) reported a current policy of requiring the cooperating teacher to have secondary teaching experience. Of the business education graduates responding, 92 per cent reported a preference for requiring secondary teaching experience.

Although 48 per cent of the business education graduates (Table 12) reported that a minimum of one or two years' teaching experience was currently required of the cooperating teacher, 52 per cent preferred a minimum of three or four years' teaching experience. More than one half (56 per cent)

TABLE 11.--Academic Level of Teaching Experience Required of the Cooperating Teacher as Reported by Business Education Graduates (Item Number 7)

| Choices                   | % Current Policies | % Preferred Policies |
|---------------------------|--------------------|----------------------|
| a. None                   | 0                  | 0                    |
| b. Secondary              | 80                 | 92                   |
| c. Junior high            | 8                  | 4                    |
| d. Elementary             | 0                  | 0                    |
| e. Other (please specify) | 0                  | 0                    |
| f. Unknown                | 12                 | 4                    |

TABLE 12.--Minimum Number of Years' Teaching Experience Required of the Cooperating Teacher as Reported by Business Education Graduates (Item Number 8)

| Choices      | % Current Policies | % Preferred Policies |
|--------------|--------------------|----------------------|
| a. None      | 4                  | 0                    |
| b. 1 to 2    | 48                 | 16                   |
| c. 3 to 4    | 16                 | 52                   |
| d. 5 or more | 8                  | 24                   |
| e. Unknown   | 24                 | 8                    |



of the business education graduates reported no knowledge of the current policy of the number of student teachers assigned to a college supervisor at one time. As presented in Table 13, the responses to the preferred policy were diverse.

TABLE 13.--Number of Student Teachers Assigned to a College Supervisor at One Time as Reported by Business Education Graduates (Item Number 9)

| Choices                        | % Current Policies | % Preferred Policies |
|--------------------------------|--------------------|----------------------|
| a. 1 to 3                      | 0                  | 16                   |
| b. 4 to 6                      | 8                  | 28                   |
| c. 7 to 9                      | 4                  | 28                   |
| d. 10 or more (please specify) | 32                 | 16                   |
| e. Unknown                     | 56                 | 12                   |

Of the business education graduates responding, 48 per cent reported a current policy of assigning one student teacher to the cooperating teacher, and 36 per cent reported the assignment of two student teachers at one time. However, the majority (88 per cent) of the business education graduates (Table 14) preferred that only one student teacher be assigned to the cooperating teacher at one time.

Thirty-six per cent of the business education graduates (Table 15) reported a current and a preferred policy of only one cooperating teacher supervising the student teacher.

TABLE 14.--Number of Student Teachers Assigned to the Cooperating Teacher at One Time as Reported by Business Education Graduates (Item Number 10)

| Choices      | % Current Policies | % Preferred Policies |
|--------------|--------------------|----------------------|
| a. 1         | 48                 | 88                   |
| b. 2         | 36                 | 8                    |
| c. 3         | 8                  | 4                    |
| d. 4         | 0                  | 0                    |
| e. 5 or more | 0                  | 0                    |
| f. Unknown   | 8                  | 0                    |

TABLE 15.--Number of Cooperating Teachers Supervising the Student Teacher During Student Teaching Assignment as Reported by Business Education Graduates (Item Number 11)

| Choices                   | % Current Policies | % Preferred Policies |
|---------------------------|--------------------|----------------------|
| a. One                    | 36                 | 36                   |
| b. Not more than two      | 32                 | 52                   |
| c. More than two          | 20                 | 12                   |
| d. Other (please specify) | 4                  | 0                    |
| e. Unknown                | 8                  | 0                    |

More than one half (52 per cent) preferred that not more than two cooperating teachers supervised the student teacher.

Although eighty-four per cent of the business education graduates (Table 16) reported the current use of group orientation conferences prior to student teaching, only 32 per cent preferred the group approach. Instead, 60 per cent preferred the utilization of individual conferences with each student teacher prior to student teaching.

TABLE 16.--Orientation Conference Held for the Student Teachers Prior to Student Teaching as Reported by Business Education Graduates (Item Number 12)

| Choices                                    | % Current Policies | % Preferred Policies |
|--|--------------------|----------------------|
| a. None                                    | 4                  | 0                    |
| b. Individual conference with each student | 0                  | 60                   |
| c. Group conference with all students      | 84                 | 32                   |
| d. Other (please specify)                  | 4                  | 4                    |
| e. Unknown                                 | 8                  | 4                    |

In Table 17, sixty per cent of the business education graduates reported that currently the college supervisor made two or three observational visits. In contrast, the responses to the preferred policies varied. For example, more than one third (36 per cent) preferred that the college supervisor

make four or five visits. Furthermore, 16 per cent of the business education graduates preferred that the college supervisor make more than five visits.

TABLE 17.--Number of Observational Visits by the College Supervisor as Reported by Business Education Graduates (Item Number 13)

| Choices                         | % Current Policies | % Preferred Policies |
|---------------------------------|--------------------|----------------------|
| a. None                         | 4                  | 4                    |
| b. One                          | 12                 | 8                    |
| c. 2 to 3                       | 60                 | 36                   |
| d. 4 to 5                       | 20                 | 36                   |
| e. More than 5 (please specify) | 0                  | 16                   |
| f. Unknown                      | 4                  | 0                    |

Fifty-two per cent of the business education graduates (Table 18) reported that the college supervisor currently held individual conferences with the student teacher after each observational visit. Forty per cent preferred an individual conference with each observational visit. Moreover, 40 per cent of the business education graduates preferred an individual conference with the college supervisor with each observational visit, at mid-point, and upon the completion of student teaching.

TABLE 18.--Individual Conference(s) That a College Supervisor Holds With a Student Teacher as Reported by Business Education Graduates (Item Number 14)

| Choices   | % Current Policies | % Preferred Policies |
|---|--------------------|----------------------|
| a. None   | 20                 | 0                    |
| b. With each observational visit  | 52                 | 40                   |
| c. At mid-point of student teaching   | 0                  | 8                    |
| d. Upon completion of student teaching  | 8                  | 0                    |
| e. With each observational visit and at mid-point of student teaching                   | 4                  | 0                    |
| f. With each observational visit, at mid-point, and upon completion of student teaching | 4                  | 40                   |
| g. Other (please specify)   | 8                  | 4                    |
| h. Unknown  | 4                  | 8                    |

As presented in Table 19, more than one half (52 per cent) of the business education graduates reported that the cooperating teacher currently held an individual conference with the student teacher periodically throughout student teaching. However, approximately one fourth (24 per cent) reported that no individual conferences were held between the student teacher and the cooperating teacher. Sixty per cent, however, preferred that individual conferences be held periodically.

TABLE 19.--Individual Conference(s) That a Cooperating Teacher Holds With a Student Teacher as Reported by Business Education Graduates (Item Number 15)

| Choices   | % Current Policies | % Preferred Policies |
|---|--------------------|----------------------|
| a. None   | 24                 | 0                    |
| b. Periodically throughout student teaching                                       | 52                 | 60                   |
| c. At mid-point of student teaching   | 0                  | 0                    |
| d. Upon completion of student teaching  | 0                  | 0                    |
| e. Periodically throughout and at mid-point of student teaching                   | 0                  | 4                    |
| f. Periodically throughout, at mid-point, and upon completion of student teaching | 16                 | 32                   |
| g. Other (please specify)   | 0                  | 0                    |
| h. Unknown  | 8                  | 4                    |

The current policies concerning the campus seminars held for student teachers were diverse (Table 20). Forty-eight per cent of the business education graduates preferred that campus seminars be held prior to, during, and upon the completion of student teaching.

Thirty-six per cent of the business education graduates reported that currently the college supervisor and the

TABLE 20.--Campus Seminar(s) Held for Student Teachers as Reported by Business Education Graduates (Item Number 16)

| Choices  | % Current Policies | % Preferred Policies |
|--|--------------------|----------------------|
| a. None  | 20                 | 0                    |
| b. Prior to student teaching                                 | 20                 | 4                    |
| c. During student teaching                                   | 12                 | 8                    |
| d. Upon completion of student teaching                       | 0                  | 4                    |
| e. Prior to and during student teaching                      | 20                 | 24                   |
| f. Prior to, during, and upon completion of student teaching | 12                 | 48                   |
| g. Other (please specify)                                    | 8                  | 4                    |
| h. Unknown   | 8                  | 8                    |

student teacher participated in a conference following observation, whereas only 24 per cent preferred such a policy. Instead, more than one half (56 per cent) of the business education graduates preferred a three-way conference among the college supervisor, the cooperating teacher, and the student teacher (Table 21).

As presented in Table 22, forty per cent of the business education graduates reported that the cooperating teacher did most of the observation during the first two weeks of the student teaching period. The responses to the

TABLE 21.--Individuals Participating in Conference Following  
Observational Visit as Reported by Business Education  
Graduates (Item Number 17)

| Choices  | % Current<br>Policies | % Preferred<br>Policies |
|--|-----------------------|-------------------------|
| a. None  | 24                    | 0                       |
| b. College supervisor and<br>student teacher                       | 36                    | 24                      |
| c. College supervisor and<br>cooperating teacher                   | 12                    | 12                      |
| d. College supervisor, cooperating<br>teacher, and student teacher | 12                    | 56                      |
| e. Other (please specify)  | 8                     | 8                       |
| f. Unknown   | 8                     | 0                       |

TABLE 22.--Cooperating Teacher Did Most of the Observation  
During the Following Part of Student Teaching as Reported by  
Business Education Graduates (Item Number 18)

| Choices                   | % Current<br>Policies | % Preferred<br>Policies |
|---------------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------|
| a. None                   | 0                     | 4                       |
| b. First two weeks        | 40                    | 20                      |
| c. 3 to 5 weeks           | 28                    | 28                      |
| d. 7 to 9 weeks           | 24                    | 32                      |
| e. Other (please specify) | 4                     | 4                       |
| f. Unknown                | 4                     | 12                      |



preferred policies were diverse, with the largest group (32 per cent) preferring that most of the observation be done during weeks seven through nine.

Analysis of Questionnaire Mailed to  
Collegiate Business Education Teachers

The results of the questionnaires returned by 82.4 per cent of the collegiate business education teachers were tabulated for each individual item. Of those items pertaining to the supervision policies, the percentage of responses for both the current and the preferred policies were presented in tabular form. With respect to each table, observations were made concerning particular differences and similarities in the current and the preferred supervision policies as reported by the collegiate business education teachers.

Whereas 11.11 per cent of the collegiate business education teachers reported the current use of a business education supervisor, 74.07 per cent preferred that the student teacher be supervised by a business education collegiate teacher. As presented in Table 23, more than one third (37.03 per cent) of the respondents reported other current policies that included the position of the college supervisor as "director of student teaching and professional education supervisor" and "director of student teaching and nine coordinators."

TABLE 23.--Position of the College Supervisor as Reported by Collegiate Business Education Teachers (Item Number 1)

| Choices  | % Current Policies | % Preferred Policies |
|--|--------------------|----------------------|
| a. Director of student teaching                              | 14.81              | 0.0                  |
| b. Professional education supervisor                         | 33.33              | 7.40                 |
| c. Business education supervisor                             | 11.11              | 74.07                |
| d. Professional education and business education supervisors | 0.0                | 14.81                |
| e. Other (please specify)                                    | 37.03              | 3.70                 |
| f. Unknown   | 3.70               | 0.0                  |

Although 40.74 per cent of the collegiate business education teachers reported a doctorate degree as the current minimum professional preparation of the college supervisor, 29.62 per cent (Table 24) preferred requiring a doctorate degree. Approximately thirty-eight (37.03) per cent of the collegiate business education teachers preferred a master's degree in business as the minimum requirement for the college supervisor.

As presented in Table 25, approximately nineteen (18.51) per cent of the collegiate business education teachers reported that currently no teaching experience was required of the college supervisor. However, 44.44 per cent of

TABLE 24.--Minimum Professional Preparation Required of the College Supervisor as Reported by Collegiate Business Education Teachers (Item Number 2)

| Choices                                 | % Current Policies | % Preferred Policies |
|---|--------------------|----------------------|
| a. Bachelor                             | 0.0                | 0.0                  |
| b. Master of teaching                   | 18.51              | 0.0                  |
| c. Master in field                      | 3.70               | 37.03                |
| d. Specialist (60 hours above bachelor) | 3.70               | 18.51                |
| e. Doctorate                            | 40.74              | 29.62                |
| f. Other (please specify)               | 18.51              | 14.81                |
| g. Unknown                              | 14.81              | 0.0                  |

TABLE 25.--Academic Level of Teaching Experience Required of the College Supervisor as Reported by Collegiate Business Education Teachers (Item Number 3)

| Choices                   | % Current Policies | % Preferred Policies |
|---------------------------|--------------------|----------------------|
| a. None                   | 18.51              | 0.0                  |
| b. College or university  | 37.03              | 22.22                |
| c. Secondary              | 7.40               | 33.33                |
| d. Junior high            | 0.0                | 0.0                  |
| e. Elementary             | 0.0                | 0.0                  |
| f. Other (please specify) | 14.81              | 44.44                |
| g. Unknown                | 22.22              | 0.0                  |

the group preferred that the college supervisor be required to have teaching experience on both the secondary and the college or the university level.

Approximately 48 per cent of the collegiate business education teachers (Table 26) reported that currently no teaching experience was required of the college supervisor. The same percentage (48.14) preferred that the minimum requirement be five or more years. Furthermore, 44.44 per cent preferred that the minimum number required be either three or four years.

TABLE 26.--Minimum Number of Years' Teaching Experience Required of the College Supervisor as Reported by Collegiate Business Education Teachers (Item Number 4)

| Choices      | % Current Policies | % Preferred Policies |
|--------------|--------------------|----------------------|
| a. None      | 48.14              | 0.0                  |
| b. 1 to 2    | 0.0                | 3.70                 |
| c. 3 to 4    | 7.40               | 44.44                |
| d. 5 or more | 11.11              | 48.14                |
| e. Unknown   | 33.33              | 3.70                 |

As illustrated in Table 27, the current policies concerning the credit-load reduction allotted to the college supervisor for supervisory duties were varied. More than one half (55.55 per cent) of the collegiate business education

teachers preferred a reduction of semester hours based on the number of student teachers assigned, and 29.62 per cent preferred an allocation of more than one half of the college supervisor's teaching load.

TABLE 27.--Credit-Load Reduction Allotted to the College Supervisor for Supervisory Duties as Reported by Collegiate Business Education Teachers (Item Number 5)

| Choices   | % Current Policies | % Preferred Policies |
|---|--------------------|----------------------|
| a. None   | 0.0                | 0.0                  |
| b. Semester hours reduced based on number of student teachers | 25.92              | 55.55                |
| c. 1/4 to 1/3 of teaching load                                | 14.81              | 0.0                  |
| d. 1/2 of teaching load                                       | 7.40               | 11.11                |
| e. More than 1/2 of teaching load                             | 33.33              | 29.62                |
| f. Unknown  | 18.51              | 3.70                 |

Approximately seventy (70.37) per cent of the collegiate business education teachers (Table 28) reported a current policy of assigning ten or more student teachers to a college supervisor at one time. Only 40.74 per cent preferred such a policy.

As presented in Table 29, the current policy (62.96 per cent) and the preferred policy (77.77 per cent) reported by the collegiate business education teachers were the same--

TABLE 28.--Number of Student Teachers Assigned to a College Supervisor at One Time as Reported by Collegiate Business Education Teachers (Item Number 6)

| Choices                        | % Current Policies | % Preferred Policies |
|--------------------------------|--------------------|----------------------|
| a. 1 to 3                      | 0.0                | 0.0                  |
| b. 4 to 6                      | 0.0                | 22.22                |
| c. 7 to 9                      | 0.0                | 22.22                |
| d. 10 or more (please specify) | 70.17              | 40.74                |
| e. Unknown                     | 29.62              | 14.81                |

TABLE 29.--Number of Student Teachers Assigned to the Cooperating Teacher at One Time as Reported by Collegiate Business Education Teachers (Item Number 7)

| Choices      | % Current Policies | % Preferred Policies |
|--------------|--------------------|----------------------|
| a. 1         | 62.96              | 77.77                |
| b. 2         | 14.81              | 18.51                |
| c. 3         | 0.0                | 0.0                  |
| d. 4         | 0.0                | 0.0                  |
| e. 5 or more | 0.0                | 0.0                  |
| f. Unknown   | 22.22              | 3.70                 |

only one student teacher assigned to the cooperating teacher at one time.

In Table 30, a majority of the collegiate business education teachers (74.07 per cent) responded that not more than two cooperating teachers currently supervised a student teacher. The same policy was preferred by 62.96 per cent of the collegiate business education teachers, whereas 22.22 per cent preferred a one-to-one relationship between the student teacher and the cooperating teacher.

TABLE 30.--Number of Cooperating Teachers Supervising the Student Teacher During Student Teaching Assignment as Reported by Collegiate Business Education Teachers (Item Number 8)

| Choices                   | % Current Policies | % Preferred Policies |
|---------------------------|--------------------|----------------------|
| a. One                    | 7.40               | 22.22                |
| b. Not more than two      | 74.07              | 62.96                |
| c. More than two          | 0.0                | 0.0                  |
| d. Other (please specify) | 3.70               | 14.81                |
| e. Unknown                | 14.81              | 0.0                  |

A majority of the collegiate business education teachers (Table 31) reported both the current policy (66.66 per cent) and the preferred policy (88.88 per cent) as no student teachers being assigned outside the supervisory radius of the college.

TABLE 31.--Percentage of Student Teachers Assigned Outside the Supervisory Radius of the College as Reported by Collegiate Business Education Teachers (Item Number 9)

| Choices          | % Current Policies | % Preferred Policies |
|------------------|--------------------|----------------------|
| a. None          | 66.66              | 88.88                |
| b. Less than 10% | 11.11              | 11.11                |
| c. 10% to 20%    | 0.0                | 0.0                  |
| d. 21% to 30%    | 0.0                | 0.0                  |
| e. 31% or more   | 0.0                | 0.0                  |
| f. Unknown       | 22.22              | 0.0                  |

Whereas 66.66 per cent of the collegiate business education teachers (Table 32) reported that currently the college did not compensate the cooperating teacher, only 48.14 per cent preferred such a policy. Approximately twenty-six (25.92) per cent of the group preferred that the cooperating teacher be paid for supervising each student teacher. The recommended amounts to be paid to the cooperating teacher ranged from \$50 to \$500 for each student teacher.

As illustrated in Table 33, the current policies as reported by the collegiate business education teachers were diverse. The practice of waiving tuition was preferred by 37.03 per cent of the group. Approximately twenty-six (25.92) per cent of the collegiate business education teachers



TABLE 32.--College Compensation to the Cooperating Teacher as Reported by Collegiate Business Education Teachers (Item Number 10)

| Choices  | % Current Policies | % Preferred Policies |
|--|--------------------|----------------------|
| a. None  | 66.66              | 48.14                |
| b. \$_____for each student<br>teacher  | 7.40               | 25.92                |
| c. A flat rate of \$_____<br>regardless of the number<br>of student teachers | 0.0                | 0.0                  |
| d. Other (please specify)  | 7.40               | 11.11                |
| e. Unknown   | 18.51              | 14.81                |

TABLE 33.--College Benefits Provided the Cooperating Teacher as Reported by Collegiate Business Education Teachers (Item Number 11)

| Choices                               | % Current Policies | % Preferred Policies |
|---------------------------------------|--------------------|----------------------|
| a. None                               | 7.40               | 11.11                |
| b. Tuition waived                     | 33.33              | 37.03                |
| c. Admission to college<br>activities | 22.22              | 14.81                |
| d. Other (please specify)             | 18.51              | 25.92                |
| e. Unknown                            | 18.51              | 11.11                |

reported "other" preferences. These preferences included "offering scholarships to graduating seniors of the cooperating school" and "providing both tuition fees and admission to college activities."

Approximately forty-four (44.44) per cent of the collegiate business education teachers (Table 34) reported "other" current policies concerning orientation conferences for student teachers. These current policies included "enrolled in an orientation course" and "conferences for business majors only." More than one half (51.85 per cent) also reported "other" preferences. These preferred policies included "conferences for business majors only," "individual conference with the cooperating teacher," "group conference with the cooperating school principal or superintendent," and "both individual and group conference with the student teachers."

Although 48.14 per cent of the collegiate business education teachers (Table 35) reported a current policy of no orientation conference for the cooperating teacher prior to student teaching, 59.25 per cent preferred an individual conference with each teacher. Furthermore, 29.62 per cent preferred that a group conference be held for the cooperating teachers prior to student teaching for orientation purposes.

Approximately forty-one (40.74) per cent of the collegiate business education teachers (Table 36) reported that the college supervisor currently made either four or five

TABLE 34.--Orientation Conference(s) Held for the Student Teachers Prior to Student Teaching as Reported by Collegiate Business Education Teachers (Item Number 12)

| Choices                                    | % Current Policies | % Preferred Policies |
|--|--------------------|----------------------|
| a. None                                    | 0.0                | 0.0                  |
| b. Individual conference with each student | 3.70               | 22.22                |
| c. Group conference with all students      | 40.74              | 25.92                |
| d. Other (please specify)                  | 44.44              | 51.85                |
| e. Unknown                                 | 11.11              | 0.0                  |

TABLE 35.--Orientation Conference(s) for the Cooperating Teachers Prior to Student Teaching as Reported by Collegiate Business Education Teachers (Item Number 13)

| Choices                                    | % Current Policies | % Preferred Policies |
|--|--------------------|----------------------|
| a. None                                    | 48.14              | 0.0                  |
| b. Individual conference with each teacher | 11.11              | 59.25                |
| c. Group conference with all teachers      | 14.81              | 29.62                |
| d. Other (please specify)                  | 3.70               | 11.11                |
| e. Unknown                                 | 22.22              | 0.0                  |

TABLE 36.--Number of Observational Visits by the College Supervisor as Reported by Collegiate Business Education Teachers (Item Number 14)

| Choices                         | % Current Policies | % Preferred Policies |
|---------------------------------|--------------------|----------------------|
| a. None                         | 0.0                | 0.0                  |
| b. One                          | 3.70               | 0.0                  |
| c. 2 to 3                       | 29.62              | 18.51                |
| d. 4 to 5                       | 40.74              | 59.25                |
| e. More than 5 (please specify) | 7.40               | 22.22                |
| f. Unknown                      | 18.51              | 0.0                  |

observational visits, whereas 59.25 per cent preferred such a policy. Moreover, 22.22 per cent of the respondents preferred that the college supervisor make more than five observational visits.

More than one half (55.55 per cent) of the collegiate business education teachers (Table 37) reported that currently the college supervisor held an individual conference with the student teacher during each observational visit, and 40.74 per cent of the respondents preferred an individual conference with each observational visit, at mid-point, and upon the completion of student teaching.

As presented in Table 38, approximately two thirds (62.96 per cent) of the collegiate business education teachers

TABLE 37.--Individual Conference(s) that a College Supervisor Holds with a Student Teacher as Reported by Collegiate Business Education Teachers (Item Number 15)

| Choices   | % Current Policies | % Preferred Policies |
|---|--------------------|----------------------|
| a. None   | 0.0                | 0.0                  |
| b. With each observational visit  | 55.55              | 48.14                |
| c. At mid-point of student teaching   | 3.70               | 0.0                  |
| d. Upon completion of student teaching  | 0.0                | 0.0                  |
| e. With each observational visit and at mid-point of student teaching                   | 0.0                | 11.11                |
| f. With each observational visit, at mid-point, and upon completion of student teaching | 11.11              | 40.74                |
| g. Other (please specify)   | 7.40               | 0.0                  |
| h. Unknown  | 22.22              | 0.0                  |

reported that the college supervisor currently held an individual conference with the cooperating teacher during each observational visit. Although more than one half (55.55 per cent) of the group preferred a conference with each observational visit, 29.62 per cent preferred an individual conference with each observational visit, at mid-point, and upon the completion of student teaching.

TABLE 38.--Individual Conference(s) that the College Supervisor Holds with the Cooperating Teacher as Reported by Collegiate Business Education Teachers (Item Number 16)

| Choices   | % Current Policies | % Preferred Policies |
|---|--------------------|----------------------|
| a. None   | 0.0                | 0.0                  |
| b. With each observational visit  | 62.96              | 55.55                |
| c. At mid-point of student teaching   | 7.40               | 0.0                  |
| d. Upon completion of student teaching  | 0.0                | 3.70                 |
| e. With each observational visit and at mid-point of student teaching                   | 0.0                | 0.0                  |
| f. With each observational visit, at mid-point, and upon completion of student teaching | 0.0                | 29.62                |
| g. Other (please specify)   | 3.70               | 11.11                |
| h. Unknown  | 25.92              | 0.0                  |

Although 40.74 per cent of the collegiate business education teachers (Table 39) reported that campus seminars were currently held for the student teachers prior to and during student teaching, only 25.92 per cent preferred such a policy. Instead, 48.14 per cent of the collegiate business education teachers recommended that campus seminars be held for the student teachers prior to, during, and upon the completion of student teaching.

TABLE 39.--Campus Seminar(s) Held for Student Teachers as Reported by Collegiate Business Education Teachers (Item Number 17)

| Choices  | % Current Policies | % Preferred Policies |
|--|--------------------|----------------------|
| a. None  | 0.0                | 0.0                  |
| b. Prior to student teaching                                 | 3.70               | 0.0                  |
| c. During student teaching                                   | 11.11              | 7.40                 |
| d. Upon completion of student teaching                       | 18.51              | 3.70                 |
| e. Prior to and during student teaching                      | 40.74              | 25.92                |
| f. Prior to, during, and upon completion of student teaching | 3.70               | 48.14                |
| g. Other (please specify)                                    | 7.40               | 14.81                |
| h. Unknown   | 14.81              | 0.0                  |

In Table 40, two thirds (66.66 per cent) of the collegiate business education teachers reported that currently no campus seminars were held for the cooperating teachers. One third (33.33 per cent) of the respondents preferred that campus seminars be held prior to student teaching, while 22.22 per cent reported "other" preferences. These preferred policies were "summer workshops," "seminars prior to and upon completion of student teaching," and "once a year."

TABLE 40.--Campus Seminar(s) Held for Cooperating Teachers as Reported by Collegiate Business Education Teachers (Item Number 18)

| Choices  | % Current Policies | % Preferred Policies |
|--|--------------------|----------------------|
| a. None  | 66.66              | 7.40                 |
| b. Prior to student teaching                                 | 0.0                | 33.33                |
| c. During student teaching                                   | 0.0                | 18.51                |
| d. Upon completion of student teaching                       | 0.0                | 0.0                  |
| e. Prior to and during student teaching                      | 0.0                | 3.70                 |
| f. Prior to, during, and upon completion of student teaching | 0.0                | 14.81                |
| g. Other (please specify)                                    | 18.51              | 22.22                |
| h. Unknown   | 14.81              | 0.0                  |

More than one half (51.85 per cent) of the respondents reported that currently the college supervisor, the co-operating teacher, and the student teacher conferred during an observational visit. A larger number (81.48 per cent) of the collegiate business education teachers (Table 41) preferred a policy of three-way participation.



TABLE 41.--Individuals Participating in Conference Following  
Observational Visit as Reported by Collegiate Business  
Education Teachers (Item Number 19)

| Choices  | % Current<br>Policies | % Preferred<br>Policies |
|--|-----------------------|-------------------------|
| a. None  | 0.0                   | 0.0                     |
| b. College supervisor and student<br>teacher                       | 11.11                 | 3.70                    |
| c. College supervisor and<br>cooperating teacher                   | 0.0                   | 0.0                     |
| d. College supervisor, cooperating<br>teacher, and student teacher | 51.85                 | 81.48                   |
| e. Other (please specify)  | 3.70                  | 14.81                   |
| f. Unknown   | 33.33                 | 0.0                     |

Analysis of Questionnaire Mailed to Cooperating  
High School Business Teachers

The results of the questionnaires returned by 86 per cent of the cooperating high school business teachers were tabulated for each individual item. Of those items pertaining to the supervision policies, the percentage of responses for both the current and the preferred policies were presented in tabular form. With respect to each table, observations were made concerning particular differences and similarities in the current and the preferred supervision policies as reported by the cooperating high school business teachers.

More than one half of the cooperating high school business teachers (Table 42) reported that currently the cooperating teacher taught only business subjects. Of the cooperating high school business teachers responding, 61.90 per cent preferred such a policy.

TABLE 42.--Position of the Cooperating Teacher as Reported by Cooperating High School Business Teachers (Item Number 1)

| Choices  | % Current Policies | % Preferred Policies |
|--|--------------------|----------------------|
| a. Department chairman and teaches business subjects | 23.80              | 23.80                |
| b. Teaches only business subjects                    | 52.38              | 0.0                  |
| c. Teaches both business and other subjects          | 19.04              | 9.50                 |
| d. Other (please specify)                            | 4.76               | 0.0                  |
| e. Unknown   | 0.0                | 4.76                 |

Of the cooperating high school business teachers reporting, (Table 43) none indicated that the current minimum professional preparation required of the cooperating teacher was a master's degree in business. Whereas 19.04 per cent of the respondents preferred requiring a master's degree in business, 47.61 per cent preferred requiring a bachelor's degree.

TABLE 43.--Minimum Professional Preparation Required of the Cooperating Teacher as Reported by Cooperating High School Business Teachers (Item Number 2)

| Choices                                 | % Current Policies | % Preferred Policies |
|---|--------------------|----------------------|
| a. Bachelor                             | 61.90              | 47.61                |
| b. Master of teaching                   | 9.52               | 23.80                |
| c. Master in field                      | 0.0                | 19.04                |
| d. Specialist (60 hours above bachelor) | 0.0                | 0.0                  |
| e. Other (please specify)               | 0.0                | 9.52                 |
| f. Unknown                              | 9.52               | 0.0                  |

The cooperating high school business teachers (Table 44) reported both a current (76.19 per cent) and a preferred (85.71 per cent) policy of requiring secondary level teaching experience of the cooperating teacher.

As illustrated in Table 45, the cooperating high school business teachers reported diverse current policies concerning the minimum number of years' teaching experience required of the cooperating teacher. Although the majority of the respondents preferred that teaching experience be required of the cooperating teacher, there was no majority preference as to the actual number of years.

Whereas 90.47 per cent of the cooperating high school business teachers (Table 46) reported that currently the

TABLE 44.--Academic Level of Teaching Experience Required of the Cooperating Teacher as Reported by Cooperating High School Business Teachers (Item Number 3)

| Choices                   | % Current Policies | % Preferred Policies |
|---------------------------|--------------------|----------------------|
| a. None                   | 14.28              | 4.76                 |
| b. Secondary              | 76.19              | 85.71                |
| c. Junior high            | 0.0                | 0.0                  |
| d. Elementary             | 0.0                | 0.0                  |
| e. Other (please specify) | 0.0                | 0.0                  |
| f. Unknown                | 9.52               | 9.52                 |

TABLE 45.--Minimum Number of Years' Teaching Experience Required of the Cooperating Teacher as Reported by Cooperating High School Business Teachers (Item Number 4)

| Choices      | % Current Policies | % Preferred Policies |
|--------------|--------------------|----------------------|
| a. None      | 23.80              | 4.76                 |
| b. 1 to 2    | 38.09              | 28.57                |
| c. 3 to 4    | 19.04              | 42.85                |
| d. 5 or more | 4.76               | 23.80                |
| e. Unknown   | 14.28              | 0.0                  |

TABLE 46.--Credit-Load Reduction Allotted the Cooperating Teacher for Supervisory Duties as Reported by Cooperating High School Business Teachers (Item Number 5)

| Choices   | % Current Policies | % Preferred Policies |
|---|--------------------|----------------------|
| a. None   | 90.47              | 28.57                |
| b. Semester hours reduced based on number of student teachers | 4.76               | 28.57                |
| c. 1/4 to 1/3 of teaching load                                | 0.0                | 19.04                |
| d. 1/2 of teaching load                                       | 0.0                | 4.76                 |
| e. More than 1/2 of teaching load                             | 0.0                | 4.76                 |
| f. Unknown  | 4.76               | 14.28                |

cooperating teacher was allotted no credit-load reduction for supervisory duties, only 28.57 per cent preferred such an arrangement. Approximately twenty-nine (28.57) per cent preferred that the cooperating teacher be allotted a reduction in semester hours based upon the number of student teachers assigned for the student teaching period.

As presented in Table 47, both the current and the preferred policies concerning the final approval of the selection of the cooperating teacher were varied. Approximately one fourth (23.80 per cent) of the cooperating high school business teachers preferred that the business education supervisor make the final decision. Only 4.76 per cent reported such a current policy.

TABLE 47.--Final Approval of the Selection of a Cooperating Teacher as Reported by Cooperating High School Business Teachers (Item Number 6)

| Choices                          | % Current Policies | % Preferred Policies |
|----------------------------------|--------------------|----------------------|
| a. Cooperating college           | 19.04              | 9.52                 |
| b. Business education supervisor | 4.76               | 23.80                |
| c. High school superintendent    | 23.80              | 23.80                |
| d. High school principal         | 28.57              | 23.80                |
| e. High school counselor         | 0.0                | 0.0                  |
| f. Other (please specify)        | 14.28              | 9.52                 |
| g. Unknown                       | 9.52               | 9.52                 |

Approximately 76 per cent of the cooperating high school business teachers (Table 48) reported no current requirement to qualify as a cooperating teacher. Only 28.57 per cent preferred that no requirement be enforced. Approximately twenty-nine (28.57) per cent of the group reported "other" preferred requirements, which included "successful experience," "competence," and "experience and willingness to accept a student teacher."

As presented in Table 49, one third (33.33 per cent) of the cooperating high school business teachers reported that currently the assignment of a cooperating teacher was on a mandatory basis. However, 90.47 per cent of the

TABLE 48.--Requirement to Qualify as a Cooperating Teacher as Reported by Cooperating High School Business Teachers (Item Number 7)

| Choices                             | % Current Policies | % Preferred Policies |
|-------------------------------------|--------------------|----------------------|
| a. None                             | 76.19              | 28.57                |
| b. Pass exam                        | 0.0                | 0.0                  |
| c. Complete a course in supervision | 0.0                | 19.04                |
| d. Submit application to college    | 0.0                | 0.0                  |
| e. Other (please specify)           | 19.04              | 23.80                |
| f. Unknown                          | 4.76               | 28.57                |

TABLE 49.--Assignment as a Cooperating Teacher as Reported by Cooperating High School Business Teachers (Item Number 8)

| Choices      | % Current Policies | % Preferred Policies |
|--------------|--------------------|----------------------|
| a. Voluntary | 47.61              | 90.47                |
| b. Mandatory | 33.33              | 4.76                 |
| c. Unknown   | 19.04              | 4.76                 |

cooperating high school business teachers preferred a voluntary assignment policy.

Although 38.09 per cent of the cooperating high school business teachers (Table 50) reported a current policy

of assigning one student teacher to the cooperating teacher at one time, 61.90 per cent preferred a one-to-one relationship between the student teacher and the cooperating teacher.

TABLE 50.--Number of Student Teachers Assigned to the Cooperating Teacher at One Time as Reported by Cooperating High School Business Teachers (Item Number 9)

| Choices      | % Current Policies | % Preferred Policies |
|--------------|--------------------|----------------------|
| a. 1         | 38.09              | 61.90                |
| b. 2         | 33.33              | 23.80                |
| c. 3         | 4.76               | 0.0                  |
| d. 4         | 4.76               | 0.0                  |
| e. 5 or more | 0.0                | 0.0                  |
| f. Unknown   | 19.04              | 14.28                |

Whereas 47.61 per cent of the cooperating high school business teachers (Table 51) indicated that currently not more than two cooperating teachers supervised a student teacher, 52.38 per cent preferred a ratio of not more than two cooperating teachers for one student teacher. Only 28.57 per cent of the respondents preferred a ratio of one to one.

As illustrated in Table 52, approximately seventy-one (71.42) per cent of the cooperating high school business teachers reported a current policy of no college compensation for the cooperating teacher. Approximately thirty-eight



TABLE 51.--Number of Cooperating Teachers Supervising the Student Teacher During Student Teaching Assignment as Reported by Cooperating High School Business Teachers (Item Number 10)

| Choices                   | % Current Policies | % Preferred Policies |
|---------------------------|--------------------|----------------------|
| a. One                    | 14.28              | 28.57                |
| b. Not more than two      | 47.61              | 52.38                |
| c. More than two          | 23.80              | 0.0                  |
| d. Other (please specify) | 9.52               | 14.28                |
| e. Unknown                | 4.76               | 4.76                 |

TABLE 52.--College Compensation to the Cooperating Teacher as Reported by Cooperating High School Business Teachers (Item Number 11)

| Choices   | % Current Policies | % Preferred Policies |
|---|--------------------|----------------------|
| a. None   | 71.42              | 19.04                |
| b. \$_____ for each student<br>teacher                                    | 0.0                | 38.09                |
| c. A flat rate of \$_____ regardless of the number of<br>student teachers | 0.0                | 4.76                 |
| d. Other (please specify)   | 28.57              | 33.33                |
| e. Unknown  | 0.0                | 4.76                 |

(38.09) per cent of the group preferred a policy of compensating the cooperating teacher for each student teacher, with amounts ranging from \$100 to \$250. One third (33.33 per cent) of the cooperating high school business teachers reported "other" preferred policies, which included compensating the cooperating teacher "\$5 per hour," "\$5 per day," and "\$50 to \$75 per student teacher."

Of the cooperating high school business teachers reporting (Table 53), 95.23 per cent indicated that there was no current policy concerning local school district compensation for the cooperating teacher. Whereas 57.14 per cent of the group preferred a policy of no compensation, 28.57 per cent preferred that the local school district compensate the cooperating teacher an amount ranging from \$50 to \$200 for each student teacher.

As presented in Table 54, the current policies reported by the cooperating high school business teachers were diverse. Approximately fifty-seven (57.14) per cent of the respondents preferred that tuition be waived for the cooperating teacher, while 28.57 per cent preferred "other" policies. These policies included such suggestions as "tuition for any interested teacher of the cooperating high school" and "both waiving tuition and admission to the college activities."

Although 61.90 per cent of the cooperating high school business teachers (Table 55) reported that currently no orientation conferences were held for the cooperating

TABLE 53.--Local School District Compensation to Cooperating Teacher as Reported by Cooperating High School Business Teachers (Item Number 12)

| Choices  | % Current Policies | % Preferred Policies |
|--|--------------------|----------------------|
| a. None  | 95.23              | 57.14                |
| b. \$_____ for each student<br>teacher                                 | 0.0                | 28.57                |
| c. A flat rate of \$_____ regardless of the number of student teachers | 0.0                | 4.76                 |
| d. Other (please specify)  | 0.0                | 0.0                  |
| e. Unknown   | 4.76               | 9.52                 |

TABLE 54.--College Benefits Provided the Cooperating Teacher as Reported by Cooperating High School Business Teachers (Item Number 13)

| Choices                            | % Current Policies | % Preferred Policies |
|------------------------------------|--------------------|----------------------|
| a. None                            | 14.28              | 0.0                  |
| b. Tuition waived                  | 33.33              | 57.14                |
| c. Admission to college activities | 28.57              | 9.52                 |
| d. Other (please specify)          | 23.80              | 28.57                |
| e. Unknown                         | 0.0                | 4.76                 |

TABLE 55.--Orientation Conference Held for the Cooperating Teacher Prior to Student Teaching as Reported by Cooperating High School Business Teachers (Item Number 14)

| Choices                                    | % Current Policies | % Preferred Policies |
|--|--------------------|----------------------|
| a. None                                    | 61.90              | 0.0                  |
| b. Individual conference with each teacher | 14.28              | 42.85                |
| c. Group conference with all teachers      | 9.52               | 33.33                |
| d. Other (please specify)                  | 14.28              | 14.28                |
| e. Unknown                                 | 0.0                | 9.52                 |

teacher, 42.85 per cent preferred that an individual conference be held with each cooperating teacher. Moreover, one third (33.33 per cent) of the cooperating high school business teachers preferred the use of a group conference with all the teachers for orientation purposes.

In Table 56, one third (33.33 per cent) of the cooperating high school business teachers reported that no orientation conference was held between the cooperating teacher and the student teacher. However, 71.42 per cent of the group preferred that an individual conference between the student teacher and the cooperating teacher be held prior to student teaching.

TABLE 56.--Orientation Conference the Cooperating Teacher Holds with the Student Teacher(s) Prior to Student Teaching as Reported by Cooperating High School Business Teachers (Item Number 15)

| Choices  | % Current Policies | % Preferred Policies |
|--|--------------------|----------------------|
| a. None  | 33.33              | 0.0                  |
| b. Individual conference with each student teacher | 57.14              | 71.42                |
| c. Group conference with all student teachers      | 9.52               | 23.80                |
| d. Other (please specify)                          | 0.0                | 0.0                  |
| e. Unknown   | 0.0                | 4.76                 |

Only 4.76 per cent of the cooperating high school business teachers (Table 57) reported that currently the college supervisor made no observational visits. More than one half (52.38 per cent) reported a current practice of two or three visits. In reference to the preferred policies, the responses varied, with no majority agreement on the preferred number of observational visit.

As presented in Table 58, approximately sixty-two (61.90) per cent of the cooperating high school business teachers reported that individual conferences between the student teacher and the cooperating teacher were held periodically throughout student teaching. Although 47.61 per cent preferred periodic individual conferences, 28.75 per cent of

TABLE 57.--Number of Observational Visits by the College Supervisor as Reported by Cooperating High School Business Teachers (Item Number 16)

| Choices                         | % Current Policies | % Preferred Policies |
|---------------------------------|--------------------|----------------------|
| a. None                         | 4.76               | 0.0                  |
| b. One                          | 9.52               | 4.76                 |
| c. 2 to 3                       | 52.38              | 38.09                |
| d. 4 to 5                       | 14.28              | 38.09                |
| e. More than 5 (please specify) | 14.28              | 14.28                |
| f. Unknown                      | 4.76               | 4.76                 |

the respondents preferred conferences held periodically throughout, at mid-point, and upon the completion of student teaching.

Whereas 61.90 per cent of the cooperating high school business teachers (Table 59) reported that currently individual conferences between the college supervisor and the cooperating teacher were held with each observational visit, only 57.14 per cent preferred such a policy. Approximately twenty-nine (28.75) per cent preferred conferences held with each observational visit, at mid-point, and upon completion of student teaching.

As presented in Table 60, the current policies concerning the individuals participating in a conference

TABLE 58.--Individual Conference(s) that the Cooperating Teacher Holds with the Student Teacher as Reported by Cooperating High School Business Teachers (Item Number 17)

| Choices   | % Current Policies | % Preferred Policies |
|---|--------------------|----------------------|
| a. None   | 9.52               | 0.0                  |
| b. Periodically throughout student teaching                                       | 61.90              | 47.61                |
| c. At mid-point of student teaching   | 4.76               | 4.76                 |
| d. Upon completion of student teaching  | 0.0                | 0.0                  |
| e. Periodically throughout and at mid-point of student teaching                   | 0.0                | 14.28                |
| f. Periodically throughout, at mid-point, and upon completion of student teaching | 19.04              | 28.75                |
| g. Other (please specify)   | 4.76               | 4.76                 |
| h. Unknown  | 0.0                | 0.0                  |

following the observational visit were varied. However, 71.42 per cent of the cooperating high school business teachers preferred a three-way conference among the college supervisor, the cooperating teacher, and the student teacher.

As illustrated in Table 61, the responses to both the current policy and the preferred policy concerning campus seminars for the student teachers were diverse. Although the majority of the cooperating high school business teachers

TABLE 59.--Individual Conference(s) that the College Supervisor Holds with the Cooperating Teacher as Reported by Cooperating High School Business Teachers (Item Number 18)

| Choices   | % Current Policies | % Preferred Policies |
|---|--------------------|----------------------|
| a. None   | 23.80              | 0.0                  |
| b. With each observational visit  | 61.90              | 57.14                |
| c. At mid-point of student teaching   | 0.0                | 0.0                  |
| d. Upon completion of student teaching  | 4.76               | 0.0                  |
| e. With each observational visit and at mid-point of student teaching                   | 0.0                | 4.76                 |
| f. With each observational visit, at mid-point, and upon completion of student teaching | 4.76               | 28.75                |
| g. Other (please specify)   | 4.76               | 4.76                 |
| h. Unknown  | 0.0                | 4.76                 |

preferred that campus seminars be held for student teachers, there was no majority agreement as to the time for such seminars.

Approximately ninety (90.47) per cent of the cooperating high school business teachers (Table 62) reported that campus seminars were not currently held for the cooperating teachers. While 23.80 per cent reported "unknown" preferences, 38.09 per cent of the cooperating high school business



TABLE 60.--Individuals Participating in Conference Following  
Observational Visit as Reported by Cooperating High School  
Business Teachers (Item Number 19)

| Choices  | % Current<br>Policies | % Preferred<br>Policies |
|--|-----------------------|-------------------------|
| a. None  | 23.80                 | 0.0                     |
| b. College supervisor and<br>student teacher                       | 9.52                  | 4.76                    |
| c. College supervisor and<br>cooperating teacher                   | 23.80                 | 9.52                    |
| d. College supervisor, cooperating<br>teacher, and student teacher | 19.04                 | 71.42                   |
| e. Other (please specify)  | 23.80                 | 9.52                    |
| f. Unknown   | 0.0                   | 4.76                    |

teachers preferred that no campus seminars be held for the cooperating teachers.

#### Summary of the Supervision Policies

The purpose of this section of Chapter IV was to present an item analysis of the supervision policies as reported by the business education graduates, the collegiate business education teachers, and the cooperating high school business teachers. Based upon the operational definition of the supervision policies as stated in Chapter I, the following summary of the three groups was divided into these two sections:

(1) qualifications of the supervisors and (2) nature of the

TABLE 61.--Campus Seminar(s) Held for Student Teachers as Reported by Cooperating High School Business Teachers (Item Number 20)

| Choices  | % Current Policies | % Preferred Policies |
|--|--------------------|----------------------|
| a. None  | 4.76               | 0.0                  |
| b. Prior to student teaching                                 | 9.52               | 9.52                 |
| c. During student teaching                                   | 9.52               | 4.76                 |
| d. Upon completion of student teaching                       | 0.0                | 4.76                 |
| e. Prior to and during student teaching                      | 23.80              | 33.33                |
| f. Prior to, during, and upon completion of student teaching | 23.80              | 33.33                |
| g. Other (please specify)                                    | 9.52               | 4.76                 |
| h. Unknown   | 19.04              | 9.52                 |

supervision. The first section concerning the qualifications of the supervisors, was divided into two parts: (1) college supervisor and (2) cooperating teacher. The second section, concerning the nature of the supervision, was divided into four parts: (1) assignment and teaching load, (2) compensation to the cooperating teacher, (3) orientation conferences and campus seminars, and (4) observational visits and individual conferences.

TABLE 62.--Campus Seminar(s) Held for Cooperating Teachers as Reported by Cooperating High School Business Teachers (Item Number 21)

| Choices  | % Current Policies | % Preferred Policies |
|--|--------------------|----------------------|
| a. None  | 90.47              | 38.09                |
| b. Prior to student teaching                                 | 4.76               | 14.28                |
| c. During student teaching                                   | 4.76               | 4.76                 |
| d. Upon completion of student teaching                       | 0.0                | 0.0                  |
| e. Prior to and during student teaching                      | 0.0                | 4.76                 |
| f. Prior to, during, and upon completion of student teaching | 0.0                | 4.76                 |
| g. Other (please specify)                                    | 0.0                | 9.52                 |
| h. Unknown   | 0.0                | 23.80                |

### Qualifications of the Supervisors

#### College Supervisor

The qualifications of the college supervisor were reported by the business education graduates and the collegiate business education teachers. The itemized responses of the business education graduates were presented in Tables 5 to 9, and the itemized responses of the collegiate business education teachers were presented in Tables 23 to 26.

Position.--The current position of the college supervisor was identified as a professional education supervisor by both the business education graduates and the collegiate business education teachers. Approximately three fourths of the collegiate business education teachers preferred a business education supervisor. Although 40 per cent of the business education graduates preferred a business education supervisor, 36 per cent preferred that the college supervisory duties be conducted by a team of both a professional education supervisor and a business education supervisor.

Minimum Professional Preparation.--As reported by both the business education graduates and the collegiate business education teachers, the current policies concerning the minimum professional preparation of the college supervisor were diverse. Less than one half of each of the two groups reported a current minimum requirement of a doctorate degree.

The preferred policies reported by both groups indicated a preference for specialization. For example, 48 per cent of the business education graduates and 37.03 per cent of the collegiate business education teachers preferred requiring a master's degree in business as the minimum professional preparation for the college supervisor.

Academic Level of Teaching Experience.--Fifty-two per cent of the business education graduates and 22.22 per cent of the collegiate business education teachers reported no

knowledge of the academic level of teaching experience currently required of the college supervisor. However, more than one third of each of the two groups reported a current requirement of college or university level teaching.

All of the participants of the two groups preferred that the college supervisor be required to have teaching experience, but there was diversity in the academic level preferred by the two groups. Whereas 40 per cent of the business education graduates preferred requiring college or university level experience, 33.33 per cent of the collegiate business education teachers preferred requiring secondary level experience. Moreover, 44.44 per cent of the collegiate business education teachers and 28 per cent of the business education graduates reported "other" preferences, which primarily included a requirement of both secondary and college or university level teaching experience.

Minimum Number of Years' Teaching Experience.--The responses of both groups to the current minimum number of years' teaching experience required of the college supervisor were limited in directional information. More than three fourths of the business education graduates reported no knowledge of the current policy. Furthermore, 48.14 per cent of the collegiate business education teachers reported that currently no teaching experience was required of the college supervisor. However, the consensus of the two groups

preferred that five or more years' teaching experience be required of the college supervisor.

#### Cooperating Teacher

The qualifications of the cooperating teacher were reported by the business education graduates and the cooperating high school business teachers. The itemized responses of the business education graduates were presented in Tables 9 to 12, and the itemized responses of the cooperating high school business teachers were presented in Tables 42 to 45.

Position.--The current position of the cooperating teacher was identified by a majority of both the business education graduates and the cooperating high school business teachers as that of teaching only business subjects. Likewise, the preferred position of the cooperating teacher, as reported by 80 per cent of the business education graduates and 61.90 per cent of the cooperating high school business teachers, was also that of teaching only business subjects.

Minimum Professional Preparation.--The consensus of the business education graduates and the cooperating high school business teachers agreed that currently the minimum professional preparation required of the cooperating teacher was a bachelor's degree. The preferred requirement, as reported by approximately one half of each of the two groups, was a bachelor's degree. However, there was a noticeable increase in the number of business education graduates and

cooperating high school business teachers reporting a preference for either a master's degree in business or a master of teaching degree.

Academic Level of Teaching Experience.--A large majority of the business education graduates and the cooperating high school business teachers reported a current policy of requiring the cooperating teacher to have secondary level teaching experience. Likewise, the majority of both groups (92 per cent of the business education graduates and 85.71 per cent of the cooperating high school business teachers) preferred that the cooperating teacher be required to have teaching experience on the secondary level.

Minimum Number of Years' Teaching Experience.--The business education graduates agreed that the cooperating teacher was currently required to have one or two years of teaching experience. The cooperating high school business teachers reported varied current policies, including 23.80 per cent requiring no teaching experience. Similarly, the business education graduates agreed upon the preferred policy of requiring three or four years of teaching experience. The cooperating high school business teachers were again somewhat diverse in their preferences; however, 42.85 per cent reported a preference for a minimum requirement of three or four years of teaching experience.

## Nature of the Supervision

### Assignment and Teaching Load

The current and the preferred policies concerning the assignment of the student teachers and the teaching load of the supervisory personnel were reported by all three groups. The itemized responses of the business education graduates were presented in Tables 13 to 15, and the itemized responses of the collegiate business education teachers were presented in Tables 27 to 31. The itemized responses of the cooperating high school business teachers were presented in Table 51.

In reference to the assignment of the student teachers and the teaching load of the supervisory personnel, the three groups were not requested to respond to the same questions. Inasmuch as a few of the questions were unique to each particular group, the responses to these questions provided descriptive information pertinent to the present study.

Credit-Load Reduction.--As reported by the collegiate business education teachers, the current policies concerning the credit-load reduction allotted to the college supervisor were diverse. However, a large majority (90.47 per cent) of the cooperating high school business teachers reported a current policy of allotting no credit-load reduction for supervisory duties.

The preferred policies were somewhat varied. For example, 28.57 per cent of the cooperating high school



business teachers preferred no reduction. More than one half of the collegiate business education teachers and 28.57 per cent of the cooperating high school business teachers preferred a reduction of semester hours based upon the number of student teachers assigned at one time.

Selection of Cooperating Teacher.--A majority of the cooperating high school business teachers reported no current requirements to qualify as a cooperating teacher. The group did not agree on a current policy concerning the final approval of the selection of a cooperating teacher; however, 47.61 per cent of the cooperating high school business teachers reported that the assignment of a cooperating teacher was currently on a voluntary basis.

Although 90.47 per cent of the cooperating high school business teachers preferred that the assignment of a cooperating teacher be on a voluntary basis, 28.57 per cent preferred no qualifying requirements. Moreover, preferences for the final approval of the selection of a cooperating teacher were evenly divided among the business education supervisor, the high school principal, and the high school superintendent.

Number of Student Teachers.--In relation to the number of student teachers currently assigned to a college supervisor at one time, 56 per cent of the business education graduates reported "unknown," whereas 70.37 per cent of the

collegiate business education teachers reported a current policy of ten or more.

In relation to the preferred policy, more than one half of the responses of the business education graduates were evenly divided between four to six and seven to nine student teachers, while 40.74 per cent of the collegiate business education teachers preferred assigning ten or more student teachers to the college supervisor at one time.

All three groups reported on the number of student teachers assigned to a cooperating teacher at one time. The consensus of the three groups reported both a current and a preferred policy of assigning only one student teacher to the cooperating teacher.

Number of Cooperating Teachers.--The current and the preferred policies concerning the number of cooperating teachers assigned to supervise the student teacher at one time were reported by all three groups. The collegiate business education teachers and the cooperating high school business teachers reported the current assignment of not more than two cooperating teachers. The business education graduates' responses were more equally divided between the assignment of one and not more than two cooperating teachers. However, in all three groups, the majority preferred assigning not more than two cooperating teachers to supervise the student teacher at one time.

Supervisory Radius.--A majority of the collegiate business education teachers reported that currently student teachers were not assigned to cooperating high schools outside the supervisory radius of the college. The consensus of the group was to recommend such a policy.

Compensation to the Cooperating Teacher

The current and the preferred policies concerning the compensation to the cooperating teacher were reported by the collegiate business education teachers and the cooperating high school business teachers. The itemized responses of the collegiate business education teachers were presented in Tables 32 and 33, and the itemized responses of the cooperating high school business teachers were presented in Tables 52 to 54.

College Compensation.--Both a majority of the collegiate business education teachers and the cooperating high school business teachers reported a current policy of no college compensation being paid to the cooperating teacher. Approximately forty-eight (48.14) per cent of the collegiate business education teachers preferred no compensation for the cooperating teacher. More than one third of the cooperating high school business teachers preferred compensating the cooperating teacher for each student teacher, whereas another one third preferred "other" policies of compensation.

College Benefits.--There was no agreement between the collegiate business education teachers and the cooperating high school business teachers concerning the current policies of college benefits for the cooperating teacher. From the preferred policies reported, more than one half of the cooperating high school business teachers and 37.03 per cent of the collegiate business education teachers recommended that tuition be waived for the cooperating teacher. Approximately one fourth of each of the two groups recommended both waiving tuition and offering admission to the college activities.

Local School District Compensation.--Approximately 95 per cent of the cooperating high school business teachers responded that the cooperating teacher was not currently compensated by the local school district. Furthermore, more than one half preferred that the cooperating teacher receive no compensation from the local school district.

#### Orientation Conferences and Campus Seminars

The current and the preferred policies concerning the orientation conferences and the campus seminars were reported by all three groups. The itemized responses of the business education graduates were presented in Tables 16 and 20. The itemized responses of the collegiate business education teachers were presented in Tables 34, 35, 39, and 40. The itemized responses of the cooperating high school business teachers were presented in Tables 55, 56, 61, and 62. As mentioned

earlier in this summary, the participants of all three groups were not requested to respond to the same questions; consequently, a few questions were used to gather descriptive information about the individual groups.

#### Orientation Conferences

Student Teachers.--Eight-four per cent of the business education graduates reported that the college currently held group conferences prior to student teaching for orientation purposes. The majority of the collegiate business education teachers' responses were almost evenly divided between the use of group conferences and "other" current policies, such as conferences for business education majors only. Although a majority of the business education graduates preferred the utilization of individual conferences prior to student teaching, more than one half of the collegiate business education teachers recommended "other" policies, such as the use of both individual and group conferences for orientation purposes.

Cooperating Teachers.--The consensus of both the collegiate business education teachers and the cooperating high school business teachers was that no college orientation conferences were held for the cooperating teachers prior to student teaching. Although approximately 60 per cent of the collegiate business education teachers preferred a policy of holding individual conferences with each cooperating teacher,

less than one half of the cooperating high school business teachers preferred such a policy. Furthermore, one third of the cooperating high school business teachers preferred that a group conference for the cooperating teachers be held by the college for orientation purposes.

Regarding the orientation conference between the cooperating teacher and the student teacher, only the cooperating high school business teachers were requested to report the current and the preferred policies. Of the participants responding, the majority reported both a current policy and a preferred policy of the cooperating teacher holding individual conferences with each student teacher prior to student teaching.

#### Campus Seminars

Student Teachers.--As reported by the three groups, the current policies concerning the campus seminars held for the student teachers were greatly diversified. Approximately one half of the business education graduates and the collegiate business education teachers agreed that the campus seminars should be held prior to, during, and upon completion of student teaching, whereas only one third of the cooperating high school business teachers preferred such a policy. Another one third of the cooperating high school business teachers preferred that the campus seminars for the student teachers be held prior to and during the student teaching period.

Cooperating Teachers.--The current policy of no campus seminars for the cooperating teachers was reported by 66.66 per cent of the collegiate business education teachers and 90.47 per cent of the cooperating high school business teachers. The two groups did not agree on a preferred policy. For example, one third of the collegiate business education teachers preferred that a seminar be held prior to student teaching, while the other responses varied. Moreover, 38.09 per cent of the cooperating high school business teachers preferred no campus seminars, while the other responses were also varied.

#### Observational Visits and Individual Conferences

The current and the preferred policies concerning the observational visits and the individual conferences were reported by all three groups. The itemized responses of the business education graduates were presented in Tables 17 to 19, 21, and 22. The itemized responses of the collegiate business education teachers were presented in Tables 36 to 38, and the itemized responses of the cooperating high school business teachers were presented in Tables 57 to 60. As noted previously, a limited amount of the information collected was unique to a particular group.

#### Observational Visits

College Supervisor.--As reported by more than one half of the business education graduates and the cooperating

high school business teachers, the college supervisor currently made either two or three observational visits, whereas 40.76 per cent of the collegiate business education teachers reported a current policy of four or five visits.

The three groups did not agree on a preferred policy. Approximately fifty-nine (59.25) per cent of the collegiate business education teachers preferred that the college supervisor make either four or five visits. The majority of the responses of both the business education graduates and the cooperating high school business teachers were equally divided between a preference for two or three visits and a preference for four or five visits.

Cooperating Teacher.--Only the business education graduates were requested to report on the policies concerning the period of student teaching in which the cooperating teachers did most of their observing. Forty per cent of the group reported a current policy of more observation during the first two weeks. However, the majority of the business education graduates preferred that the cooperating teachers do most of their observing during a period other than the first two weeks.

#### Individual Conferences

College Supervisor and Student Teacher.--More than one half of the business education graduates and the collegiate business education teachers reported a current policy of



the college supervisor holding an individual conference with the student during each observational visit. A large majority of the responses of the two groups were almost evenly divided between these two preferred policies: (1) individual conferences with each observational visit and (2) individual conferences with each observational visit, at mid-point, and upon the completion of student teaching.

Cooperating Teacher and Student Teacher.--The majority of the business education graduates and the cooperating high school business teachers reported both a current and a preferred policy of holding individual conferences between the cooperating teacher and the student teacher periodically throughout student teaching.

College Supervisor and Cooperating Teacher.--The majority of the collegiate business education teachers and the cooperating high school business teachers reported both a current and a preferred policy of holding individual conferences between the college supervisor and the cooperating teacher with each observational visit.

Individuals Participating.--Although the business education graduates and the cooperating high school business teachers reported diversified current policies, more than one half of the collegiate business education teachers reported that the college supervisor, the cooperating teacher, and the student teacher currently participated in a conference during an observational visit. The three groups agreed that the

preferred policy should be a three-way conference among the college supervisor, the cooperating teacher, and the student teacher.

### Analysis of the Evaluation Policies

#### Analysis of Questionnaire Mailed to Business Education Graduates

The results of the questionnaires returned by 82.3 per cent of the business education graduates were tabulated for each individual item. Of those items pertaining to the evaluation policies, the percentage of responses for both the current and the preferred policies were presented in tabular form. With respect to each table, observations were made concerning particular differences and similarities in the current and the preferred evaluation policies as reported by the business education graduates.

As illustrated in Table 63, the reported current policies used to convey evaluation criteria to the student teacher were varied. However, 60 per cent of the business education graduates preferred that an individual conference be held with each student teacher to convey the evaluation criteria used during student teaching.

As reported by the business education graduates (Table 64), both the current policies and the preferred policies concerning the written evaluation submitted by the college supervisor were diverse.

TABLE 63.--Method Used to Convey Evaluation Criteria to the Student Teacher as Reported by Business Education Graduates (Item Number 19)

| Choices  | % Current Policies | % Preferred Policies |
|--|--------------------|----------------------|
| a. None  | 16                 | 0                    |
| b. Individual conference with each student teacher | 20                 | 60                   |
| c. Group conference with all student teachers      | 36                 | 20                   |
| d. Written statement or handbook                   | 20                 | 8                    |
| e. Other (please specify)                          | 4                  | 4                    |
| f. Unknown   | 4                  | 8                    |

Although 76 per cent of the business education graduates (Table 65) reported that the cooperating teacher currently submitted a written evaluation upon the completion of student teaching, 40 per cent preferred that a written evaluation be submitted with each observational visit, at mid-point, and upon the completion of student teaching.

As illustrated in Table 66, twenty-four per cent of the business education graduates reported that currently no evaluation form was used during observational visits. Although, forty-eight per cent reported that a checklist rating sheet was currently used, 64 per cent of the business

TABLE 64.--Written Evaluation Submitted by the College Supervisor as Reported by Business Education Graduates (Item Number 20)

| Choices   | % Current Policies | % Preferred Policies |
|---|--------------------|----------------------|
| a. None   | 16                 | 0                    |
| b. With each observational visit  | 24                 | 24                   |
| c. At mid-point of student teaching   | 0                  | 12                   |
| d. Upon completion of student teaching  | 28                 | 20                   |
| e. With each observational visit and at mid-point of student teaching                   | 0                  | 4                    |
| f. With each observational visit, at mid-point, and upon completion of student teaching | 8                  | 36                   |
| g. Other (please specify)   | 0                  | 0                    |
| h. Unknown  | 24                 | 4                    |

education graduates preferred the use of a checklist rating sheet for evaluative purposes.

The final evaluation of student teachers was currently made with a checklist rating sheet as reported by 72 per cent of the business education graduates. However, as presented in Table 67, the preferred policies reported by the group were varied. One-fifth (20 per cent) responded by checking "other," including a preference for the use of both a

TABLE 65.--Written Evaluation Submitted by the Cooperating Teacher as Reported by Business Education Graduates (Item Number 21)

| Choices   | % Current Policies | % Preferred Policies |
|---|--------------------|----------------------|
| a. None   | 4                  | 0                    |
| b. With each observational visit  | 4                  | 0                    |
| c. At mid-point of student teaching   | 4                  | 12                   |
| d. Upon completion of student teaching  | 76                 | 32                   |
| e. With each observational visit and at mid-point of student teaching                   | 0                  | 0                    |
| f. With each observational visit, at mid-point, and upon completion of student teaching | 0                  | 40                   |
| g. Other (please specify)   | 8                  | 8                    |
| h. Unknown  | 4                  | 8                    |

TABLE 66.--Type of Evaluation Form Used During Observational Visit as Reported by Business Education Graduates (Item Number 22)

|                             | % Current Policies | % Preferred Policies |
|-----------------------------|--------------------|----------------------|
| a. None                     | 24                 | 0                    |
| b. Checklist rating sheet   | 48                 | 64                   |
| c. Open-ended question form | 4                  | 28                   |
| d. Other (please specify)   | 0                  | 0                    |
| e. Unknown                  | 24                 | 8                    |

TABLE 67.--Type of Form Used for the Final Evaluation as Reported by Business Education Graduates (Item Number 23)

| Choices                     | % Current Policies | % Preferred Policies |
|-----------------------------|--------------------|----------------------|
| a. None                     | 8                  | 0                    |
| b. Checklist rating sheet   | 72                 | 36                   |
| c. Open-ended question form | 4                  | 12                   |
| d. Letter of recommendation | 0                  | 20                   |
| e. Other (please specify)   | 4                  | 20                   |
| f. Unknown                  | 12                 | 12                   |

checklist rating sheet and a letter of recommendation for the final evaluation of the student teacher.

Whereas 40 per cent of the business education graduates (Table 68) reported that the professional education supervisor was responsible for assigning the final grade, only eight per cent preferred such a policy. Twenty-four per cent recommended the cooperative responsibility of the professional education and business education supervisors. Furthermore, 28 per cent specified "other" policies, including a preference that the "college supervisor and the cooperating teacher" be held responsible for assigning the final grade in student teaching.

As presented in Table 69, thirty-two per cent of the business education graduates reported no knowledge of the

TABLE 68.--Person Responsible for Assigning the Final Grade as Reported by Business Education Graduates (Item Number 24)

| Choices  | % Current Policies | % Preferred Policies |
|--|--------------------|----------------------|
| a. Director of student teaching                              | 16                 | 0                    |
| b. Professional education supervisor                         | 40                 | 8                    |
| c. Business education supervisor                             | 4                  | 20                   |
| d. Professional education and business education supervisors | 8                  | 24                   |
| e. Cooperating teacher                                       | 8                  | 12                   |
| f. Other (please specify)                                    | 12                 | 28                   |
| g. Unknown   | 12                 | 8                    |

TABLE 69.--College Supervisor's Role in Final Evaluation as Reported by Business Education Graduates (Item Number 25)

| Choices   | % Current Policies | % Preferred Policies |
|---|--------------------|----------------------|
| a. None   | 0                  | 0                    |
| b. Accepts recommendation of cooperating teacher        | 36                 | 40                   |
| c. Makes recommendation to director of student teaching | 28                 | 40                   |
| d. Other (please specify)                               | 4                  | 8                    |
| e. Unknown  | 32                 | 12                   |

college supervisor's role in the final evaluation of student teachers. Forty per cent preferred that the college supervisor accept the recommendation of the cooperating teacher, and 40 per cent preferred that the college supervisor make a recommendation to the director of student teaching.

As illustrated in Table 70, the majority (72 per cent) of the business education graduates preferred the current policy of the cooperating teacher making a recommendation to the college supervisor concerning the final evaluation of the student teacher.

TABLE 70.--Cooperating Teacher's Role in Final Evaluation as Reported by Business Education Graduates (Item Number 26)

| Choices   | % Current Policies | % Preferred Policies |
|---|--------------------|----------------------|
| a. None   | 0                  | 0                    |
| b. Makes recommendation to college supervisor           | 72                 | 72                   |
| c. Makes recommendation to director of student teaching | 20                 | 16                   |
| d. Other (please specify)                               | 0                  | 4                    |
| e. Unknown  | 8                  | 8                    |

Sixty per cent of the business education graduates (Table 71) reported the current use of letter grades (A to F) for student teaching, which agreed with the preferred policy reported by 56 per cent of the business education graduates.



TABLE 71.--Grading Scheme Used as Reported by Business  
Education Graduates (Item Number 27)

| Choices                              | % Current<br>Policies | % Preferred<br>Policies |
|--------------------------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------|
| a. Letter grades (A-F)               | 60                    | 56                      |
| b. Pass-fail (P-F)                   | 28                    | 20                      |
| c. Satisfactory-unsatisfactory (S-U) | 12                    | 20                      |
| d. Numerical scores (1-100)          | 0                     | 4                       |
| e. Other (please specify)            | 0                     | 0                       |
| f. Unknown                           | 0                     | 0                       |

Analysis of Questionnaire Mailed to  
Collegiate Business Education Teachers

The results of the questionnaires returned by 82.4 per cent of the collegiate business education teachers were tabulated for each individual item. Of those items pertaining to the evaluation policies, the percentage of responses for both the current and the preferred policies were presented in tabular form. With respect to each table, observations were made concerning particular differences and similarities in the current and the preferred evaluation policies as reported by the collegiate business education teachers.

Although one fourth (25.92 per cent) of the collegiate business education teachers (Table 72) reported no knowledge of the current policy, 48.14 per cent reported the

TABLE 72.--Method Used to Convey Evaluation Criteria to the Cooperating Teacher as Reported by Collegiate Business Education Teachers (Item Number 20)

| Choices                                    | % Current Policies | % Preferred Policies |
|--|--------------------|----------------------|
| a. None                                    | 0.0                | 0.0                  |
| b. Individual conference with each teacher | 18.51              | 18.51                |
| c. Group conference with all teachers      | 0.0                | 7.40                 |
| d. Written statement or handbook           | 48.14              | 51.85                |
| e. Other (please specify)                  | 7.40               | 22.22                |
| f. Unknown                                 | 25.92              | 0.0                  |

current use of either a written statement or a handbook to convey evaluation criteria to the cooperating teacher. More than one half (51.85 per cent) of the group preferred the use of either a written statement or a handbook, whereas 22.22 per cent suggested "other" policies, such as "both an individual conference and a handbook."

Approximately thirty (29.62) per cent reported no knowledge of the current policy. More than one half (51.85 per cent) of the collegiate business education teachers (Table 73) reported that the college supervisor currently submitted a written evaluation upon the completion of student teaching. Although the preferred policies reported by the

TABLE 73.--Written Evaluation Submitted by the College Supervisor as Reported by Collegiate Business Education Teachers (Item Number 21)

| Choices   | % Current Policies | % Preferred Policies |
|---|--------------------|----------------------|
| a. None   | 3.70               | 0.0                  |
| b. With each observational visit  | 7.40               | 18.51                |
| c. At mid-point of student teaching   | 7.40               | 7.40                 |
| d. Upon completion of student teaching  | 51.85              | 51.85                |
| e. With each observational visit and at mid-point of student teaching                   | 0.0                | 0.0                  |
| f. With each observational visit, at mid-point, and upon completion of student teaching | 0.0                | 14.81                |
| g. Other (please specify)   | 0.0                | 7.40                 |
| h. Unknown  | 29.62              | 0.0                  |

group varied somewhat, approximately fifty-two (51.85) per cent also preferred that a written evaluation be submitted upon the completion of student teaching.

As presented in Table 74, approximately one fourth (25.92 per cent) of the collegiate business education teachers reported "other" current policies, which included the practice of the cooperating teacher submitting a written evaluation "at mid-point and upon the completion of student

TABLE 74.--Written Evaluation Submitted by the Cooperating Teacher as Reported by Collegiate Business Education Teachers (Item Number 22)

| Choices   | % Current Policies | % Preferred Policies |
|---|--------------------|----------------------|
| a. None   | 3.70               | 0.0                  |
| b. With each observational visit  | 0.0                | 0.0                  |
| c. At mid-point of student teaching   | 0.0                | 3.70                 |
| d. Upon completion of student teaching  | 40.74              | 29.62                |
| e. With each observational visit and at mid-point of student teaching                   | 3.70               | 3.70                 |
| f. With each observational visit, at mid-point, and upon completion of student teaching | 0.0                | 14.81                |
| g. Other (please specify)   | 25.92              | 44.44                |
| h. Unknown  | 25.92              | 3.70                 |

teaching." Approximately forty-four (44.44) per cent of the group reported "other" preferences which included that the cooperating teacher should submit a written evaluation "at mid-point and upon completion of student teaching" and "when specific problems arise."

The same percentage (37.03) of the collegiate business education teachers (Table 75) reported both a current and a preferred use of the checklist rating sheet for

TABLE 75.--Type of Evaluation Form Used During Observational Visits as Reported by Collegiate Business Education Teachers (Item Number 23)

| Choices                     | % Current Policies | % Preferred Policies |
|-----------------------------|--------------------|----------------------|
| a. None                     | 18.51              | 11.11                |
| b. Checklist rating sheet   | 37.03              | 37.03                |
| c. Open-ended question form | 14.81              | 25.92                |
| d. Other (please specify)   | 0.0                | 22.22                |
| e. Unknown                  | 29.62              | 3.70                 |

evaluating observational visits. Approximately twenty-two (22.22) per cent of the respondents preferred the use of an evaluation form that combined both the checklist rating sheet and the open-ended question form.

Approximately forty-eight (48.14) per cent of the collegiate business education teachers (Table 76) reported that currently a checklist rating sheet was used for the final evaluation. Of the collegiate business education teachers responding, 44.44 per cent preferred that both a checklist rating sheet and a letter of recommendation be used for the final evaluation of the student teacher.

As presented in Table 77, approximately fifteen (14.81) per cent of the collegiate business education teachers reported that the business education supervisor was

TABLE 76.--Type of Form Used for the Final Evaluation as Reported by Collegiate Business Education Teachers (Item Number 24)

| Choices                     | % Current Policies | % Preferred Policies |
|-----------------------------|--------------------|----------------------|
| a. None                     | 0.0                | 0.0                  |
| b. Checklist rating sheet   | 48.14              | 29.62                |
| c. Open-ended question form | 0.0                | 14.81                |
| d. Letter of recommendation | 0.0                | 11.11                |
| e. Other (please specify)   | 22.22              | 44.44                |
| f. Unknown                  | 29.62              | 0.0                  |

TABLE 77.--Person Responsible for Assigning the Final Grade as Reported by Collegiate Business Education Teachers (Item Number 25)

| Choices  | % Current Policies | % Preferred Policies |
|--|--------------------|----------------------|
| a. Director of student teaching                              | 33.33              | 3.70                 |
| b. Professional education supervisor                         | 22.22              | 7.40                 |
| c. Business education supervisor                             | 14.81              | 29.62                |
| d. Professional education and business education supervisors | 0.0                | 14.81                |
| e. Cooperating teacher                                       | 0.0                | 3.70                 |
| f. Other (please specify)                                    | 14.81              | 40.74                |
| g. Unknown   | 14.81              | 0.0                  |

currently responsible for assigning the final grade, while 29.62 per cent preferred such an arrangement. Approximately forty-one (40.74) per cent reported "other" preferences which included a three-way responsibility among "the professional education supervisor, the business education supervisor, and the cooperating teacher." Another preference indicated was "conference grade by the cooperating teacher and the business education supervisor, with the director of student teaching resolving a conflict."

Although the current policies reported were diverse, 44.44 per cent of the collegiate business education teachers (Table 78) preferred "other" policies concerning the college supervisor's role in the final evaluation. For example, one preference was that the college supervisor should "accept the cooperating teacher's comments and make a recommendation to the director of student teaching," while another suggestion was that the college supervisor should have the "ultimate responsibility."

More than one half (55.55 per cent) of the collegiate business education teachers (Table 79) reported that currently the cooperating teacher made a recommendation to the college supervisor concerning the final evaluation of the student teacher. Of the collegiate business education teachers responding, 70.37 per cent preferred such a policy.

Although 51.85 per cent of the collegiate business education teachers (Table 80) reported the current use of

TABLE 78.--College Supervisor's Role in Final Evaluation as Reported by Collegiate Business Education Teachers (Item Number 26)

| Choices   | % Current Policies | % Preferred Policies |
|---|--------------------|----------------------|
| a. None   | 0.0                | 0.0                  |
| b. Accepts recommendation of cooperating teacher        | 25.92              | 29.62                |
| c. Makes recommendation to director of student teaching | 25.92              | 22.22                |
| d. Other (please specify)                               | 25.92              | 44.44                |
| e. Unknown  | 22.22              | 3.70                 |

TABLE 79.--Cooperating Teacher's Role in Final Evaluation as Reported by Collegiate Business Education Teachers (Item Number 27)

| Choices   | % Current Policies | % Preferred Policies |
|---|--------------------|----------------------|
| a. None   | 0.0                | 0.0                  |
| b. Makes recommendation to college supervisor           | 55.55              | 70.37                |
| c. Makes recommendation to director of student teaching | 22.22              | 25.92                |
| d. Other (please specify)                               | 0.0                | 3.70                 |
| e. Unknown  | 22.22              | 0.0                  |



TABLE 80.--Grading Scheme Used as Reported by Collegiate  
Business Education Teachers (Item Number 28)

| Choices                              | % Current Policies | % Preferred Policies |
|--------------------------------------|--------------------|----------------------|
| a. Letter grades (A-F)               | 51.85              | 48.14                |
| b. Pass-fail (P-F)                   | 18.51              | 3.70                 |
| c. Satisfactory-unsatisfactory (S-U) | 18.51              | 40.74                |
| d. Numerical scores (1-100)          | 0.0                | 0.0                  |
| e. Other (please specify)            | 0.0                | 7.40                 |
| f. Unknown                           | 11.11              | 0.0                  |

letter grades (A-F), only 48.14 per cent preferred the use of letter grades. Approximately forty-one (40.74) per cent preferred the use of Satisfactory-Unsatisfactory (S-U) as the grading scheme.

Analysis of Questionnaire Mailed to Cooperating  
High School Business Teachers

The results of the questionnaires returned by 86 per cent of the cooperating high school business teachers were tabulated for each individual item. Of those items pertaining to the evaluation policies, the percentage of responses for both the current and the preferred policies were presented in tabular form. With respect to each table, observations were made concerning particular differences and similarities in

the current and the preferred evaluation policies as reported by the cooperating high school business teachers.

Although one third (33.33 per cent) of the cooperating high school business teachers (Table 81) reported that currently the cooperating teacher did not receive information concerning the criteria used for evaluation, 52.38 per cent reported the current use of either a written statement or a handbook. The preferred policies were diverse, with 38.09 per cent of the respondents recommending the use of either a written statement or a handbook.

TABLE 81.--Method Used to Convey Evaluation Criteria to the Cooperating Teacher as Reported by Cooperating High School Business Teachers (Item Number 22)

| Choices                                    | % Current Policies | % Preferred Policies |
|--|--------------------|----------------------|
| a. None                                    | 33.33              | 0.0                  |
| b. Individual conference with each teacher | 9.52               | 19.04                |
| c. Group conference with all teachers      | 4.76               | 4.76                 |
| d. Written statement or handbook           | 52.38              | 38.09                |
| e. Other (please specify)                  | 0.0                | 19.04                |
| f. Unknown                                 | 0.0                | 19.04                |

Whereas 57.14 per cent of the cooperating high school business teachers (Table 82) reported that currently the

TABLE 82.--Written Evaluation Submitted by the Cooperating Teacher as Reported by Cooperating High School Business Teachers (Item Number 23)

| Choices   | % Current Policies | % Preferred Policies |
|---|--------------------|----------------------|
| a. None   | 4.76               | 0.0                  |
| b. With each observational visit  | 0.0                | 9.52                 |
| c. At mid-point of student teaching   | 0.0                | 4.76                 |
| d. Upon completion of student teaching  | 57.14              | 42.85                |
| e. With each observational visit and at mid-point of student teaching                   | 0.0                | 4.76                 |
| f. With each observational visit, at mid-point, and upon completion of student teaching | 0.0                | 4.76                 |
| g. Other (please specify)   | 38.09              | 33.33                |
| h. Unknown  | 0.0                | 0.0                  |

cooperating teacher submitted a written evaluation of the student teacher upon the completion of student teaching, 38.09 reported "other" current policies, including "at mid-point and upon completion of student teaching." Likewise, one-third (33.33 per cent) of the group preferred that the cooperating teacher submit a written evaluation "at mid-point, and upon completion of student teaching."

Although 47.61 per cent of the cooperating high school business teachers (Table 83) reported the current use of an open-ended question form for evaluation during the observational visits, 57.14 per cent preferred the use of a checklist rating sheet.

TABLE 83.--Type of Evaluation Form Used During Observational Visits as Reported by Cooperating High School Business Teachers (Item Number 24)

| Choices                     | % Current Policies | % Preferred Policies |
|-----------------------------|--------------------|----------------------|
| a. None                     | 33.33              | 4.76                 |
| b. Checklist rating sheet   | 0.0                | 57.14                |
| c. Open-ended question form | 47.61              | 19.04                |
| d. Other (please specify)   | 0.0                | 4.76                 |
| e. Unknown                  | 19.04              | 14.28                |

A majority (85.71 per cent) of the cooperating high school business teachers (Table 84) reported the current use of a checklist rating sheet for the final evaluation of the student teacher. Only 57.14 per cent preferred such a policy. Approximately nineteen (19.04) per cent of the cooperating high school business teachers reported "other" preferences, including "both a checklist rating sheet and a letter of recommendation."

TABLE 84.--Type of Form Used for the Final Evaluation as Reported by Cooperating High School Business Teachers (Item Number 25)

| Choices                     | % Current Policies | % Preferred Policies |
|-----------------------------|--------------------|----------------------|
| a. None                     | 0.0                | 0.0                  |
| b. Checklist rating sheet   | 85.71              | 57.14                |
| c. Open-ended question form | 0.0                | 19.04                |
| d. Letter of recommendation | 0.0                | 0.0                  |
| e. Other (please specify)   | 14.28              | 19.04                |
| f. Unknown                  | 0.0                | 4.76                 |

As presented in Table 85, the current and the preferred policies concerning the cooperating teacher's role in the final evaluation of the student teacher were similar. More than one half of the cooperating high school business teachers reported the current practice and the preference of the cooperating teacher making a recommendation to the college supervisor.

The current and the preferred policies concerning the person responsible for assigning the final grade in student teaching were varied as reported by the cooperating high school business teachers (Table 86). While 9.52 per cent reported that the business education supervisor was currently responsible for the final grade, only 14.28 per cent preferred

TABLE 85.--Cooperating Teacher's Role in Final Evaluation as Reported by Cooperating High School Business Teachers (Item Number 26)

| Choices   | % Current Policies | % Preferred Policies |
|---|--------------------|----------------------|
| a. None   | 19.04              | 0.0                  |
| b. Makes recommendation to college supervisor           | 57.14              | 52.38                |
| c. Makes recommendation to director of student teaching | 23.80              | 28.75                |
| d. Other (please specify)                               | 0.0                | 4.76                 |
| e. Unknown  | 0.0                | 14.28                |

TABLE 86.--Person Responsible for Assigning the Final Grade as Reported by Cooperating High School Business Teachers (Item Number 27)

| Choices  | % Current Policies | % Preferred Policies |
|--|--------------------|----------------------|
| a. Director of student teaching                              | 28.75              | 9.52                 |
| b. Professional education supervisor                         | 28.75              | 4.76                 |
| c. Business education supervisor                             | 9.52               | 14.28                |
| d. Professional education and business education supervisors | 4.76               | 28.75                |
| e. Cooperating teacher                                       | 0.0                | 9.52                 |
| f. Other (please specify)                                    | 9.52               | 23.80                |
| g. Unknown   | 19.04              | 9.52                 |

such an arrangement. Approximately twenty-four (23.80) per cent reported "other" preferences, which included a suggestion that the responsibility be that of "the supervisor and the cooperating teacher."

Two thirds (66.66 per cent) of the cooperating high school business teachers (Table 87) reported the current use of letter grades (A-F) for student teaching. Although 19.04 per cent of the group preferred the use of Satisfactory-Unsatisfactory (S-U), 57.14 per cent preferred the use of letter grades.

TABLE 87.--Grading Scheme Used as Reported by Cooperating High School Business Teachers (Item Number 28)

| Choices                              | % Current Policies | % Preferred Policies |
|--------------------------------------|--------------------|----------------------|
| a. Letter grades (A-F)               | 66.66              | 57.14                |
| b. Pass-fail (P-F)                   | 4.76               | 9.52                 |
| c. Satisfactory-unsatisfactory (S-U) | 9.52               | 19.04                |
| d. Numerical scores (1-100)          | 0.0                | 0.0                  |
| e. Other (please specify)            | 9.52               | 9.52                 |
| f. Unknown                           | 9.52               | 4.76                 |

#### Summary of the Evaluation Policies

The purpose of this section of Chapter IV was to present an item analysis of the evaluation policies as reported

by the business education graduates, the collegiate business education teachers, and the cooperating high school business teachers. Based upon the operational definition of the evaluation policies as stated in Chapter I, the following summary of the three groups was divided into these two sections:

(1) personnel involved in evaluation and (2) methods used in evaluation. The first section, concerning the personnel involved in evaluation, was further divided into the following parts: (1) cooperating teacher's role, (2) college supervisor's role, and (3) responsibility for final grade. The second section, concerning the methods used in evaluation, were further divided into the following parts: (1) conveying evaluation criteria, (2) written evaluations, (3) evaluation forms, and (4) grading scheme.

#### Personnel Involved in Evaluation

The current and the preferred policies concerning the personnel involved in evaluation were reported by all three groups. The itemized responses of the business education graduates were presented in Tables 68 to 70. The itemized responses of the collegiate business education teachers were presented in Tables 77 to 79, and the itemized responses of the cooperating high school business teachers were presented in Tables 85 and 86.



### Cooperating Teacher's Role

A majority of all three groups identified the current role of the cooperating teacher in the final evaluation of the student teacher as that of making a recommendation to the college supervisor. Likewise, all three groups preferred that the cooperating teacher's role in the final evaluation of the student teacher remain the same as the current role.

### College Supervisor's Role

For the two groups reporting, there was no agreement between the business education graduates and the collegiate business education teachers on the current role of the college supervisor's role in the evaluation of the student teacher. Furthermore, there was no agreement within either group.

In the preferred policies reported, the majority of the responses of the business education graduates were evenly divided between these two policies: (1) accepting the recommendation of the cooperating teacher and (2) making a recommendation to the director of student teaching. Forty-four per cent of the collegiate business education teachers reported "other" preferences.

### Responsibility of Final Grade

There was no agreement among the three groups concerning the person currently responsible for assigning the final grade in student teaching. For example, 40 per cent of the

business education graduates reported the professional education supervisor, whereas one third of the collegiate business education teachers reported the director of student teaching. The majority of the responses of the cooperating high school business teachers were evenly divided between the professional education supervisor and the director of student teaching. Among the three groups, there was no agreement on a preferred policy concerning the person responsible for assigning the final grade in student teaching. Furthermore, there was no agreement within any of the three groups.

#### Methods Used in Evaluation

The current and the preferred policies concerning the methods used in evaluation were reported by all three groups. The itemized responses of the business education graduates were presented in Tables 63 to 67 and 71. The itemized responses of the collegiate business education teachers were presented in Tables 72, 76, and 80. Furthermore, the itemized responses of the cooperating high school business teachers were presented in Tables 81 to 84 and 87.

#### Conveying Evaluation Criteria

Cooperating Teachers.--Of the two groups reporting, approximately one half of the collegiate business education teachers and the cooperating high school business teachers reported that the evaluation criteria were currently conveyed to the cooperating teacher through either a written statement

or a handbook. The consensus of the two groups agreed that either a written statement or a handbook should be used to convey the evaluation criteria to the cooperating teacher.

Student Teachers.--As the only group reporting, the business education graduates reported varied current policies concerning the method used to convey the evaluation criteria used during student teaching. However, 60 per cent of the business education graduates agreed that the preferred policy was the use of an individual conference with each student teacher to present the evaluation criteria.

#### Written Evaluations

College Supervisors.--The business education graduates reported diverse current policies concerning the written evaluations submitted by the college supervisor. However, more than one half of the collegiate business education teachers and the cooperating high school business teachers agreed that currently the college supervisor submitted written evaluations upon the completion of student teaching.

The preferred responses of the three groups were very similar to the current responses. The business education graduates reported varied preferences, whereas more than one half of each of the other two groups preferred that the college supervisor submit a written evaluation upon the completion of student teaching.

Cooperating Teachers.--As the two reporting groups, the business education graduates and the collegiate business education teachers agreed that the cooperating teacher currently submitted a written evaluation upon the completion of student teaching. In reporting the preferred policies, the majority of the business education graduates were almost evenly divided between these two policies: (1) upon the completion of student teaching and (2) with each observational visit, at mid-point, and upon the completion of student teaching. However, approximately one-half (44.44 per cent) of the collegiate business education teachers reported "other" preferences, primarily a written evaluation at the mid-point and upon completion of student teaching.

#### Evaluation Forms

Observational Visits.--Both the business education graduates and the collegiate business education teachers reported the current use of checklist rating sheets for evaluation during observational visits, whereas 47.61 per cent of the cooperating high school business teachers reported the current use of an open-ended question form. The three groups agreed on the preferred policy of using a checklist rating sheet for evaluation during the observational visits.

Final Evaluation.--The majority of all three groups reported the current use of a checklist rating sheet for the final evaluation of the student teacher. More than one

half (57.14 per cent) of the cooperating high school business teachers and 36 per cent of the business education graduates preferred using a checklist rating sheet for the final evaluation. Approximately forty-four (44.44) per cent of the collegiate business education teachers reported "other" preferences, primarily both a checklist rating sheet and a letter of recommendation.

#### Grading Scheme

The majority of all three groups reported both a current and a preferred policy of using letter grades (A-F) for the final evaluation of student teaching.

## CHAPTER V

### SUMMARY, IMPLICATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

#### Summary

##### Purpose

The general purpose of this study was to analyze the current and the preferred policies in the supervision and the evaluation of business student teachers at the six state colleges in Oklahoma. Specifically, based upon the opinions of collegiate business education teachers, cooperating high school business teachers, and business education graduates, the purposes of the study were (1) to determine the current policies, (2) to determine the preferred policies, and (3) to determine the nature and the amount of discrepancy between the current and the preferred policies.

##### Procedures

Based on a review of published literature and related doctoral research studies, three questionnaires, concerning the current and the preferred supervision and evaluation policies, were formulated for use in collecting data. One questionnaire was mailed to the 34 collegiate business education teachers listed in the catalogs of the six Oklahoma

state colleges (82.4 per cent return). A second questionnaire was sent to a randomly selected sample of 100 cooperating high school business teachers. These cooperating high school business teachers were employed by high schools cooperating with the six state colleges in Oklahoma by furnishing laboratory facilities for business student teachers (86 per cent return). The third questionnaire was sent to 39 of the 1969 business education graduates of the six state colleges, who were teaching in Oklahoma during the 1970-71 academic year (82.3 per cent return).

Using the facilities at the Merrick Computer Center on The University of Oklahoma campus, the data collected from the three questionnaires were processed for two forms of analyses. First, frequency tabulations were computed for an item analysis of each of the three questionnaires to identify the current and the preferred policies. Secondly, using a canonical correlation statistic, correlations among the multiple groups were computed to identify any discrepancy between the current and the preferred policies.

### Results

Following the format of the questionnaires, the item analysis for the three questionnaires was divided into these two parts: (1) the supervision policies and (2) the evaluation policies. Specifically, the results of the supervision policies, as reported by the three groups, were presented as

follows: business education graduates, Tables 5 to 22; collegiate business education teachers, Tables 23 to 41; and cooperating high school business teachers, Tables 42 to 62.

The results of the evaluation policies, as reported by the three groups, were presented as follows: business education graduates, Tables 63 to 71; collegiate business education teachers, Tables 72 to 80; and cooperating business education teachers, Tables 81 to 87. Following the item analysis of both the supervision policies and the evaluation policies, a synthesis of the current and the preferred policies, as reported by the three groups, was presented.

Correlations for the multiple groups with contrasting observations were computed and tested for significance at the .05 level. Although the results of the total computation were presented in Table 4, only six hypotheses, as stated in Chapter I, were reported individually. Specifically, the results were :

1. A significant relationship between the current policies as reported by the collegiate business education teachers and the business education graduates concerning the supervision and the evaluation of business student teachers ( $r = .226$ ;  $P < .05$ ).
2. A significant relationship between the current policies as reported by the collegiate business education teachers and the cooperating high school business teachers concerning the supervision and the evaluation of business student teachers ( $r = .382$ ;  $P < .01$ ).
3. A significant relationship between the current policies as reported by the business education graduates and the cooperating high school



business teachers concerning the supervision and the evaluation of business student teachers ( $r = .268$ ;  $P < .01$ ).

4. A significant relationship between the preferred policies as reported by the collegiate business education teachers and the business education graduates concerning the supervision and the evaluation of business student teachers ( $r = .422$ ;  $P < .01$ ).
5. A significant relationship between the preferred policies as reported by the collegiate business education teachers and the cooperating high school business teachers concerning the supervision and the evaluation of business student teachers ( $r = .212$ ;  $P < .05$ ).
6. A significant relationship between the preferred policies as reported by the business education graduates and the cooperating high school business teachers concerning the supervision and the evaluation of business student teachers ( $r = .311$ ;  $P < .01$ ).

Of particular interest, although not among the hypotheses stated in the study, was the high correlation between the current policies as reported by the collegiate business education teachers and the preferred policies as reported by the cooperating high school business teachers.

#### Implications

Based upon the current and the preferred policies as reported by the collegiate business education teachers, the cooperating high school business teachers, and the business education graduates, the following implications were inferred concerning the supervision and the evaluation of business student teachers at the six state colleges in Oklahoma:

1. While one of the state colleges used a business education supervisor, specialization was needed in the supervision of business student teachers throughout the state colleges.
2. Although teaching experience and advanced degrees were recognized as desirable qualifications for both the college supervisor and the cooperating teacher, consideration should be given to the more subjective qualities, such as evidence of teaching competency and willingness to work with student teachers.
3. Although the participants were somewhat uninformed about the number of student teachers assigned to a cooperating high school, a one-to-one ratio between the student teacher and the cooperating teacher was the ideal arrangement. However, from a practical standpoint, the ratio should not exceed either more than two student teachers to one cooperating teacher or two cooperating teachers to one student teacher.
4. As noted earlier, direct compensation to the cooperating teacher was not recognized as essential to the effectiveness of the student teaching programs. Moreover, direct compensation to the cooperating teacher would not necessarily guarantee quality guidance of the student.

5. Although group seminars, observational visits, and individual conferences were used in varying degrees at the six state colleges, better and more frequent utilization of these forms of in-service communication were needed to solidify more effectively the desired policies and the personnel involved in the student teaching programs.
6. Although the use of written evaluations during observational visits was recognized as worthwhile, more effective information could be acquired if the college supervisor and the cooperating teacher were better informed about the objectives of the evaluation and the methods to be used in the evaluation process.
7. Although a three-way conference of the college supervisor, the cooperating teacher, and the student teacher was recognized as a valuable element in the final evaluation of the prospective business teacher, the personnel involved in the evaluation process were undecided as to the contribution each member should make toward the evaluation of the student teacher. Furthermore, there was indecision as to where the final authority should lie in case of conflicts in the evaluation of the business student teachers.

8. Although the respondents, in general, indicated concern about the current and the preferred policies in the evaluation of business student teachers, they were undecided about the overall process of evaluating business student teachers.

### Recommendations

On the basis of the data collected from the collegiate business education teachers, the cooperating high school business teachers, and the business education graduates of the six state colleges in Oklahoma, the following policies concerning the supervision and the evaluation of business student teachers are recommended:

#### Supervision:

1. The college supervisor responsible for supervising the business student teachers should be a member of the business education department.
2. The minimum professional preparation of the college supervisor should include a master's degree in business and five or more years' teaching experience on either the secondary or the collegiate level.
3. The cooperating teacher assigned to supervise the business student teachers should teach only business subjects.
4. The minimum professional preparation of the cooperating teacher should include a bachelor's

degree and three or four years' teaching experience on the secondary level.

5. Only one business student teacher should be assigned to a cooperating teacher during the student teaching period.
6. Not more than two cooperating teachers should be responsible for the supervision of a business student teacher at one time.
7. All business student teachers should be assigned to cooperating high schools within the supervisory radius of the college.
8. Compensation for the cooperating teacher should be in the form of benefits rather than monetary remuneration.
9. If possible, the college supervisor should hold an individual conference with each business student teacher for orientation purposes. However, if not feasible, a group conference prior to student teaching should be used for orientation.
10. The college should hold a group orientation conference for the cooperating teachers.
11. The college should hold a campus seminar for the student teachers during the student teaching assignment.

12. The college supervisor should make at least four observational visits during the student teaching period.
13. The cooperating teacher should hold individual conferences with the student teacher periodically throughout the student teaching assignment.
14. A three-way conference, among the college supervisor, the cooperating teacher, and the student teacher, should be held during each observational visit.

Evaluation:

1. Either a handbook or a written statement should be used to convey the evaluation criteria to the cooperating teachers.
2. The criteria to be used in evaluating the prospective business teacher should be given to the student teacher during the orientation conference conducted by the college.
3. A checklist rating sheet should be used for the evaluation of both the observational visits and the final evaluation of the student teacher.
4. Both the college supervisor and the cooperating teacher should submit written evaluations for the student teacher's professional file following the completion of the student teaching assignment.

5. Letter grades (A-F) should be used for the final evaluation of the student teacher.

Inasmuch as certain policies in the supervision and the evaluation of business student teachers were not definitely determined in this study, additional research is recommended in the following areas:

1. Number of student teachers assigned to the college supervisor
2. Credit-load reduction for the college supervisor and the cooperating teacher
3. Qualifying criteria for the cooperating teacher
4. Ultimate responsibility of the final evaluation of the student teacher

Furthermore, the following possible studies are recommended:

1. Additional research is recommended to determine the causes and the effects of the correlations illustrated in Table 4. In particular, further investigation is warranted of the correlation between the current policies reported by the collegiate business education teachers and the preferred policies indicated by the cooperating high school business teachers.
2. With specific implications for the six state colleges in Oklahoma, a similar study is recommended to determine the policies used in the supervision

and the evaluation of business student teachers at the state-supported teacher-training institutions in other areas, such as the Mountain Plains Business Association region.

3. Following a similar format, a study is recommended ten to fifteen years hence to determine whether new developments in teacher education have improved the supervision and the evaluation of business student teachers at the six state colleges in Oklahoma.



## BIBLIOGRAPHY

### Books

- Andrews, L. O. Student Teaching. New York: The Center for Applied Research in Education, Inc., 1964.
- Andrews, L. O. "The Task Ahead," The Supervising Teacher, Thirty-Eighth Yearbook of The Association for Student Teaching. Cedar Falls, Iowa: The Association for Student Teaching, 1959.
- Bartky, John. Supervision As Human Relations. Boston: D. C. Heath and Company, 1953.
- Batchelder, Howard T., Lawrence, Richard E., and Myers, George R. A Guide to Planning for Off-Campus Student Teaching. No. 11: Association for Student Teaching Bulletin. Cedar Falls, Iowa: The Association for Student Teaching, 1959.
- Boykin, Leander L. "Principles of Evaluating in Student Teaching," Evaluating Student Teaching, Thirty-Ninth Yearbook of The Association for Student Teaching. Cedar Falls, Iowa: The Association for Student Teaching, 1960.
- Carroll, Margaret. "A Student Teaching Program for Experienced Teachers," The Outlook in Student Teaching, Forty-First Yearbook of The Association for Student Teaching. Cedar Falls, Iowa: The Association for Student Teaching, 1962.
- Cogan, Maurice L. "Clinical Supervision by Groups," The College Supervisor, Conflict and Challenges, Forty-Third Yearbook of The Association for Student Teaching. Cedar Falls, Iowa: The Association for Student Teaching, 1964.
- Conant, James Bryant. The Education of American Teachers. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1963.
- Devor, John W. The Experience of Student Teaching. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1964.

- Dewey, John. The Relation of Theory to Practice in Education. No. 16: Association for Student Teaching Bulletin. Cedar Falls, Iowa: The Association for Student Teaching, 1961.
- Dixon, W. J. Introduction to Mathematical Statistics. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1957.
- Dixon, W. J., ed. BMD: Biomedical Computer Programs. Berkley: University of California Press, 1970.
- Downie, N. M. and Heath, R. W. Basic Statistical Methods. New York: Harper and Row, 1965.
- Edwards, A. L. Statistical Analysis. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1969.
- Fauset, Charles E. "Current Practices," Section 2, "Case Study: A College in Transition," The Outlook in Student Teaching, Forty-First Yearbook of The Association for Student Teaching. Cedar Falls, Iowa: The Association for Student Teaching, 1959.
- Guidelines for Student Teaching: An Experimental Handbook, Multi-State Teacher Education Project. Baltimore: Maryland State Department of Education, 1969.
- Hays, W. L. Statistics. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1963.
- Hilliard, Pauline and Durrance, Charles L. Guiding Student Teaching Experiences. Washington, D. C.: The Association for Student Teaching, 1962.
- Huffman, Harry, ed. How to Teach Business Subjects. Washington, D. C.: National Association for Business Teacher Education, 1959.
- Johnson, Donald M. The Psychology of Thought and Judgment. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1955.
- Johnson, Gladys E. "Evaluation and Measurement of Student Teaching from the Point of View of the Cooperating Teacher, Part I." How to Teach Business Subjects. Edited by Harry Huffman. Washington, D. C.: National Association for Business Teacher Education, 1959.
- Junge, Charlotte W. "Redefinition and Guidelines," Section 3, "Resources, Human and Material: Essentials of a Good Program," The Outlook in Student Teaching, Forty-First Yearbook of The Association for Student

- Teaching. Cedar Falls, Iowa: The Association for Student Teaching, 1962.
- Kerlinger, Fred N. Foundations of Behavioral Research. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1964.
- Lindsey, Margaret, ed. New Horizons for the Teaching Profession. Washington, D. C.: National Education Association of the United States, 1961.
- McAllister, Jane Ellen. "Glimpses from the Past," The Outlook in Student Teaching, Forty-First Yearbook of The Association for Student Teaching. Cedar Falls, Iowa: The Association for Student Teaching, 1962.
- Pfeiffer, Robert T. "Common Concerns of College Supervisor," The College Supervisor, Conflict and Challenges, Forty-Third Yearbook of The Association for Student Teaching. Cedar Falls, Iowa: The Association for Student Teaching, 1964.
- Rabin, Bernard. "Who Are Supervising Teacher?," The Supervising Teacher, Thirty-Eighth Yearbook of The Association for Student Teaching. Cedar Falls, Iowa: The Association for Student Teaching, 1959.
- Reed, Helen M. "The College Supervisor in a Multi-Purpose University in a Rural Setting," The College Supervisor, Conflict and Challenges, Forty-Third Yearbook of The Association for Student Teaching. Cedar Falls, Iowa: The Association for Student Teaching, 1964.
- Richards, Helen and Robinson, Elizabeth. "The Supervising Teacher in Teacher Education," The Supervising Teacher, Thirty-Eighth Yearbook of The Association for Student Teaching. Cedar Falls, Iowa: The Association for Student Teaching, 1959.
- Ruman, Edward L. and Curtis, Dwight K. "The Supervising Teacher in Future Teacher Education Programs," The Supervising Teacher, Thirty-Eighth Yearbook of The Association for Student Teaching. Cedar Falls, Iowa: The Association for Student Teaching, 1959.
- Schunk, Bernadene, ed. The Outlook in Student Teaching, Forty-First Yearbook of The Association for Student Teaching. Cedar Falls, Iowa: The Association for Student Teaching, 1964.
- Staderman, Helen E. "The College Supervisor in a State-Supported Institution in a Metropolitan Area," The

College Supervisor, Conflict and Challenges, Forty-Third Yearbook of The Association for Student Teaching. Cedar Falls, Iowa: The Association for Student Teaching, 1964.

Steeves, Frank L. Issues in Student Teaching: A Casebook with Related Problems in Teacher Education. New York: The Odyssey Press, Inc., 1963.

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

Stratemeyer, Florence B. "The College Supervisor: Guidelines for Action," The College Supervisor, Conflict and Challenges, Forty-Third Yearbook of The Association for Student Teaching. Cedar Falls, Iowa: The Association for Student Teaching, 1964.

Stratemeyer, Florence B. and Lindsey, Margaret. Working with Student Teachers. New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1958.

Troisi, Nicholas. "A Brief Historical Look at Evaluation of Student Teaching," Evaluating Student Teaching, Thirty-Ninth Yearbook of The Association for Student Teaching. Cedar Falls, Iowa: The Association for Student Teaching, 1960.

Van Antwerp, Chiles. "The Evaluation and Measurement of Student Teaching from the Point of View of the College Supervisor." How to Teach Business Subjects. Edited by Harry Huffman. Washington, D. C.: National Association for Business Teacher Education, 1959.

Woodruff, Asahel D. Student Teaching Today, AACTE Study Series, Vol. V. Washington, D. C.: The American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1960.

#### Periodicals

Barber, Shirley. "Supervision of Student Teachers." The National Business Education Quarterly, XXIX (Summer, 1961), 44-46, 56.

Bennie, William A. "Compensating Co-operating Teachers." The Journal of Teacher Education, XII (June, 1961), 223-224.

- Bossone, Richard M. "Training the Supervising Teacher." The Teachers College Journal, XXXV (March, 1964), 178-179.
- Campbell, Elizabeth W. "T Is for Trial Day--the Trials, Frustrations, and Satisfactions of a Student Teacher." Journal of Teacher Education, XIV (June, 1963), 130-134.
- Clark, Marie. "Supervision in Student Teaching." Teachers College Journal, XXXIV (December, 1962), 80-81.
- Dady, M. and others. "Cruciality of Student Teaching." School and Community, LI (April, 1965), 20.
- Dixon, Paul T., Chairman. "Some Guiding Principles for Student Teaching Programs." The North Central Association Quarterly, XXXII (October, 1957), 193-196.
- Dixon, W. Robert. "Some Observations on the Role of Classroom Supervising Teachers in Teacher Education Programs." University of Michigan School of Education Bulletin, XXXIV (December, 1962), 39-41.
- Evans, Howard R. "The Supervision of Student Teaching in the Calculation of Teaching Load." Journal of Teacher Education, VIII (December, 1957), 387-392.
- Farrar, C. D. "New Dimensions in Student Teaching." The Teachers College Journal, XXXVI (January, 1965), 169-170.
- Griffith, Bob B. "Guiding the Student Teaching Program in Business Education." Journal of Business Education, XL (January, 1965), 151-152.
- Haskew, L. D. "America's Design for Good Teacher Preparation." National Education Association Journal, XLVIII (April, 1959), 16-17.
- Hoover, Kenneth H.; Boetto, Laurel; and Doyle, Roy P. "A Survey of Student Teacher Effectiveness." The Bulletin of the National Association of Secondary-School Principals, XLV (October, 1961), 166-169.
- Hotelling, J. B. "Studies in the Phenomenology of Emotions." Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, LIV (1957), 358-363.
- Hotelling, J. B. and Scott, S. "Hierarchical Linkage Analysis," Educational and Psychological Measurement, XX (1960), 55-67.

- Hruska, Jack L. "A Student Teacher's Views on Supervision." The National Business Education Quarterly, XXIX (Summer, 1961), 47-52.
- Inlow, Gail M. "A Comparative Study of Student Teaching Practices in Thirty-Eight Midwest Institutions." Journal of Experimental Education, XXVIII (June, 1960), 337-349.
- Inlow, Gail M. "The College Supervisor of Student Teaching--A Comparative Study." Journal of Teacher Education, X (June, 1959), 211-216.
- Lingren, Vernon C. "The Certification of Cooperating Teachers in Student Teaching Programs." Journal of Teacher Education, VIII (December, 1957), 403-407.
- Mercer, W. A. "The Supervising Teacher's Role." Clearing House, XXXVII (February, 1963), 342-343.
- Mercer, W. A. "What Research and Related Literature Have to Say About Off-Campus Student Teaching and Professional Laboratory Experiences." Journal of Educational Research, LVII (May, 1964), 489-491.
- Oliver, Donald W., and Shaver, James P. "A Critique of 'Practice in Teaching'." Harvard Educational Review, XXXI (Fall, 1961), 437-448.
- Oyer, Harold. "School Administration in Student Teaching." The Teachers College Journal, XXXIV (December, 1962), 79-80.
- Self, Melvin and Densford, John. "Oklahoma Analyzes the Status of Teacher Education." Clearing House, VI (January, 1962), 288-290.
- Silberman, Charles E. "Even Student Teaching Is Dismal." Today's Education, LX (January, 1971), 22-25, 63.
- Sleeper, William R. and Telfer, Harold E. "Planning Orientation to Student Teaching." Journal of Teacher Education, XIII (March, 1962), 50-54.
- Taylor, Gem K. and Fields, Jack W. "Problems Confronting the College Coordinator in an Off-Campus Student Teaching Program." Peabody Journal of Education, XLI (March, 1964), 308-311.

Westfall, Byron L. "Student Teaching Programs in Certain School Systems of the North Central Association Area." The North Central Association Quarterly, XXXVII (Winter, 1963), 237-245.

Williams, Chester S.; Deever, R. Merwin; and Flynn, Edward B., Jr. "Professional Laboratory Experiences in Oklahoma." Journal of Teacher Education, XI (December, 1960), 497-505.

Woodward, Theodore. "Classroom Visitations." The National Business Education Quarterly, XXXIII (Summer, 1965), 41-46.

#### Unpublished Materials

Alexander, Ray, Jr. "A Study of the Organizational Patterns and Operational Procedures of the Student Teaching Program in Kentucky." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Kentucky, 1967.

Barber, Donald Russell. "A Comprehensive Survey Concerning Professional Laboratory Experiences in Teacher Education in Kansas." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Kansas, 1967.

Bast, Milton L. "A Comparative Study of the Preparation of Business Teachers with Specific Implications for the State of Oklahoma." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The University of Oklahoma, 1952.

Bergen, Robert Zane. "The Status of the Cooperating Teachers in the Elementary and Secondary Schools of Oklahoma." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Oklahoma State University, 1970.

Black, Grace Allen Curry. "An Analysis of Current Trends in Professional Laboratory Experiences in Business Education in Selected Colleges and Universities." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The Ohio State University, 1969.

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

Drennan, Henry Dalton. "Comparative Analyses of Student Teaching Programs in Business Education in NATBE-Approved Colleges and Universities." Unpublished

doctoral dissertation, The University of Mississippi, 1969.

- Hasskarl, Robert Albert, Jr. "An Analysis of the Student Teaching Program in Oklahoma." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The University of Oklahoma, 1963.
- Hoskinson, Robert Everett. "The In-Service Education Needs of the Business Education Supervising Teachers in the Indiana State Teachers College Student Teaching Program." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The Ohio State University, 1961.
- Kaplan, Leonard. "An Investigation of the Role Expectations for College Supervisors of Student Teaching as Viewed by Student Teachers, Supervising Teachers and College Supervisors." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The University of Rochester, 1967.
- Ploeger, Richard Arthur. "A Survey of Secondary Student Teaching Programs in Selected Midwestern States." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of South Dakota, 1967.
- Prickett, Loy E. "Evaluation of the Student Teaching Phase of Business Teacher Preparation." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The University of Oklahoma, 1959.
- Swaim, Roland Quinn. "Criteria for Evaluating Programs in Professional Laboratory Experiences in Teacher Education." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Kansas, 1962.

#### Miscellaneous

- Johnson, James A. A National Survey of Student Teaching Programs--Final Report. Report to the Office of Education (DHEW). Washington, D. C., July, 1968. DeKalb: Northern Illinois University, 1968.
- Lis, Anthony S. "Survey of Student-Teaching Procedures and Forms Utilized by Business Education Departments in 98 Member Institutions of the National Association of Business Teacher-Training Institutions." Unpublished master's thesis, Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanical College, 1951.
- Pogue, Graham. "Student Teaching: The State of the Art." Paper presented, n.d., (ERIC Microfiche, ED030-587).



Institutional Materials

Central State College:

Central State College Bulletin, 1969-1972

Handbook for Cooperating Teachers

Handbook for Student Teachers

East Central State College:

East Central State College Undergraduate Catalog, 1970-71

Packet for Cooperating Teachers

Packet for Student Teachers

Northeastern State College:

Copy of letter mailed to supervising teachers each semester

Draft copy of proposed handbook

Northeastern State College Bulletin, 1970-1972

Policies and Procedures for Admission to Professional Education and Student Intern Teaching, May 1, 1967  
(Student Intern Teaching Committee)

Student Intern Teaching Guide for Supervising Teachers and Administrators, 1966

Northwestern State College:

A Guide for Student Teachers

A Handbook for Cooperating Teachers

Northwestern State College Catalog, 1970-1972

Southeastern State College:

Handbook for Student Teachers

Southeastern State College Bulletin/Catalog Issue, 1970-1971

Southwestern State College:

Copy of letter mailed to supervising teachers each semester

Southwestern State College Catalog, 1970-1972

Suggestions for Cooperating Teachers (Ray C. Schardein)

Workbook for Secondary Student Teachers (Dale Hassinger)

A P P E N D I X

EXHIBIT 1  
CURRENT AND PREFERRED POLICIES IN THE SUPERVISION  
AND THE EVALUATION OF BUSINESS STUDENT TEACHERS

Questionnaire

Collegiate Business Education Teachers

**PURPOSE OF STUDY:**

To analyze the current and preferred policies in the supervision and the evaluation of business student teachers on the basis of the opinions of collegiate business education teachers, cooperating high school business teachers, and business education graduates.

**DEFINITION OF TERMS USED IN QUESTIONNAIRE:**

*College Supervisor:* The college faculty member supervising business education students during their student teaching.

*Cooperating Teacher:* The faculty member teaching business subjects in the secondary schools and supervising business education students during their student teaching.

*Student Teacher:* The undergraduate business education student assigned to a secondary school for supervised teaching opportunities.

**INSTRUCTIONS:**

Please indicate your responses to the "Current Policies" AND "Preferred Policies" by placing a checkmark (✓) in the columns at the right. YOUR RESPONSES WILL BE KEPT CONFIDENTIAL.

**PART I -- SUPERVISION**

|   | <i>Current<br/>Policies</i> | <i>Preferred<br/>Policies</i> |
|---|-----------------------------|-------------------------------|
| <b>1. Position of the college supervisor</b>  |                             |                               |
| a. director of student teaching . . . . .   |                             |                               |
| b. professional education supervisor . . . . .  |                             |                               |
| c. business education supervisor . . . . .  |                             |                               |
| d. professional education and business education supervisors . . . . .                    |                             |                               |
| e. other (please specify) _____ . . . . .   |                             |                               |
| f. unknown . . . . .  |                             |                               |
| <b>2. Minimum professional preparation required of the college supervisor</b>             |                             |                               |
| a. bachelor . . . . .   |                             |                               |
| b. master of teaching . . . . .   |                             |                               |
| c. master in field . . . . .  |                             |                               |
| d. specialist (60 hours above bachelor) . . . . .   |                             |                               |
| e. doctorate . . . . .  |                             |                               |
| f. other (please specify) _____ . . . . .   |                             |                               |
| g. unknown . . . . .  |                             |                               |
| <b>3. Academic level of teaching experience required of the college supervisor</b>        |                             |                               |
| a. none . . . . .   |                             |                               |
| b. college or university . . . . .  |                             |                               |
| c. secondary . . . . .  |                             |                               |
| d. junior high . . . . .  |                             |                               |
| e. elementary . . . . .   |                             |                               |
| f. other (please specify) _____ . . . . .   |                             |                               |
| g. unknown . . . . .  |                             |                               |
| <b>4. Minimum number of years' teaching experience required of the college supervisor</b> |                             |                               |
| a. none . . . . .   |                             |                               |

|  | Current Policies | Preferred Policies |
|--|------------------|--------------------|
| b. 1-2 .....   |                  |                    |
| c. 3-4 .....   |                  |                    |
| d. 5 or more .....   |                  |                    |
| e. unknown .....   |                  |                    |
| 5. Credit-load reduction allotted to the college supervisor for supervisory duties                   |                  |                    |
| a. none .....  |                  |                    |
| b. semester hours reduced based on number of student teachers .....                                  |                  |                    |
| c. 1/4-1/3 of teaching load .....  |                  |                    |
| d. 1/2 of teaching load .....  |                  |                    |
| e. more than 1/2 of teaching load .....  |                  |                    |
| f. unknown .....   |                  |                    |
| 6. Number of student teachers assigned to a college supervisor at one time                           |                  |                    |
| a. 1-3 .....   |                  |                    |
| b. 4-6 .....   |                  |                    |
| c. 7-9 .....   |                  |                    |
| d. 10 or more (please specify) .....   |                  |                    |
| e. unknown .....   |                  |                    |
| 7. Number of student teachers assigned to the cooperating teacher at one time                        |                  |                    |
| a. 1 .....   |                  |                    |
| b. 2 .....   |                  |                    |
| c. 3 .....   |                  |                    |
| d. 4 .....   |                  |                    |
| e. 5 or more .....   |                  |                    |
| f. unknown .....   |                  |                    |
| 8. Number of cooperating teachers supervising the student teacher during student teaching assignment |                  |                    |
| a. one .....   |                  |                    |
| b. not more than two .....   |                  |                    |
| c. more than two .....   |                  |                    |
| d. other (please specify) .....  |                  |                    |
| e. unknown .....   |                  |                    |
| 9. Percentage of student teachers assigned outside the supervisory radius of the college             |                  |                    |
| a. none .....  |                  |                    |
| b. less than 10% .....   |                  |                    |
| c. 10-20% .....  |                  |                    |
| d. 21-30% .....  |                  |                    |
| e. 31% or more .....   |                  |                    |
| f. unknown .....   |                  |                    |
| 10. College compensation to the cooperating teacher  |                  |                    |
| a. none .....  |                  |                    |
| b. \$ _____ for each student teacher .....   |                  |                    |
| c. a flat rate of \$ _____ regardless of the number of student teachers .....                        |                  |                    |
| d. other (please specify) .....  |                  |                    |
| e. unknown .....   |                  |                    |
| 11. College benefits provided the cooperating teacher  |                  |                    |
| a. none .....  |                  |                    |
| b. tuition waived .....  |                  |                    |
| c. admission to college activities .....   |                  |                    |
| d. other (please specify) .....  |                  |                    |
| e. unknown .....   |                  |                    |
| 12. Orientation conference(s) held for the student teachers prior to student teaching                |                  |                    |
| a. none .....  |                  |                    |
| b. individual conference with each student .....   |                  |                    |
| c. group conference with all students .....  |                  |                    |
| d. other (please specify) .....  |                  |                    |
| e. unknown .....   |                  |                    |
| 13. Orientation conference(s) for the cooperating teachers prior to student teaching                 |                  |                    |
| a. none .....  |                  |                    |
| b. individual conference with each teacher .....   |                  |                    |
| c. group conference with all teachers .....  |                  |                    |
| d. other (please specify) .....  |                  |                    |
| e. unknown .....   |                  |                    |

|   | Current Policies | Preferred Policies |
|---|------------------|--------------------|
| 14. Number of observational visits by the college supervisor                                |                  |                    |
| a. none   |                  |                    |
| b. one  |                  |                    |
| c. 2-3  |                  |                    |
| d. 4-5  |                  |                    |
| e. more than 5 (please specify) _____   |                  |                    |
| f. unknown  |                  |                    |
| 15. Individual conference(s) that a college supervisor holds with a student teacher         |                  |                    |
| a. none   |                  |                    |
| b. with each observational point  |                  |                    |
| c. at mid-point of student teaching   |                  |                    |
| d. upon completion of student teaching  |                  |                    |
| e. with each observational visit and at mid-point of student teaching                       |                  |                    |
| f. with each observational visit, at mid-point, and upon completion of student teaching     |                  |                    |
| g. other (please specify) _____   |                  |                    |
| h. unknown  |                  |                    |
| 16. Individual conference(s) that the college supervisor holds with the cooperating teacher |                  |                    |
| a. none   |                  |                    |
| b. with each observational visit  |                  |                    |
| c. at mid-point of student teaching   |                  |                    |
| d. upon completion of student teaching  |                  |                    |
| e. with each observational visit and at mid-point of student teaching                       |                  |                    |
| f. with each observational visit, at mid-point, and upon completion of student teaching     |                  |                    |
| g. other (please specify) _____   |                  |                    |
| h. unknown  |                  |                    |
| 17. Campus seminar(s) held for student teachers   |                  |                    |
| a. none   |                  |                    |
| b. prior to student teaching  |                  |                    |
| c. during student teaching  |                  |                    |
| d. upon completion of student teaching  |                  |                    |
| e. prior to and during student teaching   |                  |                    |
| f. prior to, during, and upon completion of student teaching                                |                  |                    |
| g. other (please specify) _____   |                  |                    |
| h. unknown  |                  |                    |
| 18. Campus seminar(s) held for cooperating teachers   |                  |                    |
| a. none   |                  |                    |
| b. prior to student teaching  |                  |                    |
| c. during student teaching  |                  |                    |
| d. upon completion of student teaching  |                  |                    |
| e. prior to and during student teaching   |                  |                    |
| f. prior to, during, and upon completion of student teaching                                |                  |                    |
| g. other (please specify) _____   |                  |                    |
| h. unknown  |                  |                    |
| 19. Individuals participating in conference following observational visit                   |                  |                    |
| a. none   |                  |                    |
| b. college supervisor and student teacher   |                  |                    |
| c. college supervisor and cooperating teacher   |                  |                    |
| d. college supervisor, cooperating teacher, and student teacher                             |                  |                    |
| e. other (please specify) _____   |                  |                    |
| f. unknown  |                  |                    |
| <b>PART II -- EVALUATION</b>  |                  |                    |
| 20. Method used to convey evaluation criteria to the cooperating teacher                    |                  |                    |
| a. none   |                  |                    |
| b. individual conference with each teacher  |                  |                    |
| c. group conference with all teachers   |                  |                    |
| d. written statement or handbook  |                  |                    |
| e. other (please specify) _____   |                  |                    |
| f. unknown  |                  |                    |
| 21. Written evaluation submitted by the college supervisor                                  |                  |                    |
| a. none   |                  |                    |
| b. with each observational visit  |                  |                    |
| c. at mid-point of student teaching   |                  |                    |
| d. upon completion of student teaching  |                  |                    |
| e. with each observational visit and at mid-point of student teaching                       |                  |                    |
| f. with each observational visit, at mid-point, and upon completion of student teaching     |                  |                    |

|   | Current Policies | Preferred Policies |
|---|------------------|--------------------|
| g. other (please specify) _____   |                  |                    |
| h. unknown . . . . .  |                  |                    |
| 22. Written evaluation submitted by the cooperating teacher                                       |                  |                    |
| a. none . . . . .   |                  |                    |
| b. with each observational visit . . . . .  |                  |                    |
| c. at mid-point of student teaching . . . . .   |                  |                    |
| d. upon completion of student teaching . . . . .  |                  |                    |
| e. with each observational visit and at mid-point of student teaching . . . . .                   |                  |                    |
| f. with each observational visit, at mid-point, and upon completion of student teaching . . . . . |                  |                    |
| g. other (please specify) _____   |                  |                    |
| h. unknown . . . . .  |                  |                    |
| 23. Type of evaluation form used during observational visits                                      |                  |                    |
| a. none . . . . .   |                  |                    |
| b. checklist rating sheet . . . . .   |                  |                    |
| c. open-ended question form . . . . .   |                  |                    |
| d. other (please specify) _____   |                  |                    |
| e. unknown . . . . .  |                  |                    |
| 24. Type of form used for the FINAL evaluation  |                  |                    |
| a. none . . . . .   |                  |                    |
| b. checklist rating sheet . . . . .   |                  |                    |
| c. open-ended question form . . . . .   |                  |                    |
| d. letter of recommendation . . . . .   |                  |                    |
| e. other (please specify) _____   |                  |                    |
| f. unknown . . . . .  |                  |                    |
| 25. Person responsible for assigning the FINAL GRADE  |                  |                    |
| a. director of student teaching . . . . .   |                  |                    |
| b. professional education supervisor . . . . .  |                  |                    |
| c. business education supervisor . . . . .  |                  |                    |
| d. professional education and business education supervisors . . . . .                            |                  |                    |
| e. cooperating teacher . . . . .  |                  |                    |
| f. other (please specify) _____   |                  |                    |
| g. unknown . . . . .  |                  |                    |
| 26. College supervisor's role in final evaluation   |                  |                    |
| a. none . . . . .   |                  |                    |
| b. accepts recommendation of cooperating teacher . . . . .  |                  |                    |
| c. makes recommendation to director of student teaching . . . . .                                 |                  |                    |
| d. other (please specify) _____   |                  |                    |
| e. unknown . . . . .  |                  |                    |
| 27. Cooperating teacher's role in final evaluation  |                  |                    |
| a. none . . . . .   |                  |                    |
| b. makes recommendation to college supervisor . . . . .   |                  |                    |
| c. makes recommendation to director of student teaching . . . . .                                 |                  |                    |
| d. other (please specify) _____   |                  |                    |
| e. unknown . . . . .  |                  |                    |
| 28. Grading scheme used   |                  |                    |
| a. letter grades (A-F) . . . . .  |                  |                    |
| b. pass-fail (P-F) . . . . .  |                  |                    |
| c. satisfactory-unsatisfactory (S-U) . . . . .  |                  |                    |
| d. numerical scores (1-100) . . . . .   |                  |                    |
| e. other (please specify) _____   |                  |                    |
| f. unknown . . . . .  |                  |                    |

Explanations and/or suggestions, please:

I would like an abstract of the completed study. Yes \_\_\_\_\_; No \_\_\_\_\_

NAME: \_\_\_\_\_ TITLE: \_\_\_\_\_

SCHOOL: \_\_\_\_\_

## EXHIBIT 2

# CURRENT AND PREFERRED POLICIES IN THE SUPERVISION AND THE EVALUATION OF BUSINESS STUDENT TEACHERS

## Questionnaire

## Cooperating High School Business Teachers

## PURPOSE OF STUDY:

To analyze the current and preferred policies in the supervision and the evaluation of business student teachers on the basis of the opinions of collegiate business education teachers, cooperating high school business teachers, and business education graduates.

## DEFINITION OF TERMS USED IN QUESTIONNAIRE:

*College Supervisor:* The college faculty member supervising business education students during their student teaching.

*Cooperating Teacher:* The faculty member teaching business subjects in the secondary schools and supervising business education students during their student teaching.

*Student Teacher:* The undergraduate business education student assigned to a secondary school for supervised teaching opportunities.

## INSTRUCTIONS:

Please indicate your responses to the "Current Policies" AND "Preferred Policies" by placing a checkmark (✓) in the columns at the right. YOUR RESPONSES WILL BE KEPT CONFIDENTIAL.

## PART I -- SUPERVISION

|   | Current Policies | Preferred Policies |
|---|------------------|--------------------|
| 1. Position of the cooperating teacher  |                  |                    |
| a. department chairman and teaches business subjects . . . . .                      |                  |                    |
| b. teaches only business subjects . . . . .   |                  |                    |
| c. teaches both business and other subjects . . . . .                               |                  |                    |
| d. other (please specify) _____   |                  |                    |
| e. unknown . . . . .  |                  |                    |
| 2. Minimum professional preparation required of the cooperating teacher             |                  |                    |
| a. bachelor . . . . .   |                  |                    |
| b. master of teaching . . . . .   |                  |                    |
| c. master in field . . . . .  |                  |                    |
| d. specialist (60 hours above bachelor) . . . . .                                   |                  |                    |
| e. other (please specify) _____   |                  |                    |
| f. unknown . . . . .  |                  |                    |
| 3. Academic level of teaching experience required of the cooperating teacher        |                  |                    |
| a. none . . . . .   |                  |                    |
| b. secondary . . . . .  |                  |                    |
| c. junior high . . . . .  |                  |                    |
| d. elementary . . . . .   |                  |                    |
| e. other (please specify) _____   |                  |                    |
| f. unknown . . . . .  |                  |                    |
| 4. Minimum number of years' teaching experience required of the cooperating teacher |                  |                    |
| a. none . . . . .   |                  |                    |
| b. 1-2 . . . . .  |                  |                    |
| c. 3-4 . . . . .  |                  |                    |
| d. 5 or more . . . . .  |                  |                    |
| e. unknown . . . . .  |                  |                    |



|   | Current Policies | Preferred Policies |
|---|------------------|--------------------|
| 5. Credit-load reduction allotted the cooperating teacher for supervisory duties                      |                  |                    |
| a. none   |                  |                    |
| b. semester hours reduced based on number of student teachers   |                  |                    |
| c. 1/4- 1/3 of teaching load  |                  |                    |
| d. 1/2 of teaching load   |                  |                    |
| e. more than 1/2 of teaching load   |                  |                    |
| f. unknown  |                  |                    |
| 6. Final approval of the selection of a cooperating teacher is made by                                |                  |                    |
| a. cooperating college  |                  |                    |
| b. business education supervisor  |                  |                    |
| c. high school superintendent   |                  |                    |
| d. high school principal  |                  |                    |
| e. high school counselor  |                  |                    |
| f. other (please specify) _____   |                  |                    |
| g. unknown  |                  |                    |
| 7. Requirement to qualify as a cooperating teacher  |                  |                    |
| a. none   |                  |                    |
| b. pass exam  |                  |                    |
| c. complete a course in supervision   |                  |                    |
| d. submit application to college  |                  |                    |
| e. other (please specify) _____   |                  |                    |
| f. unknown  |                  |                    |
| 8. Assignment as a cooperating teacher  |                  |                    |
| a. voluntary  |                  |                    |
| b. mandatory  |                  |                    |
| c. unknown  |                  |                    |
| 9. Number of student teachers assigned to the cooperating teacher at one time                         |                  |                    |
| a. 1  |                  |                    |
| b. 2  |                  |                    |
| c. 3  |                  |                    |
| d. 4  |                  |                    |
| e. 5 or more  |                  |                    |
| f. unknown  |                  |                    |
| 10. Number of cooperating teachers supervising the student teacher during student teaching assignment |                  |                    |
| a. one  |                  |                    |
| b. not more than two  |                  |                    |
| c. more than two  |                  |                    |
| d. other (please specify) _____   |                  |                    |
| e. unknown  |                  |                    |
| 11. College compensation to the cooperating teacher   |                  |                    |
| a. none   |                  |                    |
| b. \$ _____ for each student teacher  |                  |                    |
| c. a flat rate of \$ _____ regardless of the number of student teachers                               |                  |                    |
| d. other (please specify) _____   |                  |                    |
| e. unknown  |                  |                    |
| 12. Local school district compensation to cooperating teacher   |                  |                    |
| a. none   |                  |                    |
| b. \$ _____ for each student teacher  |                  |                    |
| c. a flat rate of \$ _____ regardless of the number of student teachers                               |                  |                    |
| d. other (please specify) _____   |                  |                    |
| e. unknown  |                  |                    |
| 13. College benefits provided the cooperating teacher   |                  |                    |
| a. none   |                  |                    |
| b. tuition waived   |                  |                    |
| c. admission to college activities  |                  |                    |
| d. other (please specify) _____   |                  |                    |
| e. unknown  |                  |                    |
| 14. Orientation conference held for the cooperating teacher prior to student teaching                 |                  |                    |
| a. none   |                  |                    |
| b. individual conference with each teacher  |                  |                    |
| c. group conference with all teachers   |                  |                    |
| d. other (please specify) _____   |                  |                    |
| e. unknown  |                  |                    |

|  | Current Policies | Preferred Policies |
|--|------------------|--------------------|
| 15. Orientation conference the cooperating teacher holds with the student teacher(s) prior to student teaching |                  |                    |
| a. none.....   |                  |                    |
| b. individual conference with each student teacher.....  |                  |                    |
| c. group conference with all student teachers.....   |                  |                    |
| d. other (please specify) .....  |                  |                    |
| e. unknown.....  |                  |                    |
| 16. Number of observational visits by the college supervisor   |                  |                    |
| a. none.....   |                  |                    |
| b. one.....  |                  |                    |
| c. 2-3.....  |                  |                    |
| d. 4-5.....  |                  |                    |
| e. more than 5 (please specify) .....  |                  |                    |
| f. unknown.....  |                  |                    |
| 17. Individual conference(s) that the cooperating teacher holds with the student teacher                       |                  |                    |
| a. none.....   |                  |                    |
| b. periodically throughout student teaching.....   |                  |                    |
| c. at mid-point of student teaching.....   |                  |                    |
| d. upon completion of student teaching.....  |                  |                    |
| e. periodically throughout and at mid-point of student teaching.....   |                  |                    |
| f. periodically throughout, at mid-point, and upon completion of student teaching.....                         |                  |                    |
| g. other (please specify) .....  |                  |                    |
| h. unknown.....  |                  |                    |
| 18. Individual conference(s) that the college supervisor holds with the cooperating teacher                    |                  |                    |
| a. none.....   |                  |                    |
| b. with each observational visit.....  |                  |                    |
| c. at mid-point of student teaching.....   |                  |                    |
| d. upon completion of student teaching.....  |                  |                    |
| e. with each observational visit and at mid-point of student teaching.....                                     |                  |                    |
| f. with each observational visit, at mid-point, and upon completion of student teaching ..                     |                  |                    |
| g. other (please specify) .....  |                  |                    |
| h. unknown.....  |                  |                    |
| 19. Individuals participating in conference following observational visit                                      |                  |                    |
| a. none.....   |                  |                    |
| b. college supervisor and student teacher.....   |                  |                    |
| c. college supervisor and cooperating teacher.....   |                  |                    |
| d. college supervisor, cooperating teacher, and student teacher.....   |                  |                    |
| e. other (please specify) .....  |                  |                    |
| f. unknown.....  |                  |                    |
| 20. Campus seminar(s) held for student teachers  |                  |                    |
| a. none.....   |                  |                    |
| b. prior to student teaching.....  |                  |                    |
| c. during student teaching.....  |                  |                    |
| d. upon completion of student teaching.....  |                  |                    |
| e. prior to and during student teaching.....   |                  |                    |
| f. prior to, during, and upon completion of student teaching.....  |                  |                    |
| g. other (please specify) .....  |                  |                    |
| h. unknown.....  |                  |                    |
| 21. Campus seminar(s) held for cooperating teachers  |                  |                    |
| a. none.....   |                  |                    |
| b. prior to student teaching.....  |                  |                    |
| c. during student teaching.....  |                  |                    |
| d. upon completion of student teaching.....  |                  |                    |
| e. prior to and during student teaching.....   |                  |                    |
| f. prior to, during, and upon completion of student teaching.....  |                  |                    |
| g. other (please specify) .....  |                  |                    |
| h. unknown.....  |                  |                    |
| <b>PART II -- EVALUATION</b>   |                  |                    |
| 22. Method used to convey evaluation criteria to the cooperating teacher                                       |                  |                    |
| a. none.....   |                  |                    |
| b. individual conference with each teacher.....  |                  |                    |
| c. group conference with all teachers.....   |                  |                    |
| d. written statement or handbook.....  |                  |                    |
| e. other (please specify) .....  |                  |                    |
| f. unknown.....  |                  |                    |

|   | Current Policies | Preferred Policies |
|---|------------------|--------------------|
| 23. Written evaluation submitted by the cooperating teacher                                       |                  |                    |
| a. none . . . . .   |                  |                    |
| b. with each observational visit . . . . .  |                  |                    |
| c. at mid-point of student teaching . . . . .   |                  |                    |
| d. upon completion of student teaching . . . . .  |                  |                    |
| e. with each observational visit and at mid-point of student teaching . . . . .                   |                  |                    |
| f. with each observational visit, at mid-point, and upon completion of student teaching . . . . . |                  |                    |
| g. other (please specify) _____ . . . . .   |                  |                    |
| h. unknown . . . . .  |                  |                    |
| 24. Type of evaluation form used during observational visits                                      |                  |                    |
| a. none . . . . .   |                  |                    |
| b. checklist rating sheet . . . . .   |                  |                    |
| c. open-ended question form . . . . .   |                  |                    |
| d. other (please specify) _____ . . . . .   |                  |                    |
| e. unknown . . . . .  |                  |                    |
| 25. Type of form used for the FINAL evaluation  |                  |                    |
| a. none . . . . .   |                  |                    |
| b. checklist rating sheet . . . . .   |                  |                    |
| c. open-ended question form . . . . .   |                  |                    |
| d. letter of recommendation . . . . .   |                  |                    |
| e. other (please specify) _____ . . . . .   |                  |                    |
| f. unknown . . . . .  |                  |                    |
| 26. Cooperating teacher's role in final evaluation  |                  |                    |
| a. none . . . . .   |                  |                    |
| b. makes recommendation to college supervisor . . . . .   |                  |                    |
| c. makes recommendation to director of student teaching . . . . .                                 |                  |                    |
| d. other (please specify) _____ . . . . .   |                  |                    |
| e. unknown . . . . .  |                  |                    |
| 27. Person responsible for assigning the FINAL GRADE  |                  |                    |
| a. director of student teaching . . . . .   |                  |                    |
| b. professional education supervisor . . . . .  |                  |                    |
| c. business education supervisor . . . . .  |                  |                    |
| d. professional education and business education supervisors . . . . .                            |                  |                    |
| e. cooperating teacher . . . . .  |                  |                    |
| f. other (please specify) _____ . . . . .   |                  |                    |
| g. unknown . . . . .  |                  |                    |
| 28. Grading scheme used   |                  |                    |
| a. letter grades (A-F) . . . . .  |                  |                    |
| b. pass-fail (P-F) . . . . .  |                  |                    |
| c. satisfactory-unsatisfactory (S-U) . . . . .  |                  |                    |
| d. numerical scores (1-100) . . . . .   |                  |                    |
| e. other (please specify) _____ . . . . .   |                  |                    |
| f. unknown . . . . .  |                  |                    |

Explanations and/or suggestions, please:

I would like an abstract of the completed study. Yes \_\_\_\_\_ ; No \_\_\_\_\_

NAME: \_\_\_\_\_ TITLE: \_\_\_\_\_

SCHOOL: \_\_\_\_\_

## EXHIBIT 3

# CURRENT AND PREFERRED POLICIES IN THE SUPERVISION AND THE EVALUATION OF BUSINESS STUDENT TEACHERS

## Questionnaire

## Business Education Graduates

## PURPOSE OF STUDY:

To analyze the current and preferred policies in the supervision and the evaluation of business student teachers on the basis of the opinions of collegiate business education teachers, cooperating high school business teachers, and business education graduates.

## DEFINITION OF TERMS USED IN QUESTIONNAIRE:

*College Supervisor:* The college faculty member supervising business education students during their student teaching.

*Cooperating Teacher:* The faculty member teaching business subjects in the secondary schools and supervising business education students during their student teaching.

*Student Teacher:* The undergraduate business education student assigned to a secondary school for supervised teaching opportunities.

## INSTRUCTIONS:

Please indicate your responses to the "Current Policies" AND "Preferred Policies" by placing a checkmark (✓) in the columns at the right. YOUR RESPONSES WILL BE KEPT CONFIDENTIAL.

## PART I -- SUPERVISION

|  | Current Policies | Preferred Policies |
|--|------------------|--------------------|
| 1. Position of the college supervisor  |                  |                    |
| a. director of student teaching . . . . .  |                  |                    |
| b. professional education supervisor . . . . .                                     |                  |                    |
| c. business education supervisor . . . . .   |                  |                    |
| d. professional education and business education supervisors . . . . .             |                  |                    |
| e. other (please specify) _____ . . . . .  |                  |                    |
| f. unknown . . . . .   |                  |                    |
| 2. Minimum professional preparation required of the college supervisor             |                  |                    |
| a. bachelor . . . . .  |                  |                    |
| b. master of teaching . . . . .  |                  |                    |
| c. master in field . . . . .   |                  |                    |
| d. specialist (60 hours above bachelor) . . . . .                                  |                  |                    |
| e. doctorate . . . . .   |                  |                    |
| f. other (please specify) _____ . . . . .  |                  |                    |
| g. unknown . . . . .   |                  |                    |
| 3. Academic level of teaching experience required of the college supervisor        |                  |                    |
| a. none . . . . .  |                  |                    |
| b. college or university . . . . .   |                  |                    |
| c. secondary . . . . .   |                  |                    |
| d. junior high . . . . .   |                  |                    |
| e. elementary . . . . .  |                  |                    |
| f. other (please specify) _____ . . . . .  |                  |                    |
| g. unknown . . . . .   |                  |                    |
| 4. Minimum number of years' teaching experience required of the college supervisor |                  |                    |
| a. none . . . . .  |                  |                    |
| b. 1-2 . . . . .   |                  |                    |

|   | Current Policies | Preferred Policies |
|---|------------------|--------------------|
| c. 3-4 .....  |                  |                    |
| d. 5 or more .....  |                  |                    |
| e. unknown .....  |                  |                    |
| 5. Position of the cooperating teacher  |                  |                    |
| a. department chairman and teaches business .....   |                  |                    |
| b. teaches only business subjects .....   |                  |                    |
| c. teaches both business and other subjects. ....   |                  |                    |
| d. other (please specify) .....   |                  |                    |
| e. unknown .....  |                  |                    |
| 6. Minimum professional preparation required of the cooperating teacher                               |                  |                    |
| a. bachelor .....   |                  |                    |
| b. master of teaching .....   |                  |                    |
| c. master in field .....  |                  |                    |
| d. specialist (60 hours above bachelor) .....   |                  |                    |
| e. other (please specify) .....   |                  |                    |
| f. unknown .....  |                  |                    |
| 7. Academic level of teaching experience required of the cooperating teacher                          |                  |                    |
| a. none .....   |                  |                    |
| b. secondary .....  |                  |                    |
| c. junior high .....  |                  |                    |
| d. elementary .....   |                  |                    |
| e. other (please specify) .....   |                  |                    |
| f. unknown .....  |                  |                    |
| 8. Minimum number of years' teaching experience required of the cooperating teacher                   |                  |                    |
| a. none .....   |                  |                    |
| b. 1-2 .....  |                  |                    |
| c. 3-4 .....  |                  |                    |
| d. 5 or more .....  |                  |                    |
| e. unknown .....  |                  |                    |
| 9. Number of student teachers assigned to a college supervisor at one time                            |                  |                    |
| a. 1-3 .....  |                  |                    |
| b. 4-6 .....  |                  |                    |
| c. 7-9 .....  |                  |                    |
| d. 10 or more (please specify) .....  |                  |                    |
| e. unknown .....  |                  |                    |
| 10. Number of student teachers assigned to the cooperating teacher at one time                        |                  |                    |
| a. 1 .....  |                  |                    |
| b. 2 .....  |                  |                    |
| c. 3 .....  |                  |                    |
| d. 4 .....  |                  |                    |
| e. 5 or more .....  |                  |                    |
| f. unknown .....  |                  |                    |
| 11. Number of cooperating teachers supervising the student teacher during student teaching assignment |                  |                    |
| a. one .....  |                  |                    |
| b. not more than two .....  |                  |                    |
| c. more than two .....  |                  |                    |
| d. other (please specify) .....   |                  |                    |
| e. unknown .....  |                  |                    |
| 12. Orientation conference held for the student teachers prior to student teaching                    |                  |                    |
| a. none .....   |                  |                    |
| b. individual conference with each student .....  |                  |                    |
| c. group conference with all students .....   |                  |                    |
| d. other (please specify) .....   |                  |                    |
| e. unknown .....  |                  |                    |
| 13. Number of observational visits by the college supervisor  |                  |                    |
| a. none .....   |                  |                    |
| b. one .....  |                  |                    |
| c. 2-3 .....  |                  |                    |
| d. 4-5 .....  |                  |                    |
| e. more than 5 (please specify) .....   |                  |                    |
| f. unknown .....  |                  |                    |

|   | Current Policies | Preferred Policies |
|---|------------------|--------------------|
| 14. Individual conference(s) that a college supervisor holds with a student teacher               |                  |                    |
| a. none . . . . .   |                  |                    |
| b. with each observational visit . . . . .  |                  |                    |
| c. at mid-point of student teaching . . . . .   |                  |                    |
| d. upon completion of student teaching . . . . .  |                  |                    |
| e. with each observational visit and at mid-point of student teaching . . . . .                   |                  |                    |
| f. with each observational visit, at mid-point, and upon completion of student teaching . . . . . |                  |                    |
| g. other (please specify) _____ . . . . .   |                  |                    |
| h. unknown . . . . .  |                  |                    |
| 15. Individual conference(s) that a cooperating teacher holds with a student teacher              |                  |                    |
| a. none . . . . .   |                  |                    |
| b. periodically throughout student teaching . . . . .   |                  |                    |
| c. at mid-point of student teaching . . . . .   |                  |                    |
| d. upon completion of student teaching . . . . .  |                  |                    |
| e. periodically throughout and at mid-point of student teaching . . . . .                         |                  |                    |
| f. periodically throughout, at mid-point, and upon completion of student teaching . . . . .       |                  |                    |
| g. other (please specify) _____ . . . . .   |                  |                    |
| h. unknown . . . . .  |                  |                    |
| 16. Campus seminar(s) held for student teachers   |                  |                    |
| a. none . . . . .   |                  |                    |
| b. prior to student teaching . . . . .  |                  |                    |
| c. during student teaching . . . . .  |                  |                    |
| d. upon completion of student teaching . . . . .  |                  |                    |
| e. prior to and during student teaching . . . . .   |                  |                    |
| f. prior to, during, and upon completion of student teaching . . . . .                            |                  |                    |
| g. other (please specify) _____ . . . . .   |                  |                    |
| h. unknown . . . . .  |                  |                    |
| 17. Individuals participating in conference following observational visit                         |                  |                    |
| a. none . . . . .   |                  |                    |
| b. college supervisor and student teacher . . . . .   |                  |                    |
| c. college supervisor and cooperating teacher . . . . .   |                  |                    |
| d. college supervisor, cooperating teacher, and student teacher . . . . .                         |                  |                    |
| e. other (please specify) _____ . . . . .   |                  |                    |
| f. unknown . . . . .  |                  |                    |
| 18. Cooperating teacher did MOST of the observation during the following part of student teaching |                  |                    |
| a. none . . . . .   |                  |                    |
| b. first two weeks . . . . .  |                  |                    |
| c. 3-5 weeks . . . . .  |                  |                    |
| d. 7-9 weeks . . . . .  |                  |                    |
| e. other (please specify) _____ . . . . .   |                  |                    |
| f. unknown . . . . .  |                  |                    |
| <b>PART II -- EVALUATION</b>  |                  |                    |
| 19. Method used to convey evaluation criteria to the student teacher                              |                  |                    |
| a. none . . . . .   |                  |                    |
| b. individual conference with each student teacher . . . . .                                      |                  |                    |
| c. group conference with all student teachers . . . . .   |                  |                    |
| d. written statement or handbook . . . . .  |                  |                    |
| e. other (please specify) _____ . . . . .   |                  |                    |
| f. unknown . . . . .  |                  |                    |
| 20. Written evaluation submitted by the college supervisor  |                  |                    |
| a. none . . . . .   |                  |                    |
| b. with each observational visit . . . . .  |                  |                    |
| c. at mid-point of student teaching . . . . .   |                  |                    |
| d. upon completion of student teaching . . . . .  |                  |                    |
| e. with each observational visit and at mid-point of student teaching . . . . .                   |                  |                    |
| f. with each observational visit, at mid-point, and upon completion of student teaching . . . . . |                  |                    |
| g. other (please specify) _____ . . . . .   |                  |                    |
| h. unknown . . . . .  |                  |                    |
| 21. Written evaluation submitted by the cooperating teacher                                       |                  |                    |
| a. none . . . . .   |                  |                    |
| b. with each observational visit . . . . .  |                  |                    |
| c. at mid-point of student teaching . . . . .   |                  |                    |

|  | Current Policies | Preferred Policies |
|--|------------------|--------------------|
| d. upon completion of student teaching .....   |                  |                    |
| e. with each observational visit and at mid-point of student teaching .....                |                  |                    |
| f. with each observational visit, at mid-point, and upon completion of student teaching .. |                  |                    |
| g. other (please specify) .....  |                  |                    |
| h. unknown .....   |                  |                    |
| 22. Type of evaluation form used during observational visits                               |                  |                    |
| a. none .....  |                  |                    |
| b. checklist rating sheet .....  |                  |                    |
| c. open-ended question form .....  |                  |                    |
| d. other (please specify) .....  |                  |                    |
| e. unknown .....   |                  |                    |
| 23. Type of form used for the FINAL evaluation   |                  |                    |
| a. none .....  |                  |                    |
| b. checklist rating sheet .....  |                  |                    |
| c. open-ended question form .....  |                  |                    |
| d. letter of recommendation .....  |                  |                    |
| e. other (please specify) .....  |                  |                    |
| f. unknown .....   |                  |                    |
| 24. Person responsible for assigning the FINAL GRADE                                       |                  |                    |
| a. director of student teaching .....  |                  |                    |
| b. professional education supervisor .....   |                  |                    |
| c. business education supervisor .....   |                  |                    |
| d. professional education and business education supervisors .....                         |                  |                    |
| e. cooperating teacher .....   |                  |                    |
| f. other (please specify) .....  |                  |                    |
| g. unknown .....   |                  |                    |
| 25. College supervisor's role in final evaluation  |                  |                    |
| a. none .....  |                  |                    |
| b. accepts recommendation of cooperating teacher .....                                     |                  |                    |
| c. makes recommendation to director of student teaching .....                              |                  |                    |
| d. other (please specify) .....  |                  |                    |
| e. unknown .....   |                  |                    |
| 26. Cooperating teacher's role in final evaluation   |                  |                    |
| a. none .....  |                  |                    |
| b. makes recommendation to college supervisor .....  |                  |                    |
| c. makes recommendation to director of student teaching .....                              |                  |                    |
| d. other (please specify) .....  |                  |                    |
| e. unknown .....   |                  |                    |
| 27. Grading scheme used  |                  |                    |
| a. letter grades (A - F) .....   |                  |                    |
| b. pass-fail (P - F) .....   |                  |                    |
| c. satisfactory-unsatisfactory (S - U) .....   |                  |                    |
| d. numerical scores (1 - 100) .....  |                  |                    |
| e. other (please specify) .....  |                  |                    |
| f. unknown .....   |                  |                    |

Explanations and/or suggestions, please:

I would like an abstract of the completed study. Yes \_\_\_\_\_; No \_\_\_\_\_

NAME: \_\_\_\_\_ TITLE: \_\_\_\_\_

SCHOOL: \_\_\_\_\_

EXHIBIT 4

COVER LETTER ACCOMPANYING QUESTIONNAIRE TO  
COLLEGIATE BUSINESS EDUCATION TEACHERS

May I have your assistance with a research study sponsored by the College of Education at The University of Oklahoma?

The purpose of the study is to determine the current and the preferred policies of the supervision and the evaluation of business student teachers at the six state colleges in Oklahoma.

Your frank and honest comments will provide an insight into the current policies being used, and your preferences could indicate any needed improvement in the supervision and the evaluation of business student teachers.

Your response to the enclosed questionnaire will be kept confidential--no person will be identified in the study. A stamped, addressed envelope is enclosed for your convenience. An abstract of the completed study will be mailed to you upon request.

Your immediate cooperation in the collection of data is essential to the success of this project. Inasmuch as a 100 per cent return is needed, will you please complete and return the questionnaire as soon as possible.

Sincerely,

(Miss) Joe Anna Hibler  
Research Assistant

Enclosures: questionnaire  
envelope



## EXHIBIT 5

COVER LETTER ACCOMPANYING QUESTIONNAIRE TO  
COOPERATING HIGH SCHOOL  
BUSINESS TEACHERS

Have you supervised a business student teacher from (name of college) within the last three years? If so, your assistance is needed to complete a research study sponsored by the College of Education at The University of Oklahoma.

The purpose of the study is to determine the current and the preferred policies of the supervision and the evaluation of business student teachers at the six state colleges in Oklahoma.

Your frank and honest comments will provide an insight into the current policies being used, and your preferences could indicate any needed improvement in the supervision and the evaluation of business student teachers.

Your response to the enclosed questionnaire will be kept confidential--no person will be identified in the study. A stamped, addressed envelope is enclosed for your convenience. An abstract of the completed study will be mailed to you upon request.

If you have not supervised a business student teacher from (name of college) within the last three years, will you please return the questionnaire unanswered, inasmuch as a 100 per cent return is desired for this study.

Your immediate cooperation in the collection of data is essential to the success of this study. Please complete and return the questionnaire as soon as possible.

Sincerely,

(Miss) Joe Anna Hibler  
Research Assistant

Enclosures: questionnaire  
envelope

\_\_\_\_ No, I have not supervised a business student teacher from (name of college) during the last three years; therefore, I am returning the questionnaire unanswered.

EXHIBIT 6

COVER LETTER ACCOMPANYING QUESTIONNAIRE TO  
BUSINESS EDUCATION GRADUATES

As a recent graduate of (name of college), you were recommended by (chairman's name) to assist in a research study sponsored by the College of Education at The University of Oklahoma.

The purpose of the study is to determine the current and the preferred policies of the supervision and the evaluation of business student teachers at the six state colleges in Oklahoma.

Your frank and honest comments will provide an insight into the current policies being used, and your preferences could indicate any needed improvement in the supervision and the evaluation of business student teachers.

Your response to the enclosed questionnaire will be kept confidential--no person will be identified in the study. A stamped, addressed envelope is enclosed for your convenience. An abstract of the completed study will be mailed to you upon request.

Your immediate cooperation in the collection of data is essential to the success of this project. Inasmuch as a 100 per cent return is desired, will you please complete and return the questionnaire as soon as possible.

Sincerely,

(Miss) Joe Anna Hibler  
Research Assistant

Enclosures: questionnaire  
envelope

EXHIBIT 7

FOLLOW-UP LETTER ACCOMPANYING QUESTIONNAIRE TO  
COLLEGIATE BUSINESS EDUCATION TEACHERS

Your assistance is needed to complete a research study sponsored by the College of Education at The University of Oklahoma.

The purpose of the study is to determine the current and the preferred policies of the supervision and the evaluation of business student teachers at the six state colleges in Oklahoma.

Will you please take a few minutes and complete the enclosed questionnaire, if you have not already done so. Your comments will be kept confidential--no person will be identified in the study. A stamped, addressed envelope is enclosed for your convenience.

Your immediate response is essential to the success of this research project. Please complete and return the questionnaire as soon as possible.

Sincerely,

(Miss) Joe Anna Hibler  
Research Assistant

Enclosures: questionnaire  
envelope

## EXHIBIT 8

FOLLOW-UP LETTER ACCOMPANYING QUESTIONNAIRE TO  
COOPERATING HIGH SCHOOL BUSINESS TEACHERS

Your assistance is needed to complete a research study sponsored by the College of Education at The University of Oklahoma.

The purpose of the study is to determine the current and the preferred policies of the supervision and the evaluation of business student teachers at the six state colleges in Oklahoma.

Will you please take a few minutes and complete the enclosed questionnaire, if you have not already done so. Your comments will be kept confidential--no person will be identified in the study. A stamped, addressed envelope is enclosed for your convenience.

Your immediate response is essential to the success of this research project. Please complete and return the questionnaire as soon as possible.

Sincerely,

(Miss) Joe Anna Hibler  
Research Assistant

Enclosures: questionnaire  
envelope

\_\_\_\_ No, I have not supervised a business student teacher from (name of college) within the last three years. Therefore, I am returning the questionnaire unanswered, inasmuch as a 100 per cent return is desired for this study.

EXHIBIT 9

FOLLOW-UP LETTER ACCOMPANYING QUESTIONNAIRE TO  
BUSINESS EDUCATION GRADUATES

Your assistance is needed to complete a research study sponsored by the College of Education at The University of Oklahoma.

The purpose of the study is to determine the current and the preferred policies of the supervision and the evaluation of business student teachers at the six state colleges in Oklahoma.

Will you please take a few minutes and complete the enclosed questionnaire, if you have not already done so. Your comments will be kept confidential--no person will be identified in the study. A stamped, addressed envelope is enclosed for your convenience.

Your immediate response is essential to the success of this research project. Please complete and return the questionnaire as soon as possible.

Sincerely,

(Miss) Joe Anna Hibler  
Research Assistant

Enclosures: questionnaire  
envelope

71-27,616

HICKS, J. C. 1922-

THE RHETORIC OF JOHN ROSS.

The University of Oklahoma, Ph.D., 1971  
Speech

University Microfilms, A XEROX Company, Ann Arbor, Michigan