

A DESCRIPTION AND EVALUATION OF THE MONTANA STATE
COLLEGE STUDENT TEACHER TRAINING PROGRAM
CONDUCTED IN THE MANHATTAN SCHOOLS

BY
MILO GRUE

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the Master of Education degree
in the School of Education
Montana State College
August, 1963

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Statement of the Problem	2
Procedures	2
Limitations	3
Definition of Terms	4
II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE	5
Student Teaching Concepts Used in Other Programs	5
Evaluative Criteria	20
Summary	23
III. DESCRIPTION OF THE STUDENT TEACHER PROGRAM . . .	25
Features of the Program	25
Certain Procedures Used in the Program	26
Summary	28
IV. EVALUATION OF THE STUDENT TEACHER PROGRAM , . .	30
Comparison of Program with Other Similar Programs Throughout the United States	31
Opinions of Student Teachers and Manhattan Staff Members Concerning the Program	34
Study of Student Teacher Activities	38
Summary	40
V. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS . . .	43
Summary	43
Conclusions	46
Recommendations	47
BIBLIOGRAPHY	49
APPENDIX	52
Appendix A: Student Teacher Activity Questionnaire	53
Appendix B: Compilation of Student Teacher Activities	55

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

There is a high degree of interest today among educators in what is happening in student teaching programs throughout the country, and there is great concern about the quality of the student teaching experience.¹

The concern for the quality of student teacher training has brought, in recent years, encouraging trends of change. Some of the more promising of those trends are: a longer, more inclusive period of time spent in student teaching; student teacher training as a joint responsibility of both colleges and local school systems; classroom experience in new teaching techniques such as team teaching and television. The student teaching program involved in this study utilized some of those trends.

This study is concerned with those changes that have taken place in student teacher training in recent years, and with how the Montana State College Student Teacher Training Program conducted in the Manhattan, Montana Schools utilized some of those changes in setting up a different type of student teacher training program.

¹The Association for Student Teaching, The Outlook in Student Teaching, p. 11.

Statement of Problem

The problem in this investigation was to describe and evaluate the Montana State College Student Teacher Training Program in the Manhattan, Montana School System during the first 16 weeks of the 1962-63 school year.

Procedures

In order to describe and evaluate the program the following procedures were used. First it was necessary to become thoroughly acquainted with all phases of the program. As the writer was employed in the Manhattan School System as the elementary principal and also as one of the supervising teachers he was able to observe and study the program as it progressed.

An examination was made of the related literature in the field to: (1) determine what similar programs were being conducted at other colleges and universities throughout the country and with what success they were able to carry out those programs, (2) locate comparative data useful in the interpretation of results of the Montana State College Student Teacher Training Program conducted in the Manhattan Schools, and (3) locate criteria upon which to evaluate this program.

Interview survey questions were prepared based on the findings from the review of related literature. The

questions were designed to obtain evaluations and opinions of certain selected participants in the program.

Personal interview surveys of the supervising teachers, the student teachers, and the school administrators who took part in the program were conducted to obtain their evaluation and opinions of the program.

The responses to the interview questions were then reviewed and tabulated to determine what these evaluations and opinions were and to note any significant opinion trends or ideas emerging from the participating groups.

In order that information concerning the various duties and activities engaged in by the participating student teachers could be studied, each student teacher was asked to compile a comprehensive list of those duties and activities.

The duty and activities lists were then studied to determine the scope and value of the activities in which the student teachers engaged while a part of the program.

Limitations

The concern of this study was limited to the Montana State College Student Teacher Training Program conducted in the Manhattan, Montana Schools during the first 16 weeks of the 1962-63 school year. The evaluation of the Program was limited by the subjective nature of the interviews. The evaluation of the student teacher activities was confined to

the responses from the questionnaire. The review of literature was limited to the reporting of certain student teaching concepts and the locating of criteria upon which to evaluate the Montana State College Student Teacher Training Program conducted in the Manhattan Schools.

Definition of Terms

In the remainder of this study the Montana State College Student Teacher Training Program conducted in the Manhattan, Montana Schools during the first 16 weeks of the 1962-63 school year shall be referred to as the "Manhattan Project."

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

In order to become better acquainted with certain recent philosophies, concepts, and trends of student teaching in the United States, a review of literature was made. The review of literature was limited to the areas of: (1) reporting certain current student teaching concepts used in other student teaching programs throughout the United States which were found to be similar to concepts used in the Manhattan Project, and (2) locating criteria upon which to evaluate the Manhattan Project. The first area reviewed will be concerned with the reporting of certain current concepts used in other student teacher training programs which were found to be similar to concepts used in the Manhattan Project.

Student Teaching Concepts Used in Other Programs

The student teaching concepts covered in this review were:

1. Longer period of time spent in student teaching
2. Professional block
3. Team teaching
4. Partnership concept between the teacher training institution and the cooperating public school
5. Teaching internships

6. Gaining classroom experience in new teaching techniques

7. Selection and training of supervising teachers

Longer period of time spent in student teaching.

Jones pointed out that the present trend is to spend a longer period of time in student teaching. In a study involving 551 teacher preparing institutions and 49,297 off-campus student teachers throughout the United States, he reported that the median time spent in off-campus student teaching was 12 weeks. The range in the study ran from 5 weeks to 36 weeks.¹

In a study entitled, "Time for Student Teaching" Raymond Kuhl summarized the opinions of 138 elementary and secondary school supervising teachers regarding arrangements for student teaching. He reported the supervising teachers indicated a strong preference (77 per cent) for a system of student teaching and observation which involved an all-day session lasting for a semester. Supervising teachers "found its value in the long, uninterrupted period of time sufficient to develop a teacher and, at the same time, benefit the pupils and cooperating teachers." Student teaching all day for a half semester in the junior year and a half semester in the senior year was selected by 13 per cent of the

¹Jones, Rodney M., "Off-Campus Student Teaching Programs—Their size and Importance," The Journal of Teacher Education 2:513, December, 1960.

respondents. The remaining 10 per cent selected a variety of other systems.²

There was a difference between the preferences of supervising teachers indicated in the Kuhl study and actual current practice as indicated by a study made by Gail Inlow. This would indicate there is still a gulf between what is and what should be in the area of student teaching time. Inlow reported in a questionnaire study in which the respondent sample consisted of eight of the Big Ten Universities, and 10 universities, five teachers colleges, and 15 liberal arts colleges in Indiana and Illinois. He found the dominant pattern of student teaching at both the elementary and secondary levels was a half-day experience—for 19 of the 38 institutions at the elementary level and 15 of the 36 at the secondary level. The next most frequent was the full day program with totals of nine institutions at the elementary level and eight at the secondary level. Six institutions at the elementary level followed both patterns. A few institutions had one or two-hour programs per day. All but two institutions had student teaching five days weekly. The range in terms of weeks was 9-27 weeks at the elementary level and 8-32 weeks at the secondary level.³

²Kuhl, Raymond E., "Time for Student Teaching," Journal of Teacher Education 12:44, March, 1961.

³Inlow, Gail M., "A Comparative Study of Student Teaching Practices in Thirty-Eight Midwest Institutions," Journal of Experimental Education 28:337, June, 1960.

Professional block. The Association for Student Teaching in its forty-first yearbook states there is a definite trend towards concentration of professional education, including student teaching, in rather short time blocks during the second half of the junior year or during the senior year in college.⁴

Expected advantages of the professional semester or other time block plans are:

1. It makes student teaching experience the nucleus around which the professional education courses revolve.
2. It fuses theory and practice.
3. It facilitates the scheduling of students for more desirable teaching experiences.
4. It extends the horizons of professionalism for students, psychologically and physically.
5. It effects desirable social contacts among student teachers, supervising teachers, coordinators, and members of the professional and academic staff more easily and more frequently.⁵

During the fall of 1960 Ivernia Tyson, Associate Professor of Education, at Arizona State University sent a survey questionnaire to 251 departments, divisions, and colleges of education in various institutions of higher learning in the United States to obtain, in part, information relative to practices concerning the professional block. Approximately

⁴The Association for Student Teaching, The Outlook in Student Teaching, Forty-First Yearbook, p. 54.

⁵Ibid., p. 54.

60 per cent of the respondents to the survey said that a professional block was incorporated in the education program of their respective institutions. In most cases, it was described as a professional semester. In 15 instances a professional quarter was mentioned. Thirty-six per cent of the responses indicated there was no professional semester or quarter. One respondent remarked, "We feel that we do well to develop concepts and competencies in four years." In the other four per cent of the cases there was a partial time block organization.⁶

Typical of the professional blocks reviewed in the review of literature for this study was the program at Arizona State University. The block for elementary education majors consisted of a total of 16 semester hours of credit: Student teaching, 10 hours; Philosophy of Education, three hours; Measurement and Evaluation, three hours. The registration procedure identified a group of students who were, for a full semester, responsible to only two instructors and to their supervising teachers. The instructors of the measurement and philosophy courses served as the college supervisors of the students during their student teaching experience.⁷ Supervising teachers generally approved of the arrangement. Nearly all of them felt that they had more time

⁶Ibid., p. 61.

⁷Ibid., p. 63.

for conferences and joint planning sessions. They also felt more secure in making full and reasonable demands upon their student teachers.

Team teaching. "Team teaching," as defined in recent literature, involves the reorganization of a professional staff in such a way as to use the talents and energies of that staff more efficiently. More specifically, "team teaching designates the activities of two or more people who simultaneously and cooperatively are planning for, teaching, and evaluating a group of learners in such a manner that the strengths of each team member are utilized."⁸

Saunders and Sechler from New Mexico Western College have attempted to indicate some of the values associated with using student teachers on the classroom team. The activities described in their article demonstrated that two or more people could plan for, teach, and evaluate a group of learners cooperatively so that the strength of each team member is utilized. They went on to say that when the team is made up of two people, the supervising teacher and the student teacher, the children's behavior can be observed from two points of view; there are two persons to help children, two to help groups of children, and two to enrich children's

⁸National Educational Association, Research Division, Studies of Utilization of Staff, Buildings, and Audio Visual Aids in the Public Schools, p. 9.

experiences.⁹

Fullerton indicated in the following statement that supervising teacher-student teacher teams offer a means of sharing the responsibility for instructing a group of learners thus permitting a chance for gradual development of the student teacher:

For a number of years outstanding supervising teachers have been helping student teachers become oriented by the team teaching approach, since it offers much security for the student teacher. In this way, the responsibility for instructing a group of learners is shared, thus permitting the student teacher a chance to develop gradually under the guidance of a supervising teacher. This kind of team teaching activity has an added element which allows the supervising teacher and the student teacher to teach the learners at the same time. Furthermore, they may seek to take advantage of their teaching strengths by planning for individual assignments. However, if it is truly to be team teaching, more must be involved than just planning for a teaching task which eventually will be assumed by the student teacher.¹⁰

Anderson, Hagstrom, and Robinson of Harvard University have recently published information about team teaching activities in an elementary school in Lexington, Massachusetts.¹¹ Major objectives of this research project

⁹Saunders, Jack O., and Sechler, Hazel, "Student Teachers on the Classroom Team," Elementary School Journal 61:33, October, 1960.

¹⁰Fullerton, Bill J., The Association for Student Teaching, The Outlook in Student Teaching, Forty-First Yearbook, p. 84.

¹¹Anderson, Robert H., Hagstrom, Ellis A., and Robinson, Wade M., "Team Teaching in an Elementary School," The School Review 71, Spring, 1960.

were to discover and to demonstrate new and more promising ways of utilizing teacher competencies, primarily through the utilization of team teaching. Included as members of their teaching teams were interns who were trainees in a program of teacher education and who were doing full time student teaching in a school for one semester.

Cunningham serves warning that much research is still needed to determine the effectiveness of team teaching as it involves the supervising teacher--student teacher team. He expressed the need for real evaluation at the learning level of the actual effectiveness of team teaching:

Seldom have the teacher education programs using this kind of student teacher team activity been based upon careful plans for team teaching. Usually more than one student teacher is assigned to the supervising teacher and if simultaneous and cooperative planning, teaching and evaluating take place, the design is considered to be team teaching. Clearly, some experimental design is needed which would permit objective evaluation of the outcomes of such an experience. Most of the thinking to date (as it relates to team teaching activity) has been at the organizational and administrative level and not at the learning level. Considerable thought has been given to improving the utilization of teaching talent but only incidental attention has been given to impact upon learning.¹²

Partnership concept. Most of what has been written on the subject indicates that the total teaching profession will become increasingly involved in teacher education as

¹²Cunningham, Luvern L., "Team Teaching: Where Do We Stand?" Administrator's Notebook 8:3, April, 1960.

indicated by the thinking of Adams and Toulouse:

Viewed in historical perspective, public school education and teacher education have made great strides toward a common goal. To men of vision, whether laymen or educators, the goal has always been to afford for oncoming generations the best possible education that our resources and ingenuity could provide. Among those men have been educational statesmen who have seen the education of teachers and the education of children and youth not as separate entities but as aspects of the larger process of education. To such men there are no problems which can be classified neatly as teacher education or public school education to be solved by either group alone.¹³

In 1961 the Association for Student Teaching submitted a questionnaire to 91 teacher training institutions in 33 states designed to seek information on practices in partnership relations between teacher education institutions and cooperative public schools.¹⁴ Approximately half of the programs studied reported definite movement toward the assumption of responsibility for teacher education by both the teacher education institution and the cooperating public school. This movement was evidenced by (1) demonstrated attempts to build strong good human relationships between personnel in the college and personnel in the public school; (2) a growing willingness to work together in an orderly

¹³Adams, Wayne, and Toulouse, Robert B., Association for Student Teaching, Facilities for Professional Laboratory Experiences in Teacher Education, Thirty-Third Yearbook, p. 92.

¹⁴The Association for Student Teaching, Teacher Education and the Public Schools, Fortieth Yearbook, p. 21.

fashion as reflected in a written contract; and (3) the cooperative building of guide materials which establish mutually accepted procedures.

The same 1961 Association for Student Teaching questionnaire study gave the following list of practices which may point the way to tomorrows trends:

1. An increasing number of states encouraging cooperative study of the laboratory phase of teacher education at the grass-roots level and then providing for the evolution of study into a more highly developed statement of standards. (Examples of such growth may be found in the areas of selection of student teacher centers and selection of supervising teachers.)
2. An increasing number of preparation programs designed for the supervising teacher
3. The cooperative use of supervising or coordinating personnel
4. An approach toward financing which will provide time for effective supervisory service performed by the supervising teacher in the cooperating public school¹⁵

Edelfelt considered the benefits which a school system derives from cooperating in a program of student teaching. He felt that the right kind of supervising of student teaching could definitely improve instruction in the cooperating school, as indicated by the following statement:

When supervision of student teaching is competent and creative, the possibilities for improving instruction are impressive. Improving instruction

¹⁵Ibid., p. 21.

and changing the curriculum involves changes in the values of teachers' discovery and mastery of different approaches and processes, better understanding of children and subject matter, modifications in one's view of what education is for—and a change in the people who are teachers.¹⁶

Teaching internships. The Ford Foundation in its 1959 annual report, a report based on a 15 million dollar study to develop "new patterns in the preparation of teachers," was interested in the internship concept. The report outlined one use of internships in a regular four year program:

The use of internships is exemplified by the University of Wisconsin's program. The University, which has long stressed mastery of subject matter in teacher education, is assigning third and fourth-year students to a number of cooperating schools in several cities and towns. Between one-third and one-half of their professional training will be acquired through actual experience in internships comparable to hospital internships for physicians.¹⁷

The Central Michigan University plan was quite representative of internship efforts across the country. This program involved a fifth year, which is basic to many internship programs:

Under the Central Michigan University five-year plan students will have more teaching experience than in the typical teacher education program.

¹⁶Edelfelt, Roy, "Student Teaching Can Contribute to the Improvement of Instruction," Journal of Teacher Education 11:67, March, 1960.

¹⁷The Ford Foundation, The Ford Foundation Annual Report-1959, p. 17.

The first two years will be spent on campus in a program especially suited to the need of each student. The remaining three years will consist of alternating semesters of study on campus and teaching off campus. During the off-campus periods the student will take a closely related professional course or a course in a subject field in which he is teaching. These courses will be taught by regular faculty members in regional centers or on campus in late afternoon or Saturday classes.¹⁸

In each of the three off-campus semesters, under the Central Michigan University plan, the student would both learn and earn as a full-time paid employee of a selected public school. General education made up 30 per cent of the five-year program. Specialized education in the major fields required 35 per cent of the time. Fifteen per cent was devoted to organized course work in psychology and education, and 20 per cent was devoted to on-the-job experience.¹⁹

Classroom experience in new teaching techniques. The Ford Foundation Annual Report of 1959 listed, as one of the promising new trends in teacher education, the recognition of the importance for giving student teachers classroom experience in new teaching techniques and arrangements, such as team teaching, television, films, and tape recorders.²⁰

Klein points out that it would seem self-evident that

¹⁸Sleeper, William R., Association for Student Teaching, Teacher Education and the Public Schools, Fortieth Yearbook, p. 73.

¹⁹Ibid., p. 74.

²⁰The Ford Foundation, op. cit., p. 17.

any person preparing to teach in the schools of this country should be skilled in the use of audio-visual aids and other new teaching techniques. He goes on to say that there is a positive correlation between the amount of college instruction and student teacher practice a future teacher has had in the use of audio-visual materials and the extent to which those aids are later used by the teacher in her own classroom.²¹

Selection and training of supervising teachers. Gordon Foster, director of student teaching at Arizona State College, pointed out that "as it becomes increasingly necessary to place student teachers in off-campus centers, the problems of selection and qualification of supervising teachers become more crucial." Foster felt that the supervising teachers should have: (1) at least a bachelor's degree, (2) at least two years of successful teaching experience, and (3) a specific course in supervision of student teaching.²²

Perrodin, writing in the Journal of Teacher Education, underscored the importance of educating supervising teachers for their important work with student teachers. He presented evidence based on the Georgia Supervising Teacher Education Program consisting of three types of experience, each of

²¹Klein, Raymond L., Association for Student Teaching, The Outlook in Student Teaching, Forty-first Yearbook, p. 120.

²²Foster, Gordon F., Association for Student Teaching, The Outlook in Student Teaching, Forty-first Yearbook, p. 58.

which carried five quarter hours of graduate credit: (1) a workshop for beginning supervising teachers, (2) a year of internship, and (3) a follow-up workshop on supervisory problems. The Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory given to 113 elementary education majors prior to and after the student teaching experience (12 weeks full time) showed that student teachers tended to make greater increases when placed with supervising teachers who had completed the supervising teacher preparation program.²³

Durrance and Blake felt that the "most crucial" aspect of the student teacher program was the selection of the supervising teachers. They stated the supervising teacher should be a superior teacher with a positive professional attitude who could work well with other people, and who would willingly cooperate with all phases of the student teaching program; or, in their words, a supervising teacher should:

1. Be a superior teacher in his own right
2. Possess a positive professional attitude
3. Be a cooperative participant in the total school program
4. Want to participate in the student teaching program
5. Be able and willing to make frank and objective evaluations of the student teacher's work and progress

²³Perrodin, Alex F., "In Support of Supervising Teacher Education Programs," Journal of Teacher Education 12:36, March, 1961.

6. Be able to work with another adult in the classroom
7. Be willing to cooperate with the university or college in providing the program of experiences desired for the student teachers²⁴

The University of Wyoming working cooperatively with public school personnel developed certain criteria for selecting supervising teachers in off-campus schools and uses them in the selection of those teachers. Their criteria suggested that the teacher who is selected to work with student teachers should be a person who:

1. Has a minimum of three years of successful classroom teaching
2. Has a minimum of a bachelor's degree and preferably a master's degree
3. Shows evidence of genuine professional interest and growth:
 - a. Has a positive professional attitude and a real liking for teaching;
 - b. Is a responsible and willing participant in the affairs of the school and works harmoniously with others;
 - c. Takes advantage of opportunities to improve through in-service training, course work, workshops, conferences, etc.
4. Can demonstrate and analyze basic principles of teaching and learning
5. Is willing to work with a student teacher, to give time and effort necessary, and to focus on the student teacher as a learner—a student of teaching

²⁴Durrance, Charles L., and Blake, Garth K., "Selecting Directing Teachers," Florida Education 38:17, May, 1961.

6. Be able to work with another adult in the classroom
7. Be willing to cooperate with the university or college in providing the program of experiences desired for the student teachers²⁴

The University of Wyoming working cooperatively with public school personnel developed certain criteria for selecting supervising teachers in off-campus schools and uses them in the selection of those teachers. Their criteria suggested that the teacher who is selected to work with student teachers should be a person who:

1. Has a minimum of three years of successful classroom teaching
2. Has a minimum of a bachelor's degree and preferably a master's degree
3. Shows evidence of genuine professional interest and growth:
 - a. Has a positive professional attitude and a real liking for teaching;
 - b. Is a responsible and willing participant in the affairs of the school and works harmoniously with others;
 - c. Takes advantage of opportunities to improve through in-service training, course work, workshops, conferences, etc.
4. Can demonstrate and analyze basic principles of teaching and learning
5. Is willing to work with a student teacher, to give time and effort necessary, and to focus on the student teacher as a learner—a student of teaching

²⁴Durrance, Charles L., and Blake, Garth K., "Selecting Directing Teachers," Florida Education 38:17, May, 1961.

6. Has vision and enthusiasm for the profession, is able to provide a wide variety of experiences, and will share the student teaching experiences with the student teacher.²⁵

This section of the review of literature has covered certain concepts and trends in student teacher training used in other teacher training institutions throughout the United States that were similar to the concepts and trends used in the Manhattan Project. In brief review these concepts and trends were: (1) more time spent in student teaching, (2) professional block, (3) team teaching, (4) partnership concept between teacher training institution and the cooperating public school, (5) teaching internships, (6) gaining classroom experience in new teaching techniques, and (7) selection and training of supervising teachers. These, and other concepts and trends were used to form a criteria with which to evaluate, in part, the Manhattan Project.

Evaluative Criteria

In order to evaluate the Manhattan Project it was first necessary to establish a criteria upon which to do the evaluating. In this study current concepts and trends in student teacher training were used to form the evaluation. This part of the review of literature will be devoted to an examination of some of the new directions and trends that

²⁵The University of Wyoming, Criteria for Selection of Teachers in Off-Campus Schools, mime.

might be usable in forming such a criteria.

The Ford Foundation in its 1959 Annual Report lists several promising new trends in teacher education. Three pertained directly to student teaching: (1) acceptance of teacher training, through cooperative programs and financing, as a joint responsibility of both colleges and local school systems, (2) classroom experience in new teaching techniques; such as team teaching, television, films, and tape recorders, and (3) teaching internships, with emphasis on supervised practice for professional training.²⁶

Shizuko reported the findings from a review of literature on teacher education and visits made to five Midwestern institutions in order to ascertain practices in teacher education. His findings indicated more time and training should be spent in the area of student teaching, and noted the following trends: (1) increased amount of varied, guided, and meaningful experiences with children and youth prior to student teaching, (2) offering basic professional courses in a curriculum common to students in both elementary and secondary education, (3) providing concurrent or post-student teaching seminars or both, (4) increasing the amount of student teaching to a full day and establishing a professional quarter or semester, (5) making special methods courses more meaningful to prospective teachers by relating them more

²⁶The Ford Foundation, op. cit., p. 17.

closely to student teaching, and (6) increasing interdepartmental responsibility for teacher education.²⁷

Other new concepts and trends upon which to build a criteria to evaluate the Manhattan Project have been reported in the earlier pages of this review of literature, and in brief review they include: (1) longer period of time spent in student teaching, (2) professional block, (3) team teaching, (4) partnership concept between the teacher training institution and the cooperating public school, (5) teaching internships, (6) gaining classroom experience in new teaching techniques, and (7) selection and training of supervising teachers.

This section of the review of literature has reported certain current concepts and trends that could be used in establishing a criteria upon which to evaluate, in part, the Manhattan Project. The current concepts and trends, briefly stated, were: (1) acceptance of teacher training as a joint responsibility of colleges and local school systems, (2) need for the student teacher to have classroom experience in new teaching techniques, (3) teaching internships, with greater emphasis on more supervised practice for professional training, (4) increasing experiences with children prior to student teaching, (5) basic professional courses in a curriculum common to students in both elementary and secondary

²⁷Shizuko, Harry N., "Some Trends in Teacher Education," Educational Research Bulletin, Ohio State University 37:158, September, 1958.

education, (6) providing concurrent or post-student teaching seminars, (7) increasing the amount of time spent in student teaching, (8) relating methods courses more closely to student teaching, (9) increasing interdepartmental responsibility for teacher education, (10) professional block, (11) team teaching, (12) selection and training of supervising teachers.

Summary

The review of literature was limited to two areas related to student teacher training. The first of these areas was the reporting of certain student teaching concepts used in other teacher training institutions in the United States that were similar to concepts used in the Manhattan Project. The similar concepts reported were: (1) more time spent in student teaching, (2) professional block, (3) team teaching, (4) partnership concept, (5) teaching internships, (6) classroom experience in new teaching techniques, and (7) selection and training of supervising teachers.

The second of the areas reported in the review of literature was the establishment of criteria upon which to evaluate the Manhattan Project. In this study certain current concepts and trends in student teacher training were used to form the evaluating criteria. The criteria encompassed the concepts reported in the first area above plus the following additional concepts and trends: (1) more

experiences with children prior to student teaching, (2) basic professional courses in a curriculum common to students in both elementary and secondary education. (3) relating methods courses more closely to student teaching, and (4) more interdepartmental responsibility for teacher education.

The current concepts and trends reported in this review of literature were used, in part, to form the evaluations of the Manhattan Project which are described in the next chapter.

CHAPTER III

DESCRIPTION OF THE STUDENT TEACHER PROGRAM

The Manhattan Project was a cooperative, experimental project conducted by the Education Department of Montana State College in cooperation with the Faculty and Board of Education of the Manhattan, Montana Schools.

The principle purpose of the program was to provide a laboratory situation for the student teacher that would give him a longer, broader, and more varied student teaching experience than the regular Montana State College student teacher program; thereby, making more effective teachers out of the participating student teachers when they got into their own classrooms.

The ground work for the program was laid in the spring of 1962 with a series of meetings that included certain faculty members from the Education Department of Montana State College, certain faculty members of the Manhattan Schools, and the Manhattan School Trustees.

Features of the Program

The main features of the Manhattan Project were:

1. The student teachers were in the Manhattan Schools for 16 weeks, and many of them lived in Manhattan during that time. They were in the school system from the opening of school in the fall and participated in all opening meetings

and procedures.

2. Each student teacher in the elementary field worked with one supervising teacher for the full 16 weeks. They observed in other classrooms during that time. Each student teacher in the secondary field had two or more supervising teachers in their major and minor fields during the 16 weeks.

3. The student teachers spent a full day in the Manhattan Schools with no on-campus work.

4. During the 16 week period the student teachers took college courses in Principles of Education and School Curriculum. These courses were taught by members of the Education Department of Montana State College and were conducted at the Manhattan Schools. The Manhattan Schools provided a live laboratory for these courses.

5. Student teachers spent about two-thirds of each day in teaching related activities and about one-third of each day on problems and course work.

6. Features of the usual six week secondary student teaching program and those of the usual elementary program were incorporated into one program.

Certain Procedures Used in the Program

In order to fulfill the principle purpose of the program, that of providing for the student teacher a longer,

broad, and more varied student teaching experience, the following procedures were used:

1. Having the student teacher spend a longer period of time in his student teaching experience.

2. Encouraging the student teacher to participate and share responsibilities in teaching, staff meetings, extra-curricular activities, Parent-Teacher Association, parent-teacher conferences, community activities, and other similar activities in a teacher's schedule—to a larger extent than would be possible under the usual Montana State College Program.

3. Giving the student teacher more supervision and guidance than would be possible under the usual Montana State College program; by both the college supervisors and the Manhattan School faculty. This, in part, was realized by (a) utilizing a team teaching approach in the classroom, (b) individual help for the student teacher by college supervisors, supervising teachers, college instructors who were teaching the courses, and the administrators of the Manhattan Schools, (c) the student teacher and the supervising teacher sharing the responsibility for the progress of every child in the classroom on a cooperative basis, and (d) giving the student teacher a chance to observe other teachers than the supervising teacher.

4. The assignment of curriculum problems and projects associated with, and of benefit to, the Manhattan Schools.

These included: (a) cataloging resource materials such as filmstrips, reference materials, recordings, and other audio-visual aids, (b) classification and cataloging of classroom and central library books, (c) preparing displays, bulletin boards, and teaching aids, and (d) assignment of curriculum projects such as the identification of study skills and preparing scope and sequence charts for use in the Manhattan Schools.

Summary

The principle purpose of the Manhattan Project was to provide a laboratory situation for the student teacher that would give him a longer, broader, and more varied student teaching experience than the regular Montana State College student teacher program.

The principle features of the program were: (1) student teachers were in the Manhattan Schools for 16 weeks, (2) student teachers in the elementary field were with one supervising teacher for the full 16 weeks; student teachers in the secondary field had two or more supervising teachers, (3) student teachers spent full day in Manhattan Schools with no on-campus work, (4) student teachers took college courses while at Manhattan, (5) student teachers spent about two-thirds of each day in teacher related activities and about one-third of each day on problems and course work, and

(6) features of the usual elementary program and those of the usual six week secondary program were incorporated into one program.

The principle procedures used in the program were:

(1) having the student teacher spend a longer period of time in his student teaching experience, (2) encouraging student teacher to participate and share responsibilities, (3) giving the student teacher more supervision and guidance, and (4) assignment of curriculum problems and projects associated with, and of benefit to, the Manhattan Schools.

An evaluation of these purposes, procedures, and features is made in the following chapter.

CHAPTER IV

EVALUATION OF THE STUDENT TEACHER PROGRAM

The evaluation of any comprehensive student teacher training program is difficult. In addition to subjective elements inherent in any evaluation procedure there were difficulties engendered by inconsistencies in the use of terminology, by inadequate descriptions of other programs, and by variations in interpretations of results. Furthermore, Washburne surmised that the final proof was in the final product, and said, "Before we can really know how effective the program is, we must first see what happens to children taught by the teachers we train."¹

In order to evaluate the Manhattan Project the following procedures were used: (1) a comparison was made of the Manhattan Project with certain other similar student teacher programs of other teacher training institutions throughout the United States, (2) opinions of the program from certain student teachers, supervising teachers, and administrators who participated in the program were reported, and (3) a study was made of the activities in which student teachers engaged while a part of the program. The first of these procedures to be reported was the comparison of the Manhattan Project with other similar programs throughout the United

¹Washburne, Carleton W., "Democratic Planning for Teacher Education," Educational Leadership 8:187, December, 1955.

States.

Comparison of Program with Other Similar Programs Throughout the United States

The comparison of the Manhattan Project with certain other similar student teacher training programs throughout the United States was made by comparing the way the Manhattan Project employed certain concepts and trends that were being currently used by those other similar teacher training programs. The purpose of this comparison was to determine the extent to which the Manhattan Project utilized those concepts and trends.

The current concepts and trends in student teacher training indicated in the review of literature as being used by certain student teacher training programs throughout the United States that were similar to certain concepts and trends used in the Manhattan Project are given below, together with the manner in which the Manhattan Project utilized each concept and trend.

1. Teacher training, through cooperative programs and financing, is a joint responsibility of both colleges and local school systems.

The Manhattan Project was a cooperatively planned program and was a joint responsibility of both Montana State College and the Manhattan Schools. The program was not jointly financed.

2. The student teacher is spending a longer period

of time in his student teaching experience.

Under the Manhattan Project the student teacher spent 16 weeks in his student teaching experience. This was a considerably longer period of time than the usual six weeks spent by the secondary education students in the regular Montana State College student teacher program, and longer, by several weeks, than the usual elementary education student teacher program.

3. Student teachers are having more actual classroom experiences in the use of new teaching techniques; such as team teaching, television, films, and tape recorders.

Under the Manhattan Project the student teachers gained classroom teaching experience in the use of certain new teaching techniques. A team teaching approach was used at times in certain classrooms between the supervising teacher and the student teacher. Television was used to teach French in two sixth grade classes. Films and filmstrips were used in most classrooms. The tape recorder, record player, over-head projector, micro-projector, tachistoscope, and various other aids were also utilized by the student teachers.

4. Education courses are being made more meaningful by relating them more closely to student teaching.

While taking part in the Manhattan Project the student teachers took college courses in Principles of Education and School Curriculum. These courses were taught by members of the Education Department of Montana State College and were conducted at the Manhattan Schools. The Manhattan School classrooms provided a live laboratory for these courses.

5. Students in teacher training are being offered more basic professional courses in a curriculum common to students in both elementary and secondary education.

While taking part in the Manhattan Project all student teachers, regardless of whether they were in elementary or secondary education, took the same professional courses. These courses were Principles of

Education and School Curriculum.

6. Student teaching is in the form of a teaching internship situation, comparable to hospital internships for physicians, with emphasis on supervised practice for professional training.

Under the Manhattan Project the student teacher became a responsible member of the Manhattan School Staff and a part of the community life of Manhattan during the 16 weeks they were a part of the program. They were thus able to assume an internship situation to a greater degree than those students enrolled in the regular Montana State College student teacher program.

7. More effort and time is being spent in the selection and training of supervising teachers.

Under the Manhattan Project the selection of supervising teachers was done by the administrators of the Manhattan Schools. As certain student teachers had to do their student teaching in certain subject matter areas; and since, in most cases, only one teacher taught in that area, there was very little opportunity for any choice in the selection of supervising teachers. There was no training given to the supervising teachers prior to the program, other than short meetings to discuss the program.

Seven current concepts and trends in student teacher training were used to compare the Manhattan Project with similar programs being used in other teacher training institutions throughout the United States. Of these seven, six were employed, to some degree, in the Manhattan Program. They were: (1) teacher training is a joint responsibility of both colleges and local school systems, (2) a longer period of time spent in student teaching, (3) more classroom experiences in the use of new teaching techniques, (4)

relating education courses more closely to student teaching, (5) more basic professional courses common to students in both elementary and secondary education, and (6) recognition of the student teaching experience as a teaching internship. The seventh current concept and trend—the selection and training of supervising teachers—was not employed to a very large degree in the Manhattan Project. There was very little selection possible of supervising teachers because of the small number of teachers involved in the program. There was no training given to the supervising teachers prior to the start of the program, either by the College or by the Manhattan School, other than short meetings to discuss the program.

Opinions of the Manhattan Project from certain student teachers, supervising teachers, and school administrators who participated in the program will be reported next.

Opinions of Student Teachers and Manhattan Staff Members Concerning the Program

Personal interviews were held with certain student teachers, supervising teachers, and Manhattan School administrators who participated in the Manhattan Project. The purpose of the interviews was to obtain from certain participating groups their evaluation and opinions of the program, and to note if there were any significant opinion trends emerging from those participating groups.

The term "participating staff" was used to include all those supervising teachers and school administrators from the Manhattan Schools who participated in the program. Eighteen student teachers and participating staff members were interviewed.

In order to facilitate the reporting of the interview questions each question is stated, and below each question is listed the most frequently given response. The responses are listed in a descending order of the frequency in which they were given.

1. What were those points about the program that you felt were the strongest and the most helpful to the student teacher?

- a. A longer period of time spent in student teaching
- b. Team teaching approach
- c. Having college classes along with student teaching
- d. More chance to see whole school system in action
- e. Being able to take part in community affairs
- f. Participating in parent-teacher conferences

2. What were those parts of the program that you felt were the weakest and the least helpful to the student teacher?

- a. Lack of organization at the beginning of program
- b. Did not know what was expected
- c. College classes were started too late
- d. Did not get to work in two or three grades as we were told we would (elementary)

- e. Student teachers did not have enough time to observe other classes enough

3. What were the advantages, as you saw them, of this program over the regular student teaching program now in effect at Montana State College?

- a. A longer period of student teaching
- b. Team teaching approach
- c. More like being a real teacher
- d. Being able to take college classes at same time
- e. More student teacher-community relationships

4. What were the disadvantages, as you saw them, of this program over the regular student teaching program now in effect at Montana State College?

- a. Taking two education courses along with everything else was too much
- b. For the amount of student teaching done more college credits should be given
- c. The program was more disorganized
- d. Student teachers were torn in too many directions at one time

5. What are ways you feel the Manhattan Project can be improved?

- a. Better organization
- b. Better information to all involved as to what is expected
- c. Start college classes earlier in the quarter
- d. Have only one college class instead of two
- e. Have more chance to observe other classes

- f. Do not assign student teachers to inexperienced supervising teachers

6. What do you feel were the advantages or disadvantages of taking college classes at Manhattan along with student teaching?

- a. It was an advantage to have classes and then be able to apply what was learned in the classroom
- b. It was an advantage to have college teachers in the school more often for consultation
- c. Gave student teachers chance to take needed courses they might not have been able to get otherwise
- d. Two classes took too much time away from student teaching duties and responsibilities

7. In what ways do you feel the Manhattan School was helped by this program?

- a. Manhattan students received more individual help than would have been otherwise possible
- b. Manhattan teachers gained new ideas from student teachers
- c. Projects were undertaken that helped the Manhattan School
- d. Brought good publicity to the school

8. Were there any ways you felt the Manhattan School might have been harmed by the program?

- a. Adjustments that will have to be made after the student teachers leave could cause some disturbance
- b. Some unfavorable publicity resulted as a result of a student teacher dating a high school student

The interview responses pointed out several definite

evaluative opinions of the Manhattan Project. Fifteen of the 18 participating student teachers and staff members interviewed felt the longer period of time spent in the student teaching program was the biggest single advantage, while the same number felt an apparent lack of organization and information at the beginning of the program was the biggest disadvantage. The majority of student teachers favored taking college classes along with student teaching; but they felt the classes were started too late, and that two classes at one time was too much of a load to carry along with student teaching. As one student teacher put it, "How can one eat, sleep, and dream student teaching when one has to worry about six credits of college courses?" The participating staff members of the Manhattan School felt the college classes were one of the strong points of the program. All, but one of the respondents, felt the Manhattan School was benefited by the program.

The last of the evaluative procedures will be a study of certain aspects of the activities engaged in by the student teachers while a part of the Manhattan Project.

Study of Student Teacher Activities

One of the major purposes of the Manhattan Project was to provide the student teacher with a broader and more varied student teaching experience. How well the program

accomplished this purpose can be determined, in part, by how broad and varied the activities were in which the student teachers took part. A list of the activities in which the student teachers took part can be found in the appendix.²

A study of this list indicates the number and scope of activities engaged in by the student teachers while a part of the Manhattan Project. The list of activities was compiled from the responses of the participating student teachers in reply to a questionnaire.³ Such a list of activities would not be likely to be 100 per cent accurate or complete, but it would indicate a general pattern.

The Compilation of Student Teacher Activities lists 83 different activities in which the student teacher engaged while a participant in the Manhattan Project, and, for ease of interpretation, is arbitrarily divided into three categories: (1) instructional related activities, (2) non-instructional related activities, and (3) extra-curricular activities. Some activities can be placed into more than one category. "Instructional related" activities includes those activities directly related to classroom instruction such as teaching and making lesson plans, and constitutes 37 per cent of all the activities listed. "Non-instructional related" activities includes those activities that were school or classroom connected but non-instructional in nature such as standing

²See Appendix B.

³See Appendix A.

playground duty and taking roll, and included 50 per cent of the total list. "Extra-curricular" activities includes those activities which were extra-curricular in nature such as attending P.T.A. meetings and community affairs, and included activities both in and out of the Manhattan School System. This group comprised 11 per cent of the list.

Summary

In order to evaluate the Manhattan Project three evaluative procedures were used. The first procedure was to compare the Manhattan Project with certain other similar teacher training programs throughout the United States. The purpose of this comparison was to determine the extent to which the Manhattan Project utilized current concepts and trends that were being used in other similar programs. The comparison used the following current concepts and trends as a criteria: (1) teacher training is a joint responsibility of both colleges and local school systems, (2) longer period of time spent in student teaching, (3) more classroom experience in new teaching techniques, (4) education courses related more closely to student teaching, (5) more basic professional courses in a curriculum common to students in both elementary and secondary education, (6) student teaching as an internship situation, and (7) more effort and time spent in selection and training of supervising teachers. Of the seven

current concepts and trends used for the comparison, the first six listed above were employed, to some degree, in the Manhattan Project. The seventh concept was employed only to a very small degree.

The second procedure was to report certain opinions of student teachers and staff members who participated in the student teaching program. The opinions indicated that the strongest points of the program were its greater length and broader range of experiences; while the weakest point was lack of organization at the beginning of the program. Other opinions indicated the student teachers liked taking college classes along with student teaching; but felt the classes were started too late, and that two at the same time was too much course work to carry along with their student teaching. The participating staff members of the Manhattan School felt the college courses taught along with the student teaching was one of the strong points of the Program. Almost all the respondents felt the Manhattan Schools benefited from the Program.

The third evaluative procedure was a study of student teacher activities, to help determine if the student teacher received a broader more varied student teaching experience. The 83 activities reported in a student teacher questionnaire were divided into three categories: (1) instructional related activities, (2) non-instructional related activities, and (3) extra-curricular activities.

A summary, conclusions, and recommendations will be made next on the basis of the findings from these evaluative procedures.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This study is concerned with certain changes that have taken place in student teacher training in recent years, and with how the Manhattan Project utilized some of these changes in setting up a different type of student teacher training program. The principle purpose of the Manhattan Project was to provide a laboratory situation for the student teacher that would give him a longer, broader, and more varied student teacher experience than the regular Montana State College student teacher training program; thereby, making more effective teachers out of the participating student teachers when they got into their own classrooms.

Summary

The problem in this investigation was to describe and evaluate the Manhattan Project. In order to do this the following procedures were used:

1. A study of the Manhattan Project was made in order to become thoroughly acquainted with all phases of the Program.
2. An examination was made of the related literature in the field to determine what similar programs were being conducted at other teacher training institutions, and to locate comparative data and criteria upon which to evaluate

the Manhattan Project.

3. Interview survey questions were prepared, interviews conducted, and responses reviewed and tabulated in order to obtain opinions and evaluations of the Manhattan Project from certain selected participants in the Program.

4. A study was made of the duties and activities engaged in by the student teachers while participating in the Manhattan Project. Information for this study was obtained by an activities questionnaire submitted to all participating student teachers.

Three evaluative procedures were used to evaluate the Manhattan Project. The first procedure was to compare the Manhattan Project with certain other similar teacher training programs throughout the United States to determine the extent to which the Manhattan Project utilized certain current concepts and trends that were being used in the other similar programs. It was found that the Manhattan Project employed, to some degree, six of the seven current concepts and trends used in the evaluative criteria. They were: (1) teacher training is a joint responsibility of both colleges and local school systems, (2) longer period of time spent in student teaching, (3) more classroom experience in new teaching techniques, (4) education courses more closely related to student teaching, (5) more basic professional courses in a curriculum common to both secondary and elementary education students, and (6) student teaching as an internship situation.

The seventh concept—more time and effort spent in the training and selection of supervising teachers—was not employed to a very large degree in the Manhattan Project.

The second evaluating procedure was the reporting of certain opinions of the program by the participating student teachers and staff members. The opinions indicated that the strongest points of the program were its greater length and the offering of broader, more varied experiences; while the weakest point was the lack of organization at the beginning of the program. Other significant opinions indicated the student teachers favored taking college classes along with student teaching; but felt the classes were started too late in the program, and that two classes were too much to carry along with student teaching. The participating staff members felt the college classes were one of the strong points of the program. Almost all participants felt the Manhattan School benefited by the Manhattan Project.

The third evaluative procedure was a study of student teacher activities to help determine if the student teacher received a broader, more varied student teaching experience. The 83 activities reported in a student teacher activity questionnaire were divided into three categories for ease of interpretation. These three categories, along with the per cent of the total activities in each, were: (1) instructional related activities—37 per cent, (2) non-instructional related activities—50 per cent, and (3) extra-curricular activities

11 per cent.

Conclusions

In view of the findings summarized above the following conclusions can be drawn:

1. Since the Manhattan Project was found to employ, to some degree, six of the seven current concepts and trends that were used to form an evaluative criteria; and, since research and use have supported the effectiveness of these concepts and trends, it would appear that the Manhattan Project, by comparison with other programs, was at least partially successful.

2. Since the majority of the participants in the Manhattan Project, who were interviewed, reacted favorably to the program, it can be concluded that the program was favorably received by those taking part in it. On the basis of those interviews the following conclusions can be made:

(a) the strongest points of the program were the longer period of time spent in student teaching and the broader, more varied student teaching experience, (b) the weakest point was lack of organization at the beginning of the program, (c) the college classes taught in conjunction with student teaching were desirable but should be started earlier in the program and should not be of such a load as to affect the effectiveness of the student teaching experience, (d) the program was of

benefit to the Manhattan School.

3. On the basis of the increased length of time of the program and the student teacher activity study it would appear that the student teacher received a longer, broader, and more varied student teacher experience than he would have received under the regular Montana State College student teacher program, and, therefore, fulfilled to some degree one of the major purposes of the Manhattan Project.

Recommendations

In view of the findings and the conclusions reached the following recommendations are made:

1. In view of the apparent merits of the Manhattan Project it is recommended that further programs of a similar nature be conducted by Montana State College to improve and further test the effectiveness of such programs.

2. It is recommended that some type of program be developed by the Education Department of Montana State College to train supervising teachers. This could be in the form of a regular college course, or it could be in the form of a college conducted in-service program, or both.

3. It is recommended that a criteria be set up by the Education Department of Montana State College and certain cooperating public schools working jointly together for the selection of supervising teachers, and that this criteria be

followed by the College or by the participating school in the selection of supervising teachers.

4. It is recommended that more cooperative organizational work be done between the College and the participating school so that all participating groups are fully informed, in ample time, of all phases of the program.

5. It is recommended that a rating committee be set up to rate each student teacher, and that this committee be made up of college supervisors, supervising teachers, and participating school administrators. This committee would meet together to jointly rate or grade the student teacher.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Anderson, Robert H.; Hagstrom, Ellis A.; and Robinson, Wade M., "Team Teaching in an Elementary School," The School Review 20:71-84, Spring, 1960.
- Andrews, L. O., "Facilities for Professional Laboratory Experiences," Education 72:315-324, January, 1952.
- Association for Student Teaching, Evaluating Student Teaching, Thirty-ninth Yearbook, The Association, Cedar Falls, Iowa, 1960, 286 pp.
- Association for Student Teaching, The Outlook in Student Teaching, Forty-first Yearbook, The Association, Cedar Falls, Iowa, 1962, 234 pp.
- Association for Student Teaching, Teacher Education and the Public School, Fortieth Yearbook, The Association, Cedar Falls, Iowa, 1961, 291 pp.
- Cornish, Jane, "Overcoming the First-Year Teaching Dilemma," Education 80:115-117, October, 1959.
- Cox, Dan, "Why Should Public Schools Accept Student Teachers?" Educational Administration and Supervision 45:275-279, September, 1959.
- Cunningham, Luvern L., "Team Teaching: Where Do We Stand?" Administrator's Notebook 8:3, April, 1960.
- Del Popolo, Joseph A., "Experiences a Student Teacher Should Have," Journal of Teacher Education 11:75-78, March, 1960.
- Durrance, Charles L. and Blake, Garth K., "Selecting Directing Teachers," Florida Education 38:17-18, May, 1961.
- Edelfelt, Roy, "Student Teaching Can Contribute to the Improvement of Instruction," Journal of Teacher Education 11:75-76, March, 1960.
- Fitzpatrick, William J., "The Battle Over Student Teaching," School and Society 88:50-51, January, 1960.
- Ford Foundation Annual Report-1959, The Ford Foundation, New York, 1959, 75 pp.

- Hazelton, Paul, "Student Teaching: A Hard Look," Journal of Teacher Education 11:470-473, December, 1960.
- Inlow, Gail M., "A Comparative Study of Student Teaching Practices in Thirty-Eight Midwest Institutions," Journal of Experimental Education 28:337-349, June, 1960.
- Jones, Rodney, M., "Off-Campus Student Teaching Programs-- Their Size and Importance," Journal of Teacher Education 2:512-519, December, 1960.
- Kearney, Nolan C., "Evaluation Criteria for Teacher Educational Institutions," Journal of Teacher Education 9:395-401, December, 1958.
- Kuhl, Raymond E., "Time for Student Teaching," Journal of Teacher Education 12:43-47, March, 1961.
- Miller, Lebern N., "Teachers and Principals on the Block," Journal of Teacher Education 10:483-485, December, 1959.
- Perrodin, Alex F., "In Support of Supervising Teacher Education Programs," Journal of Teacher Education 12:36-38, March, 1961.
- Sands, John E., "A Survey of Off-Campus Student Teaching Practices in 112 Institutions," Education 73:636-644, June, 1953.
- Saunders, Jack O., and Sechler, Hazel, "Student Teachers on the Classroom Team," Elementary School Journal 61: 32-34, October, 1960.
- Shizuko, Harry N., "Some Trends in Teacher Education," Educational Research Bulletin 37:153-160, September, 1958.
- University of Wyoming, Criteria for Selecting Teachers in Off-Campus Schools, mimeo.
- Wasburne, Carleton W., "Democratic Planning for Teacher Education," Educational Leadership 8:187, December, 1955.
- Woodruff, Asahel, "Problems in Improving Teacher Education," Journal of Teacher Education 9:243-247, September, 1958.

APPENDIX

Appendix A
Student Teacher Activity Questionnaire

STUDENT TEACHER ACTIVITY QUESTIONNAIRE

During the sixteen weeks you participated in the Manhattan Project you were engaged in many diverse activities. These ran all the way from the mundane, everyday tasks so common to every teacher; to that of assuming full responsibility for classroom teaching. Please list, as completely as you can, all the school connected activities you engaged in while a participant in this program. Use additional paper if necessary. Please include activities engaged in both in and out of the classroom and both on and off the Manhattan School campus--curricular and extra-curricular.

Appendix B
Compilation of Student Teacher Activities

Compilation of Student Teacher Activities

To facilitate the classification of different kinds of activities, the following have been arbitrarily divided into three categories: (1) instructional related activities, (2) non-instructional related activities, and (3) extra-curricular activities. The activities in each category are listed in rank order of frequency as determined by the number of respondents who included the activity in his list.

Instructional Related Activities

- Taught classes
- Made lesson plans
- Observed classes
- Helped students with work
- Corrected papers
- Prepared tests
- Gave tests
- Corrected tests
- Made bulletin boards
- Prepared ditto materials
- Ran off ditto materials
- Corrected workbooks
- Observed other classrooms
- Helped students with make-up work
- Helped make out report cards
- Helped make out grades
- Read stories to class
- Substituted when teacher was ill
- Played piano
- Worked on Christmas program
- Made Christmas decorations for classroom
- Operated movie projector
- Operated filmstrip projector
- Operated tape recorder
- Operated record player
- Operated educational television set
- Operated micro-projector
- Used tachistoscope with slow reading groups
- Supervised science laboratories
- Averaged grades
- Disciplined students

Non-Instructional Related Activities

Attended faculty meetings
Attended college classes at Manhattan School
Classified room libraries
Stood lunch duty
Stood hall duty
Stood playground duty
Took care of minor injuries
Took care of sick students
Catalogued filmstrips
Catalogued phonograph records
Supervised study halls
Kept room libraries in order
Straightened classroom
Took attendance
Counseled students
Cleaned chalkboards
Repaired library books
Attended class meetings
Catalogued library books
Cleaned up after sick child
Made coffee
Made seating chart
Repaired pupil's shoe
Helped with F.H.A.-F.F.A. banquet
Ordered groceries for Home Economics Department
Made flower arranging file
Went on errands
Collected money
Took student home who missed bus
Typed papers for supervising teacher
Wrote letters to State Film Library
Sold tickets
Took duty at football games
Made flash cards
Recorded names in grade book
Recorded names in register
Sewed on button for student
Weighed and measured students
Checked vision of students
Attended student council meetings
Worked with annual staff

Extra-Curricular Activities

Attended M.E.A. meetings
Attended P.T.A. meetings
Attended parent-teacher conferences
Attended Education Week Masonic program
Attended extra-curricular student activities
Assisted with extra-curricular student activities
Attended pep rallies
Attended various education meetings having to do
with teaching fields
Attended M.E.A. convention
Attended various community affairs