

This dissertation has been
microfilmed exactly as received

69-9657

WECKMULLER, Raymond Jensen, 1927-
THE INFLUENCE OF THE ORGANIZATIONAL
PATTERN FOR STUDENT TEACHING UPON
THE DEGREE TO WHICH STUDENT TEACHERS
PARTICIPATE IN SELECTED EXPERIENCES.

The University of Nebraska, Ed.D., 1968
Education, teacher training

University Microfilms, Inc., Ann Arbor, Michigan

THE INFLUENCE OF THE ORGANIZATIONAL PATTERN FOR STUDENT
TEACHING UPON THE DEGREE TO WHICH STUDENT TEACHERS
PARTICIPATE IN SELECTED EXPERIENCES

by

Raymond Jensen Weckmuller

A DISSERTATION

Presented to the Faculty of

The Graduate College in the University of Nebraska

In Partial Fulfillment of Requirements

For the Degree of Doctor of Education

Department of Educational Administration

Under the Supervision of Professor Leslie L. Chisholm

Lincoln, Nebraska

July, 1968

TITLE

The Influence of the Organizational Pattern for Student Teaching Upon the Degree
to Which Student Teachers Participate in Selected Experiences

BY

Mr. Raymond Jensen Weckmuller

APPROVED

DATE

Leslie L. Chisholm

June 26, 1968

Rex Reckewey

June 26, 1968

Norman Thorpe

June 26, 1968

Erwin H. Goldenstein

June 26, 1968

SUPERVISORY COMMITTEE

GRADUATE COLLEGE

UNIVERSITY OF NEBRASKA

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

An expression of appreciation is due those school officials and teachers who gave so generously of their time in assisting with the collection of data for this study.

A special debt of gratitude is owed Dr. Leslie L. Chisholm whose help and encouragement made the research possible. An expression of thanks is also due the many members of the Nebraska Council on Teacher Education who expressed an interest and offered suggestions for the research.

My wife, Mary and our four children must also be thanked for putting up with a preoccupied husband and father.

RJW

PREVIEW

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Statement of the Problem.	2
The Procedure	3
The Selection of a Sample	5
Definition of Terms	13
Delimitations	15
II. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE	16
Experiences for Student Teachers.	20
Evaluation of Student Teaching Experiences.	26
Relative Merits of Organizational Patterns.	33
Summary	36
III. EXTENT OF PARTICIPATION IN STUDENT TEACHING EXPERIENCES. .	37
Utilization of Supervisory Resources.	37
Out of Classroom Activities	38
Instructional Techniques.	41
Orientation to the Cooperating School	43
Evaluative Techniques	43
Meeting the Needs of Individual Students.	46
Instructional Media	46
Items Checked "More than Necessary"	54
IV. CHI-SQUARE VALUES FOR RESPONSES TO QUESTIONNAIRE ITEMS BY TEACHERS WHO EXPERIENCED FULL-DAY STUDENT TEACHING AND TEACHERS WHO EXPERIENCED PART-DAY STUDENT TEACHING. . .	56

CHAPTER	PAGE
Utilization of Supervisory Resources.	57
Out of Class Activities	65
Instructional Techniques.	76
Orientation to the Cooperating School	86
Evaluative Techniques	92
Meeting the Needs of Individual Students.	99
Instructional Media	105
Routine Classroom Duties.	113
V. VALUE PLACED ON STUDENT TEACHING EXPERIENCES	120
Utilization of Supervisory Resources.	120
Out of Class Activities	122
Instructional Techniques.	122
Orientation to the Cooperating School	125
Evaluative Techniques	127
Meeting the Needs of Individual Students.	127
Instructional Media	130
Routine Classroom Duties.	130
VI. STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES OF STUDENT TEACHING PROGRAMS AS REVEALED BY RESPONSES TO "OPEN-END" QUESTIONS	135
Strengths Identified by Teachers who Experienced Full-Day Student Teaching	135
Weaknesses Identified by Teachers who Experienced Full-Day Student Teaching	137

CHAPTER	PAGE
Strengths Identified by Teachers who Experienced	
Part-Day Student Teaching	138
Weaknesses Identified by Teachers who Experienced	
Part-Day Student Teaching	140
Combined Responses	142
Strengths and Weaknesses of Full-Day and Part-Day	
Student Teaching as Viewed by School Adminis-	
trators	146
VII. SUMMARY, FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS	148
Problem.	148
Procedures	149
Findings	149
Utilization of Supervisory Resources.	149
Out of Classroom Activities	150
Instructional Techniques.	151
Orientation to the Cooperating School	152
Evaluative Techniques	152
Meeting the Needs of Individual Students.	153
Instructional Media	154
Routine Classroom Activities.	155
Influence of Organizational Pattern for Student	
Teaching Upon Extent of Experience	156
Summary of "Open-end" Responses	157

CHAPTER	PAGE
Conclusions.	159
BIBLIOGRAPHY	162
APPENDIX A	167
APPENDIX B	169
APPENDIX C	175

PREVIEW

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE	PAGE
1 Statistics Dealing with the Distribution of the Questionnaire.	7
2 Distribution of Respondents by Class of School in Which They Were Teaching	8
3 Distribution of Respondents by Class of School in Which They Were Teaching and by the Type of Student Teaching They Experienced	9
4 Size of School Systems in Which Respondents Engaged in Student Teaching	10
5 Colleges Where Respondents Completed Their Program of Teacher Education.	11
6 Teaching Areas of Respondents	12
7 Percentages of Respondents who Indicated Sufficient Utilization of Supervisory Resources	39
8 Percentages of Respondents who Indicated Sufficient Contact with Out of Class Activities	40
9 Percentages of Respondents who Indicated Sufficient Contact in the Area of Instructional Techniques.	42
10 Percentages of Respondents who Indicated Sufficient Contact with Orientation to the Cooperating School	44
11 Percentages of Respondents who Indicated Sufficient Contact with Evaluative Techniques	45
12 Percentages of Respondents who Indicated Sufficient Contact with Meeting the Needs of Individual Students.	47
13 Percentages of Respondents who Indicated Sufficient Contact with Various Instructional Media	48
14 Percentages of Respondents who Indicated Sufficient Contact with Routine Classroom Duties.	50

TABLE

PAGE

15	Percent of Respondents who Reported Sufficient Contact with Listed Experiences by Categories.51
16	Activities Experienced in Sufficient Depth by More than Eighty-Five Percent of the Respondents52
17	Activities Experienced in Sufficient Depth by Less than Ten Percent of the Respondents53
18	The Chi-Square Value for Responses to Item 21 with Respect to Teachers who Experienced Full or Part-Day Student Teaching59
19	The Chi-Square Value for Responses to Item 22 with Respect to Teachers who Experienced Full or Part-Day Student Teaching59
20	The Chi-Square Value for Responses to Item 23 with Respect to Teachers who Experienced Full or Part-Day Student Teaching .	.60
21	The Chi-Square Value for Responses to Item 25 with Respect to Teachers who Experienced Full or Part-Day Student Teaching .	.60
22	The Chi-Square Value for Responses to Item 26 with Respect to Teachers who Experienced Full or Part-Day Student Teaching .	.61
23	The Chi-Square Value for Responses to Item 69 with Respect to Teachers who Experienced Full or Part-Day Student Teaching .	.61
24	The Chi-Square Value for Responses to Item 70 with Respect to Teachers who Experienced Full or Part-Day Student Teaching .	.62
25	The Chi-Square Value for Responses to Item 71 with Respect to Teachers who Experienced Full or Part-Day Student Teaching .	.62
26	The Chi-Square Value for Responses to Item 74 with Respect to Teachers who Experienced Full or Part-Day Student Teaching .	.63
27	The Chi-Square Value for Responses to Item 75 with Respect to Teachers who Experienced Full or Part-Day Student Teaching .	.63
28	Number of Times Teachers Reported Being Visited by College Supervisors During Their Student Teaching Experience64
29	The Chi-Square Value for Responses to Item 2 with Respect to Teachers who Experienced Full or Part-Day Student Teaching .	.67

TABLE

PAGE

30	The Chi-Square Value for Responses to Item 3 with Respect to Teachers who Experienced Full or Part-Day Student Teaching . .	67
31	The Chi-Square Value for Responses to Item 7 with Respect to Teachers who Experienced Full or Part-Day Student Teaching . .	68
32	The Chi-Square Value for Responses to Item 8 with Respect to Teachers who Experienced Full or Part-Day Student Teaching . .	68
33	The Chi-Square Value for Responses to Item 9 with Respect to Teachers who Experienced Full or Part-Day Student Teaching . .	69
34	The Chi-Square Value for Responses to Item 42 with Respect to Teachers who Experienced Full or Part-Day Student Teaching . .	69
35	The Chi-Square Value for Responses to Item 43 with Respect to Teachers who Experienced Full or Part-Day Student Teaching . .	70
36	The Chi-Square Value for Responses to Item 44 with Respect to Teachers who Experienced Full or Part-Day Student Teaching . .	70
37	The Chi-Square Value for Responses to Item 45 with Respect to Teachers who Experienced Full or Part-Day Student Teaching . .	71
38	The Chi-Square Value for Responses to Item 46 with Respect to Teachers who Experienced Full or Part-Day Student Teaching . .	71
39	The Chi-Square Value for Responses to Item 90 with Respect to Teachers who Experienced Full or Part-Day Student Teaching . .	72
40	The Chi-Square Value for Responses to Item 91 with Respect to Teachers who Experienced Full or Part-Day Student Teaching . .	72
41	The Chi-Square Value for Responses to Item 92 with Respect to Teachers who Experienced Full or Part-Day Student Teaching . .	73
42	The Chi-Square Value for Responses to Item 93 with Respect to Teachers who Experienced Full or Part-Day Student Teaching . .	73
43	The Chi-Square Value for Responses to Item 94 with Respect to Teachers who Experienced Full or Part-Day Student Teaching . .	74
44	The Chi-Square Value for Responses to Item 95 with Respect to Teachers who Experienced Full or Part-Day Student Teaching . .	74
45	The Chi-Square Value for Responses to Item 96 with Respect to Teachers who Experienced Full or Part-Day Student Teaching . .	75

TABLE

PAGE

46	The Chi-Square Value for Responses to Item 1 with Respect to Teachers who Experienced Full or Part-Day Student teaching. .	77
47	The Chi-Square Value for Responses to Item 4 with Respect to Teachers who Experienced Full or Part-Day Student Teaching. .	77
48	The Chi-Square Value for Responses to Item 5 with Respect to Teachers who Experienced Full or Part-Day Student Teaching. .	78
49	The Chi-Square Value for Responses to Item 6 with Respect to Teachers who Experienced Full or Part-Day Student Teaching. .	78
50	The Chi-Square Value for Responses to Item 36 with Respect to Teachers who Experienced Full or Part-Day Student Teaching. .	79
51	The Chi-Square Value for Responses to Item 37 with Respect to Teachers who Experienced Full or Part-Day Student Teaching. .	79
52	The Chi-Square Value for Responses to Item 38 with Respect to Teachers who Experienced Full or Part-Day Student Teaching. .	80
53	The Chi-Square Value for Responses to Item 39 with Respect to Teachers who Experienced Full or Part-Day Student Teaching. .	80
54	The Chi-Square Value for Responses to Item 40 with Respect to Teachers who Experienced Full or Part-Day Student Teaching. .	81
55	The Chi-Square Value for Responses to Item 41 with Respect to Teachers who Experienced Full or Part-Day Student Teaching. .	81
56	The Chi-Square Value for Responses to Item 47 with Respect to Teachers who Experienced Full or Part-Day Student Teaching. .	82
57	The Chi-Square Value for Responses to Item 76 with Respect to Teachers who Experienced Full or Part-Day Student Teaching. .	82
58	The Chi-Square Value for Responses to Item 77 with Respect to Teachers who Experienced Full or Part-Day Student Teaching. .	83
59	The Chi-Square Value for Responses to Item 78 with Respect to Teachers who Experienced Full or Part-Day Student Teaching. .	83
60	The Chi-Square Value for Responses to Item 79 with Respect to Teachers who Experienced Full or Part-Day Student Teaching. .	84
61	The Chi-Square Value for Responses to Item 80 with Respect to Teachers who Experienced Full or Part-Day Student Teaching. .	84

TABLE

PAGE

62	The Chi-Square Value for Responses to Item 81 with Respect to Teachers who Experienced Full or Part-Day Student Teaching. .	85
63	The Chi-Square Value for Responses to Item 85 with Respect to Teachers who Experienced Full or Part-Day Student Teaching. .	85
64	The Chi-Square Value for Responses to Item 28 with Respect to Teachers who Experienced Full or Part-Day Student Teaching. .	87
65	The Chi-Square Value for Responses to Item 29 with Respect to Teachers who Experienced Full or Part-Day Student Teaching. .	87
66	The Chi-Square Value for Responses to Item 30 with Respect to Teachers who Experienced Full or Part-Day Student Teaching. .	88
67	The Chi-Square Value for Responses to Item 34 with Respect to Teachers who Experienced Full or Part-Day Student Teaching. .	88
68	The Chi-Square Value for Responses to Item 35 with Respect to Teachers who Experienced Full or Part-Day Student Teaching. .	89
69	The Chi-Square Value for Responses to Item 58 with Respect to Teachers who Experienced Full or Part-Day Student Teaching. .	89
70	The Chi-Square Value for Responses to Item 59 with Respect to Teachers who Experienced Full or Part-Day Student Teaching. .	90
71	The Chi-Square Value for Responses to Item 62 with Respect to Teachers who Experienced Full or Part-Day Student Teaching. .	90
72	The Chi-Square Value for Responses to Item 63 with Respect to Teachers who Experienced Full or Part-Day Student Teaching. .	91
73	The Chi-Square Value for Responses to Item 65 with Respect to Teachers who Experienced Full or Part-Day Student Teaching. .	91
74	The Chi-Square Value for Responses to Item 13 with Respect to Teachers who Experienced Full or Part-Day Student Teaching. .	93
75	The Chi-Square Value for Responses to Item 14 with Respect to Teachers who Experienced Full or Part-Day Student Teaching. .	93
76	The Chi-Square Value for Responses to Item 16 with Respect to Teachers who Experienced Full or Part-Day Student Teaching. .	94
77	The Chi-Square Value for Responses to Item 17 with Respect to Teachers who Experienced Full or Part-Day Student Teaching. .	94

TABLE

PAGE

78	The Chi-Square Value for Responses to Item 48 with Respect to Teachers who Experienced Full or Part-Day Student Teaching. .	95
79	The Chi-Square Value for Responses to Item 49 with Respect to Teachers who Experienced Full or Part-Day Student Teaching. .	95
80	The Chi-Square Value for Responses to Item 50 with Respect to Teachers who Experienced Full or Part-Day Student Teaching. .	96
81	The Chi-Square Value for Responses to Item 55 with Respect to Teachers who Experienced Full or Part-Day Student Teaching. .	96
82	The Chi-Square Value for Responses to Item 56 with Respect to Teachers who Experienced Full or Part-Day Student Teaching. .	97
83	The Chi-Square Value for Responses to Item 87 with Respect to Teachers who Experienced Full or Part-Day Student Teaching. .	97
84	The Chi-Square Value for Responses to Item 88 with Respect to Teachers who Experienced Full or Part-Day Student Teaching. .	98
85	The Chi-Square Value for Responses to Item 89 with Respect to Teachers who Experienced Full or Part-Day Student Teaching. .	98
86	The Chi-Square Value for Responses to Item 18 with Respect to Teachers who Experienced Full or Part-Day Student Teaching. .	100
87	The Chi-Square Value for Responses to Item 19 with Respect to Teachers who Experienced Full or Part-Day Student Teaching. .	100
88	The Chi-Square Value for Responses to Item 20 with Respect to Teachers who Experienced Full or Part-Day Student Teaching. .	101
89	The Chi-Square Value for Responses to Item 24 with Respect to Teachers who Experienced Full or Part-Day Student Teaching. .	101
90	The Chi-Square Value for Responses to Item 27 with Respect to Teachers who Experienced Full or Part-Day Student Teaching. .	102
91	The Chi-Square Value for Responses to Item 66 with Respect to Teachers who Experienced Full or Part-Day Student Teaching. .	102
92	The Chi-Square Value for Responses to Item 67 with Respect to Teachers who Experienced Full or Part-Day Student Teaching. .	103
93	The Chi-Square Value for Responses to Item 68 with Respect to Teachers who Experienced Full or Part-Day Student Teaching. .	103

TABLE	PAGE
94 The Chi-Square Value for Responses to Item 94 with Respect to Teachers who Experienced Full or Part-Day Student Teaching. .104	.104
95 The Chi-Square Value for Responses to Item 73 with Respect to Teachers who Experienced Full or Part-Day Student Teaching. .104	.104
96 The Chi-Square Value for Responses to Item 10 with Respect to Teachers who Experienced Full or Part-Day Student Teaching. .106	.106
97 The Chi-Square Value for Responses to Item 11 with Respect to Teachers who Experienced Full or Part-Day Student Teaching. .106	.106
98 The Chi-Square Value for Responses to Item 12 with Respect to Teachers who Experienced Full or Part-Day Student Teaching. .107	.107
99 The Chi-Square Value for Responses to Item 15 with Respect to Teachers who Experienced Full or Part-Day Student Teaching. .107	.107
100 The Chi-Square Value for Responses to Item 51 with Respect to Teachers who Experienced Full or Part-Day Student Teaching. .108	.108
101 The Chi-Square Value for Responses to Item 52 with Respect to Teachers who Experienced Full or Part-Day Student Teaching. .108	.108
102 The Chi-Square Value for Responses to Item 53 with Respect to Teachers who Experienced Full or Part-Day Student Teaching. .109	.109
103 The Chi-Square Value for Responses to Item 54 with Respect to Teachers who Experienced Full or Part-Day Student Teaching. .109	.109
104 The Chi-Square Value for Responses to Item 57 with Respect to Teachers who Experienced Full or Part-Day Student Teaching. .110	.110
105 The Chi-Square Value for Responses to Item 82 with Respect to Teachers who Experienced Full or Part-Day Student Teaching. .110	.110
106 The Chi-Square Value for Responses to Item 83 with Respect to Teachers who Experienced Full or Part-Day Student Teaching. .111	.111
107 The Chi-Square Value for Responses to Item 84 with Respect to Teachers who Experienced Full or Part-Day Student Teaching. .111	.111
108 The Chi-Square Value for Responses to Item 86 with Respect to Teachers who Experienced Full or Part-Day Student Teaching. .112	.112
109 The Chi-Square Value for Responses to Item 61 with Respect to Teachers who Experienced Full or Part-Day Student Teaching. .114	.114

TABLE	PAGE
110 The Chi-Square Value for Responses to Item 64 with Respect to Teachers who Experienced Full or Part-Day Student Teaching. .	114
111 The Chi-Square Value for Responses to Item 33 with Respect to Teachers who Experienced Full or Part-Day Student Teaching. .	115
112 The Chi-Square Value for Responses to Item 60 with Respect to Teachers who Experienced Full or Part-Day Student Teaching. .	115
113 The Chi-Square Value for Responses to Item 31 with Respect to Teachers who Experienced Full or Part-Day Student Teaching. .	116
114 The Chi-Square Value for Responses to Item 32 with Respect to Teachers who Experienced Full or Part-Day Student Teaching. .	116
115 A List of Student Teaching Experiences More Likely to be Encountered by Full-Day Student Teachers and the Degree to Which the Experiences Were Values.	118
116 A List of Student Teaching Experiences More Likely to be Encountered by Part-Day Student Teachers and the Degree to Which the Experiences Were Valued.	119
117 Percent Responding "Of Great Value" and Percent Responding "Of Little Value" to Items Dealing with Utilization of Supervisory Resources	121
118 Percent Responding "Of Great Value" and Percent Responding "Of Little Value" to Items Dealing with Out of Classroom Activities.	123
119 Percent Responding "Of Great Value" and Percent Responding "Of Little Value" to Items Dealing with Instructional Techniques. .	124
120 Percent Responding "Of Great Value" and Percent Responding "Of Little Value" to Items Dealing with Orientation to the Cooperating School.	126
121 Percent Responding "Of Great Value" and Percent Responding "Of Little Value" to Items Dealing with Evaluation Techniques . .	128
122 Percent Responding "Of Great Value" and Percent Responding "Of Little Value" to Items Dealing with Meeting the Needs of Individual Students	129
123 Percent Responding "Of Great Value" and Percent Responding "Of Little Value" to Items Dealing with Instructional Media . . .	131

TABLE	PAGE
124 Percent Responding "Of Great Value" and Percent Responding "Of Little Value" to Items Dealing with Routine Classroom Duties.	132
125 Mean Percents of "Great Value" and "Little or No Value" Designations by Categories.	134
126 Unstructured Responses to Questions Asking for the Greatest Strength of Student Teaching Assignment	143
127 Unstructured Responses to Questions Asking for the Greatest Weakness of Student Teaching Assignment	145
128 Degree of Participation of Student Teachers in Those Activities They Considered to be of Most Value	157

PREVIEW

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

There is currently much debate throughout the nation concerning the effectiveness of our various programs of student teaching. Articles appear in the professional literature calling for bold and imaginative programs to replace what some assume to be ineffective and stagnant approaches to student teaching. Few writers have attempted to evaluate the degree to which our current student teaching practices are achieving our stated goals.

Debate has also centered around the merits of various organizational patterns for programs of student teaching. This debate was heightened when NCATE endorsed full-day student teaching in the 1960 Standards and Guide.¹ Those who favor part-day student teaching over a longer period of time make the charge that it has not been demonstrated that one organizational pattern is superior to another. The author's search of the literature tends to support this charge.

As an active member of the Nebraska Council on Teacher Education and the Nebraska Association for Student Teaching, the author is aware of much similar dialogue within educational circles of Nebraska.

¹National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education, Standards and Guide for Accreditation of Teacher Education (Washington, D.C.: The Council, 1960), p. 20.

Statistics obtained from a publication of the Nebraska State Department of Education² indicate that one-half of the teachers entering the profession in 1965 from Nebraska institutions engaged in full-day student teaching and one-half did student teaching on a less than full-day basis. This equal distribution is probably a unique situation and provides an excellent opportunity to compare the experiences which student teachers have under these two basic types of programs.

No investigation has been reported which compares the experiences which student teachers have under these programs.

I. STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

The problem undertaken in this study was to determine the degree to which secondary teachers who have recently completed programs of teacher education feel that their student teaching experience resulted in their taking part in experiences which are generally assumed to be desirable in a student teaching program. The author further intended to determine if the organizational pattern for student teaching had a significant relationship to the degree to which student teachers encountered these experiences.

²Nebraska Department of Education, Statistics and Facts About Nebraska Schools 1966 Teacher Supply and Demand (Lincoln, Nebraska: The Department, 1966).

II. THE PROCEDURE

The following steps were employed to carry the problem to its completion.

1. The author conducted an extensive search of the literature to establish the status of research in the areas of objectives, practices, and organizational patterns for student teaching.

2. A questionnaire was designed to reflect accepted objectives for student teaching programs. Publications of the Nebraska Council on Teacher Education, the Nebraska State Department of Education, the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education, the National Student Teaching Association and leading authorities in the field of student teaching were reviewed for items to be included in the questionnaire.

The questionnaire was divided into three sections. The first part was a data sheet which obtained such information as organizational pattern of student teaching experienced, name of school where student teaching was done, present teaching assignment, and the name of the teacher preparation institution where the education program was completed. The second portion of the questionnaire contained a listing of experiences which student teachers might have. The respondents were asked to check the degree to which they engaged in the experience and their evaluation of its value to them. The third portion of the questionnaire contained three "open-end" questions where the respondents were asked to identify the greatest strength of their student teaching experience and

the greatest weakness. They were also requested to suggest changes in the program which they experienced.

3. Nebraska secondary schools were selected so as to achieve a stratified random sample of the new teacher population in Nebraska schools. The sample was stratified according to class of school and randomly selected within the given classes. Statistics for determining the percentage of respondents which were used from each class of school were obtained from the statistical services department of the Nebraska State Department of Education. Only teachers who have completed their undergraduate program of teacher education since January, 1966, and who are graduates of accredited Nebraska institutions were asked to respond to the questionnaire.

4. Responses to the questionnaire were analyzed to determine the following:

- a. The extent to which the obtained sample accurately represents the teacher population of Nebraska
- b. The extent to which the respondents participated in the listed experiences
- c. The degree to which the organizational pattern of the student teaching program influenced the extent of participation in the listed experiences
- d. The value placed upon the listed experiences by the respondents
- e. The strengths and weaknesses of the respective student teaching programs as expressed by the respondents in "open-end" questions

5. Selected school administrators were interviewed concerning their views on the desirability of the various organizational patterns for student teaching.

III. THE SELECTION OF A SAMPLE

The author collected data only from individuals who completed their program of teacher education since January, 1966, and who were teaching in a Nebraska public secondary school. It was assumed that their teaching experience helped them to make more valid judgments relative to the merits of the various student teaching experiences they encountered. The recency of their student teaching assured accuracy in the recall of their experiences.

The sample was limited to graduates of accredited Nebraska institutions. The assumption underlying this limitation was that the combination of NCATE and Nebraska Department of Education accreditation policies insured some uniformity of required courses in education for secondary teachers.

A tabulation of teacher population in Nebraska secondary schools by class was accomplished from statistics found in the 1967-68 Nebraska Directory.³ This tabulation revealed the percent of the total secondary teacher population employed in each class of secondary school. It was

³Nebraska Department of Education, Seventieth Nebraska Educational Directory (Lincoln, Nebraska: The Department, 1968).

assumed that the new teacher population would be distributed among the various classes in approximately the same ratio as the total teacher population.

The Class II and III schools to be used in the study were selected by assigning each school district in those classes a number; numbers were then selected randomly and matched with the school systems.

A total of 215 questionnaires were sent to school administrators who had agreed to distribute the questionnaires to those teachers in their school who met the criteria established for the study. These administrators had previously indicated the number of questionnaires required. Twenty-four of this total were returned unanswered because of error in the number requested.

A total of 155 completed questionnaires were returned in time to be used in the study. Four of these returned questionnaires were rejected because the respondents were graduates of non-Nebraska teacher education institutions. Nineteen completed questionnaires were received after the statistical computations were well under way and were not used in the study.

A total of 191 questionnaires were actually distributed to teachers for completion. Of these 191, a total of 155 were received in time for use in the study; this represents 81.15 percent. The percentage of completed questionnaires received, including those received too late for use in the study, was 91.1 percent. The number of completed questionnaires used in the study was 151. Table 1 presents these statistics in tabular form.

TABLE 1
STATISTICS DEALING WITH THE DISTRIBUTION
OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE

Number of questionnaires sent to school administrators for distribution	215
Number returned by administrators because of error in number requested	24
Number actually distributed	191
Number of completed questionnaires received in time for inclusion in the study	155
Number rejected because respondents failed to meet criteria	4
Percent of distributed questionnaires returned in time for use in the study	81.15
Number of completed questionnaires received too late for use in the study	19
Total percent of completed questionnaires received, including those received too late for use	91.10

Table 2 indicates the distribution of respondents by class of school in which they are now teaching. The author attempted to achieve a sample which would be representative of beginning Nebraska teachers according to the class of school in which they were teaching. The widest variation between the sample and the actual teaching population is five percentage points. This variation occurred in the sample from Class V schools and was brought about by a nearly one hundred percent