

THE FUNCTIONS OF SCHOOL PRINCIPALS
IN STUDENT TEACHING PROGRAMS

by

LAWSON JAMES BROWN

A DISSERTATION

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of Doctor of Education in the
Department of Elementary Education of the
College of Education in the Graduate
School of the University of Alabama

UNIVERSITY, ALABAMA

1962

2 R
17729

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Grateful appreciation is expressed to Dr. Yewell Thompson, chairman of the writer's advisory committee, for the encouragement and guidance which he so generously gave throughout the course of this study. Appreciation is expressed to other members of the advisory committee. Helpful suggestions and encouragement, particularly during the early stages of the study, were given by Dr. Daisy Parton and Dr. H. B. Woodward, Jr. Dr. Ray Loree gave especially helpful assistance and advice pertaining to the statistical treatment of the data. Dr. Esther J. Swenson gave invaluable advice and help in the final organization and writing of the dissertation.

Gratitude is expressed for the encouragement given by fellow graduate students in Elementary Education, Milly Cowles, Mary Jo Harris, Curtis Osborn, and Ronald Dennis.

The cooperation in this study of the colleges and universities in Alabama and the personnel in the elementary and high schools is gratefully acknowledged.

Appreciation is expressed to Mrs. Margaret Bittner who typed the first draft of this study and to Mrs. Margaret Thomas who typed the final copies.

D378
B813f
1962

399897

To his wife, Mrs. Annie L. Brown, who gave encouragement and valuable assistance in editing, the writer is especially indebted.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter		Page
I	INTRODUCTION	1
	Need for the Study	5
	Statement of Problem	6
	General Procedures	7
	Limitations of the Study	8
	Definition of Terms	9
II	REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	11
	The Importance of the School Principal in Student Teaching Programs	12
	Selection of Supervising Teachers	15
	Assisting Supervising Teachers	17
	Working With Student Teachers	21
	Working With the Colleges	27
	Interpreting the Student Teaching Program to Parents and the People of the Community	29
	Related Research	31
	Summary	41
III	PROCEDURE	44
	Development of the Questionnaire	44
	The Respondents	47
	Compilation of Responses	49
	Statistical Treatment	50
	Summary	59
IV	RESULTS OF STUDY	61
	Presentation of Data	62
	Analysis of Data	70
	Summary	121
V	CONCLUSIONS, INTERPRETATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS	127
	Conclusions	128
	Interpretations	133
	Recommendations	137

TABLE OF CONTENTS--Continued

	Page
APPENDIX A	141
APPENDIX B	147
APPENDIX C	151
BIBLIOGRAPHY	220

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Table II: Amounts of Help Received from Various Staff Members by Student Teachers (Vernon C. Lingren, "Help Needed and Received by Student Teachers," <u>Journal of Teacher Education</u> , X March, 1959)p. 25) . .	35
2. Number of Participating Staff Members Reported by the Cooperating Colleges . . .	48
3. Per Cent of Returns on the Questionnaire by the Three Participating Groups	49
4. Chi Square Table for Statement 1, "The Principal Becomes Acquainted With the Teacher Education Institution's Program and Policies for Student Teaching."	52
5. Tabulation of Responses of 49 College Supervisors to the Questionnaire	63
6. Tabulation of Responses of 97 Principals to the Questionnaire	65
7. Tabulation of Responses of 314 Supervising Teachers to the Questionnaire	67
8. Per Cents of "Yes" Responses to the First Question, "Is This Appropriate?"	68
9. Per Cents of "Yes" Responses to the Second Question, "Is This Done?"	69
10. Findings from the Chi Square Tables Pertaining to the Statements in Group 1: "The Principals Seek to Become Better Informed about Student Teaching Programs."	75
11. Findings from the Chi Square Tables Pertaining to the Statements in Group 2: "The Principals Help the College Supervisors to Become Acquainted with the Program and Policies of the School."	79

LIST OF TABLES--Continued

Table		Page
12.	Findings from the Chi Square Tables Pertaining to the Statements in Group 3: "The Principals Participate in the Selection of the Supervising Teachers."	83
13.	Findings in the Chi Square Tables Pertaining to the Statements in Group 4: "The Principals Promote the Professional Growth of the Supervising Teachers."	88
14.	Findings in the Chi Square Tables Pertaining to the Statements in Group 5: "The Principals Assist the Supervising Teachers in the Student Teaching Program." .	92
15.	Findings in the Chi Square Tables Pertaining to the Statements in Group 6: "The Principals Assume Supervisory Responsibilities in the Student Teaching Program."	96
16.	Findings in the Chi Square Tables Pertaining to the Statements in Group 7: "The Principals Involve the Student Teachers in the Total Program of the School and Community and Seek to Give the Student Teachers Status as Teachers." . . .	104
17.	Findings in the Chi Square Tables Pertaining to the Statements in Group 8: "The Principals Work Directly with the Student Teachers."	109
18.	Findings of the Chi Square Test of the Significance of the Differences Between the Responses of the College Supervisors, Principals, and Supervising Teachers to the Two Questions: "Is This Appropriate?" and "Is This Done?"	114

LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS

Figure		Page
1.	2x2 Table Showing Responses of 97 Principals to Statement 5	57

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

To meet the demands for more teachers, institutions engaged in teacher training are faced with the problem of making arrangements with the public schools to provide for student teaching experiences.¹ Evidence from the professional literature dealing with student teaching indicates that there is a trend toward expanding the student teaching programs to off-campus facilities. A publication of the Association for Student Teaching states:

Nearly every institution which prepares teachers for American schools is--or soon will be--faced with the problem of planning for a new or expanded program of off-campus student teaching. Growing numbers of students are putting heavy demands on currently used facilities for student teaching. Many colleges and universities already have found it necessary to seek and develop new situations in which student teaching can take place. The continued need for giving attention to problems of expansion is obvious.²

With the increased number of student teachers the campus laboratory schools can no longer provide the student

¹Ivane Applegate, "Many People Affect the Student Teaching Program," Educational Administration and Supervision, XLIV (July, 1958), 205-212.

²Howard T. Batchelder, Richard E. Lawrence, and George R. Myers, A Guide To Planning For Off-Campus Student Teaching, Bulletin No. 11 of The Association for Student Teaching (Cedar Falls, Iowa: The Association for Student Teaching, 1959), p. 3.

teaching experiences needed and at the same time provide for the pre-student teaching experiences and the opportunities for graduate study demanded. In a study of the campus laboratory school, Otto Hughes of Indiana University concluded that the major emphasis is shifting from student teaching to pre-student teaching experiences and that this trend is characteristic throughout the country.³

In line with this trend, during the school year 1961-62, the College of Education of the University of Alabama expanded its student teaching program. For the first time, student teachers in elementary education were placed in elementary schools in Tuscaloosa City and Tuscaloosa County schools other than Verner Elementary School. Some of the student teachers in secondary education were placed in schools other than Tuscaloosa City and Tuscaloosa County schools. Some University of Alabama students had student teaching experiences in Mexico City during the spring semester, 1960-61, and the spring semester, 1961-62.

The expanded program of student teaching and the shift of the student teaching experiences to off-campus schools bring about new relationships and responsibilities among the personnel involved. The school principal is involved in these relationships and responsibilities.

³Otto Hughes, The Role of the Campus Laboratory School, Bulletin of the School of Education (Bloomington, Indiana: Indiana University, 1959).

Batchelder and others in a bulletin published by The Association for Student Teaching point out some crucial issues about which decisions should be made before a program of expanded student teaching goes into operation. Among the crucial problems identified are the following that pertain to the relationship of the principals and other personnel:

1. To what extent is it necessary for the college and the cooperating school to share views regarding the curriculum, the philosophy, and instructional procedures?

2. Will the cooperating schools be expected to make all their facilities available to student teachers?

3. How will the cooperating teachers be selected?

4. To what extent will the student teacher be a participating member of the faculty of the school in which he is doing student teaching?

5. What policies need to be established regarding the assignments of student teachers to a school and assignment within the school to a particular supervising teacher?

6. To what extent will the supervision of the student teaching program be shared among the college supervisor, supervising teacher, and school principal?

7. Who will participate in the evaluation of the work of the student teachers?⁴

⁴Batchelder, Lawrence, and Myers, 10-12.

Writers in the 1961 Yearbook of The Association for Student Teaching look upon the relationship of the colleges and public schools as a partnership in student teaching programs. The concerns of teacher education during the next decade will be focused upon problems arising from the emerging partnership of colleges and public schools in the preparation of teachers. The partnership is viewed as having passed from the initial stage of expediency into "the long-range refinement of a recognizable permanent relationship."⁵

C. M. Clarke, editor of this yearbook, in the "Foreword" characterizes the tasks of the colleges and public schools as follows:

Already leaders in both schools and colleges search for a clearer delineation of their respective responsibilities and opportunities and for a clearer view of the roles to be played by the persons involved at the several points of contact. Tough problems are being identified in the intertwining of administrative function . . . and in the reconstruction of views and attitudes toward teacher education held by practitioners in both colleges and public schools.⁶

The new partnership should see a diminishing of the influence of college personnel who see student teaching as a "trying out" of the principles they have taught the students. Also diminishing will be the influence of these public school personnel who have looked upon student

⁵C. M. Clarke, "Foreword," Teacher Education and the Public Schools, Fortieth Yearbook, The Association for Student Teaching (Dubuque, Iowa: The Association for Student Teaching, 1961), p. xiii.

⁶Clarke, xiii-xiv.

teaching programs as a favor rendered to colleges. The development of an integrated pattern of professional learnings for teachers-to-be will require the cooperative effort of principals, supervising teachers, and college supervisors toward the refinement of the best opportunities for student teachers.⁷

Smith and Cunningham in the same yearbook point out the need for acceptance of the partnership in teacher education by both the colleges and the public schools.

All that has been written on the subject indicates that the total teaching profession will become increasingly involved in teacher education. Is the college ready to accept the cooperating public school as a fully responsible partner in the teacher education endeavor? Is the cooperating public school ready to accept teacher education as a bona fide function of the public school?⁸

Need for the Study

The foregoing discussion of the emergence of new relationships and problems in expanding student teaching programs suggests the need for more clearly identifying the roles of the personnel involved.

A survey of literature dealing with the studies pertaining to student teaching programs reveal that many

⁷Clarke, xiv.

⁸Emmitt D. Smith and Fred J. Cunningham, "Administrative Relationships Between Teacher Education Institutions and Cooperating Public Schools," The Association for Student Teaching, Fortieth Yearbook, Teacher Education and the Public Schools, p. 3.

studies and surveys have been made of the functions and responsibilities of college supervisors and supervising teachers in student teaching programs. However, the role of the principal in student teaching programs has not been studied to the same extent.

One doctoral dissertation⁹ and three surveys dealing with the functions of school principals in student teaching programs were encountered in the study of the literature.¹⁰ These studies will be reviewed in Chapter II, "Review of the Literature."

Since very little research has been done concerning the functions of school principals in student teaching programs, there is a need to explore this matter.

Statement of Problem

The purpose of this study was to compare the perceptions of school principals, supervising teachers, and college supervisors concerning the functions of school

⁹Phi Delta Kappa, Research Studies in Education, 1952 (Bloomington, Illinois: Phi Delta Kappa, Inc., 1955), p. 9. Cleo O. Hearnton, "Teacher Education and the Public Schools, An Annotated Bibliography." The Association for Student Teaching Fortieth Yearbook, Teacher Education and the Public Schools, p. 199.

¹⁰Helen Reed, "The Responsibility of the Principal," The Supervising Teacher, Thirty-Eighth Yearbook of The Association for Student Teaching, 1959), pp. 92-94. Vernon C. Lingren, "Help Needed and Received by Student Teachers," Journal of Teacher Education, X (March, 1959), 22-27. Smith and Cunningham, 3-21.

principals in student teaching programs. The study was concerned with three aspects of this problem.

1. To compare the perceptions of school principals, supervising teachers, and college supervisors concerning the functions which are appropriate for school principals to perform in student teaching programs.

2. To compare the perceptions of school principals, supervising teachers, and college supervisors concerning the functions which school principals are performing in student teaching programs.

3. To compare the perceptions within each group as to the appropriateness and performance of functions of school principals in student teaching programs.

General Procedures

The procedures used in this study are presented in detail in Chapter III. Briefly the procedures consisted of the following steps:

1. A questionnaire was constructed consisting of 34 statements. The statements were derived from a study of the professional literature dealing with student teaching programs.

2. The questionnaire was submitted to the college supervisors, principals, and supervising teachers engaged in working with student teachers from the

accredited universities and colleges in Alabama for white students.¹¹

3. The responses were tallied separately for the three groups.

4. The data obtained were subjected to statistical treatment to determine if the differences in the perceptions of the three groups were statistically significant.

Limitations of the Study

The purpose of this study was to explore the differences in perceptions among three groups: principals, supervising teachers, and college supervisors. No attempt was made to determine the causes of the differences nor to evaluate the effectiveness of the principal's work in the student teaching program.

The study was limited by the statements included in the questionnaire. These statements were taken from the literature pertaining to student teaching programs. To have included all statements found in the literature would have made the questionnaire too long. Also, it is conceivable that principals are performing important and necessary functions in student teaching programs that have not been included in the literature.

¹¹Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools, Proceedings of the Sixty-sixth Annual Meeting (Atlanta, Ga.: Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools, 1961), p. 9.

This study was limited to the perceptions of college supervisors, principals, and supervising teachers who were engaged in working with student teachers from accredited universities and colleges in Alabama for white students.¹²

Definition of Terms

In this study the following definitions of terms pertaining to student teaching are used as they are defined for the most part by the Association for Student Teaching:

1. "Supervising Teacher: One who teaches children or youth and who also supervises student teaching."¹³ In the literature the supervising teacher is sometimes referred to as cooperating or directing teacher.

2. "College Supervisor: The college representative who is responsible for supervising a student teacher or a group of student teachers."¹⁴

3. School Principal: "The administrative head and professional leader of a school . . . usually limited to a single school or attendance area."¹⁵ In the

¹²Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools, 9.

¹³The Association for Student Teaching, Thirty-Eighth Yearbook, 1959, The Supervising Teacher, p. x.

¹⁴The Association for Student Teaching, Thirty-Eighth Yearbook, 1959, x.

¹⁵Dictionary of Education (Second Edition) ed. Carter V. Good (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1959).

literature dealing with student teaching programs, the principal is sometimes called the cooperating principal.

4. "Student Teaching: The period of guided teaching during which the student takes increasing responsibility for the work with a given group of learners over a period of consecutive weeks."¹⁶ This period is also referred to as internship.

5. Campus laboratory school: "A school which is controlled and supported (all or in part) by the college and which is organized as an integral part of the teacher education program to provide significant opportunities to study and relate the various phases of the teacher's activities both in and out of school."¹⁷

6. Cooperating school or off-campus school: "A school which is not controlled or supported by the college but which does provide facilities for professional laboratory experiences in a teacher education program."¹⁸

¹⁶The Association for Student Teaching, Thirty-Eighth Yearbook, 1959, x.

¹⁷The Association for Student Teaching, Thirty-Eighth Yearbook, 1959, x.

¹⁸The Association for Student Teaching, Thirty-Eighth Yearbook, 1959, x.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

As was indicated in Chapter I, the professional literature dealing with the functions of school principals in student teaching programs was studied to arrive at the statements to be included in the questionnaire. This chapter will review some of the main viewpoints of the writers in the professional literature.

First those items in the literature which point out the importance attached to the role of the principal in student teaching programs are reviewed. Next the review deals with those reports which reveal the ways the principal assumes his leadership role in the student teaching program as he (1) participates in the selection of the supervising teachers, (2) assists the supervising teachers in the work with student teachers, (3) works with the college supervisors, and (4) interprets the program of student teaching to the parents of the school and the people of the community.

The Importance of the School Principal
in Student Teaching Programs

A study of the professional literature dealing with student teaching programs reveals the importance attached to the functions of school principals in student teaching programs.

The principal is responsible for all activities within his school. When student teaching is seen as an integral part of the on-going school program, the principal has responsibility for the coordination of the activities of the student teaching program. Margaret Dahlem, writing in the most recent yearbook of the Association for Student Teaching, sees the role of the school principal as follows:

Inevitably, student teaching becomes an integral part of a principal's administrative and supervisory functions. He regards his work with student teachers and supervising teachers as a stepping-stone toward the upgrading of the instructional program. Working with student teachers to improve their teaching skills and with his staff to make them effective supervising teachers, he is able to raise the level of the educational offerings of his school.¹⁹

The principal, by virtue of his position, is recognized as being a key person in the development and administration of the student teaching program.

He has responsibility for giving leadership in the development of the total school program, including

¹⁹Margaret Dahlem, "A Role Perception: The Cooperating School Principal," Teacher Education and the Public Schools, Fortieth Yearbook of The Association For Student Teaching, 1961, p. 54.

the student teaching program. He has responsibility for establishing good working relationships among the supervising teachers, college supervisors, student teachers, and pupils in the schools. Aleyne Clayton Haines describes the principal's leadership role as follows:

The principal is a key person in the school, and his leadership is essential to effective functioning of the student teaching program. The better informed the principal is and the more understanding he has of central purposes and goals of student teaching, the more likely it is that the administration of the program will be successful.²⁰

The principal is in a leadership position which affords many opportunities for him to be sensitive to educational experiences. As he works with coordinator, with cooperating teachers, and with student teachers, he makes valuable suggestions and arrangements which facilitate the functioning of the entire program. He is in a position to open channels for participation and, at the same time, to safeguard the interest of all concerned.²¹

Burnham, in the 1951 Yearbook of The Association for Student Teaching, pointed out the necessity for securing the cooperation of the principal in planning a student teaching program. The cooperation of the principal is needed not only because he is the chief liaison person between the college and the local school but also because what the principal does will determine the attitude toward cooperation throughout the entire school. The principal should not only be concerned with cooperating with the

²⁰Aleyne Clayton Haines, Guiding the Student Teaching Process in Elementary Education (Chicago: Rand McNally, 1960), p. 58.

²¹Haines, 67.

college in the student teaching program but he should also be concerned with the need of the profession for well qualified teachers.²²

As indicated in Chapter I, writers in the most recent Yearbook of the Association for Student Teaching emphasize the recognition of the public schools, with the principal as the head of the school, as full partners in the program of student teaching.²³ In discussing this partnership in action one chapter in this publication deals with the role of "The Cooperating Principal."²⁴

The specific responsibilities that principals assume for student teaching programs vary greatly from situation to situation. In some situations the principal may not participate directly in supervising the student teaching program, but will make himself available as a resource to the supervising teacher and college supervisor.²⁵ In other situations, it may be important for the principal to have a more active part in the supervision of the program.

²²Myrtle Burnham, "The Cooperating School Staff Look at the Program," Off-Campus Student Teaching, Thirtieth Yearbook of The Association for Student Teaching (Lock Haven, Penna.: The Association for Student Teaching, 1951), p. 102.

²³Clarke, xiii.

²⁴Dahlem, 46-53.

²⁵Florence B. Stratemeyer and Margaret Lindsay, Working With The Student Teacher (New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1958), p. 119.

Sam Duker, in the following quotation, points out that in many situations the responsibility for the supervision of the student teaching program depends to a large extent upon the principal:

In a large number of cases the teacher training institution sends its students into the schools of the community for student teaching experiences. In many such cases the college has no jurisdiction over the school, and the success of the experience is almost entirely dependent on the school administrator and his staff. The main burden here, as in so many other situations, rests directly on the shoulders of the school principal.

.
There are some phases of student teaching relationships with the school that can be carried out successfully only when the school principal takes steps to see that they are.²⁶

Selection of Supervising Teachers

Most writers agree that the principal should have a part in the selection of supervising teachers. "Nelson and McDonald point out that the principal 'plays a key role in selecting and approving members of his staff who will act as cooperating teachers.'²⁷

Manuals and guides for student teaching developed by colleges indicate the responsibility of the principal in such statements as the following:

²⁶Sam Duker, "The Elementary School Principal and the Student Teacher," Educational Administration and Supervision, XLI (December, 1955), p. 467.

²⁷Asahel D. Woodruff, Student Teaching Today (AACTE Study Series, Number 5, Washington, D.C.: The American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1960), p. 5.

"Work jointly with the coordinator in the selection of the staff members who are to serve as cooperating teachers."²⁸

"Survey the field of teachers and select the ones who would make good prospective supervising teachers, using the criteria furnished by the college."²⁹

"Recommend only those cooperating teachers who are willing and qualified."³⁰

In indicating ways a school principal can contribute and cooperate with a teacher-education institution in recruiting outstanding teachers, Perrodin states:

The principal can recommend and encourage the best qualified teachers in the local school to participate in the supervision of student teaching. No one is in a better position than the local school principal to serve this recruitment function. He knows which teachers are truly master teachers, which have well adjusted personalities, which have a contagious zeal for teaching, and which are equipped with the human relations skills that are needed for guiding and sharing teaching and learning experiences.³¹

²⁸E. S. Christenbury, Tentative Policies and Procedures for Student Teaching (Knoxville, Tennessee: College of Education, University of Tennessee, 1959), p. 19.

²⁹Appalachian State Teachers College, Handbook for Student Teaching (Boone, North Carolina: Appalachian State Teachers College, 1954) (Mimeographed), p. 11.

³⁰School of Education, Indiana University, A Guide for Student Teaching (Bloomington, Indiana: Indiana University, 1959), p. 18.

³¹Alex F. Perrodin, "The Principal and the Student Teacher," Educational Administration and Supervision, Vol. XLII, No. 3, p. 149.

Haines suggests that when the principal participates in the selection of supervising teachers he establishes the framework for the development of many other activities in the school. Since he is acquainted with the teachers in the school, his advice and judgement are of great value in making wise choices of supervising teachers.³²

Assisting Supervising Teachers

One of the most important functions of the school principal as indicated in the literature is that of encouraging and assisting the supervising teacher. The principal has the responsibility of giving support and encouragement to the supervising teachers in the same way as he does for all teachers. In addition the principal should be aware of the special needs of the supervising teachers and the special demands made upon them. While it is desirable that supervising teachers participate as do other teachers in the on-going activities of the school, the principal may need to protect the supervising teacher from undue demands to work on school and community committees that come to them because of their outstanding leadership ability. In planning the over-all teacher load principals need to give consideration to allowing time for the super-

³²Haines, 58.

vising teachers to have conferences and to plan and evaluate the work of student teachers.³³

The principal can assist the supervising teachers in planning experiences for the student teachers outside the classroom. The principal can help in arranging for visitation in other classrooms and for contacts with some of the people who work in the school such as school nurse, librarian, or lunchroom manager. The principal can introduce the student teachers to personnel from the central office when they visit in the school.³⁴

The principal contributes to the improvement of the effectiveness of the supervising teachers' work with the student teachers. He can work with the supervising teachers to maintain a healthy balance in the duties assigned to student teachers such as a proper proportion of the more creative teaching activities and the various kinds of routine jobs. He can help the supervising teachers to provide a flexible schedule that will allow the student teachers to have experiences in the various phases of the school program.³⁵

Attendance at professional meetings with personnel from the college and with supervising teachers from other schools should be of great benefit to the supervising

³³Haines, 66.

³⁴Perrodin, 150.

³⁵Dahlem, 57.

teachers. Occasionally there are statewide or regional meetings of professional organizations such as The Association for Student Teaching which supervising teachers may wish to attend. To help the supervising teacher to participate in these activities the principal not only should give his approval and encouragement but he may need to arrange for suitable substitute teachers to relieve the supervising teachers. In some instances the principal takes over the teaching responsibilities himself in order that the supervising teachers may benefit from attending in-service and professional meetings.³⁶

The principal can do much to build readiness on the part of the teachers to work with student teachers and to promote the acceptance of the student teaching program in the school by the faculty as a whole. Teachers can be helped by the principals to realize the benefits that accrue from the program of student teaching.³⁷

Along with working with the supervising teachers the principal has the responsibility of helping the entire faculty to become acquainted with the student teaching program and to accept the student teachers as contributing members of the faculty. The example set by all faculty members as they work together in a professional manner will have great influence on the student teachers.³⁸

³⁶Perrodin, 152.

³⁷Dahlem, 57.

³⁸Haines, 63-64.

Information about the student teachers available from the college is channeled to the supervising teachers through the principal. Through studying the records and data on student teachers the principal is in a position to work jointly with the college supervisor in assigning the student teachers to supervising teachers.³⁹

The principal is seen as performing an important function by helping the supervising teachers in becoming acquainted with the student teachers. Haines describes this function as follows:

Before student teachers arrive in the school, the principal should receive affirmation of previous arrangements and specific information about their arrival. Personal data on the student with accompanying photographs help the principal and teachers to prepare more adequately. Information about the coordinator and his initial visit should also be available well in advance.

The principal assumes responsibility, once agreements have been reached, for channeling information to the teachers about the arrival of students and the allocation of student teachers' time. Any changes or misunderstandings also are cleared through his office. Since he is the designated administrator for the school, he helps to establish working relationships with college coordinators and facilitates scheduling of necessary contacts. This means he must allow some time for conferences and must use initiative in acquainting coordinators and student teachers with school policies. When handbooks or pamphlets are available containing information about the school, these may prove valuable for the principal to use for orientation purposes.⁴⁰

Dahlem views the principal as a partner in evaluation. As the principal has contacts with the student

³⁹Haines, 58.

⁴⁰Haines, 58.

teachers he can give the supervising teachers, and college supervisors as well, valuable help in the evaluation of the work of student teachers. The principal should work along with the supervising teachers in defining and making understandable the goals of teaching to the student teachers and to help each student appraise his progress toward the goals.⁴¹

In summary, the principal fulfills a vital role in the student teaching program as he assists and encourages the supervising teachers in professional growth, in planning and evaluating the experiences of student teachers, and in making available to them resources for use in the student teaching program.

Working With Student Teachers

The writers of the professional literature on student teaching programs place emphasis upon the principal's relationship with student teachers. Student teachers are advised not to be afraid to go to the school principal for help.⁴² The initial contact the student teachers have in the school, most often with the principal, sets the tone of the student teaching experiences.

⁴¹Dahlem, 57.

⁴²Sam P. Wiggins, The Student Teacher In Action (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1937), pp. 11, 27.

"The principal who meets with student teachers upon their arrival and welcomes them graciously sets the tone of their initial experiences."⁴³

The principal should be aware of the importance of the impressions the students receive upon their first contacts with the school and the way they perceive their relationship with the principal. Dahlem expresses the importance of these first impressions as follows:

Through initial contacts, the principal establishes himself as a professional person and becomes acquainted personally with each student. He communicates his expectations and helps students to identify their relationship with him.⁴⁴

One of the major areas in which principals can do effective work with student teachers is in orientation activities. For the most part orientation activities come early in student teaching experience, although some orientation may be scheduled throughout the term. Dahlem recommends regularly scheduled orientation meetings. Orientation activities led by the principal may include a number of other people, the college supervisor, the supervising teacher, the supervisor of instruction, the director of guidance, the school nurse, and in some activities the pupil leaders in the school.⁴⁵

During the orientation activities early in the term, the principal will introduce the student teachers

⁴³Haines, 59.

⁴⁴Dahlem, 54-55.

⁴⁵Dahlem, 54, and Haines, 59.

to both the teaching and non-teaching staff, show the student teachers around the school and inform them as to the location of supplies, equipment, teaching materials and pupil personnel records.⁴⁶ The student teachers are informed about the general policies and organization of the school. Any written materials that have been prepared for the guidance of student teachers is discussed.⁴⁷

The principal can talk to the student teachers about the school community and the importance of the student teachers' helping to build good public relations by attending parent-teacher meetings. The principal can help the student teachers to anticipate and look forward to parent-teacher conferences and home visits.⁴⁸ As the term progresses the principal can provide opportunities for the student teachers to become acquainted with the operation of the school office.⁴⁹

One of the functions of the school principal mentioned frequently in the literature is that of helping the student teacher learn something of the role of the principal in the school and the operation of the school office. Student teachers need to perceive the principal as an educational leader in the school. They should have opportunities to learn the true significance of the principal's

⁴⁶Dahlem, 54.

⁴⁷Haines, 59.

⁴⁸Dahlem, 55.

⁴⁹Dahlem, 55.

role as an educational leader rather than just as a disciplinarian.⁵⁰ Perrodin suggests a way in which the student teachers may become more fully aware of the role of the principal in the school:

The principal can arrange to acquaint the student teacher with the roles of the principal and the school administration. In many schools, principals arrange for the student teacher to spend approximately a day in close association with the principal and his activities. The student teacher may be invited to assist in them and to follow the principal throughout the day in order to gain a greater appreciation, understanding and respect for the manifold functions of an administrator. This is a rich and profitable adventure for any teacher, and one that can be accomplished most easily during the period of student teaching.⁵¹

The principal is seen as contributing to the student teaching program by being available for conferences with student teachers and giving assistance and encouragement as they face the student teaching experiences. It is desirable that the principal keep in touch with the progress and activities of the student teachers in the school, not just to check up on the work of the student teachers or supervising teachers, but to be available for counseling and guidance when needed.⁵²

Perrodin suggests that there be provided time during each week when the supervising teacher and student teacher can discuss progress, problems, and plans with the principal. The principal by demonstrating interest

⁵⁰Dahlem, 55.

⁵¹Perrodin, 152.

⁵²Duker, 471.

in the program and giving encouragement will be building desirable relationships that will be of great help to the student teacher when he needs to seek the help of the principal after employment in a teaching position.⁵³

Perrodin emphasizes that the contacts of the principal with the student teacher do not in any way lessen the importance of the supervising teacher.

Although the principal does not interfere with any of the specific responsibilities of the supervising teacher, as a professional educator he needs to share in the guidance and continuous evaluation of the student teacher.⁵⁴

There arise during the student teaching term circumstances affecting the welfare of the student teacher which necessitate cooperative decisions. The principal should be available for conferences. Sometimes cooperative conferences are needed; at other times individual conferences may be in order. Haines indicates the principal's role under such circumstances as follows:

The principal keeps informed about students' progress, and when serious decisions must be made about the future status of the student teacher, he helps to formulate an effective plan in consultation with appropriate personnel.⁵⁵

It is the responsibility of the principal to pave the way for the acceptance of the student teachers in the school by both the faculty and the pupils in the school.

⁵³Perrodin, 152, and Dahlem, 55.

⁵⁴Perrodin, 152.

⁵⁵Haines, 61.

The example the principal sets in accepting the student teachers as participating members of the school faculty has much influence on the faculty and the pupils in the school. Perrodin suggests some ways in which this acceptance can be demonstrated:

This acceptance will be demonstrated through actions such as including the student teacher on the distribution list of school announcements, providing a place where the student teacher may receive his mail, inviting the student teacher to faculty meetings, and encouraging the student teacher to participate in appropriate teachers' committees. At parent-teacher meetings the principal can assume responsibility for introducing the student teacher to parents in the same manner as he would present any new teacher. If it is the practice for faculty members to perform certain duties in connection with athletic events, concerts, study halls and lunchroom supervision, the student teacher should be scheduled for similar responsibilities, but only as he shows sufficient readiness to undertake these activities successfully.⁵⁶

Dahlem points out that acceptance of the student teachers as regular staff members "gives the student a genuine feeling of belonging."⁵⁷

The principal, as well as the supervising teacher, needs to set the stage for the arrival of the student teachers in order to promote acceptance and respect among the pupils. The extent to which the pupils understand the place of the student teachers in the school has much influence on the kind of experiences the student teachers will have in the school. Material developed at Florida State University contains the following suggested ways

⁵⁶Perrodin, 150.

⁵⁷Dahlem, 56.

through which the principals can help to develop these understandings:

- a. Announcing the pending arrival to the student body several days before he [intern] reports.
- b. Introducing the intern to student groups.
- c. Making clear to students that the intern has the status of a teacher.
- d. Giving the intern the same support and assistance in the handling of discipline cases and other problems of teaching as would be given a regular member of the faculty.⁵⁸

Perrodin warns against the temptation to exploit the services of the student teachers. Student Teachers should not be used to "run errands" or "to do clerical work." The principal should always keep in mind the major purposes of student teaching.⁵⁹

In summary, the writers in the literature see the school principal as performing important functions as he works with students in orientation activities, in planning and evaluating, in making school and community resources known and available, and in accepting the student teachers as participating members of the faculty.

Working With the Colleges

If the principal is to coordinate the program of student teaching in the school, he must become acquainted

⁵⁸Florida State University, "The Principal and the Interns in His School" (Tallahassee, Florida: Florida State University). (Mimeographed material) Statement 2.

⁵⁹Perrodin, 152.

with the teacher education institution's program for student teaching. The principal needs to be able to see how the goals and needs of the program can be met in the school of which he is principal. Dahlem describes the most important function a principal performs in a student teaching program as that of serving as liaison officer between his school and the teacher education institution. He is in a unique position to establish desirable relationships among all personnel in the program. He works in partnership with the college supervisors and the supervising teachers.⁶⁰

In the literature two aspects of this function are considered: (1) the principal's becoming acquainted with the teacher training institution's program and policies of student teaching, and (2) the principal's helping the college supervisors to become acquainted with the program and policies of the school.

Perrodin lists as one of the important ways a principal can contribute to the student teaching program that of becoming acquainted with the college's purposes and program for teacher education. He needs to know what supervision of the student teaching program will be provided by the college.⁶¹

The principal will need to be aware of gaps or inconsistencies between the philosophy and methods taught

⁶⁰Dahlem, 54.

⁶¹Perrodin, 149.

at the college and the practices in the school. He can be of invaluable service in helping the supervising teacher and student teacher to view these inconsistencies in an objective way.⁶²

It is the responsibility of the principal to acquaint the college supervisors with the program and policies of the school. Understanding the program and policies of the school by the college supervisors is very important if they are to be effective in helping the student teachers in planning and evaluation. The principal may orient the college supervisors to the local school situation through conferences and visitation in the school. The college supervisor can work more effectively if he is well grounded in understanding the local community and the resources and facilities of the school.⁶³

Interpreting the Student Teaching Program to Parents and the People of the Community

The principal is in a strategic position to interpret the student teaching program to the parents and the community for the purposes of winning acceptance and approval of the program.

Stratemeyer and Lindsey see the building of community understanding and acceptance of the student teaching program as one of the contributions principals can

⁶²Perrodin, 149.

⁶³Perrodin, 149.

make to the program of student teaching. The principal should take the initiative in working with the school board in providing for a discussion of the program with the Parent-Teacher Association and community groups.⁶⁴

Haines emphasizes the influence the principal can have on community acceptance of the student teaching program by his attitude and understanding of the program as he communicates with members of the community. It is important and appropriate that parents be informed about student teaching programs. Children may comment about their "practice teachers" or "new teachers" and their attitude and reactions will be influenced by the parents. To help parents to understand the purposes of the program, to know who the student teachers are, and from what teacher training institution they come, the principal can introduce the student teachers to parents at Parent-Teacher Association meetings, letters can be sent to the parents, and conferences can be held with individual parents.⁶⁵

Through discussion in community gatherings such as civic club meetings, through newspaper releases, and through school publications, the principal can "develop a wholesome atmosphere" in the community toward the student teaching program.⁶⁶

⁶⁴Stratemeyer and Lindsey, 143.

⁶⁵Haines, 61.

⁶⁶Haines, 61.

Although the winning of parent and community understanding and acceptance of the student teaching program is not an exclusive responsibility of the principal, as personnel of the college, personnel from the central office of the school system, supervising teachers, and the faculty as a whole have a share in this responsibility, the writers in the literature emphasize the importance of the principal in meeting this need.

Related Research

Three surveys of the functions of school principals in student teaching programs were encountered in the literature.

Helen Reed of the University of Kentucky received replies from one hundred thirty supervising teachers who were asked what they believed to be the responsibilities of the principal of a school in which student teaching was being done.⁶⁷ The replies are summarized as follows:

1. Hold meetings with the student teachers early in the period and explain the school organization, school policies, and the role of the student teacher in his school.
2. Invite student teachers to faculty meetings and to all community affairs in which the school participates.
3. Observe the student teacher in his actual teaching and have a conference with the supervising

⁶⁷Reed, 93. (In the report of this survey available to the writer, no information is given as to the design of the questionnaire, the geographical distribution of the respondents, or the statistical treatment of the data.)

teacher, the student teacher, and the college supervisor immediately following the observation, when feasible.

4. Make provision for the student teacher to observe and participate in other teachers' classes.

6. Give the student teacher an opportunity to see what tasks are performed in the office of the principal.

7. Hold a meeting at the close of the student teaching experience in order to evaluate this experience with the supervising teacher and the student teacher.

8. Guide and encourage the supervising teacher and the student teacher in developing high professional standards.

9. Let the supervising teacher know what responsibilities he believes the student teacher should accept in the classroom.

10. Provide time during the day for the supervising teacher, the student teacher, and college supervisor to have conferences.

11. "Open the Way" for experimentation on the part of the supervising teacher.

12. Make professional literature related to student teaching available to the supervising teacher.

13. Explain the student teaching program to the total faculty.

14. Work closely and cooperatively with the college supervisor and have a clear understanding of what the college expects of the services offered by his school.

15. Help the community to understand that student teaching is the source of good teachers.

16. Keep informed about what is being tried in teacher education programs.⁶⁸

The same article reports on the findings from a study of seventy-five principals who responded to a questionnaire asking for their attitude toward having student teachers in their schools. The summary of their replies is quoted as follows:

1. Instruction by supervising teachers continuously improved (these supervising teachers had been selected because they were considered "master" teachers).

⁶⁸Reed, 92-93.

2. Teachers became more interested in professional meetings.

3. Teachers took additional college work after they had worked with student teachers "for a while."

4. Teachers felt that supervising a student teacher was a professional responsibility.

5. Student teachers brought to their classroom many new ideas and materials which aroused the curiosity of the pupils and of the supervising teachers.

6. Student teachers introduced new books to the principals and teachers.

7. Student teachers brought a "freshness" and "new enthusiasm" to the school.

8. Student teachers kept the principals and supervising teachers in touch with the college.

9. Student teachers strengthened their [principals] confidence in the schools of the future.

10. The professional attitude of student teachers is an attitude which all should help maintain.

11. They [principals] felt that they have a professional obligation in the preparation of prospective teachers.

12. They [principals] recruited replacements and additions to faculties from the student teachers who did student teaching in their schools.⁶⁹

A study was made by Vernon C. Lingren with student teachers at the University of Pittsburg. One hundred forty student teachers who were completing one semester of student teaching in June, 1957, replied anonymously to an opinionnaire designed "to determine the kind and amount of help needed by student teachers and the amount of help received from each of the major cooperating staff members."⁷⁰

The student teachers were asked to indicate (1) the various amounts of help needed during the semester and (2) the various amounts of help received for each of the

⁶⁹Reed, 94.

⁷⁰Lingren, 22.

types of help listed. The data obtained from the opinionnaire were tabulated in two tables: Table I contains the responses as to the amount of certain types of help needed and received by student teachers. Table II contains the responses to the second part of the opinionnaire, the various amounts of help received for each of the types of help listed. The frequencies of response reported in Table I do not have particular meaning to this study of the functions of principals in student teaching programs. However, the statements under "Type of Help" do have value in this study and in understanding Table II. The statements from Table I are quoted as follows:

- Understanding the goals of the school
- Developing better personal qualities as a teacher-- voice, poise, emotional control, etc.
- Understanding and using special school services-- standardized test results, health, remedial reading, psychologists, etc.
- Keeping and making out official records and reports
- Understanding and using courses of study and curriculum guides
- Making effective use of community resources
- Handling disciplinary problems
- Planning for and working with gifted and retarded children
- Getting acquainted with the community and its people.

Table II from Lingren's study is quoted in its entirety as Table 1.

TABLE 1

TABLE II: AMOUNTS OF HELP RECEIVED FROM VARIOUS STAFF MEMBERS BY STUDENT TEACHERS^a

	Number of Student Teachers Reporting Various Amounts of Help				
	No Response	No Help	Little Help	Some Help	Much Help
Director of Student Teaching	1	25	40	54	20
Co-ordinator of Elementary Student Teaching	65	40	22	10	3
University Supervisor or Supervisors	1	11	38	47	43
Co-operating Teacher or Teachers	0	3	14	28	95
Administrators or Other Officials in Cooperating School	4	65	33	24	14
University Methods Instructor or Instructors	1	25	47	40	27
Other Student Teachers	2	21	33	64	20

^aVernon C. Lingren, "Help Needed and Received by Student Teachers," Journal of Teacher Education, X (March, 1959), p. 25.

The author says that "administrators or other officials in co-operating schools were not 'in the running' as being helpful." This is contrasted with cooperating teachers as being of "much help" in 95 cases.

Lingren lists 12 specific proposals which he believes are justified by the findings from the study. The proposals from his list that pertain to the work of the principal are as follows:

1. The principals or head teachers in each building having student teachers should hold group meetings as a part of the orientation procedure and include discussions designed to foster an understanding of the goals of the particular school.

3. Principals should schedule group conferences to familiarize the student teachers with special school services relating to testing, pupil health, remedial teaching and psychological services.

6. The use of community resources should be attempted as an integral part of the teaching experiences.

7. Discipline should be studied at every possible opportunity. A school-wide conference guided by the principal should be supplemented by numerous conferences with cooperating teachers.

9. Special attention should be given to acquainting the student teacher with the community and its people. A school-wide orientation meeting plus follow-up work in the classroom would be a desirable minimum.⁷¹

It seems to the writer that if a principal participates in the student teaching program in keeping with the ideas from the literature presented in the first section of this chapter, he would be of much help to student teachers in several of the functions represented in the

⁷¹Lingren, 22-27.

statements under "Type of Help" in the foregoing study such as "Understanding the goals of the school, Understanding and using special services, . . . [and] Getting acquainted with the community and its people."⁷²

The 1961 Yearbook Committee of The Association for Student Teaching made an effort to discover institutions in which interesting practices and ideas were represented pertaining to administrative relationships between colleges and public schools.⁷³

A questionnaire designed to seek descriptive information about administrative relationships was submitted to 91 teacher training institutions. Seventy-five institutions from 31 states replied. Although the responses were of an essay type they were grouped into categories.

1. "Approximately two-thirds of the respondents indicated some form of cooperative planning and policy formation was going on in their program." However, within this number practices varied greatly. An example of this practice can be found at the University of Southern California where a representative group from the college and public schools met once each month to study problems and to recommend policies.

2. Fewer than one out of five of the institutions reported the cooperative use of supervisory and coordinating

⁷²Lingren, 24.

⁷³Smith and Cunningham, 4-21.

personnel. An example of this practice in operation was reported at Michigan State University at East Lansing where the coordinators in many instances were jointly employed by the university and the local school district.

3. Approximately 50 per cent of the reporting institutions indicated some type of cooperative development of materials, usually handbooks or guides. A small number gave evidence of working together on instructional materials. For example, at Bucknell, elementary science materials were being developed cooperatively.

4. From the 75 institutions the following responses were obtained on the cooperative selection of public school supervisory personnel:

- | | |
|---|----|
| (1) Cooperatively built standards or criteria used in the selection of supervising teachers | 3 |
| (2) Selection arrived at cooperatively on an individual basis - no evidence of guiding criteria | 42 |
| (3) No evidence of cooperative selection | 30 |

For those institutions reporting some type of cooperation in the selection of supervising teachers there was no indication of the extent of the participation of the principal in the process.

5. Fifty-five of the 75 institutions reported no development of criteria for selection and evaluation of

student teaching centers. There is some evidence that suggests that the profession is beginning to sense this very important problem.

The University of Wyoming included some points in its criteria pertaining to the administrative staff:

The cooperating school must be one in which the administrative staff, the faculty, and the board of trustees understand the importance and function of the student teaching experience, and believe that the student-teaching experience is a vital and necessary part of the program of teacher education. The school administrative staff and the teachers must be willing to have student teachers in their school. Willing to accept the student teachers as a part of the school, and willing to provide an experience of quality in order to make a strong contribution to the future success of the student in the teaching field. . . .

The administrative staff and faculty must be enthusiastic in their efforts to strengthen the profession. . . . The administrative staff shall arrange for time for the supervising teacher to do the job of supervision which is assigned and count that supervision as part of the teaching load. . . .⁷⁴

Other points reported in this survey are not pertinent to this study.

A review of one doctoral dissertation related to this study was found in the literature. In 1953 Robert B. Kennedy made a study of "The Role of the High School Principal in the Administration of a Teacher Education Program." This was a Doctor of Education study at Stanford University. The purpose of the study was to determine how public senior high school principals of Santa Clara and San Mateo counties, California, organize, administer, and

⁷⁴Smith and Cunningham, 17.

supervise teacher education programs in their schools, and to explore changes in attitudes and procedures that might make for more effective teacher education.⁷⁵

A questionnaire and personal interviews were used to gather information. The report of this study contained no information as to the design of the questionnaire and personal interviews.

The findings and conclusions that seem to be pertinent to the role of the principals in student teaching programs are as follows:

5. Most important organizational role of principals is that of chief liaison officer between their own schools and teacher education institutions.

6. Two-thirds of all principals in the study delegated the responsibility of administering teacher education programs in their school.

8. Nearly 100 per cent of principals indicated that they gave little class room supervision to student teachers. This is left to supervising teachers and representatives of the preparing institutions.

9. Less than 1 per cent of 130 public senior high school principals reporting indicated that their participation in teacher education is among their major responsibilities.

15. Majority of principals say there is definite lack of time for them to administer a teacher education program.

17. Majority of principals say good relationships exist between collegiate institution's personnel and principals.

⁷⁵The Association for Student Teaching, Research Abstract, Number 3, Research Abstracts Series, Edited by Geneva Hanna (Cedar Falls, Iowa: The Association for Student Teaching, 1959), pp. 7-10. The original study which was requested on Interlibrary Loan was not available.

Among the recommendations made that seem to be related to the purposes of this study of the functions of school principals in student teaching programs are the following:

1. Teacher education program must be an integral part of a principal's administrative functions.

2. There must be successful personal relations of principals to all personnel in the program if teacher education is to succeed.

5. Coordination of supervisory responsibilities of high school principals and preparing institutions is needed to make for more effective supervision.

9. Time studies of the time the principal devotes to teacher education should be made. This will include the place of teacher education among his duties.

10. The high school principal should conduct stated orientation meetings for student and supervising teachers in the teacher education program.

13. Constant evaluation by principal and staff members of their own internal organization is needed.⁷⁶

Summary

In this chapter the literature pertaining to the functions of school principals in student teaching programs has been reviewed.

The principal is viewed as a key person in the student teaching program as he gives leadership in establishing good working relationships in the school. The principal is seen as making contributions to the student teaching program as he (1) participates with the personnel

⁷⁶The Association for Student Teaching, Research Abstract, Number 3, Research Abstracts Series, 7-10.

from the college in the selection of the supervising teachers, (2) assists the supervising teachers in planning and making arrangements for the experiences of the student teachers, (3) works directly with the student teachers in orientation activities, conferences, and faculty meetings, (4) works with the personnel from the college, and (5) interprets the student teaching program to the parents and people of the community.

The related research that has been done in the area pertaining to the functions of school principals in student teaching programs was reviewed. Although little research has been done in this area, there is developing an awareness of the need to identify the role of the principal in student teaching programs.

Helen Reed of the University of Kentucky, from the replies of 130 supervising teachers, compiled a list of 16 responsibilities of principals in student teaching programs. The same report contained a summary of the replies of 75 principals who responded to a questionnaire pertaining to their attitude toward having student teachers. Twelve statements were listed.

Vernon C. Lingren of the University of Pittsburg obtained the responses of 140 student teachers to an opinionnaire designed to determine the amount of help needed by student teachers and the amount of help received from various staff members. The findings indicated that

the student teachers considered administrators in the school to be of very little help.

Smith and Cunningham in an effort to discover interesting practices and ideas pertaining to administrative relationships in student teaching programs found in the replies of 75 institutions some trends toward cooperative planning and policy formation.

Robert B. Kennedy made a study of "The Role of the High School Principal in the Administration of a Teacher Education Program." The purpose of the study was to determine how Santa Clara and San Mateo counties, California, organize, administer, and supervise teacher education programs in their schools. Findings indicate that the most important organizational role of principals is that of chief liaison officer between their own schools and teacher education institutions.

CHAPTER III

PROCEDURE

The purpose of this study was to compare the perceptions of college supervisors, school principals, and supervising teachers concerning the functions of school principals in student teaching programs. The perceptions were compared in three ways: (1) differences among the groups as to appropriateness of the functions, (2) differences among the groups as to the performance of the functions, and (3) differences within each group as to the appropriateness and the performance of the functions.

Development of the Questionnaire

A questionnaire was developed based on the functions of school principals as revealed by a survey of the professional literature. The professional literature dealing with student teaching programs, reviewed in Chapter II, was examined to determine the suggested functions of principals in student teaching programs. Also fourteen manuals and guides developed by universities and colleges

were available to the writer.⁷⁷ These were examined to see how the suggested functions were stated as practices in student teaching programs. From these sources a tentative list of statements of functions of school principals in student teaching programs was developed.

Particularly useful in developing the list of tentative statements were the lists of functions listed by Reed as reviewed in Chapter II and the lists of functions in the manuals and guides. These sources yielded a list of twenty-seven different statements. This tentative list of statements was checked against the more general suggestions of functions of the principals in student teaching programs as reviewed in Chapter II which suggested to the author two additional statements, making a total of twenty-nine statements in the list.

Many of the ideas were repeated in different forms in several of the sources.

The functions as stated in these sources were combined and revised so that each basic idea was used only one time. Statements were reworded so as to achieve consistency in the wording of statements to be included in the questionnaire.

The list of statements in this tentative form was submitted to the members of the staff of the Department of

⁷⁷The manuals and guides used in the development of the questionnaire are listed in the Bibliography under the heading, "Manuals and Guides."

Elementary Education at the University of Alabama and the graduate students in a Seminar in Elementary Education during the school year 1961-62. Members of the seminar were asked to make suggestions to improve the list of statements by rewording statements, eliminating repetitious statements, combining related statements, and dividing statements that included more than one function.

Suggestions from the members of the seminar resulted in a questionnaire of thirty-four statements. Two statements, Numbers 4 and 9 in the final form of the questionnaire, were added to provide contrasting functions to the functions represented in Numbers 5 and 10.

For each of the thirty-four statements two questions were asked: "Is This Appropriate?" and "Is This Done?" A request was made to place a circle around the numbers of six statements that best indicated the functions that contributed the most to the success of the student teaching program. An invitation was given to explain or comment on any of the answers and to list any additional functions considered to be important in working with student teachers.

The chairman of the writer's advisory committee approved the questionnaire in its final form. A copy of the questionnaire is supplied in Appendix A.

The Respondents

The study was limited to the college supervisors, principals and supervising teachers engaged in working with student teachers from the accredited colleges and universities in Alabama which enroll white students.⁷⁸

A letter was written to the deans of each college requesting a list of the names and addresses of the college supervisors, principals, and supervising teachers engaged in work with student teachers from their colleges. Accompanying this letter was a letter written by the Chairman of the Department of Elementary Education, University of Alabama, addressed to the deans of the colleges, stating the purpose of the study and asking for the cooperation of each college in the study. Copies of these letters are supplied in Appendix B.

Lists of the names and addresses of college supervisors, principals, and supervising teachers were received from thirteen of the fourteen colleges. Table 2 gives the names of the colleges participating in the study and the number of college supervisors, principals, and supervising teachers from each college.

The questionnaire along with a cover letter was mailed to all the college supervisors, principals, and supervising teachers whose names were furnished by the

⁷⁸Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools, 9.

TABLE 2
 NUMBER OF PARTICIPATING STAFF MEMBERS
 REPORTED BY THE COOPERATING COLLEGES

Name of University or College	Number of College Supervisors	Number of Principals	Number of Supervising Teachers
Alabama College	2	2	30
Athens College	2	4	8
Auburn University	20	37	78
Birmingham Southern College	2	5	17
Florence State College	4	7	32
Howard College	4	14	95
Jacksonville State College	2	2	22
Judson College	1	1	22
Livingston State College	4	16	33
Spring Hill College	2	2	5
St. Bernard College	0	10	9
Troy State College	3	11	72
University of Alabama	12	14	89
Totals	58	125	512

colleges. The cover letter explained the purposes of the study, asked that the questionnaire be checked and returned, and indicated that no individual would be identified in the study. A copy of this letter is in Appendix B.

A code number was placed in the upper right corner on the first page of each questionnaire indicating that it was being sent to either college supervisor, principal, or supervising teacher.

Compilation of Responses

Table 3 shows the number and per cent of questionnaires returned by each group.

TABLE 3
PER CENT OF RETURNS ON THE QUESTIONNAIRE
BY THE THREE PARTICIPATING GROUPS

	Number Sent	Number of Usable Questionnaires Returned	Per Cent Returned
College Supervisors	58	49	84.48
Principals	125	97	77.60
Supervising Teachers	512	314	61.32
Total	695	460	66.18

Forty-nine (84.48 per cent) of the college supervisors returned the questionnaires. Ninety-seven (77.60 per cent) of the principals responded and 314 (61.32 per cent) of the teachers returned questionnaires. Actually 319 teachers returned questionnaires but five of these had not been checked due to the fact that the teachers were not at that time engaged in supervising student teachers.

The responses of the college supervisors, principals, and teachers were tallied separately. The responses were tallied as "Yes," "No," or "Omitted." The omissions were counted in order to check the accuracy of the tally. The "Omitted" designation included those statements which were omitted with an explanation such as "Don't know," "Not applicable in our school," or "Sometimes yes, sometimes no."

The responses of the three groups to the request to place circles around the numbers of six statements which contributed the most to the success of the student teaching program were tallied under the heading "Most Important."

Statistical Treatment

To determine if the differences among the three groups (college supervisors, principals, and supervising teachers) were significant, the chi square test was used.⁷⁹

⁷⁹Charles C. Peters and Walter R. Van Voorhis, Statistical Procedures and Their Mathematical Bases (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1940), pp. 414-17.

Chi square tables for each of the thirty-four statements in the questionnaire were constructed. Table 4 shows this procedure as applied to the data obtained on Statement 1.

The chi square tables are in four parts. Parts a and b pertain to the first question, "Is This Appropriate?" and parts c and d pertain to the second question, "Is This Done?" Parts a and c show the obtained and theoretical frequencies. Parts b and d show the deviations between the obtained and theoretical frequencies and the weighted squared deviations.

The first entries in the chi square tables are the responses to the statements contained in the questionnaire. In the case of Table 4 Part a, the first entry, 24, is the number of college supervisors who considered this statement as "Most Important." The responses to "Most Important" were included in the tables showing the responses to the first question, "Is This Appropriate?" This response was considered to be closely related to the response of "Yes" to the question "Is This Appropriate?" Therefore, in constructing the thirty-four tables for this question, the responses under "Most Important" were subtracted from the "Yes" responses.

Continuing with Table 4, the second entry, 25, in the first row under "Yes" was obtained by subtracting 24 from the total "Yes" responses, 49, by the college

TABLE 4^a

CHI SQUARE TABLE FOR STATEMENT 1, "THE PRINCIPAL BECOMES ACQUAINTED WITH THE TEACHER EDUCATION INSTITUTION'S PROGRAM AND POLICIES FOR STUDENT TEACHING."

First Question, "Is This Appropriate?"

Part a Obtained Frequencies (f_o) and Theoretical Frequencies (f_t)

Note: Theoretical frequencies are shown in parentheses

	Most Important	Yes	No	Omitted	Total
College Supervisors	24(14.16)	25 (32.80)	0(0.53)	0(1.49)	49
Principals	22(28.06)	70 (64.94)	2(1.05)	3(2.95)	97
Teachers	87(90.78)	213(210.24)	3(3.41)	11(9.55)	314
Total	133	308	5	14	460

Part b Deviations Between Obtained Frequencies and Theoretical Frequencies ($f_o - f_t$) and Weighted Squared Deviations $\frac{(f_o - f_t)^2}{f_t}$

Note: Weighted squared deviations are shown in parentheses

	Most Important	Yes	No	Omitted	Total
College Supervisors	9.84(6.83)	7.80(1.85)	.53(.50)	1.49(1.49)	10.67
Principals	6.06(1.30)	5.06(0.39)	.95(.85)	.05(0.00)	2.54
Teachers	3.78(0.15)	2.76(0.03)	.41(.04)	1.45(0.22)	0.44
Total	8.28	2.27	1.39	1.71	13.65

Chi square = the sum of the weighted squared deviations

Chi square = 13.65

P = .034

^aReproduction of Table 1 in Appendix C.

TABLE 4--Continued

Second Question, "Is This Done?"

Part c Obtained Frequencies (f_o) and Theoretical
Frequencies (f_t)

Note: Theoretical frequencies are shown in parentheses

	Yes	No	Omitted	Total
College Supervisors	43 (44.10)	3 (2.77)	3 (2.13)	49
Principals	91 (87.30)	5 (5.48)	1 (4.22)	97
Teachers	280(282.60)	18(17.75)	16(13.65)	314
Total	414	26	20	460

Part d Deviations Between Obtained Frequencies and Theo-
retical Frequencies (f_o-f_t) and Weighted Squared
Deviations $\frac{(f_o-f_t)^2}{f_t}$

Note: Weighted squared deviations are shown in parentheses

	Yes	No	Omitted	Total
College Supervisors	1.10(0.03)	.23(.02)	.87(0.36)	.41
Principals	3.70(0.16)	.48(.04)	3.22(2.46)	2.66
Teachers	2.60(0.02)	.25(.01)	2.35(0.40)	.43
Total	.21	.07	3.22	3.50

Chi square = the sum of the weighted squared deviations

Chi square = 3.50

P = .482

supervisors to the first statement. Likewise, the entries under "No" and "Omitted" are the numbers of these responses.

Looking at the second row in Table 4, "Principals," the first entry in the first column, 22, is the number of responses to "Most Important." The first entry in the second column under "Yes," 70, is the difference between the "Yes" responses of the principals and the responses to "Most Important" to the first question, "Is This Appropriate?" for Statement 1.

The second entries in each column in Part a of the chi square tables are the theoretical frequencies. The theoretical frequencies are the numbers of responses that could be expected if the different groups of respondents had answered in the same ratio to each of the questions. The theoretical frequencies are shown in parentheses in the tables. In Table 4 Part a, (14.16) is the theoretical frequency for college supervisors under "Most Important" on the first statement. The procedure for determining the theoretical frequencies as given by Peters and Van Voorhis⁸⁰ is to multiply the total for the column over the total for the table by the total of the row over the total for the table and to multiply this product by the total for the table. For the first entry of Table 4, the formula would have these figures: $\frac{133}{460} \times \frac{49}{460} \times 460$. By cancellation it is seen that the formula can be reduced

⁸⁰Peters and Van Voorhis, 415-16.

to $\frac{133 \times 49}{460}$. This simplification of the formula is true for each of the problems; therefore, the procedure for finding the theoretical frequencies in the tables was reduced to dividing the product of the total for the column and the total for the row by the total for the table.

To obtain the deviations between the obtained frequencies and the theoretical frequencies, the theoretical frequencies were subtracted from the obtained frequencies. The results were entered as the first entries in the second table. In Table 4 Part b, 9.84 is the difference between 24 and 14.16. This means that the college supervisors gave more responses of "Most Important" to the first question than could have been expected if they had answered in the same ratio as the total for all the groups.

To proceed with Table 4, the deviation was squared and this result divided by the theoretical frequency to give the weighted squared deviation. In the case of the first column in Table 4 Part b, the figures are as follows: $(9.84)^2/14.16 = 6.83$. The weighted squared deviations are shown in parentheses in Part b of the tables. The figure, (6.83), is the weighted squared deviation for the college supervisors in the column "Most Important."

The weighted squared deviations for all the columns and rows were totaled to give "chi square." In the case of Table 4, chi square is 13.65 which corresponds to a probability of .034. This means that for Statement 1 the differences among the group to the first question, "Is

This Appropriate?" can be attributed to sampling error in only about three cases in one hundred or that the results are significant at the .03 level of confidence.

The probability values were found in the table given in Peters and Van Voorhis, "Values of P for the Chi Square Test of Goodness of Fit."⁸¹

In this study the .05 level of confidence was taken as the critical point. Results at or beyond the .05 level were considered to be statistically significant.

Parts c and d of the chi square tables pertain to the second question contained in the questionnaire, "Is This Done?" The procedure for finding the chi square is the same as for Parts a and b except that the frequencies for "Most Important" are not included in Parts c and d.

To determine if the differences between the results obtained on the first question, "Is This Appropriate?" and the second question, "Is This Done?" were significant, the significance of the differences between correlated proportions were found. The procedure worked out by McNemar⁸² and discussed by Ferguson⁸³ was used. The data were arranged in 2x2 tables.

⁸¹Peters and Van Voorhis, Table XLVIII, 498.

⁸²Quinn McNemar, Psychological Statistics, Second Edition (New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1955), pp. 224-30.

⁸³George A. Ferguson, Statistical Analysis in Psychology and Education (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1959), pp. 169-71.

		Is This Done?		
		No	Yes	
Is This Appropriate?	Yes	11 <u>A</u>	64 <u>B</u>	75
	No	21 <u>C</u>	1 <u>D</u>	22
		32	65	97

FIGURE 1

2x2 TABLE SHOWING RESPONSES OF 97 PRINCIPALS TO STATEMENT 5

On the right side of the 2x2 tables are the "Yes" and "No" responses to the first question, "Is This Appropriate?"⁸⁴ The numbers at the bottom of the tables are the "No" and "Yes" responses to the second question, "Is This Done?" On the right side of Figure 1, the number 75 shows the number of "Yes" responses and the number 22 shows the number of "No" responses of the principals to the first question, "Is This Appropriate?" for Statement 5. At the bottom of Figure 1, the number 32 shows the number of "No" responses and the number 65 shows the number of "Yes" responses of the principals to the second question, "Is This Done?" for Statement 5.

The A cell contains the number of responses which were "Yes" for the first question and "No" for the second

⁸⁴The "No" responses include the number who failed to respond to the statement.

question. The B cell contains the responses which were "Yes" for the first question and "Yes" for the second question. The C cell contains the number of responses which were "No" for the first question and "No" for the second question. The D cell contains the number of responses which were "No" to the first question and "Yes" to the second question. To find the number of responses for the cells in the tables the number of responses of "No" to the first question, "Is This Appropriate?" and "Yes" to the second question, "Is This Done?" (cell D) were tallied. The numbers in the other cells were then computed by arithmetic.

In Figure 1 the number in cell D, 1, was obtained by tallying the number of principals who recorded a "No" response to the first question and "Yes" to the second question. The number in cell B, 64, was obtained by subtracting 1 from 65. The number in cell A, 11, was obtained by subtracting 64 from 75. The number in cell C, 21, was obtained by subtracting 11 from 32 or 1 from 22.

The formula given by McNemar for finding the significance of the difference between correlated proportions is chi square = $\frac{(A - D)^2}{A + D}$. When the sum of A + D proved to be less than 20, Yates' correction for continuity was applied. This resulted in the formula becoming

$$\chi^2 = \frac{([A - D] - 1)^2}{A + D} .85$$

Substituting the numbers in Figure 1, the formula

$$\text{chi square} = \frac{(\frac{[A - D]}{A + D} - 1)^2}{\frac{11 + 1}{12}}$$
 gives $\frac{[(\frac{11 - 1}{11 + 1}) - 1]^2}{\frac{12}{12}} = \frac{(9)^2}{12}$
 $= \frac{81}{12} = 6.75$. Chi square = 6.75; $P = >.01$.

The probability of the differences in the responses of the principals on the first question, "Is This Appropriate?" and the second question, "Is This Done?" being due to chance is less than 1 out of 100 for the responses of the principals to Statement 5.

For convenience in the discussion of the data the per cent of "Yes" responses for each group on both questions was determined. These data are shown in appropriate tables in Chapter IV.

Summary

In this chapter the procedures used in carrying out this study were described.

1. A questionnaire consisting of thirty-four statements was developed. The statements were a compilation of the functions of school principals in student teaching programs revealed by a review of the professional literature. Members of a Seminar in Elementary Education at the University of Alabama during the school year 1961-62 assisted the writer in the development of the questionnaire.

2. The questionnaire was submitted to the college supervisors, principals, and supervising teachers for their responses to two questions for each of the statements.

The two questions were, "Is This Appropriate?" and "Is This Done?" The respondents were also asked to indicate six of the statements which they considered to contribute the most to the success of the student teaching programs in their schools.

3. Forty-nine college supervisors, 97 principals and 314 supervising teachers returned questionnaires. The responses of the groups were tallied separately and tables were constructed showing the responses of each group.

4. The data obtained from the questionnaire were subjected to two statistical treatments:

a) The chi square test was used to determine the significance of the differences among the responses of the three groups concerning the appropriateness and the performance of the functions represented by the statements in the questionnaire.

b) The chi square test of the significance of differences between correlated proportions was used to compare the responses to the first question, "Is This Appropriate?" with the responses to the second question, "Is This Done?"

The results obtained through these procedures are discussed in Chapter IV.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS OF STUDY

The data presented in this chapter were obtained through the use of a questionnaire. The procedures followed in the development of the questionnaire were explained in Chapter III. The 34 statements in the questionnaire were derived from a review of the professional literature pertaining to student teaching programs. The questionnaire was submitted to college supervisors, principals, and supervising teachers engaged in working with student teachers from accredited universities and colleges in Alabama for white students.⁸⁶

The respondents were asked to make three different responses to the statements in the questionnaire: first, they were asked to indicate by checking "Yes" or "No" whether or not they thought each statement on the questionnaire was an appropriate function of the principal. Second, they were asked to indicate by checking "Yes" or "No" whether or not they thought each function was being performed by the principals of the schools in which they were working with student teachers. Third, the respondents

⁸⁶Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools, 9.

were asked to circle the numbers of six statements in the questionnaire which, in their opinion, best indicated the functions that contributed the most to the success of the program of student teaching in their schools.

Presentation of Data

Tabulation of Responses to the Questionnaire

Tables 5, 6, and 7 show the responses of the three groups to the statements contained in the questionnaire.

The tables were made up of the responses "Yes," "No," and "Omitted" for the two questions, "Is This Appropriate?" and "Is This Done?" The responses to the request to indicate six of the statements which best indicated the function that contributed most to the success of the student teaching program were recorded under the heading, "Most Important."

Table 5 contains the responses of the 49 college supervisors to the statements contained in the questionnaire. An examination of this table indicates that the vast majority of the statements received a "Yes" response to the first question, "Is This Appropriate?" There were exceptions to this as some statements received a majority or a large number of "No" responses. These statements were those numbered 4, 8, 9, 19, 23, 26, and 30.

An examination of the "Omitted" column indicates that the college supervisors omitted very few statements.

An examination of the responses to the second question, "Is This Done?", indicates that, although some statements received large numbers of responses in the "Yes" column, there were many more "No" responses than were found under the first question, "Is This Appropriate?" It is also apparent that the college supervisors omitted many more responses to the second question than they did to the first question.

Five college supervisors did not respond to the request to indicate six most important statements.

Table 6 contains the responses of the 97 principals to the statements contained in the questionnaire.

An examination of this table indicates that the principals checked a large number of "Yes" responses in reply to the first question, "Is This Appropriate?" There were some exceptions, notably Statements 4, 8, 9, and 26.

There was a tendency for the principals to omit certain statements, namely, 8, 9, 10, 23, 29, 30, 33, and 34.

Reference to the responses of the principals to the second question, "Is This Done?" reveals that the principals gave a large number of "Yes" responses. However, the number of "No" responses was greater than those found in answer to the first question.

As in the case of the first question, the principals tended to omit the responses to certain statements, namely,

Numbers 8, 9, 23, and 30. Seventeen principals failed to designate any statements as most important.

Table 7 contains the responses of the 314 supervising teachers to the statements contained in the questionnaire.

An examination of this table reveals that, as in the case of the college supervisors and principals, the supervising teachers checked a large number of "Yes" responses in answer to both questions but there were exceptions, notably Statements 4, 5, 8, 9, 19, 20, 26, and 30. It can be seen that there was a tendency for the supervising teachers to omit responses to many of the statements.

Per Cents of "Yes" Responses

Table 8 shows the per cent of "Yes" responses of the three groups for each statement to the question concerning appropriateness of the stated function of the principal. Table 9 shows the same for the question concerning whether or not the principal performed the stated function. A comparison of the "Yes" responses of the three groups can be made by an examination of these tables. An examination of Table 8 showing the per cent of "Yes" responses to the first question, "Is This Appropriate?", shows that the responses of the college supervisors yielded the highest per cent of "Yes" responses for 19 of the statements. The responses of the principals yielded the highest per cent of "Yes" responses for 14 of the statements. The

TABLE 8

PER CENTS OF "YES" RESPONSES TO THE FIRST QUESTION,
"IS THIS APPROPRIATE?"

STATEMENT NUMBER	COLLEGE SUPERVISORS		PRINCIPALS		TEACHERS	
	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent
1	49	100.00	92	94.84	300	95.54
2	47	95.91	91	93.81	293	93.31
3	45	91.83	93	95.87	289	92.03
4	2	4.08	22	22.68	53	16.87
5	43	87.75	75	77.31	244	77.70
6	47	95.91	86	88.65	263	83.75
7	45	91.83	74	76.28	224	71.33
8	17	34.69	58	59.79	174	55.41
9	22	44.89	26	26.80	183	58.28
10	37	75.51	67	69.07	192	61.14
11	46	93.87	91	93.81	272	86.62
12	45	91.83	85	87.62	268	85.35
13	45	91.83	89	91.75	254	80.89
14	46	93.87	92	94.84	276	87.89
15	46	93.87	91	93.81	268	85.35
16	47	95.91	87	89.69	273	86.94
17	40	81.63	88	90.72	225	71.65
18	45	91.83	88	90.72	262	83.43
19	26	53.06	73	75.25	155	49.36
20	41	83.67	82	84.53	210	66.87
21	43	87.75	81	83.50	244	71.33
22	48	97.95	91	93.81	285	90.76
23	37	75.51	77	79.38	211	67.19
24	46	93.87	91	93.81	288	91.71
25	48	97.95	91	93.81	289	92.03
26	27	55.10	62	63.91	182	57.96
27	45	91.83	83	85.56	262	83.43
28	41	83.67	85	87.62	219	69.74
29	41	83.67	86	88.65	265	84.39
30	27	55.10	57	58.76	136	43.31
31	44	89.79	63	64.94	210	66.87
32	44	89.79	89	91.75	222	70.70
33	40	81.63	83	85.56	232	73.88
34	44	89.79	78	80.41	225	71.65

TABLE 9

PER CENTS OF "YES" RESPONSES TO THE SECOND QUESTION,
"IS THIS DONE?"

STATEMENT NUMBER	COLLEGE SUPERVISORS		PRINCIPALS		TEACHERS	
	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent
1	43	87.75	91	93.81	280	89.17
2	32	65.30	75	77.31	254	80.89
3	40	81.63	87	89.69	267	85.03
4	4	8.16	13	13.40	46	14.64
5	32	65.30	65	67.01	201	64.01
6	24	48.97	70	72.16	164	52.22
7	16	32.65	47	48.45	106	33.75
8	8	16.32	56	57.73	118	37.57
9	31	63.26	31	31.95	225	71.65
10	20	40.81	49	50.31	121	38.53
11	35	71.42	80	82.47	220	70.06
12	30	61.22	78	80.41	204	64.96
13	31	63.26	80	82.47	178	56.68
14	34	69.38	88	90.72	217	69.10
15	38	77.55	85	87.62	224	71.33
16	37	75.51	74	76.28	223	71.01
17	24	43.97	79	81.48	132	42.03
18	30	61.22	78	80.41	187	59.55
19	11	22.44	55	56.70	82	26.11
20	24	48.97	72	74.22	153	48.72
21	14	28.57	55	56.70	141	44.90
22	33	67.34	90	92.78	242	77.07
23	18	36.73	60	61.85	137	43.63
24	22	44.89	81	83.50	249	79.29
25	40	81.63	91	93.81	276	87.89
26	7	14.28	51	52.57	105	33.43
27	34	69.38	79	81.44	212	67.51
28	24	48.97	79	81.44	147	46.81
29	36	73.46	87	89.69	242	77.07
30	14	28.57	37	38.14	70	22.29
31	27	55.10	63	64.94	134	42.67
32	25	51.02	86	88.65	178	56.68
33	30	61.22	75	77.31	176	56.05
34	24	48.97	79	81.44	177	56.36

responses of the supervising teachers yielded the highest per cent of "Yes" responses for only one of the statements. It can be observed that many of the per cents of "Yes" responses of the three groups appeared to vary considerably while others varied very little.

An examination of Table 9 showing the per cents of "Yes" responses to the second question, "Is This Done?", reveals that the responses of the principals yielded the highest per cent of "Yes" responses for all of the statements except 3, for which responses of the supervising teachers yielded the highest per cent.

A comparison of the per cents of "Yes" responses in Tables 8 and 9 shows that for most statements the per cent of "Yes" responses to the first question, "Is This Appropriate?", are higher than for the second question, "Is This Done?"

However, it appears that there is less difference between the per cents of "Yes" responses of the principals to the two questions than there is for the other groups.

The differences among the perceptions of the three groups are discussed more fully in the next section of this chapter, where the results of more detailed statistical analysis are available.

Analysis of Data

In this section of the study the data will be studied to compare the responses of the three groups to the statements contained in the questionnaire.

Overview of Procedures for Analysis

The data obtained through the use of the questionnaire were subjected to two statistical treatments: (1) the chi square test of the significance of differences among the groups⁸⁷ and (2) the chi square test of the differences between the responses of each group to the two questions contained in the questionnaire.⁸⁸

The first statistical procedure was used to determine whether the groups (college supervisors, principals, and supervising teachers) differed significantly in their perceptions of the functions of school principals in student teaching programs. The responses to the two questions, "Is This Appropriate?" and "Is This Done?" were both treated by this procedure. This procedure is explained in Chapter III, pages 50-56.

Tables 1 through 34 in Appendix C are the chi square tables which show the significance of differences among the groups according to the chi square test, one such table being devoted to the data from each of the 34 statements. The various entries in the tables are used in the interpretation of the data. The chi square tables are not included in this chapter because the inclusion of so many intervening pages would make the reading of the study cumbersome.

⁸⁷Peters and Van Voorhis, 414-17.

⁸⁸McNemar, 224-30, and Ferguson, 169-71.

Instead of these separate tables for each statement, the findings are summarized in this chapter in tables which cover a group of statements at a time.

The chi square tables are in four parts. Parts a and b pertain to the first question, "Is This Appropriate?" and Parts c and d pertain to the second question, "Is This Done?" Parts a and c show the obtained and theoretical frequencies. Parts b and d show the deviations between the obtained and theoretical frequencies and the weighted squared deviations.

The second statistical procedure was used to determine the significance of differences between the responses to the first question, "Is This Appropriate?", and the responses to the second question, "Is This Done?", for each of the groups to the 34 statements. The procedure for doing this was explained in Chapter III, pages 56-59.

The .05 level of confidence was taken as the critical point. Results significant at the .05 level of confidence and .01 level or beyond were interpreted as being statistically significant.

The next section deals with the findings pertaining to the differences among the perceptions of the three groups as to the appropriateness and performance of the functions represented by the statements in the questionnaire. A later section deals with the findings pertaining to differences between the responses of each group to the first question

contained in the questionnaire, "Is This Appropriate?", and the second question contained in the questionnaire, "Is This Done?"

Differences in Perceptions Among the Groups Pertaining to the Statements Contained in the Questionnaire

For the purpose of discussing the findings in this section of the study the statements in the questionnaire were grouped under eight headings. Although it is recognized that some of the statements might fit under more than one of these, each statement has been listed under only the one heading that seemed to be most appropriate. It is also recognized that most of the statements represent different, although related, aspects of the functions of school principals in student teaching programs.

Each group of statements and the data from the chi square tests are presented in a separate table. The chi square finding and the probability level for each statement are indicated under each question "Is This Appropriate?" and "Is This Done?" The data in the tables were examined to determine whether or not the differences among the perceptions of the groups were significant as to the appropriateness and performance of the functions represented by the statements in the questionnaire. The chi square tables located in Appendix C pertaining to the statements which were found to contain statistically significant differences among the groups were examined to

discover the direction of the differences. This examination was the basis of the interpretive discussion.

The Principals Seek to Become Better Informed About Student Teaching Programs

Three of the statements related to the principals' becoming better informed about student teaching programs. Table 10 shows the results of the application of the chi square test of the significance of differences among perceptions of the groups and the corresponding probability levels for each of these statements.

Appropriateness.--The differences among the groups as to the appropriateness of the above statements were statistically significant beyond the .05 level of confidence for Statement 1 and beyond the .01 level of confidence for Statement 28. The differences among the groups were not statistically significant for Statement 24.

The statistically significant differences among the groups for Statement 1 are due in large measure to the differences in perception in the "Most Important" column in which the college supervisors gave a relatively larger number of responses than did the other groups.⁸⁹ (See Table 1 in Appendix C.)

⁸⁹In the type of data obtained in this study, when one group has favored a statement to a higher degree the other two groups have favored the statement to a lesser degree. Conversely, when one group has favored the statement to a lesser degree the other two groups have favored the statement to a greater degree.

TABLE 10

FINDINGS FROM THE CHI SQUARE TABLES PERTAINING TO THE STATEMENTS IN GROUP 1: "THE PRINCIPALS SEEK TO BECOME BETTER INFORMED ABOUT STUDENT TEACHING PROGRAMS."

Statements	First Question "Is This Appropriate?"		Second Question "Is This Done?"	
	Chi Square ^a	Probabil- ity Level	Chi Square ^a	Probabil- ity Level
1. The principal becomes acquainted with the teacher education institution's program and policies for student teaching.	13.65	.03 ^c	3.50	.48
24. The principal keeps himself informed about current education programs in teacher education.	5.41	.53	35.10	.001 ^b
28. The principal studies all the information furnished by the college regarding the student teachers.	24.86	.001 ^b	34.10	.001 ^b

^aChi squares indicate differences in perceptions of college supervisors, principals, and supervising teachers with respect to principals' functions in student teaching programs.

^bStatistically significant beyond the .01 level of confidence.

^cStatistically significant beyond the .05 level of confidence.

As observed previously the college supervisors gave more "Most Important" responses to this statement than they did to any other statement, and all the college supervisors gave "Yes" responses as to the appropriateness of this function.

The statistically significant differences among the groups for Statement 28, "The principal studies all the information furnished by the college regarding the student teachers," were due in large measure to three trends in responses:

1. The college supervisors perceived this function as "Most Important" to a relatively higher degree as contrasted with the supervising teachers who perceived this function as "Most Important" to a lesser degree.

2. The principals and college supervisors perceived the appropriateness of this function to a higher degree as compared to the supervising teachers who perceived the appropriateness of this function to a lesser degree.

3. The supervising teachers omitted the responses to this statement to a higher degree as compared to the college supervisors who did not omit the responses to this statement at all. (See Table 28 in Appendix C.)

This statement received very few "Most Important" responses, only 10 for all groups combined. Many teachers and principals commented to the effect that the colleges furnished little information on the student teachers.

Also, many of the respondents who checked "No" underlined the word "all" in the statement.

Performance.--The differences among the groups as to the principals' performance of the functions in this group were statistically significant beyond the .01 level of confidence for Statements 24 and 28. The differences were not statistically significant for Statement 1.

The statistically significant differences among the groups were due principally to the tendency of the principals to perceive themselves as performing these functions to a higher degree than did the college supervisors and supervising teachers. (See Tables 24 and 28 in Appendix C.)

Reference to Table 9 indicates that for Statement 24, "The principal keeps himself informed about current education programs in teacher education," approximately 84 per cent of the principals, 79 per cent of the supervising teachers, and 45 per cent of the college supervisors perceived the principals as performing this function and for Statement 28, "The principal studies all the information furnished by the college regarding the student teacher," approximately 81 per cent of the principals, 49 per cent of the college supervisors and 47 per cent of the supervising teachers perceived the principals as performing this function.⁹⁰

⁹⁰In the discussion of findings, the per cents of "Yes" responses are used to emphasize the differences among the groups.

Summary.--The findings pertaining to the differences among the groups for these statements are summarized as follows:

1. The college supervisors saw to a greater degree than did the other groups (a) the appropriateness and the importance of the principals' becoming acquainted with the teacher education institution's program and policies for student teaching and (b) the importance of the principals' studying the information furnished by the college regarding the student teachers.

2. The supervising teachers saw these functions as being less important and less appropriate than did the other groups.

3. The principals perceived themselves as performing these functions to a greater degree than did the other groups.

The Principals Help the College Supervisor to Become Acquainted with the Program and Policies of the School

Two of the statements related to the principals' helping the college supervisors to become acquainted with the program and policies of the school. Table 11 shows the results of the application of the chi square test of the significance of differences among perceptions of the groups and the corresponding probability levels for each of these statements.

TABLE 11

FINDINGS FROM THE CHI SQUARE TABLES PERTAINING TO THE STATEMENTS IN GROUP 2: "THE PRINCIPALS HELP THE COLLEGE SUPERVISORS TO BECOME ACQUAINTED WITH THE PROGRAM AND POLICIES OF THE SCHOOL."

Statements	First Question "Is This Appropriate?"		Second Question "Is This Done?"	
	Chi Square ^a	Probabil- ity Level	Chi Square ^a	Probabil- ity Level
2. The principal meets with the college supervisors to acquaint them with the school program and policies.	1.17	.97	16.28	.002 ^b
18. The principal, as the need arises, offers suggestions to the college supervisor concerning the work of the student teachers.	16.03	.01 ^b	17.62	.002 ^b

^aChi squares indicate differences in perceptions of college supervisors, principals, and supervising teachers with respect to principals' functions in student teaching programs.

^bStatistically significant beyond the .01 level of confidence.

^cStatistically significant beyond the .05 level of confidence.

Appropriateness.--The differences among the groups to the first question, "Is This Appropriate?" were not statistically significant for Statement 2, but were statistically significant for Statement 18.

The statistically significant differences among the groups for Statement 18, "The principal, as the need arises, offers suggestions to the college supervisors concerning the work of the student teacher," were due in large measure to (a) the supervising teachers' perceiving this function as most important to a greater degree than the other groups, (b) the college supervisors' and principals', to about the same extent, perceiving this function to be appropriate to a greater degree than did the supervising teachers, and (c) a relatively large number of teachers', 31, omitting responses to this statement as compared to no omissions by the college supervisors.

Performance.--The differences among the groups as to judgments of the principals' performances of the functions in these statements were statistically significant beyond the .01 level of confidence for both statements.

The statistically significant differences among the responses of the groups on Statement 2, "The principal meets with the college supervisors to acquaint them with the school program and policies," were due mainly to the college supervisors' perceiving the principals as not performing this function to as great a degree as did the

principals and supervising teachers, particularly the supervising teachers. (See Table 2 in Appendix C.) The fact that fewer principals omitted this statement than did the other groups also contributed to the differences among the groups.

The statistically significant differences among the responses of the groups on Statement 18, "The principal, as the need arises, offers suggestions to the college supervisor concerning the work of the student teachers," were due mainly to the principals' seeing themselves as performing this function to a greater degree than did the other groups. (See Table 18 in Appendix C.)

Reference to Table 9 shows that the per cents of "Yes" responses to Statement 18 were 80 per cent for principals, 61 per cent for college supervisors, and 60 per cent for teachers.

Summary.---The findings pertaining to the differences among the groups for these statements are summarized as follows:

1. The college supervisors and principals agreed as to the appropriateness of the principals' making suggestions to the college supervisors, Statement 18, while the supervising teachers saw this function as being less appropriate. The principals saw themselves as performing this function to a greater degree than did the other groups.

2. The college supervisors did not believe that the principals were doing as good a job in acquainting the

college supervisors with the program and policies of the school as did the other groups.

The Principals Participate in the Selection of the Supervising Teachers

Four of the statements related to the principals' participating in the selection of the supervising teachers. Table 12 shows the results of the application of the chi square test of the significance of differences among the perceptions of the groups and the corresponding probability levels for each of these statements.

Appropriateness.--The differences among the responses of the groups as to the appropriateness of Statements 3 and 33 were not statistically significant.

The differences among the responses of the groups as to the appropriateness of the functions expressed in Statements 4 and 5 were statistically significant beyond the .01 level of confidence.

Statements 4 and 5 state contrasting views as to the principals' function in selecting the supervising teacher.

The statistically significant differences in the responses of the groups on these statements were due mainly to contrasting views of the college supervisors as opposed to the principals and supervising teachers, particularly the principals.

TABLE 12

FINDINGS FROM THE CHI SQUARE TABLES PERTAINING TO THE STATEMENTS IN GROUP 3: "THE PRINCIPALS PARTICIPATE IN THE SELECTION OF THE SUPERVISING TEACHERS."

Statements	First Question "Is This Appropriate?"		Second Question "Is This Done?"	
	Chi Square ^a	Probabil- ity Level	Chi Square ^a	Probabil- ity Level
3. The principal approves the supervising teachers selected in the school of which he is principal.	8.60	.20	6.57	.16
4. The principal has the sole responsibility for selecting the supervising teachers in the school of which he is principal.	25.37	.01 ^b	1.73	.78
5. The principal works jointly with the college representatives and the representative of the local school system administration in the selection of the supervising teachers.	21.75	.01 ^b	5.04	.28

TABLE 12--Continued

Statements	First Question "Is This Appropriate?"		Second Question "Is This Done?"	
	Chi Square ^a	Probabil- ity Level	Chi Square ^a	Probabil- ity Level
33. The principal studies the qualifications of the faculty of the school and, using the criteria furnished by the college, selects teachers to recommend as good prospective supervising teachers.	11.48	.06	17.03	.001 ^b

^aChi squares indicate differences in perceptions of college supervisors, principals, and supervising teachers with respect to principals' functions in student teaching programs.

^bStatistically significant beyond the .01 level of confidence.

^cStatistically significant beyond the .05 level of confidence.

Only 2 college supervisors (4 per cent) indicated Statement 4 to be appropriate as compared to 22 principals (23 per cent) and 53 supervising teachers (17 per cent). (See Table 8, page 68, and Table 4 in Appendix C.)

The responses on Statement 5 take a different trend. The college supervisors gave a relatively higher number of responses, 18, to indicate the importance of this function and the principals gave a relatively lower number of responses, 32. Likewise, the college supervisors gave a relatively higher per cent of responses, 88 per cent, compared to 77 per cent of principals and 78 per cent of supervising teachers as to the appropriateness of Statement 5. (See Table 8, page 68, and Table 5 in Appendix C.)

Performance.--The difference among the responses of the three groups concerning the principals' performances of the functions was statistically significant only for Statement 33, "The principal studies the qualifications of the faculty of the school and, using the criteria furnished by the college, selects teachers to recommend as good prospective supervising teachers." The statistically significant difference among the groups on this statement, beyond the .01 level of confidence, was due mainly to the principals' perceiving this function as being performed to a greater degree than did the other groups. (Also, the principals did not omit the responses to this statement to the same degree as did the other groups.)

Summary.--The findings pertaining to the differences in the perceptions among the groups on these statements are summarized as follows:

1. The college supervisors to a greater degree than did the principals and supervising teachers favored the selection of the supervising teachers as a joint function.

2. The principals and supervising teachers, particularly the principals, to a greater degree than the college supervisors favored the principals as having the sole responsibility for the selection of the supervising teachers.

Some further observations pertaining to the responses on these statements appear to be pertinent.

All the groups favored the selection of the supervising teachers as a joint function as expressed in Statement 5 to a greater degree than they favored the principals' having the sole responsibility for the selection of the supervising teachers as expressed in Statement 4. There were great differences in the per cent of "Yes" responses for the two statements as follows: college supervisors: 4.08 per cent for Statement 4 as compared with 87.75 per cent for Statement 5; principals: 22.68 per cent for Statement 4 as compared to 77.31 per cent for Statement 5; supervising teachers: 16.87 per cent for Statement 4 as compared to 77.70 per cent for Statement 5. (See Table 8.)

It appears that some principals perceived as an appropriate function the principals' having the sole responsibility for the selection of the supervising teachers. However, it should be pointed out that the vast majority of principals, 77 per cent, perceived this function as a shared responsibility as indicated by their "Yes" responses to Statement 5.

It is worthy of note that on Statement 4, the college supervisors gave a higher per cent of "Yes" responses to performance than they did to appropriateness. It seems that some college supervisors perceived that some principals had the sole responsibility for the selection of the supervising teachers, which they regarded as inappropriate.

Although a relatively small number of principals indicated that the principals should have the sole responsibility for the selections of supervising teachers, (23 per cent), some principals had very strong feelings about this function as evidenced by their comments such as "This is most important," "This can make or break a program," and "The principal must have this responsibility."

The Principals Promote the Professional Growth of the Supervising Teachers

Three of the statements related to the principals' promoting the professional growth of the supervising teachers. Table 13 shows the results of the application of the chi square test of the significance of differences

TABLE 13

FINDINGS IN THE CHI SQUARE TABLES PERTAINING TO THE STATEMENTS IN GROUP 4: "THE PRINCIPALS PROMOTE THE PROFESSIONAL GROWTH OF THE SUPERVISING TEACHERS."

Statements	First Question "Is This Appropriate?"		Second Question "Is This Done?"	
	Chi Square ^a	Probabil- ity Level	Chi Square ^a	Probabil- ity Level
21. The principal makes available to the supervising teacher professional literature relating to student teaching.	11.24	.08	24.04	.001 ^b
22. The principal encourages the supervising teacher in professional growth.	5.91	.43	20.21	.001 ^b
34. The principal encourages the supervising teacher to try new ways of teaching.	12.92	.04 ^c	25.23	.001 ^b

^aChi squares indicate differences in perceptions of college supervisors, principals, and supervising teachers with respect to principals' functions in student teaching programs.

^bStatistically significant beyond the .01 level of confidence.

^cStatistically significant beyond the .05 level of confidence.

among perceptions of the groups and the corresponding probability levels for each of these statements.

Appropriateness.--The differences among the responses of the groups to Statements 21 and 22 were not found to be statistically significant as to ideas of appropriateness. The differences among the responses of the groups to Statement 34 were found to be statistically significant beyond the .05 level of confidence.

The statistically significant differences among the groups on Statement 34, "The principal encourages the supervising teacher to try new ways of teaching," were due in large measure to the responses of the college supervisors, who favored the appropriateness of this statement to a greater degree than did the principals and supervising teachers. (See Table 34 in Appendix C.) Reference to Table 8 reveals a "Yes" response of approximately 90 per cent for the college supervisors, 80 per cent for the principals and 72 per cent for the supervising teachers.

Performance.--The differences among the responses of the groups were statistically significant beyond the .01 level of confidence for all three of these statements concerning principals' performance.

The statistically significant differences were due to a large extent to the principals' perceiving themselves as performing the functions represented by these statements to a higher degree than did the college

supervisors and supervising teachers. (See Tables 21, 22, and 34 in Appendix C.) Reference to Table 9 yields the following per cents of "Yes" responses as to the performance of these statements: Statement 21, "The principal makes available to the supervising teacher professional literature relating to student teaching," college supervisors, 29 per cent, principals, 57 per cent, supervising teachers, 45 per cent; Statement 22, "The principal encourages the supervising teacher in professional growth," college supervisors, 67 per cent, principals, 93 per cent, supervising teachers, 77 per cent; Statement 34, "The principal encourages the supervising teacher to try new ways of teaching," college supervisors, 49 per cent, principals, 81 per cent, supervising teachers, 56 per cent.

The differences among the groups for Statements 21 and 22 were partly due to the college supervisors' omitting these statements to a greater degree than did the other groups.

Summary.--The findings pertaining to the differences among the groups for these statements are summarized as follows:

1. The college supervisors favored the appropriateness of the principals' encouraging the supervising teachers to try new ways of teaching to a greater degree than did the principals and supervising teachers.

2. The principals saw themselves as performing these functions to a greater extent than did the other groups.

The Principals Assist the Supervising Teachers in the Student Teaching Program

Four of the statements related to the principals' assisting the supervising teachers in the student teaching program. Table 14 shows the results of the application of the chi square test of the significance of differences among perceptions of the groups and the corresponding probability levels for each of these statements.

Appropriateness.--The differences among the responses of the group to these statements were statistically significant beyond the .01 level of confidence for Statements 20 and 27 and beyond the .05 level of confidence for Statement 23. The differences among the groups were not statistically significant for Statement 12.

The statistically significant differences among the responses of the groups on all three of the statements, Numbers 20, 23, and 27, were due in a large degree to the supervising teachers' seeing these functions as being less appropriate than did the college supervisors and principals. (See Tables 20, 23, and 27 in Appendix C.) Reference to Table 8 shows the per cent of "Yes" responses for the appropriateness of the statements approximately

TABLE 14

FINDINGS IN THE CHI SQUARE TABLES PERTAINING TO THE STATEMENTS IN GROUP 5: "THE PRINCIPALS ASSIST THE SUPERVISING TEACHERS IN THE STUDENT TEACHING PROGRAM."

Statements	First Question "Is This Appropriate?"		Second Question "Is This Done?"	
	Chi Square ^a	Probabil- ity Level	Chi Square ^a	Probabil- ity Level
12. The principal arranges for the supervising teachers to meet the student teachers before the student teachers report to the classrooms.	10.49	.11	23.43	.001 ^b
20. The principal provides or arranges time for the supervising teacher to have conferences with the student teacher.	30.36	.001 ^b	25.50	.001 ^b
23. The principal takes the initiative to provide suitable and adequate instructional materials for the use of the supervising teacher and the student teacher.	13.59	.04 ^c	21.11	.001 ^b

TABLE 14--Continued

Statements	First Question "Is This Appropriate?"		Second Question "Is This Done?"	
	Chi Square ^a	Probabil- ity Level	Chi Square ^a	Probabil- ity Level
27. The principal makes available to the supervising teachers the information on the student teachers furnished by the college.	14.58	.001 ^b	7.91	.10

^aChi squares indicate differences in perceptions of college supervisors, principals, and supervising teachers with respect to principals' functions in student teaching programs.

^bStatistically significant beyond the .01 level of confidence.

^cStatistically significant beyond the .05 level of confidence.

as follows: Statement 20, college supervisors, 84 per cent, principals, 85 per cent, supervising teachers, 67 per cent; Statement 23, college supervisors, 76 per cent, principals, 79 per cent, supervising teachers, 67 per cent; Statement 27, college supervisors, 92 per cent, principals, 86 per cent, supervising teachers, 83 per cent.

The statistically significant differences among the groups on these statements were due in part to the principals' perceiving these functions to be important to a lesser degree than did the other groups.

Performance.--The differences among the responses of the groups to the principals' performance for all the statements in this group were statistically significant beyond the .01 level of confidence except Number 27.

The statistically significant differences among the groups as to the principals' performances of these functions are due mainly to two trends: (a) the principals perceived themselves as performing these functions to a greater degree than did the other groups and (b) the college supervisors omitted the responses to these statements to a greater degree than did the other groups.

Summary.--The findings pertaining to the differences in the perceptions of the groups for these statements are summarized as follows:

1. The supervising teachers did not perceive the appropriateness of the principals' assisting them in the student teaching program to the same degree as did the college supervisors and principals.

2. Although the principals perceived the functions represented by these statements to be appropriate to a greater degree than did the supervising teachers, they did not perceive these functions to be among the most important functions in the entire list to the same extent as did the college supervisors and supervising teachers.

3. The principals perceived themselves as performing these functions to a greater degree than did the other groups.

4. The omission by the college supervisors of the responses as to the performance of these functions raises the question as to whether or not the college supervisors thought they were not acquainted with what was being done in this area of the student teaching program.

The Principals Assume Supervisory Responsibilities in the Student Teaching Program

Seven of the statements related to the principals' assuming supervisory responsibilities in the student teaching program. Table 15 shows the results of the application of the chi square test of the significance of differences among perceptions of the groups and the corresponding probability levels for each of these statements.

TABLE 15

FINDINGS IN THE CHI SQUARE TABLES PERTAINING TO THE STATEMENTS IN GROUP 6: "THE PRINCIPALS ASSUME SUPERVISORY RESPONSIBILITIES IN THE STUDENT TEACHING PROGRAM."

Statements	First Question "Is This Appropriate?"		Second Question "Is This Done?"	
	Chi Square ^a	Probabil- ity Level	Chi Square ^a	Probabil- ity Level
8. The principal advises the supervising teachers of their specific duties in the student teaching program.	17.28	.001 ^b	27.26	.001 ^b
9. The principal leaves the planning of the experiences and responsibilities of the student teachers to the college supervisor and the supervising teachers.	31.42	.001 ^b	52.79	.001 ^b
10. The principal works jointly with the college supervisor and the supervising teachers in planning the experiences and responsibilities the student teachers will have in the classroom and the school.	19.57	.003 ^b	13.14	.01 ^b

TABLE 15--Continued

Statements	First Question "Is This Appropriate?"		Second Question "Is This Done?"	
	Chi Square ^a	Probabil- ity Level	Chi Square ^a	Probabil- ity Level
14. The principal has conferences with the student teacher and the supervising teacher when needed.	8.08	.23	20.53	.001 ^b
19. The principal participates with the supervising teacher and the student teacher in the evaluation of the student teaching experience.	26.92	.001 ^b	36.40	.001 ^b
29. The principal approves the assignment of the student teachers in the school.	15.70	.008 ^b	8.86	.07

TABLE 15--Continued

Statements	First Question "Is This Appropriate?"		Second Question "Is This Done?"	
	Chi Square ^a	Probabil- ity Level	Chi Square ^a	Probabil- ity Level
32. The principal safeguards the welfare of the student teachers by seeing that they are not used to perform menial tasks or assume responsibilities with which they cannot cope.	32.13	.001 ^b	36.37	.001 ^b

^aChi squares indicate differences in perceptions of college supervisors, principals, and supervising teachers with respect to principals' functions in student teaching programs.

^bStatistically significant beyond the .01 level of confidence.

^cStatistically significant beyond the .05 level of confidence.

Appropriateness.--The differences among the responses of the groups to these statements were statistically significant beyond the .01 level of confidence for all of these statements except Statement 14.

Statements 9 and 10 express opposing points of view pertaining to the principals' participation in planning the experiences and responsibilities of the student teachers. Statement 8 is closely related to these two statements.

The statistically significant differences among the perceptions of the groups for Statement 9, "The principal leaves the planning of the experiences and responsibilities of the student teachers to the college supervisor and the supervising teacher," were due in large part to (1) the principals' viewing this statement of the function to be (a) of less importance and (b) less appropriate, to a greater degree than did the other groups and (2) the supervising teachers' viewing this statement to be (a) of more importance and (b) more appropriate than did the other groups.

The statistically significant differences in perceptions among the groups for Statement 10, "The principal works jointly with the college supervisor and the supervising teachers in planning the experiences and responsibilities the student teachers will have in the classroom and the school," seemed to be due in large measure to the

supervising teachers viewing this function as being (a) of less importance and (b) less appropriate than did the other groups.

The statistically significant differences among the perceptions of the groups for Statement 8, "The principal advises the supervising teachers of their specific duties in the student teaching program," arose principally from the college supervisors' seeing this function of the principal as being of (a) less importance and (b) less appropriate than did the other groups.

The principals omitted responding to all three of these statements, Numbers 8, 9, and 10, to a greater degree than did the other groups.

The statistically significant differences among the perceptions of the groups to Statement 19 seemed to be associated in large measure with the principals' viewing this function to be of (a) more importance and (b) more appropriate than did the other groups as contrasted with the teachers' viewing this function as less appropriate.

The statistically significant differences among the perceptions of the groups to Statement 29, "The principal approves the assignment of the student teachers in the school," arose in large measure from the college supervisors' (a) seeing this function to be of less importance and (b) disapproving of this function by giving a relatively higher "No" response as to its appropriateness in contrast to the principals' and supervising teachers' more

frequent omissions of responses to this statement. The differences in the "Yes" responses as to the appropriateness of this function were not great. (See Table 29 in Appendix C.)

The statistically significant differences among the perceptions of the groups to Statement 32, "The principal safeguards the welfare of the student teachers by seeing that they are not used to perform menial tasks or assume responsibilities with which they cannot cope," were due principally to the college supervisors' and principals' favoring the importance and appropriateness of this idea to a greater degree than did the supervising teachers. Comments of a number of supervising teachers to this statement indicated that they may have had strong feelings about the use of the words "menial tasks." Such comments as "Not necessary in our school." and "Don't all teachers have to perform menial tasks?" were made.

It is interesting to note that approximately 90 per cent of both college supervisors and principals perceived Statement 32 as appropriate while only approximately 70 per cent of the teachers perceived the statement to be appropriate. (See Table 8.)

Performance.--The differences among the perceptions of the groups as to the performance of the functions represented by this group of statements were statistically significant beyond the .01 level of confidence for all except Statement 29.

The differences among the perceptions of the groups as to the performance of Statement 9, "The principal leaves the planning of the experiences and responsibilities of the student teachers to the college supervisor and the supervising teachers," were statistically significant principally due to the college supervisors' and teachers' seeing the principal as evidencing such behavior to a greater degree than did the principals. Reference to Table 9 shows a "Yes" response of 72 per cent for supervising teachers and 63 per cent for college supervisors as compared with 32 per cent for principals.

The statistically significant differences among the perceptions of the groups as to the performance of the principals on the other statements in this group were mainly due to the principals' perceiving themselves as performing these functions to a greater degree than did the college supervisors and supervising teachers.

Summary.--The findings pertaining to the differences in the perceptions of the groups to these statements are summarized as follows:

1. The supervising teachers to a greater degree than did the principals and college supervisors felt that the principals should not participate with the supervising teachers in planning the experiences and responsibilities of the student teachers.

2. The college supervisors to a lesser degree than did the principals and supervising teachers believed

that the principals should advise the supervising teacher of their specific duties in the student teaching program.

3. The supervising teachers and principals differed in their perceptions of the appropriateness of the principals' participating in the evaluation of the student teaching experiences, as the supervising teachers did not favor this function to the same extent as did the principals.

4. The college supervisors did not, to the same extent as did the other groups, feel that the principals should approve the assignment of the student teachers in the school.

5. The supervising teachers to a lesser degree than did the college supervisors and principals felt that the principals needed to safeguard the welfare of the student teachers.

The Principals Involve the Student Teachers in the Total Program of the School and Community and Seek to Give the Student Teachers Status as Teachers

Six of the statements related to the principals' involving the student teachers in the total program of the school and community and seeking to give the student teachers status as teachers. Table 16 shows the results of the application of the chi square test of the significance of differences among perceptions of the groups and the corresponding probability levels for each of these statements.

TABLE 16

FINDINGS IN THE CHI SQUARE TABLES PERTAINING TO THE STATEMENTS IN GROUP 7: "THE PRINCIPALS INVOLVE THE STUDENT TEACHERS IN THE TOTAL PROGRAM OF THE SCHOOL AND COMMUNITY AND SEEK TO GIVE THE STUDENT TEACHERS STATUS AS TEACHERS."

Statements	First Question "Is This Appropriate?"		Second Question "Is This Done?"	
	Chi Square ^a	Probabil- ity Level	Chi Square ^a	Probabil- ity Level
6. The principal explains the student teaching program to the total faculty of the school.	10.85	.10	22.02	.001 ^b
7. The principal informs the parents and the community of the purposes and benefits of the student teaching program.	13.23	.04 ^c	14.77	.005 ^b
11. The principal provides opportunities for the student teachers to observe in several situations and classrooms in the school.	11.86	.07	22.93	.001 ^b
15. The principal invites the student teachers to faculty meetings.	12.34	.06	15.69	.003 ^b

TABLE 16--Continued

Statements	First Question "Is This Appropriate?"		Second Question "Is This Done?"	
	Chi Square ^a	Probabil- ity Level	Chi Square ^a	Probabil- ity Level
16. The principal invites the student teachers to P.T.A. or other community meetings and introduces the student teachers at the meetings.	6.04	.42	15.22	.004 ^b
31. The principal introduces the student teachers to the pupil groups in the school in such a way as to give the student teachers status of teachers.	19.61	.003 ^b	15.66	.003 ^b

^aChi squares indicate differences in perceptions of college supervisors, principals, and supervising teachers with respect to principals' functions in student teaching programs.

^bStatistically significant beyond the .01 level of confidence.

^cStatistically significant beyond the .05 level of confidence.

Appropriateness.--The differences among the perceptions of the groups as to the appropriateness of these statements were not statistically significant for Numbers 6, 11, 15, and 16. Reference to Table 8 shows that all of the groups gave very high per cents of "Yes" responses as to the appropriateness of these statements.

The differences among the perceptions of the groups were statistically significant for Statements 7 and 31.

The statistically significant differences as to the appropriateness of both Statement 7, "The principal informs the parents and the community of the purposes and benefits of the student teaching program," and Statement 31, "The principal introduces the student teachers to the pupil groups in the school in such a way as to give the student teachers status of teachers," were due to a large extent to the college supervisors' viewing these functions as appropriate to a greater degree than did the principals and supervising teachers.

Performance.--The differences among the perceptions of the groups as to the principals' performance of the functions expressed in this group of statements were statistically significant beyond the .01 level of confidence for all six statements.

These differences were in part due to the fact that the principals perceived themselves as performing

these functions to a greater degree than did the other groups for all of these statements, but particularly Statements 6, 7, and 15. The differences were due in part to the fact that the college supervisors omitted these statements to a greater degree than did the other groups. The fact that the supervising teachers felt that Statements 16 and 31 were less appropriate than did the other groups was also evident as contributing to the differences.

Summary.--The findings pertaining to the differences in perception among the groups for this group of statements are summarized as follows:

1. The college supervisors to a greater degree than did the principals and supervising teachers felt that it was important and appropriate for the principal to explain the student teaching program to the parents and introduce the student teachers to the pupils of the school.

2. The principals saw themselves as performing these functions to a greater degree than did the other groups.

3. The tendency of the college supervisors to omit the responses for these statements may suggest that they did not know what was being done on these matters.

4. The supervising teacher to a lesser degree than did the other groups saw the need for the principals to introduce the student teachers to the parents and to the pupils.

The Principals Work Directly With the Student Teachers

Five of the statements related to the principals' working directly with the student teachers. Table 17 shows the results of the application of the chi square test of the significance of differences among perceptions of the groups and the corresponding probability levels for each of these statements.

The respondents seemed to experience difficulty in understanding the intended meaning of Statement 30, probably due to poor wording. Therefore, the responses to this statement are not analyzed although the data received the same statistical treatment as the data for all the other statements.

Reference to Tables 6 and 7 indicated that a large number of principals and supervising teachers omitted the responses to this statement. Seventeen principals out of 49 and 102 supervising teachers out of 314 omitted this statement.

Appropriateness.--The differences among the perceptions of the groups to Statements 25 and 26 were not statistically significant. The differences among the perceptions of the groups to Statements 13 and 17 were statistically significant beyond the .01 level of confidence.

The statistically significant differences in perceptions among the groups for Statement 13, "The principal

TABLE 17

FINDINGS IN THE CHI SQUARE TABLES PERTAINING TO THE STATEMENTS IN GROUP 8: "THE PRINCIPALS WORK DIRECTLY WITH THE STUDENT TEACHERS."

Statements	First Question "Is This Appropriate?"		Second Question "Is This Done?"	
	Chi Square ^a	Probabil- ity Level	Chi Square ^a	Probabil- ity Level
13. The principal helps the student teachers become acquainted with the administrative policies of the school and the operation of the school office.	18.05	.006 ^b	22.02	.001 ^b
17. The principal, on occasions, observes the student teacher in his or her actual teaching and offers suggestions of encouragement and assistance.	19.19	.003 ^b	51.23	.001 ^b
25. The principal meets and welcomes the student teachers upon their first arrival at the school.	5.87	.44	8.33	.084
26. The principal tells the student teacher something of the special interests and strengths of the supervising teacher.	7.53	.28	27.55	.001 ^b

TABLE 17--Continued

Statements	First Question "Is This Appropriate?"		Second Question "Is This Done?"	
	Chi Square ^a	Probabil- ity Level	Chi Square ^a	Probabil- ity Level
30. The principal assists the student teachers in securing living quarters in situations where assistance is needed.	23.04	.001 ^b	18.07	.001 ^b

^aChi squares indicate differences in perceptions of college supervisors, principals, and supervising teachers with respect to principals' functions in student teaching programs.

^bStatistically significant beyond the .01 level of confidence.

^cStatistically significant beyond the .05 level of confidence.

helps the student teachers become acquainted with the administrative policies of the school and the operation of the school office," were due largely to the college supervisors' and principals' seeing this function as appropriate and important to a greater degree than did the supervising teachers. (See Table 13 in Appendix C.) Reference to Table 8 shows that about 92 per cent of the college supervisors and principals saw this statement to be appropriate as compared to 81 per cent for the supervising teachers.

The differences in the perception among the groups for Statement 17, "The principal, on occasions, observes the student teacher in his or her actual teaching and offers suggestions of encouragement and assistance," were statistically significant mainly due to the responses of the principals who saw this function to be more important and more appropriate than did the college supervisors and supervising teachers. Table 8 indicates that approximately 91 per cent of principals, 82 per cent of college supervisors, and 72 per cent of supervising teachers perceived this function to be appropriate.

Performance.--The differences among the perceptions of the groups as to the principals' performance of Function 25, "The principal meets and welcomes the student teachers upon their first arrival at the school," were not statistically significant.

The differences among the perceptions of the groups were statistically significant beyond the .01 level of confidence for the other three statements in this group:

13. The principal helps the student teachers become acquainted with the administrative policies of the school and the operation of the school office.

17. The principal, on occasions, observes the student teacher in his or her actual teaching and offers suggestions of encouragement and assistance.

26. The principal tells the student teacher something of the special interests and strengths of the supervising teacher.

The significant differences for these statements were due mainly to responses of the principals who perceived themselves as performing these functions to a greater degree than did the other groups. The perceptions of the principals differed more sharply with the perceptions of the supervising teachers on Statement 17 and more sharply with the perceptions of the college supervisors on Statement 26.

Summary.---The findings pertaining to the differences in the perceptions of the three groups to the ideas in this group of statements are summarized as follows:

1. The supervising teachers to a lesser degree than did the college supervisors and principals felt that it was appropriate for the principals (a) to help the student teachers in becoming acquainted with the administrative policies of the school and the operation of the school office and (b) for the principal to observe the

work of the student teacher and offer suggestions of encouragement and assistance.

2. The principals to a greater degree than did the college supervisors and supervising teachers saw themselves as entering directly into the work of the student teachers.

In this section of the study the data have been examined to see to what extent the groups differ in their perceptions of the appropriateness and performance of the functions of school principals in student teaching programs. Differences among the groups were found to be statistically significant for 19 of the statements as to appropriateness for principals and for 26 of the statements as to performance by principals.

Differences in the Responses Within Each Group to the Questions: "Is This Appropriate?" and "Is This Done?"

In this section of the study the findings from the chi square test of the significance of the differences between the responses of each group to the two questions are discussed. Table 18 shows the chi square findings and the corresponding probability levels for each statement. These findings are of particular interest because judgments of appropriateness of principals' assuming certain functions have little effect on the student teaching program unless these functions are actually performed by the principals.

TABLE 18

FINDINGS OF THE CHI SQUARE TEST OF THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE RESPONSES OF THE COLLEGE SUPERVISORS, PRINCIPALS, AND SUPERVISING TEACHERS TO THE TWO QUESTIONS: "IS THIS APPROPRIATE?" AND "IS THIS DONE?"

Statement Number	College Supervisors		Principals		Supervising Teachers	
	Chi Square ^a	Probability Level ^b	Chi Square ^a	Probability Level ^b	Chi Square ^a	Probability Level ^b
1	4.16	.05	1.00	.46	18.05	.001
2	13.07	.001	14.60	.001	37.09	.001
3	3.2	.10	4.16	.05	18.61	.001
4	0.45 ^c	.50	6.23	.02	1.56	.30
5	9.09	.01	8.33	.01	39.3	.001
6	23.0	.001	14.06	.001	93.34	.001
7	29.0	.001	27.00	.001	118.0	.001
8	7.1	.01	2.00	.20	54.06	.001
9	9.09 ^c	.01	1.23 ^c	.30	42.0 ^c	.001
10	15.06	.001	16.06	.001	67.21	.001
11	9.09	.01	9.09	.01	48.28	.001
12	13.07	.001	5.14	.05	62.06	.001
13	13.07	.001	5.81	.01	76.0	.001
14	10.83	.001	2.25	.20	59.0	.001
15	6.12	.02	4.16	.05	40.33	.001
16	8.1	.01	11.08	.001	48.08	.001
17	14.06	.001	8.10	.01	87.36	.001
18	13.07	.001	8.10	.01	67.77	.001
19	13.07	.001	10.50	.01	67.45	.001
20	15.06	.001	5.79	.02	55.07	.001
21	29.0	.001	24.14	.001	100.4	.001
22	13.07	.001	1.00	.46	43.0	.001
23	16.9	.001	13.40	.001	72.05	.001
24	24.0	.001	8.10	.01	39.0	.001
25	6.12	.02	0.00	.99	11.08	.001
26	18.05	.001	9.09	.01	77.0	.001

TABLE 18--Continued

Statement Number	College Supervisors		Principals		Supervising Teachers	
	Chi Square ^a	Proba- bility Level ^b	Chi Square ^a	Proba- bility Level ^b	Chi Square ^a	Proba- bility Level ^b
27	9.09	.01	1.50	.20	46.29	.001
28	15.06	.001	3.10	.10	72.0	.001
29	3.3	.10	0.00 ^c	.99	23.0	.001
30	11.08	.001	18.05	.01	66.0	.001
31	15.06	.001	0.00	.99	72.2	.001
32	17.05	.001	1.33	.30	42.08	.001
33	8.1	.01	5.14	.05	53.07	.001
34	18.05	.001	0.00 ^c	.99	48.0	.001

^aChi squares determined by significance of differences between correlated proportions formula given by McNemar in Psychological Statistics, p. 229.

^bMcNemar, 386-87.

^cChi square due to performance being favored to a greater degree than appropriateness.

College Supervisors

The significance of the differences between the responses of the college supervisors concerning the appropriateness and performance of the functions reached the .01 level of confidence for 27 of the statements and reached the .05 level of confidence for 3 additional statements.⁹¹ The differences between the responses of the college supervisors were not found to be statistically significant for 3 of the statements.

The three statements for which statistically significant differences were not found were Number 3, "The principal approves the supervising teachers selected in the school of which he is principal," Number 29, "The principal approves the assignment of the student teachers in the school," and Number 4, "The principal has the sole responsibility for selecting the supervising teachers in the school of which he is principal." The slight differences in the proportions of responses for these statements were in favor of appropriateness for Statements 3 and 29 and in favor of performance for Statement 4.

Reference to Tables 8 and 9 reveals that the percents of "Yes" responses on the statements for which the differences were statistically significant were greater for appropriateness than for performance for all the

⁹¹In this section, as in the previous section, the results obtained for Statement 30 are not discussed.

statements except Number 9, "The principal leaves the planning of the experiences and responsibilities of the student teachers to the college supervisors and the supervising teachers." This statement received "Yes" responses of 44.89 per cent for appropriateness as compared to 63.26 per cent for performance. As indicated previously, Statement 9 expresses an opposing viewpoint from Statement 10, "The principal works jointly with college supervisors and the supervising teachers in planning the experiences and responsibilities the student teachers will have in the classroom and the school." The per cents of "Yes" responses for Statement 10 were considerably higher for appropriateness (75.51) than for performance (40.81). The trends of the responses of the college supervisors on these opposing viewpoints appeared to be consistent.

The findings from the comparison of the responses of the college supervisors appeared to indicate that the college supervisors felt that the principals were not performing the vast majority of the functions to the same degree they felt these functions to be appropriate.

Principals

An examination of Table 18 reveals that out of 33 statements the differences in the responses of the principals to the two questions were statistically significant at the .01 level of confidence for 15 of the statements and were statistically significant at the .05 level of

confidence for 6 additional statements. The differences between the responses of the principals were not statistically significant for 12 of the statements.

Reference to Tables 8 and 9 reveals that for only 3 statements, Numbers 9, 29, and 34 did the principals give higher "Yes" responses concerning performance than they did concerning appropriateness. These three statements were among the 12 for which statistically significant differences were not found. The principals gave higher per cents of "Yes" responses to appropriateness than they did for performance for all of the statements for which statistically significant differences were found.

A study of the findings pertaining to the responses of the principals suggest the following:

1. Statistically significant differences in favor of appropriateness were found, with only a few exceptions, for those functions relating to the principals' (a) helping the college supervisors to become acquainted with the program and policies of the school, (b) participating in the selection of the supervising teachers, (c) assisting the supervising teachers in the student teaching program, (d) involving the student teachers in the total program of the school, and (e) working directly with the student teachers.

2. Statistically significant differences were not found, with only a few exceptions, for those functions relating to the principals' (a) seeking to become better

informed about student teaching programs, (b) promoting the professional growth of the supervising teachers, and (c) assuming supervisory responsibilities in the student teaching program.

The findings from the comparison of the perceptions of the principals concerning the appropriateness and performance of the functions appeared to indicate that the principals perceived themselves as performing the functions to a lesser degree than they perceived these functions to be appropriate for only a little more than one-half of the functions represented by the statements contained in the questionnaire.

Supervising Teachers

An examination of Table 18 indicates that the differences between the responses of the supervising teachers as to the appropriateness and performance of the functions were statistically significant beyond the .01 level of confidence for all of the statements except Number 4. The supervising teachers favored appropriateness over performance to only a very small degree for Statement 4, "The principal has the sole responsibility for the selection of the supervising teachers."

A comparison of the data in Tables 8 and 9 shows that the per cents of "Yes" responses were higher for the question, "Is This Appropriate?" than for the question, "Is This Done?" for all of the statements except Number 9.

The "Yes" responses for Statement 9, "The principal leaves the planning of the experiences and responsibilities of the student teachers to the college supervisors and the supervising teachers," were 58.28 per cent for appropriateness and 71.65 per cent for performance.

The findings from the comparison of the responses of the supervising teachers to the two questions contained in the questionnaire appeared to indicate that the supervising teachers to a high level of confidence did not see the principals as performing most of the functions represented by the statements in the questionnaire to the same degree as they saw these functions to be appropriate.

In this section of the study the data have been examined to see to what extent there were statistically significant differences within the perceptions of each group as to the appropriateness and performance of functions of school principals in student teaching programs. The perceptions of both the college supervisors and the supervising teachers in favor of appropriateness appeared to be statistically significant for nearly all of the statements. This is in contrast to the fact that the perceptions of the principals appeared to be statistically significant for only a little more than one-half of the statements.

Summary

In this chapter the data have been analyzed to compare the perceptions of the three groups, college supervisors, principals, and supervising teachers, pertaining to the functions of school principals in student teaching programs represented by the statements contained in the questionnaire. The data have been studied to compare the responses in three respects: (1) the differences among the three groups as to the appropriateness of the functions, (2) the differences among the three groups as to the performance of the functions, and (3) the differences between the responses of each group as to the appropriateness and performance of the functions.

The findings are summarized as follows:

Appropriateness.--Statistically significant differences among the perceptions of groups as to the appropriateness of the functions represented by the statements in the questionnaire were found for 19 of the 33 statements analyzed. That is, college supervisors, principals, and supervising teachers differed considerably in their perceptions of the role of the principal in the student teaching program. The significant differences seemed to be due in large measure to the following:

1. The college supervisors to a greater degree than did the other groups favored the appropriateness of

(a) the principals' becoming acquainted with the teacher education institution's program and policies for student teaching, (b) the selection of the supervising teachers as a joint function, (c) the principals' encouraging the supervising teachers to try new ways of teaching, (d) the principals' explaining the student teaching program to the parents, and (e) the principals' introducing the student teachers to the pupils in the school.

2. The principals to a greater degree than did the other groups favored the appropriateness of (a) the principals' having the sole responsibility for the selection of the supervising teachers, (b) the principals' studying the information furnished by the college regarding the student teachers, (c) the principals' participating in the evaluation of the work of the student teachers, and (d) the principals' observing the work of the student teachers and offering suggestions of encouragement and assistance.

3. The supervising teachers to a greater degree than did the other groups favored the appropriateness of the principals' leaving the planning of the experiences and responsibilities of the student teachers to the college supervisors and the supervising teachers.

4. The college supervisors thought it less appropriate than did the other groups that the principals should (a) advise the supervising teachers of their specific

duties in the student teaching program, and (b) approve the assignment of the student teachers in the school.

5. The supervising teachers considered it less appropriate than did the other groups that the principals should (a) make suggestions to the college supervisors concerning the work of the student teachers, (b) provide or arrange time for the supervising teachers to have conferences with the student teachers, (c) provide instructional materials for the use of the supervising teacher and the student teacher, (d) make available to the supervising teacher the information regarding the student teachers furnished by the college, (e) work jointly with the college supervisors and the supervising teachers in planning the experiences and responsibilities of student teachers, (f) safeguard the welfare of the student teachers by seeing that they are not used to perform menial tasks or assume responsibilities with which they cannot cope, and (g) help the student teachers become acquainted with the administrative policies of the school and the operation of the school office.

Performance.---Statistically significant differences among the perceptions of the groups pertaining to the performance of the functions represented by the statements in the questionnaire were found for 26 of the statements. It appeared that college supervisors, principals, and supervising teachers differed considerably in their perceptions

as to the principals' performing the functions in student teaching programs. The significant differences were due in large measure to the following:

1. The supervising teachers to a lesser degree than did the other groups thought that the principals (a) invited the student teachers to P.T.A. or other community meetings and introduced the student teachers at the meetings and (b) introduced the student teachers to the pupil groups in the school in such a way as to give the student teachers status of teachers.

2. The college supervisors to a lesser degree than did the other groups saw the principals as keeping themselves informed about current education programs in teacher education.

3. The principals to a lesser degree than did the other groups saw themselves as leaving the planning of the experiences and responsibilities of the student teachers to the college supervisors and supervising teachers.

4. The principals to a greater degree than did the other groups saw themselves as performing the vast majority of the functions represented by the statements in the questionnaire. In fact, among the functions for which significant differences were found, the principals perceived themselves as performing these functions to a lesser degree than did the other groups for only one as described in the preceding paragraph.

Differences in the Responses of Each Group to the Two Questions.--The findings pertaining to the significant differences between the perceptions of each group to the two questions, "Is This Appropriate?" and "Is This Done" are summarized as follows:

1. The college supervisors, to a statistically significant degree, perceived the principals as not performing the functions represented by the statements in the questionnaire to the same degree as they perceived these functions to be appropriate for 29 out of 33 of the statements. The college supervisors perceived the principals as performing two functions to a greater degree than they perceived these functions to be appropriate. These two functions were (a) the principals' having the sole responsibility for the selection of the supervising teachers and (b) the principals' not having a part in planning the experiences and responsibilities of the student teachers.

2. The principals saw themselves as performing the functions represented by the statements in the questionnaire to a lesser degree than they perceived the functions to be appropriate for 21 out of 33 statements.

3. The supervising teachers did not see the principals as performing the functions represented by the statements in the questionnaire to the same degree as they saw these functions to be appropriate for all of the statements but one. The exception was that the supervising

teachers perceived the principals as leaving the planning of the experiences and responsibilities of the student teachers to the college supervisor and supervising teachers to a greater degree than they saw this function to be appropriate.

General Summary.--The findings pertaining to the perceptions of college supervisors, principals, and supervising teachers concerning the functions of school principals in student teaching programs suggest that there was considerable difference among the perceptions. The differences among the perceptions seemed to be statistically significant more often concerning the performances of the functions than concerning the appropriateness of the functions. The differences in the perceptions of each group pertaining to the appropriateness and performance of the functions were statistically significant more often in the case of the college supervisors and supervising teachers than in the case of the principals.

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSIONS, INTERPRETATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The problem of this study was to compare the perceptions of college supervisors, principals, and supervising teachers pertaining to the functions of school principals in student teaching programs. A questionnaire was developed to obtain these perceptions. The questionnaire consisted of 34 statements of the functions of school principals in student teaching programs. The statements were derived from a review of the professional literature dealing with student teaching programs. The questionnaire was submitted to the college supervisors, principals, and supervising teachers engaged in working with student teachers from the accredited universities and colleges in Alabama enrolling white students.⁹² Forty-nine college supervisors, 97 principals, and 314 supervising teachers replied to the questionnaire.

The perceptions of the groups were compared in three respects:

⁹²Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools, 9.

1. The differences among the perceptions of the groups as to the appropriateness of the functions of school principals in student teaching programs.

2. The differences among the perceptions of the groups as to the principals' performances of the functions.

3. The differences within each group as to their perceptions of the appropriateness and the performance of the functions.

Conclusions

The conclusions that are drawn from this study are subject to the limitations of the study as set out in Chapter I. The findings of this study and the conclusions drawn apply to the perceptions of the groups: college supervisors, principals, and supervising teachers. The findings cannot be interpreted as applying to individual college supervisors, principals, and supervising teachers.

The findings in this study, within the limitations, support the following conclusions:

1. College supervisors, principals, and supervising teachers, as groups, differed to a considerable degree in their perceptions of the appropriateness of the stated functions of school principals in student teaching programs.

Statistically significant differences among the perceptions of the groups as to the appropriateness of the functions represented by the statements contained in the questionnaire were found for 19 of the 33 statements

analyzed in Chapter IV.⁹³ The significant differences in the perceptions as to the appropriateness of the functions seemed to be due in large measure to the following findings:

a) The college supervisors in greater proportions than the other groups, favored the importance and/or the appropriateness of (1) the principals' becoming acquainted with the teacher education institution's programs and policies for student teaching, (2) the selection of the supervising teachers as a joint function, (3) the principals' encouraging the supervising teachers to try new ways of teaching, (4) the principals' explaining the student teaching program to the parents, and (5) the principals' introducing the student teachers to the pupils in the school.

b) The principals in greater proportions than the other groups favored the importance and appropriateness of the principals' (1) having the sole responsibility for the selection of the supervising teachers, (2) studying the information furnished by the college regarding the student teachers, (3) participating in the evaluation of the work of the student teachers, and (4) observing the work of the student

⁹³Statement 30, for the reasons explained in Chapter IV, p. 108, is not included.

teachers and offering suggestions of encouragement and assistance.

c) The supervising teachers in greater proportions than the other groups favored the appropriateness of the principals' leaving the planning of the experiences and responsibilities of the student teachers to the college supervisors and supervising teachers.

d) The college supervisors in lesser proportions than the other groups favored the appropriateness of the principals' (1) advising the supervising teachers of their specific duties in the student teaching program and (2) approving the assignment of the student teachers in the school.

e) The supervising teachers in lesser proportions than the other groups indicated that the principals should (1) make suggestions to the college supervisors concerning the work of the student teachers, (2) provide or arrange time for the supervising teachers to have conferences with the student teachers, (3) provide instructional materials for the use of the supervising teacher and the student teacher, (4) make available to the supervising teacher the information regarding the student teachers, (5) work jointly with the college supervisors and the supervising teachers in planning the experiences and responsibilities of the student teachers, (6) safeguard the welfare of the student teachers by seeing that they are not used to

perform menial tasks or assume responsibilities with which they cannot cope, and (7) help the student teachers become acquainted with the administrative policies of the school and the operation of the school office.

2. College supervisors, principals, and supervising teachers, as groups, differed to a considerable degree in their perceptions of the principals' performances of the functions of school principals in student teaching programs.

The differences among the groups as to the principals' performance of the functions represented by the statements contained in the questionnaire were statistically significant for 26 out of 33 statements. The significant differences among the groups for these statements were due in large part to the following:

a) The supervising teachers less frequently than the other groups thought that the principals (1) invited the student teachers to P.T.A. or other community meetings and introduced the student teachers at the meetings and (2) introduced the student teachers to the pupil groups in the school in such a way as to give the student teachers the status of teachers.

b) The college supervisors less frequently than the other groups saw the principals as keeping themselves informed about current education programs in teacher education.

c) The principals less frequently than the other groups saw themselves as leaving the planning of the experiences and responsibilities of the student teachers to the college supervisors and supervising teachers.

d) The principals more frequently than the other groups saw themselves as performing the large majority of the functions represented by the statements contained in the questionnaire.

3. The college supervisors and the supervising teachers did not see the principals as performing most of the functions in the student teaching programs to the same degree as they saw these functions to be appropriate.

a) There were statistically significant differences between the perceptions of the college supervisors as to the appropriateness and performance of the functions for 30 out of 33 statements. The responses were higher for appropriateness for all of these statements except one.

b) Statistically significant differences between the perceptions of the supervising teachers pertaining to the appropriateness and performance of the functions were found for 32 out of 33 statements. The supervising teachers gave higher per cents of responses in favor of appropriateness than they did for performance in their replies to all of the statements.

4. The principals themselves, as a group, indicated a discrepancy between their perceptions of appropriateness and their actual performance of the stated functions for a majority of the statements. Statistically significant differences were found for 21 out of 33 statements. The statements for which statistically significant differences were found received higher proportions of responses in favor of appropriateness.

5. Principals did not differ in their perceptions of the appropriateness and performance of the functions to the same degree as did the college supervisors and supervising teachers. This conclusion is supported by two findings:

a) College supervisors and supervising teachers differed to a statistically significant degree more often in their perceptions of the appropriateness and performance of the functions than did the principals.

b) The differences in the perceptions of the principals for those statements for which statistically significant differences were found did not reach as high a level of confidence for many of the statements as did the differences in the perceptions of the college supervisors and supervising teachers.

Interpretations

The findings in this study suggest some interpretations pertaining to the functions of school principals in student teaching programs.

1. In spite of numerous group differences, there appeared to be considerable agreement among the groups and within each group as to the appropriateness of the functions of school principals in student teaching programs.

a) Statistically significant differences were not found among the perceptions of the groups for 14 statements. As far as can be determined from the data available in this study, college supervisors, principals, and supervising teachers felt about the same regarding the appropriateness of these 14 functions.

b) The responses of each group were highly in favor or highly opposed to many of the functions. The college supervisors gave 80 per cent or more of responses favoring appropriateness for 26 of the statements. The principals gave 80 per cent or more of "Yes" responses favoring appropriateness for 23 statements. The supervising teachers recorded a "Yes" response for 80 per cent or more for 13 statements. All of the groups recorded less than 20 per cent of their responses in favor of the appropriateness of one statement.

2. Although there also appeared to be some agreement among the groups and within the groups pertaining to the performance of the functions, this agreement appeared not to be as great as in the case of the appropriateness of the functions.

a) Statistically significant differences among the perceptions of the groups pertaining to the performance of the functions were not found for 7 statements.

b) The responses of each group pertaining to the performance of the functions did not contain as many proportions highly in favor or highly opposed as was the case for the appropriateness of the functions. Three functions were perceived as being performed by 80 per cent or more of the college supervisors. Eighty per cent or more of the principals saw themselves as performing 17 of the functions. Four functions were seen by 80 per cent or more of the supervising teachers as being performed.

3. All of the groups felt that the principals should be doing more in the performance of the functions. Generally, the appropriateness of the functions were perceived to a higher degree than the performance of the functions.

4. The principals perceived themselves as doing a better job in the performance of the functions than did the college supervisors and supervising teachers. There were fewer statements for which statistically significant differences were found in the case of the principals than in the case of the other groups. The per cents of "Yes" responses of the principals for performance of the functions were higher for most statements than were the

per cents of "Yes" responses of the college supervisors and supervising teachers.

5. College supervisors and supervising teachers were reluctant to share with the principals responsibilities for which the college supervisors and supervising teachers now may have major or almost exclusive authority.

The supervising teachers did not see, to the same extent as the other groups, the need for the principals to assume supervisory responsibilities in the student teaching program in planning and evaluating the work of the student teachers and in safeguarding the welfare of the student teachers.

The college supervisors to a lesser degree than did the other groups, particularly the principals, saw a need to share responsibilities of a supervisory nature with the principals such as advising the supervising teachers of their specific responsibilities in the student teaching program and approving the assignment of the student teachers in the school.

6. The college supervisors, principals, and supervising teachers did not perceive the student teaching program to be a partnership endeavor to the extent suggested by the writers in the literature reviewed in Chapter II.

This interpretation is limited to the extent to which the statements contained in the questionnaire represent the idea of the partnership between the colleges and the public

schools in the student teaching program expressed in the literature.

This conclusion is supported by the findings in the study suggesting that there are significant differences in the perceptions of the three groups regarding the appropriateness of the functions represented by the statements contained in the questionnaire.

Recommendations

The analyses of the data in this study suggest some recommendations.

1. The colleges and the public schools should have more orientation and planning activities for the personnel involved in working with student teachers than they are now having to reach some common understandings regarding policies and procedures.

2. The colleges should make a greater effort than is now being done to help the personnel in the schools to know more about the student teachers they are to have.

3. Principals should be doing more than they are now doing in the student teaching program, but in assuming more responsibilities, they should be careful not to take over responsibilities now being performed by college supervisors and supervising teachers. The principals should look upon their assumption of greater responsibilities as involving more cooperative effort as they work jointly with

the college supervisors and supervising teachers in the student teaching program.

There is a need for further research concerning the functions of principals in student teaching programs. Very little research has been done on this problem. This study has explored the differences in the perceptions of the groups concerning the functions of principals in student teaching programs. Further research is needed using other techniques of gathering information to further test the trends revealed in this study. Some problems more specifically stated might be:

1. To determine the effectiveness of the principals' performance of the functions listed in this study by securing the perceptions of the various groups, including student teachers, relative to the contributions these functions are making to the success of the student teaching program.

2. To obtain responses to statements representing different degrees of the same functions.

3. To study more thoroughly any one of the areas of the functions of school principals in student teaching programs in which the differences in perceptions according to this study appear to be significant, such as the responsibility for the selection of the supervising teacher.

4. To study the following questions raised by the discussion of the interpretations:

a) Would the college supervisors and supervising teachers like to see the principals doing more in the student teaching programs than they are now doing?

b) Do the college supervisors to a lesser degree than the other groups see as appropriate those statements which imply that the principals would assume some authority or responsibility in those phases of the program for which the college supervisors now have major or almost exclusive authority or responsibility such as the assignment of the student teachers to the supervising teachers?

c) Do the supervising teachers to a lesser degree than the other groups see as less appropriate those statements that imply that the principals would assume some authority or responsibility in those phases of the programs for which the supervising teachers now have major or almost exclusive responsibility, such as scheduling and holding conferences with the student teachers?

5. To determine the appropriateness of functions, such as the ones represented in this study, in different types of student teaching situations such as small schools and large schools or schools close to the main campus of the college and schools away from the campus.

6. To determine to what extent various functions in the student teaching program should be a joint effort

or should be more the responsibility of either the college supervisor, principal, or supervising teacher.

APPENDIX A
THE QUESTIONNAIRE

OPINIONS RELATED TO THE FUNCTIONS OF SCHOOL
PRINCIPALS FOR STUDENT TEACHING PROGRAMS

The statements that follow indicate some possible functions of school principals for student teaching programs. Please check (✓) the appropriate answers.

1. Check (✓) in the first column whether or not you believe this is an appropriate function for the principal in your particular school situation, that is, does the principal need to perform this function.

2. Check (✓) in the second column whether or not the principal in your school is performing this function.

IS THIS
APPRO-
PRIATE?

IS THIS
DONE?

Yes ___

Yes ___

1. The principal becomes acquainted with the teacher education institution's program and policies for student teaching.

No ___

No ___

Yes ___

Yes ___

2. The principal meets with the college supervisors to acquaint them with the school program and policies.

No ___

No ___

Yes ___

Yes ___

3. The principal approves the supervising teachers selected in the school of which he is principal.

No ___

No ___

Yes ___

Yes ___

4. The principal has the sole responsibility for selecting the supervising teachers in the school of which he is principal.

No ___

No ___

Yes ___

Yes ___

5. The principal works jointly with the college representatives and the representative of the local school system administration in the selection of the supervising teachers.

No ___

No ___

IS THIS APPRO- PRIATE?	IS THIS DONE?	
Yes ___ No ___	Yes ___ No ___	6. The principal explains the student teaching program to the total faculty of the school.
Yes ___ No ___	Yes ___ No ___	7. The principal informs the parents and the community of the purposes and benefits of the student teaching program.
Yes ___ No ___	Yes ___ No ___	8. The principal advises the supervising teachers of their specific duties in the student teaching program.
Yes ___ No ___	Yes ___ No ___	9. The principal leaves the planning of the experiences and responsibilities of the student teachers to the college supervisor and the supervising teachers.
Yes ___ No ___	Yes ___ No ___	10. The principal works jointly with the college supervisor and the supervising teachers in planning the experiences and responsibilities the student teachers will have in the classroom and the school.
Yes ___ No ___	Yes ___ No ___	11. The principal provides opportunities for the student teachers to observe in several situations and classrooms in the school.
Yes ___ No ___	Yes ___ No ___	12. The principal arranges for the supervising teachers to meet the student teachers before the student teachers report to the classrooms.
Yes ___ No ___	Yes ___ No ___	13. The principal helps the student teachers become acquainted with the administrative policies of the school and the operation of the school office.

IS THIS
APPRO-
PRIATE?

IS THIS
DONE?

Yes ___

Yes ___

14. The principal has conferences with the student teacher and the supervising teacher when needed.

No ___

No ___

Yes ___

Yes ___

15. The principal invites the student teachers to faculty meetings.

No ___

No ___

Yes ___

Yes ___

16. The principal invites the student teachers to P.T.A. or other community meetings and introduces the student teachers at the meetings.

No ___

No ___

Yes ___

Yes ___

17. The principal, on occasions, observes the student teacher in his or her actual teaching and offers suggestions of encouragement and assistance.

No ___

No ___

Yes ___

Yes ___

18. The principal, as the need arises, offers suggestions to the college supervisor concerning the work of the student teachers.

No ___

No ___

Yes ___

Yes ___

19. The principal participates with the supervising teacher and the student teacher in the evaluation of the student teaching experience.

No ___

No ___

Yes ___

Yes ___

20. The principal provides or arranges time for the supervising teacher to have conferences with the student teacher.

No ___

No ___

Yes ___

Yes ___

21. The principal makes available to the supervising teacher professional literature relating to student teaching.

No ___

No ___

Yes ___

Yes ___

22. The principal encourages the supervising teacher in professional growth.

No ___

No ___

- | IS THIS
APPRO-
PRIATE? | IS THIS
DONE? | |
|------------------------------|------------------|---|
| Yes ___ | Yes ___ | 23. The principal takes the initiative to provide suitable and adequate instructional materials for the use of the supervising teacher and the student teacher. |
| No ___ | No ___ | |
| <hr/> | | |
| Yes ___ | Yes ___ | 24. The principal keeps himself informed about current education programs in teacher education. |
| No ___ | No ___ | |
| <hr/> | | |
| Yes ___ | Yes ___ | 25. The principal meets and welcomes the student teachers upon their first arrival at the school. |
| No ___ | No ___ | |
| <hr/> | | |
| Yes ___ | Yes ___ | 26. The principal tells the student teacher something of the special interests and strengths of the supervising teacher. |
| No ___ | No ___ | |
| <hr/> | | |
| Yes ___ | Yes ___ | 27. The principal makes available to the supervising teachers the information on the student teachers furnished by the college. |
| No ___ | No ___ | |
| <hr/> | | |
| Yes ___ | Yes ___ | 28. The principal studies all the information furnished by the college regarding the student teachers. |
| No ___ | No ___ | |
| <hr/> | | |
| Yes ___ | Yes ___ | 29. The principal approves the assignment of the student teachers in the school. |
| No ___ | No ___ | |
| <hr/> | | |
| Yes ___ | Yes ___ | 30. The principal assists the student teachers in securing living quarters in situations where assistance is needed. |
| No ___ | No ___ | |
| <hr/> | | |

IS THIS
APPRO-
PRIATE?

IS THIS
DONE?

Yes ___

Yes ___

31. The principal introduces the student teachers to the pupil groups in the school in such a way as to give the student teachers status of teachers.

No ___

No ___

Yes ___

Yes ___

32. The principal safeguards the welfare of the student teachers by seeing that they are not used to perform menial tasks or assume responsibilities with which they cannot cope.

No ___

No ___

Yes ___

Yes ___

33. The principal studies the qualifications of the faculty of the school and, using the criteria furnished by the college, selects teachers to recommend as good prospective supervising teachers.

No ___

No ___

Yes ___

Yes ___

34. The principal encourages the supervising teacher to try new ways of teaching.

No ___

No ___

Now that you have indicated your responses to the statements, please go back to the statements and place a circle around the number of six statements that in your opinion best indicate the functions that contribute the most to the success of the program of student teaching in your school.

Also, it would be helpful to the study if you would write on the back of these sheets any functions not given that you find to be important in your work with student teachers. If you wish, you may explain or comment on any of your answers to the statements.

APPENDIX B

LETTERS

UNIVERSITY OF ALABAMA
University, Alabama

December 26, 1961

College of Education

Dean Theron Montgomery
Jacksonville State College
Jacksonville, Alabama

Dear Dean Montgomery:

Mr. Lawson J. Brown is a doctoral student in the Elementary Education Department at the University of Alabama. His dissertation topic has been approved by his advisory committee consisting of: Dr. Esther Swenson, Dr. Daisy Parton, Dr. Bascom Woodward, Dr. Ray Loree, and myself. We are quite enthusiastic about the project and feel that Mr. Brown is qualified to handle it in a most efficient and professional manner.

We are very anxious to have every teacher training institution in the state represented in the study. Since we are in the process of expanding our student teaching program, this study will be quite beneficial to us. It may be useful to other institutions, also, and will be available for that purpose. No comparisons of institutions will be made and no institution or individual will be identified in the study.

If you would like to have your college represented in this study, I shall greatly appreciate your furnishing Mr. Brown the information requested in his enclosed letter. The people whose names you submit will be asked to respond to a short questionnaire later. A self-addressed stamped envelope is enclosed for your convenience.

With kindest personal regards, I am

Sincerely yours,

Yewell Thompson
Chairman, Elementary
Education Department

ebn

Enclosure:

UNIVERSITY OF ALABAMA
University, Alabama
Box 4228
December 26, 1961

College of Education

Dean Truman M. Pierce
School of Education
Auburn University
Auburn, Alabama

Dear Dean Pierce:

I am making a study of the functions of school principals in student teaching programs. A part of this study involves a survey of the opinions of supervisory personnel in student teaching programs in colleges and universities of Alabama accredited by the Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools. Will you kindly send to me the following information:

1. The names and addresses of the people on your college staff who direct and supervise student teaching experiences.
2. The names and addresses of the principals of the elementary and secondary schools in which your students do student teaching.
3. The names and addresses of the teachers in the elementary and secondary schools who serve as supervising or critic teachers in your student teaching programs.

Your assistance in this endeavor will be greatly appreciated. If this request should be made to some member of your staff, will you please pass it on to that person.

Sincerely,

Lawson J. Brown

UNIVERSITY OF ALABAMA
UNIVERSITY, ALABAMA

College of Education

Box 4228

February 6, 1962

Dear College Supervisor, Principal and Supervising Teacher:

I am making a study of the functions of school principals in student teaching programs. A part of the study involves a survey of the opinions of college supervisors, principals, and supervising teachers who work with student teachers in Alabama.

The Dean of the college from which your students come has indicated his willingness to cooperate with this study and has sent to me the names and addresses of the people who work with the students from his college.

Will you please check the enclosed questionnaire and return it to me. A stamped addressed envelope is enclosed for your convenience in returning the questionnaire.

The statements in the questionnaire have been taken from the literature dealing with student teaching programs. They represent a wide variety of practices in many varying situations. You should check your answers according to the needs and practices in your own situation. The number of "Yes" or "No" responses will in no way indicate the quality of your program. No comparison between particular institutions will be made and no institution or individual will be identified in the study. The numbers written in the upper right hand corner of the questionnaires are for use in tabulating the responses by machine and to check on the number of questionnaires returned. You need not sign your name unless you wish to do so.

Your assistance in this endeavor is greatly appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

Lawson J. Brown

APPENDIX C
CHI SQUARE TABLES

TABLE 1

CHI SQUARE TABLE FOR STATEMENT 1, "THE PRINCIPAL BECOMES ACQUAINTED WITH THE TEACHER EDUCATION INSTITUTION'S PROGRAM AND POLICIES FOR STUDENT TEACHING."

First Question, "Is This Appropriate?"

Part **a** Obtained Frequencies (f_o) and Theoretical Frequencies (f_t)

Note: Theoretical frequencies are shown in parentheses

	Most Important	Yes	No	Omitted	Total
College Supervisors	24(14.16)	25 (32.80)	0(0.53)	0(1.49)	49
Principals	22(28.06)	70 (64.94)	2(1.05)	3(2.95)	97
Teachers	87(90.78)	213(210.24)	3(3.41)	11(9.55)	314
Total	133	308	5	14	460

Part **b** Deviations Between Obtained Frequencies and Theoretical Frequencies ($f_o - f_t$) and Weighted Squared Deviations $\frac{(f_o - f_t)^2}{f_t}$

Note: Weighted squared deviations are shown in parentheses

	Most Important	Yes	No	Omitted	Total
College Supervisors	9.84(6.83)	7.80(1.85)	.53(.50)	1.49(1.49)	10.67
Principals	6.06(1.30)	5.06(0.39)	.95(.85)	.05(0.00)	2.54
Teachers	3.78(0.15)	2.76(0.03)	.41(.04)	1.45(0.22)	0.44
Total	8.28	2.27	1.39	1.71	13.65

Chi square = the sum of the weighted squared deviations

Chi square = 13.65

P = .034

TABLE 1--Continued

Second Question, "Is This Done?"

Part c Obtained Frequencies (f_o) and Theoretical
Frequencies (f_t)

Note: Theoretical frequencies are shown in parentheses

	Yes	No	Omitted	Total
College Supervisors	43 (44.10)	3 (2.77)	3 (2.13)	49
Principals	91 (87.30)	5 (5.48)	1 (4.22)	97
Teachers	280(282.60)	18(17.75)	16(13.65)	314
Total	414	26	20	460

Part d Deviations Between Obtained Frequencies and Theoretical Frequencies (f_o-f_t) and Weighted Squared Deviations $\frac{(f_o-f_t)^2}{f_t}$

Note: Weighted squared deviations are shown in parentheses

	Yes	No	Omitted	Total
College Supervisors	1.10(0.03)	.23(.02)	.87(0.36)	.41
Principals	3.70(0.16)	.48(.04)	3.22(2.46)	2.66
Teachers	2.60(0.02)	.25(.01)	2.35(0.40)	.43
Total	.21	.07	3.22	3.50

Chi square = the sum of the weighted squared deviations

Chi square = 3.50

P = .482

TABLE 2

CHI SQUARE TABLE FOR STATEMENT 2, "THE PRINCIPAL MEETS WITH THE COLLEGE SUPERVISORS TO ACQUAINT THEM WITH THE SCHOOL PROGRAM AND POLICIES."

First Question, "Is This Appropriate?"

Part a Obtained Frequencies (f_o) and Theoretical Frequencies (f_t)

Note: Theoretical frequencies are shown in parentheses

	Most Important	Yes	No	Omitted	Total
College Supervisors	9 (7.45)	38 (38.45)	1(1.17)	1 (1.91)	49
Principals	13(14.76)	78 (76.12)	2(2.31)	4 (3.79)	97
Teachers	48(47.78)	245(246.42)	8(7.50)	13(12.28)	314
Total	70	361	11	18	460

Part b Deviations Between Obtained Frequencies and Theoretical Frequencies (f_o-f_t) and Weighted Squared Deviations $\frac{(f_o-f_t)^2}{f_t}$

Note: Weighted squared deviations are shown in parentheses

	Most Important	Yes	No	Omitted	Total
College Supervisors	1.55(.32)	.45(.01)	.17(.03)	.91(.43)	.79
Principals	1.76(.21)	1.88(.04)	.31(.04)	.21(.01)	.30
Teachers	.22(.00)	1.42(.01)	.50(.03)	.72(.04)	.08
Total	.53	.06	.10	.48	1.17

Chi square = the sum of the weighted squared deviations

Chi square = 1.17

P = .974

TABLE 2--Continued

 Second Question, "Is This Done?"

 Part c Obtained Frequencies (f_o) and Theoretical
 Frequencies (f_t)

Note: Theoretical frequencies are shown in parentheses

	Yes	No	Omitted	Total
College Supervisors	32 (38.45)	14 (8.10)	3 (2.45)	49
Principals	75 (76.12)	22(16.03)	0 (4.85)	97
Teachers	254(246.42)	40(51.88)	20(15.70)	314
Total	361	76	23	460

 Part d Deviations Between Obtained Frequencies and Theo-
 retical Frequencies ($f_o - f_t$) and Weighted Squared
 Deviations $\frac{(f_o - f_t)^2}{f_t}$

Note: Weighted squared deviations are shown in parentheses

	Yes	No	Omitted	Total
College Supervisors	6.45(1.08)	5.90(4.30)	.55(0.12)	5.50
Principals	1.12(0.02)	5.97(2.22)	4.85(4.85)	7.09
Teachers	7.58(0.23)	10.88(2.28)	4.30(1.18)	3.69
Total	1.33	8.80	6.15	16.28

Chi square = the sum of the weighted squared deviations

Chi square = 16.28

P = .0027

TABLE 3

CHI SQUARE TABLE FOR STATEMENT 3, "THE PRINCIPAL APPROVES THE SUPERVISING TEACHERS SELECTED IN THE SCHOOL OF WHICH HE IS PRINCIPAL."

First Question, "Is This Appropriate?"

Part a Obtained Frequencies (f_o) and Theoretical Frequencies (f_t)

Note: Theoretical frequencies are shown in parentheses

	Most Important	Yes	No	Omitted	Total
College Supervisors	5 (5.43)	40 (40.05)	4 (1.59)	0 (1.91)	49
Principals	9(10.75)	84 (79.28)	1 (3.16)	3 (3.79)	97
Teachers	37(34.81)	252(256.66)	10(10.23)	15(12.28)	314
Total	51	376	15	18	460

Part b Deviations Between Obtained Frequencies and Theoretical Frequencies ($f_o - f_t$) and Weighted Squared Deviations $\frac{(f_o - f_t)^2}{f_t}$

Note: Weighted squared deviations are shown in parentheses

	Most Important	Yes	No	Omitted	Total
College Supervisors	.43(.03)	.05(.00)	2.41(3.65)	1.91(1.91)	5.59
Principals	1.75(.28)	4.72(.28)	2.16(1.47)	.79(0.16)	2.16
Teachers	2.19(.13)	4.66(.08)	.23(0.01)	2.72(0.60)	.82
Total	.44	.36	5.13	2.67	8.60

Chi square = the sum of the weighted squared deviations

Chi square = 8.60

P = .200

TABLE 3--Continued

Second Question, "Is This Done?"

Part c Obtained Frequencies (f_o) and Theoretical Frequencies (f_t)

Note: Theoretical frequencies are shown in parentheses

	Yes	No	Omitted	Total
College Supervisors	40 (41.97)	5 (4.90)	4 (2.13)	49
Principals	87 (83.08)	10 (9.70)	0 (4.22)	97
Teachers	267(268.95)	31(31.40)	16(13.65)	314
Total	394	46	20	460

Part d Deviations Between Obtained Frequencies and Theoretical Frequencies ($f_o - f_t$) and Weighted Squared Deviations $\frac{(f_o - f_t)^2}{f_t}$

Note: Weighted squared deviations are shown in parentheses

	Yes	No	Omitted	Total
College Supervisors	1.97(.09)	.10(.00)	1.87(1.64)	1.73
Principals	3.92(.19)	.30(.01)	4.22(4.22)	4.42
Teachers	1.95(.01)	.40(.01)	2.35(0.40)	.42
Total	.29	.02	6.26	6.57

Chi square = the sum of the weighted squared deviations

Chi square = 6.57

P = .163

TABLE 4

CHI SQUARE TABLE FOR STATEMENT 4, "THE PRINCIPAL HAS THE SOLE RESPONSIBILITY FOR SELECTING THE SUPERVISING TEACHERS IN THE SCHOOL OF WHICH HE IS PRINCIPAL."

First Question, "Is This Appropriate?"

Part a Obtained Frequencies (f_o) and Theoretical Frequencies (f_t)

Note: Theoretical frequencies are shown in parentheses

	Most Important	Yes	No	Omitted	Total
College Supervisors	1(1.28)	1 (6.92)	47 (37.18)	0 (3.62)	49
Principals	2(2.53)	20(13.71)	69 (73.59)	6 (7.17)	97
Teachers	9(8.19)	44(44.37)	233(238.23)	28(23.21)	314
Total	12	65	349	34	460

Part b Deviations Between Obtained Frequencies and Theoretical Frequencies ($f_o - f_t$) and Weighted Squared Deviations $\frac{(f_o - f_t)^2}{f_t}$

Note: Weighted squared deviations are shown in parentheses

	Most Important	Yes	No	Omitted	Total
College Supervisors	.28(.06)	5.92(5.06)	9.82(2.59)	3.62(3.62)	11.33
Principals	.53(.11)	6.29(2.89)	4.59(0.29)	1.17(0.19)	3.48
Teachers	.81(.08)	.37(0.01)	5.23(0.11)	4.79(0.99)	1.19
Total	.25	7.96	2.99	4.80	16.00

Chi square = the sum of the weighted squared deviations

Chi square = 16.00

P = .014

TABLE 4--Continued

 Second Question, "Is This Done?"

 Part c Obtained Frequencies (f_o) and Theoretical
 Frequencies (f_t)

Note: Theoretical frequencies are shown in parentheses

	Yes	No	Omitted	Total
College Supervisors	4 (6.71)	41 (38.77)	4 (3.52)	49
Principals	13(13.28)	78 (76.76)	6 (6.96)	97
Teachers	46(43.00)	245(248.47)	23(22.53)	314
Total	63	364	33	460

 Part d Deviations Between Obtained Frequencies and Theo-
 retical Frequencies (f_o-f_t) and Weighted Squared
 Deviations $\frac{(f_o-f_t)^2}{f_t}$

Note: Weighted squared deviations are shown in parentheses

	Yes	No	Omitted	Total
College Supervisors	2.71(1.09)	2.33(.14)	.48(.07)	1.30
Principals	.28(0.01)	1.24(.02)	.96(.13)	.16
Teachers	3.00(0.21)	3.47(.05)	.47(.01)	.27
Total	1.31	.21	.21	1.73

Chi square = the sum of the weighted squared deviations

Chi square = 1.73

P = .784

TABLE 5

CHI SQUARE TABLE FOR STATEMENT 5, "THE PRINCIPAL WORKS JOINTLY WITH THE COLLEGE REPRESENTATIVES AND THE REPRESENTATIVE OF THE LOCAL SCHOOL SYSTEM ADMINISTRATION IN THE SELECTION OF THE SUPERVISING TEACHERS."

First Question, "Is This Appropriate?"

Part a Obtained Frequencies (f_o) and Theoretical Frequencies (f_t)

Note: Theoretical frequencies are shown in parentheses

	Most Important	Yes	No	Omitted	Total
College Supervisors	18(12.24)	25 (28.44)	5 (5.11)	1 (3.30)	49
Principals	32(24.03)	43 (56.30)	17(10.12)	5 (6.54)	97
Teachers	64(77.82)	199(182.25)	26(32.76)	25(21.16)	314
Total	114	267	48	31	460

Part b Deviations Between Obtained Frequencies and Theoretical Frequencies (f_o-f_t) and Weighted Squared Deviations $\frac{(f_o-f_t)^2}{f_t}$

Note: Weighted squared deviations are shown in parentheses

	Most Important	Yes	No	Omitted	Total
College Supervisors	5.76(2.83)	3.44(0.42)	.11(0.00)	2.30(1.60)	4.85
Principals	7.97(2.64)	13.30(3.14)	6.88(4.68)	1.54(0.36)	10.82
Teachers	13.82(2.45)	16.75(1.54)	6.76(1.39)	3.84(0.70)	6.08
Total	7.92	5.10	6.07	2.66	21.75

Chi square = the sum of the weighted squared deviations

Chi square = 21.75

P = .001

TABLE 5--Continued

Second Question, "Is This Done?"

Part c Obtained Frequencies (f_o) and Theoretical
Frequencies (f_t)

Note: Theoretical frequencies are shown in parentheses

	Yes	No	Omitted	Total
College Supervisors	32 (31.74)	11(11.72)	6 (5.54)	49
Principals	65 (62.84)	27(23.20)	5(10.97)	97
Teachers	201(203.42)	72(75.09)	41(35.50)	314
Total	298	110	52	460

Part d Deviations Between Obtained Frequencies and Theo-
retical Frequencies ($f_o - f_t$) and Weighted Squared
Deviations $\frac{(f_o - f_t)^2}{f_t}$

Note: Weighted squared deviations are shown in parentheses

	Yes	No	Omitted	Total
College Supervisors	.26(.01)	.72(.04)	.46(0.04)	.09
Principals	2.16(.07)	3.80(.62)	5.97(3.25)	3.94
Teachers	2.42(.03)	3.09(.13)	5.50(0.85)	1.01
Total	.11	.79	4.14	5.04

Chi square = the sum of the weighted squared deviations

Chi square = 5.04

P = .283

TABLE 6

CHI SQUARE TABLE FOR STATEMENT 6, "THE PRINCIPAL EXPLAINS THE STUDENT TEACHING PROGRAM TO THE TOTAL FACULTY OF THE SCHOOL."

First Question, "Is This Appropriate?"

Part a Obtained Frequencies (f_o) and Theoretical Frequencies (f_t)

Note: Theoretical frequencies are shown in parentheses

	Most Important	Yes	No	Omitted	Total
College Supervisors	14 (8.73)	33 (33.45)	2 (3.41)	0 (3.41)	49
Principals	14 (17.29)	72 (66.21)	4 (6.75)	7 (6.75)	97
Teachers	54 (55.97)	209 (214.34)	26 (21.84)	25 (21.84)	314
Total	82	314	32	32	460

Part b Deviations Between Obtained Frequencies and Theoretical Frequencies ($f_o - f_t$) and Weighted Squared Deviations $\frac{(f_o - f_t)^2}{f_t}$

Note: Weighted squared deviations are shown in parentheses

	Most Important	Yes	No	Omitted	Total
College Supervisors	5.27 (3.18)	.45 (.01)	1.41 (0.58)	3.41 (3.41)	7.18
Principals	3.29 (0.63)	5.79 (.51)	2.75 (1.12)	.25 (0.01)	2.27
Teachers	1.97 (0.07)	4.16 (.08)	4.16 (0.79)	3.16 (0.46)	1.40
Total	3.88	.60	2.49	3.88	10.85

Chi square = the sum of the weighted squared deviations

Chi square = 10.85

P = .101

TABLE 6--Continued

Second Question, "Is This Done?"

Part c Obtained Frequencies (f_o) and Theoretical
Frequencies (f_t)

Note: Theoretical frequencies are shown in parentheses

	Yes	No	Omitted	Total
College Supervisors	24 (27.48)	18 (18.96)	7 (2.56)	49
Principals	70 (54.40)	23 (37.53)	4 (5.06)	97
Teachers	164(176.11)	137(121.50)	13(16.38)	314
Total	258	178	24	460

Part d Deviations Between Obtained Frequencies and Theo-
retical Frequencies (f_o-f_t) and Weighted Squared
Deviations $\frac{(f_o-f_t)^2}{f_t}$

Note: Weighted squared deviations are shown in parentheses

	Yes	No	Omitted	Total
College Supervisors	3.48(0.44)	.96(0.05)	4.44(7.70)	8.19
Principals	15.60(4.47)	14.53(5.63)	1.06(0.22)	10.32
Teachers	12.11(0.83)	15.50(1.98)	3.38(0.70)	3.51
Total	5.74	7.66	8.62	22.02

Chi square = the sum of the weighted squared deviations

Chi square = 22.02

P = .0002

TABLE 7

CHI SQUARE TABLE FOR STATEMENT 7, "THE PRINCIPAL INFORMS THE PARENTS AND THE COMMUNITY OF THE PURPOSES AND BENEFITS OF THE STUDENT TEACHING PROGRAM."

First Question, "Is This Appropriate?"

Part a Obtained Frequencies (f_o) and Theoretical Frequencies (f_t)

Note: Theoretical frequencies are shown in parentheses

	Most Important	Yes	No	Omitted	Total
College Supervisors	14 (7.66)	31 (28.86)	2 (8.10)	2 (4.37)	49
Principals	13(15.18)	61 (59.14)	16(16.03)	7 (8.65)	97
Teachers	45(49.15)	179(184.99)	58(57.87)	32(27.98)	314
Total	72	271	76	41	460

Part b Deviations Between Obtained Frequencies and Theoretical Frequencies (f_o-f_t) and Weighted Squared Deviations $\frac{(f_o-f_t)^2}{f_t}$

Note: Weighted squared deviations are shown in parentheses

	Most Important	Yes	No	Omitted	Total
College Supervisors	6.44(5.41)	2.14(.16)	6.10(4.59)	2.37(1.29)	11.45
Principals	1.82(0.22)	3.86(.26)	.03(0.00)	1.65(0.31)	.79
Teachers	4.15(0.35)	5.99(.06)	.13(0.00)	4.02(0.58)	.99
Total	5.98	.48	4.59	2.18	13.23

Chi square = the sum of the weighted squared deviations

Chi square = 13.23

P = .039

TABLE 7--Continued

 Second Question, "Is This Done?"

 Part c Obtained Frequencies (f_o) and Theoretical
 Frequencies (f_t)

Note: Theoretical frequencies are shown in parentheses

	Yes	No	Omitted	Total
College Supervisors	16 (18.00)	24 (26.73)	9 (4.26)	49
Principals	47 (35.64)	47 (52.93)	3 (8.43)	97
Teachers	106(115.36)	180(171.33)	28(27.30)	314
Total	169	251	40	460

 Part d Deviations Between Obtained Frequencies and Theo-
 retical Frequencies (f_o-f_t) and Weighted Squared
 Deviations $\frac{(f_o-f_t)^2}{f_t}$

Note: Weighted squared deviations are shown in parentheses

	Yes	No	Omitted	Total
College Supervisors	2.00(0.22)	2.73(0.28)	4.74(5.27)	5.77
Principals	11.36(3.62)	5.93(0.66)	5.43(3.50)	7.78
Teachers	9.36(0.76)	8.67(0.44)	.70(0.02)	1.22
Total	4.60	1.38	8.79	14.77

Chi square = the sum of the weighted squared deviations

Chi square = 14.77

P = .005

TABLE 8

CHI SQUARE TABLE FOR STATEMENT 8, "THE PRINCIPAL ADVISES THE SUPERVISING TEACHERS OF THEIR SPECIFIC DUTIES IN THE STUDENT TEACHING PROGRAM."

First Question, "Is This Appropriate?"

Part a Obtained Frequencies (f_o) and Theoretical Frequencies (f_t)

Note: Theoretical frequencies are shown in parentheses

	Most Important	Yes	No	Omitted	Total
College Supervisors	1 (4.79)	16 (21.74)	30 (19.38)	2 (0.91)	49
Principals	11 (9.48)	47 (43.01)	29 (38.38)	10 (6.11)	97
Teachers	33 (30.71)	141 (139.25)	123 (124.23)	17 (19.80)	314
Total	45	204	182	29	460

Part b Deviations Between Obtained Frequencies and Theoretical Frequencies ($f_o - f_t$) and Weighted Squared Deviations $\frac{(f_o - f_t)^2}{f_t}$

Note: Weighted squared deviations are shown in parentheses

	Most Important	Yes	No	Omitted	Total
College Supervisors	3.79(3.00)	5.74(1.52)	10.62(5.82)	1.09(1.31)	11.65
Principals	1.52(0.24)	3.99(0.37)	8.62(1.94)	3.89(2.48)	5.03
Teachers	2.29(0.17)	1.75(0.02)	.77(0.01)	2.80(0.40)	.60
Total	3.41	1.91	7.77	4.19	17.28

Chi square = the sum of the weighted squared deviations

Chi square = 17.28

P = .0008

TABLE 8--Continued

Second Question, "Is This Done?"

Part c Obtained Frequencies (f_o) and Theoretical Frequencies (f_t)

Note: Theoretical frequencies are shown in parentheses

	Yes	No	Omitted	Total
College Supervisors	8 (19.39)	35 (26.52)	6 (3.09)	49
Principals	56 (38.38)	35 (52.51)	6 (6.12)	97
Teachers	118(124.23)	179(169.97)	17(19.80)	314
Total	182	249	29	460

Part d Deviations Between Obtained Frequencies and Theoretical Frequencies ($f_o - f_t$) and Weighted Squared Deviations $\frac{(f_o - f_t)^2}{f_t}$

Note: Weighted squared deviations are shown in parentheses

	Yes	No	Omitted	Total
College Supervisors	11.39(6.69)	8.48(2.71)	2.91(2.74)	12.14
Principals	17.62(8.09)	17.51(5.84)	.12(0.00)	13.93
Teachers	6.23(0.31)	9.03(0.48)	2.80(0.40)	1.19
Total	15.09	9.03	3.14	27.26

Chi square = the sum of the weighted squared deviations

Chi square = 27.26

P = .000008

TABLE 9

CHI SQUARE TABLE FOR STATEMENT 9, "THE PRINCIPAL LEAVES THE PLANNING OF THE EXPERIENCES AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE STUDENT TEACHERS TO THE COLLEGE SUPERVISOR AND THE SUPERVISING TEACHERS."

First Question, "Is This Appropriate?"

Part a Obtained Frequencies (f_o) and Theoretical Frequencies (f_t)

Note: Theoretical frequencies are shown in parentheses

	Most Important	Yes	No	Omitted	Total
College Supervisors	8 (8.42)	14 (16.19)	24 (19.20)	3 (4.47)	49
Principals	4 (16.66)	22 (32.05)	57 (39.43)	14 (8.85)	97
Teachers	67 (53.92)	116 (103.75)	106 (127.65)	25 (28.67)	314
Total	79	152	187	42	460

Part b Deviations Between Obtained Frequencies and Theoretical Frequencies ($f_o - f_t$) and Weighted Squared Deviations $\frac{(f_o - f_t)^2}{f_t}$

Note: Weighted squared deviations are shown in parentheses

	Most Important	Yes	No	Omitted	Total
College Supervisors	.42 (0.02)	2.19 (0.30)	4.80 (1.20)	1.47 (0.48)	2.00
Principals	12.66 (8.86)	10.05 (0.97)	17.57 (7.83)	5.15 (3.00)	20.60
Teachers	13.08 (3.17)	12.25 (1.45)	21.65 (3.67)	3.67 (0.47)	8.76
Total	12.05	2.72	12.70	3.95	31.42

Chi square = the sum of the weighted squared deviations

Chi square = 31.42

P = .00003

TABLE 9--Continued

 Second Question, "Is This Done?"

 Part c Obtained Frequencies (f_o) and Theoretical
 Frequencies (f_t)

Note: Theoretical frequencies are shown in parentheses

	Yes	No	Omitted	Total
College Supervisors	31 (30.57)	14(15.34)	4 (3.09)	49
Principals	31 (60.52)	52(30.36)	14 (6.12)	97
Teachers	225(195.90)	78(98.30)	11(19.80)	314
Total	287	144	29	460

 Part d Deviations Between Obtained Frequencies and Theo-
 retical Frequencies (f_o-f_t) and Weighted Squared
 Deviations $\frac{(f_o-f_t)^2}{f_t}$

Note: Weighted squared deviations are shown in parentheses

	Yes	No	Omitted	Total
College Supervisors	.43 (0.01)	1.34 (0.12)	.91 (0.27)	.40
Principals	29.52(14.40)	21.64(15.42)	7.88(10.15)	39.97
Teachers	29.10 (4.32)	20.30 (4.19)	8.80 (3.91)	12.42
Total	18.73	19.73	14.33	52.79

Chi square = the sum of the weighted squared deviations

Chi square = 52.79

P = .0000001

TABLE 10

CHI SQUARE TABLE FOR STATEMENT 10, "THE PRINCIPAL WORKS JOINTLY WITH THE COLLEGE SUPERVISOR AND THE SUPERVISING TEACHERS IN PLANNING THE EXPERIENCES AND RESPONSIBILITIES THE STUDENT TEACHERS WILL HAVE IN THE CLASSROOM AND THE SCHOOL."

First Question, "Is This Appropriate?"

Part a Obtained Frequencies (f_o) and Theoretical Frequencies (f_t)

Note: Theoretical frequencies are shown in parentheses

	Most Important	Yes	No	Omitted	Total
College Supervisors	16(12.78)	21 (18.74)	9(12.56)	3 (4.90)	49
Principals	36(25.30)	31 (37.11)	16(24.88)	14 (9.70)	97
Teachers	68(81.91)	124(120.14)	93(80.54)	29(31.40)	314
Total	120	176	118	46	460

Part b Deviations Between Obtained Frequencies and Theoretical Frequencies ($f_o - f_t$) and Weighted Squared Deviations $\frac{(f_o - f_t)^2}{f_t}$

Note: Weighted squared deviations are shown in parentheses

	Most Important	Yes	No	Omitted	Total
College Supervisors	3.22(0.81)	2.26(0.27)	3.56(1.01)	1.90(0.74)	2.83
Principals	10.70(5.71)	6.11(1.01)	8.88(3.17)	4.30(1.91)	11.80
Teachers	13.91(2.36)	3.86(0.12)	13.54(2.28)	2.40(0.18)	4.94
Total	8.88	1.40	6.46	2.83	19.57

Chi square = the sum of the weighted squared deviations

Chi square = 19.57

P = .003

TABLE 10--Continued

 Second Question, "Is This Done?"

 Part c Obtained Frequencies (f_o) and Theoretical
 Frequencies (f_t)

Note: Theoretical frequencies are shown in parentheses

	Yes	No	Omitted	Total
College Supervisors	20 (20.24)	25 (24.92)	4 (3.83)	49
Principals	49 (40.07)	35 (49.34)	13 (7.59)	97
Teachers	121 (129.70)	174 (159.73)	19 (24.57)	314
Total	190	234	36	460

 Part d Deviations Between Obtained Frequencies and Theo-
 retical Frequencies ($f_o - f_t$) and Weighted Squared
 Deviations $\frac{(f_o - f_t)^2}{f_t}$

Note: Weighted squared deviations are shown in parentheses

	Yes	No	Omitted	Total
College Supervisors	.24 (0.00)	.08 (0.00)	.17 (0.01)	.01
Principals	8.93 (1.99)	14.34 (4.17)	5.41 (3.86)	10.02
Teachers	8.70 (0.58)	14.27 (1.27)	5.57 (1.26)	3.11
Total	2.57	5.44	5.13	13.14

Chi square = the sum of the weighted squared deviations

Chi square = 13.14

P = .011

TABLE 11

CHI SQUARE TABLE FOR STATEMENT 11, "THE PRINCIPAL PROVIDES OPPORTUNITIES FOR THE STUDENT TEACHERS TO OBSERVE IN SEVERAL SITUATIONS AND CLASSROOMS IN THE SCHOOL."

First Question, "Is This Appropriate?"

Part a Obtained Frequencies (f_o) and Theoretical Frequencies (f_t)

Note: Theoretical frequencies are shown in parentheses

	Most Important	Yes	No	Omitted	Total
College Supervisors	11(14.80)	35 (28.76)	0 (2.66)	3 (2.77)	49
Principals	27(29.31)	64 (56.93)	1 (5.27)	5 (5.48)	97
Teachers	101(94.88)	171(184.30)	24(17.06)	18(17.75)	314
Total	139	270	25	26	460

Part b Deviations Between Obtained Frequencies and Theoretical Frequencies ($f_o - f_t$) and Weighted Squared Deviations $\frac{(f_o - f_t)^2}{f_t}$

Note: Weighted squared deviations are shown in parentheses

	Most Important	Yes	No	Omitted	Total
College Supervisors	3.80(.98)	6.24(1.35)	2.66(2.66)	.33(.04)	5.03
Principals	2.31(.18)	7.07(0.88)	4.27(1.56)	.48(.04)	2.66
Teachers	6.12(.39)	13.30(0.96)	6.94(2.82)	.25(.00)	4.17
Total	1.55	3.19	7.04	.08	11.86

Chi square = the sum of the weighted squared deviations

Chi square = 11.86

P = .066

TABLE 11--Continued

 Second Question, "Is This Done?"

 Part c Obtained Frequencies (f_o) and Theoretical
 Frequencies (f_t)

Note: Theoretical frequencies are shown in parentheses

	Yes	No	Omitted	Total
College Supervisors	35 (35.68)	7(11.40)	7 (1.92)	49
Principals	80 (70.64)	15(22.56)	2 (3.79)	97
Teachers	220(228.67)	85(73.04)	9(12.29)	314
Total	335	107	18	460

 Part d Deviations Between Obtained Frequencies and Theo-
 retical Frequencies (f_o-f_t) and Weighted Squared
 Deviations $\frac{(f_o-f_t)^2}{f_t}$

Note: Weighted squared deviations are shown in parentheses

	Yes	No	Omitted	Total
College Supervisors	.68(0.01)	4.40(1.70)	5.08(13.44)	15.15
Principals	9.36(1.24)	7.56(2.53)	1.79(00.84)	4.61
Teachers	8.67(0.33)	11.96(1.96)	3.29(00.88)	3.17
Total	1.58	6.19	15.16	22.93

Chi square = the sum of the weighted squared deviations

Chi square = 22.93

P = .0001

TABLE 12

CHI SQUARE TABLE FOR STATEMENT 12, "THE PRINCIPAL ARRANGES FOR THE SUPERVISING TEACHERS TO MEET THE STUDENT TEACHERS BEFORE THE STUDENT TEACHERS REPORT TO THE CLASSROOMS."

First Question, "Is This Appropriate?"

Part a Obtained Frequencies (f_o) and Theoretical Frequencies (f_t)

Note: Theoretical frequencies are shown in parentheses

	Most Important	Yes	No	Omitted	Total
College Supervisors	6 (8.52)	39(33.87)	3 (3.94)	1 (2.66)	49
Principals	12(16.87)	73(67.05)	4 (7.80)	8 (5.27)	97
Teachers	62(54.60)	206(47.07)	30(25.25)	16(17.07)	314
Total	80	318	37	25	460

Part b Deviations Between Obtained Frequencies and Theoretical Frequencies (f_o-f_t) and Weighted Squared Deviations $\frac{(f_o-f_t)^2}{f_t}$

Note: Weighted squared deviations are shown in parentheses

	Most Important	Yes	No	Omitted	Total
College Supervisors	2.52(0.75)	5.13(.78)	.94(0.22)	1.66(1.02)	2.77
Principals	4.87(1.41)	5.95(.53)	3.80(1.85)	2.73(1.41)	5.20
Teachers	7.40(1.00)	11.07(.56)	4.75(0.89)	1.07(0.07)	2.52
Total	3.16	1.87	2.96	2.50	10.49

Chi square = the sum of the weighted squared deviations

Chi square = 10.49

P = .107

TABLE 12--Continued

Second Question, "Is This Done?"

Part c Obtained Frequencies (f_o) and Theoretical
Frequencies (f_t)

Note: Theoretical frequencies are shown in parentheses

	Yes	No	Omitted	Total
College Supervisors	30 (33.23)	12(13.74)	7 (2.02)	49
Principals	78 (65.79)	16(27.20)	3 (4.01)	97
Teachers	204(212.97)	101(88.05)	9(12.97)	314
Total	312	129	19	460

Part d Deviations Between Obtained Frequencies and Theoretical
Frequencies (f_o-f_t) and Weighted Squared
Deviations $\frac{(f_o-f_t)^2}{f_t}$

Note: Weighted squared deviations are shown in parentheses

	Yes	No	Omitted	Total
College Supervisors	3.23(0.31)	1.74(0.22)	4.98(12.28)	12.81
Principals	12.21(2.27)	11.20(4.61)	1.01 (0.25)	7.13
Teachers	8.97(0.38)	12.95(1.90)	3.97 (1.21)	3.49
Total	2.96	6.73	13.74	23.43

Chi square = the sum of the weighted squared deviations

Chi square = 23.43

P = .0001

TABLE 13

CHI SQUARE TABLE FOR STATEMENT 13, "THE PRINCIPAL HELPS THE STUDENT TEACHERS BECOME ACQUAINTED WITH THE ADMINISTRATIVE POLICIES OF THE SCHOOL AND THE OPERATION OF THE SCHOOL OFFICE."

First Question, "Is This Appropriate?"

Part a Obtained Frequencies (f_o) and Theoretical Frequencies (f_t)

Note: Theoretical frequencies are shown in parentheses

	Most Important	Yes	No	Omitted	Total
College Supervisors	19(13.42)	26 (27.91)	3 (4.26)	1 (3.41)	49
Principals	37(26.56)	52 (55.25)	3 (8.43)	5 (6.75)	97
Teachers	70(86.01)	184(178.84)	34(27.30)	26(21.84)	314
Total	126	262	40	32	460

Part b Deviations Between Obtained Frequencies and Theoretical Frequencies ($f_o - f_t$) and Weighted Squared Deviations $\frac{(f_o - f_t)^2}{f_t}$

Note: Weighted squared deviations are shown in parentheses

	Most Important	Yes	No	Omitted	Total
College Supervisors	5.58(2.32)	1.91(.13)	1.26(0.37)	2.41(1.70)	4.52
Principals	10.40(4.07)	3.25(.19)	5.43(3.50)	1.75(0.45)	8.21
Teachers	16.01(2.98)	5.16(.15)	6.70(1.40)	4.16(0.79)	5.32
Total	9.37	.47	5.27	2.94	18.05

Chi square = the sum of the weighted squared deviations

Chi square = 18.05

P = .006

TABLE 13--Continued

 Second Question, "Is This Done?"

 Part c Obtained Frequencies (f_o) and Theoretical
 Frequencies (f_t)

Note: Theoretical frequencies are shown in parentheses

	Yes	No	Omitted	Total
College Supervisors	31 (30.78)	13(14.70)	5 (3.51)	49
Principals	80 (60.94)	14(29.10)	3 (6.96)	97
Teachers	178(197.27)	111(94.20)	25(22.53)	314
Total	289	138	33	460

 Part d Deviations Between Obtained Frequencies and Theo-
 retical Frequencies (f_o-f_t) and Weighted Squared
 Deviations $\frac{(f_o-f_t)^2}{f_t}$

Note: Weighted squared deviations are shown in parentheses

	Yes	No	Omitted	Total
College Supervisors	.22(0.00)	1.70(0.20)	1.49(0.63)	.83
Principals	19.06(5.96)	15.10(7.83)	3.96(2.25)	16.04
Teachers	19.27(1.88)	16.80(3.00)	2.47(0.27)	5.15
Total	7.84	11.03	3.15	22.02

Chi square = the sum of the weighted squared deviations

Chi square = 22.02

P = .0002

TABLE 14

CHI SQUARE TABLE FOR STATEMENT 14, "THE PRINCIPAL HAS CONFERENCES WITH THE STUDENT TEACHER AND THE SUPERVISING TEACHER WHEN NEEDED."

First Question, "Is This Appropriate?"

Part a Obtained Frequencies (f_o) and Theoretical Frequencies (f_t)

Note: Theoretical frequencies are shown in parentheses

	Most Important	Yes	No	Omitted	Total
College Supervisors	4 (5.22)	42 (38.88)	1 (1.60)	2 (3.46)	49
Principals	8(10.33)	84 (76.97)	0 (3.16)	5 (6.54)	97
Teachers	37(33.45)	239(249.15)	14(10.24)	24(21.16)	314
Total	49	365	15	31	460

Part b Deviations Between Obtained Frequencies and Theoretical Frequencies ($f_o - f_t$) and Weighted Squared Deviations $\frac{(f_o - f_t)^2}{f_t}$

Note: Weighted squared deviations are shown in parentheses

	Most Important	Yes	No	Omitted	Total
College Supervisors	1.22(.29)	3.12(.25)	.60(0.23)	1.46(.62)	1.39
Principals	2.33(.53)	7.03(.07)	3.16(3.16)	1.54(.36)	4.12
Teachers	3.55(.40)	10.15(.41)	3.76(1.38)	2.84(.38)	2.57
Total	1.22	.73	4.77	1.36	8.08

Chi square = the sum of the weighted squared deviations

Chi square = 8.08

P = .233

TABLE 14--Continued

Second Question, "Is This Done?"

Part c Obtained Frequencies (f_o) and Theoretical Frequencies (f_t)

Note: Theoretical frequencies are shown in parentheses

	Yes	No	Omitted	Total
College Supervisors	34 (36.11)	9 (9.59)	6 (3.30)	49
Principals	88 (71.48)	7(18.98)	2 (6.54)	97
Teachers	217(231.40)	74(61.43)	23(21.16)	314
Total	339	90	31	460

Part d Deviations Between Obtained Frequencies and Theoretical Frequencies (f_o-f_t) and Weighted Squared Deviations $\frac{(f_o-f_t)^2}{f_t}$

Note: Weighted squared deviations are shown in parentheses

	Yes	No	Omitted	Total
College Supervisors	2.11(0.12)	.59(0.04)	2.70(2.21)	2.37
Principals	16.52(3.82)	11.98(7.56)	4.54(3.15)	14.53
Teachers	14.40(0.90)	12.57(2.57)	1.84(0.16)	3.63
Total	4.84	10.17	5.52	20.53

Chi square = the sum of the weighted squared deviations

Chi square = 20.53

P = .0004

TABLE 15

CHI SQUARE TABLE FOR STATEMENT 15, "THE PRINCIPAL INVITES THE STUDENT TEACHERS TO FACULTY MEETINGS."

First Question, "Is This Appropriate?"

Part a Obtained Frequencies (f_o) and Theoretical Frequencies (f_t)

Note: Theoretical frequencies are shown in parentheses

	Most Important	Yes	No	Omitted	Total
College Supervisors	2 (4.58)	44 (38.56)	1 (1.02)	2 (2.66)	49
Principals	7 (9.07)	84 (76.33)	1 (6.26)	5 (5.27)	97
Teachers	34(29.35)	234(247.10)	28(20.47)	18(17.06)	314
Total	43	362	30	25	460

Part b Deviations Between Obtained Frequencies and Theoretical Frequencies ($f_o - f_t$) and Weighted Squared Deviations $\frac{(f_o - f_t)^2}{f_t}$

Note: Weighted squared deviations are shown in parentheses

	Most Important	Yes	No	Omitted	Total
College Supervisors	2.58(1.45)	5.44(.77)	.02(0.00)	.66(.17)	2.39
Principals	2.07(0.47)	7.77(.79)	5.26(4.42)	.27(.01)	5.69
Teachers	4.65(0.74)	13.10(.70)	7.53(2.77)	.94(.05)	4.26
Total	2.66	2.26	7.19	.23	12.34

Chi square = the sum of the weighted squared deviations

Chi square = 12.34

P = .055

TABLE 15--Continued

Second Question, "Is This Done?"

Part c Obtained Frequencies (f_o) and Theoretical Frequencies (f_t)

Note: Theoretical frequencies are shown in parentheses

	Yes	No	Omitted	Total
College Supervisors	38 (36.96)	5 (8.95)	6 (3.09)	49
Principals	85 (73.17)	10(17.71)	2 (6.12)	97
Teachers	224(236.87)	69(57.34)	21(19.80)	314
Total	347	84	29	460

Part d Deviations Between Obtained Frequencies and Theoretical Frequencies (f_o-f_t) and Weighted Squared Deviations $\frac{(f_o-f_t)^2}{f_t}$

Note: Weighted squared deviations are shown in parentheses

	Yes	No	Omitted	Total
College Supervisors	1.04(0.03)	3.95(1.74)	2.91(2.74)	4.51
Principals	11.83(1.91)	7.71(3.36)	4.12(2.77)	8.04
Teachers	12.87(0.70)	11.66(2.37)	1.20(0.07)	3.14
Total	2.64	7.47	5.58	15.69

Chi square = the sum of the weighted squared deviations

Chi square = 15.69

P = .004

TABLE 16

CHI SQUARE TABLE FOR STATEMENT 16, "THE PRINCIPAL INVITES THE STUDENT TEACHERS TO P.T.A. OR OTHER COMMUNITY MEETINGS AND INTRODUCES THE STUDENT TEACHERS AT THE MEETING."

First Question, "Is This Appropriate?"

Part a Obtained Frequencies (f_o) and Theoretical Frequencies (f_t)

Note: Theoretical frequencies are shown in parentheses

	Most Important	Yes	No	Omitted	Total
College Supervisors	3 (3.52)	44 (39.83)	0 (2.88)	2 (2.77)	49
Principals	5 (6.96)	82 (78.86)	5 (5.69)	5 (5.48)	97
Teachers	25 (22.52)	248 (255.30)	22 (18.43)	19 (17.74)	314
Total	33	374	27	26	460

Part b Deviations Between Obtained Frequencies and Theoretical Frequencies ($f_o - f_t$) and Weighted Squared Deviations $\frac{(f_o - f_t)^2}{f_t}$

Note: Weighted squared deviations are shown in parentheses

	Most Important	Yes	No	Omitted	Total
College Supervisors	.52 (.08)	4.17 (.44)	2.88 (2.88)	.77 (.21)	3.61
Principals	1.96 (.55)	3.14 (.13)	.69 (0.08)	.48 (.04)	.80
Teachers	2.48 (.27)	7.30 (.21)	4.43 (1.06)	1.26 (.09)	1.63
Total	.90	.78	4.02	.34	6.04

Chi square = the sum of the weighted squared deviations

Chi square = 6.04

P = .419

TABLE 16--Continued

Second Question, "Is This Done?"

Part c Obtained Frequencies (f_o) and Theoretical
Frequencies (f_t)

Note: Theoretical frequencies are shown in parentheses

	Yes	No	Omitted	Total
College Supervisors	37 (35.58)	4(10.44)	8 (2.98)	49
Principals	74 (70.43)	20(20.67)	3 (5.90)	97
Teachers	223(227.99)	74(66.89)	17(19.11)	314
Total	334	98	28	460

Part d Deviations Between Obtained Frequencies and Theoretical
Frequencies (f_o-f_t) and Weighted Squared
Deviations $\frac{(f_o-f_t)^2}{f_t}$

Note: Weighted squared deviations are shown in parentheses

	Yes	No	Omitted	Total
College Supervisors	1.42(.06)	6.44(3.97)	5.02(8.46)	12.49
Principals	3.53(.18)	.67(0.02)	2.90(1.43)	1.63
Teachers	4.99(.11)	7.11(0.76)	2.11(0.23)	1.10
Total	.35	4.75	10.12	15.22

Chi square = the sum of the weighted squared deviations

Chi square = 15.22

P = .004

TABLE 17

CHI SQUARE TABLE FOR STATEMENT 17, "THE PRINCIPAL, ON OCCASIONS, OBSERVES THE STUDENT TEACHER IN HIS OR HER ACTUAL TEACHING AND OFFERS SUGGESTIONS OF ENCOURAGEMENT AND ASSISTANCE."

First Question, "Is This Appropriate?"

Part a Obtained Frequencies (f_o) and Theoretical Frequencies (f_t)

Note: Theoretical frequencies are shown in parentheses

	Most Important	Yes	No	Omitted	Total
College Supervisors	7 (7.88)	33 (29.71)	7 (8.63)	2 (2.77)	49
Principals	20(15.60)	68 (58.83)	4(17.08)	5 (5.48)	97
Teachers	47(50.51)	178(190.45)	70(55.29)	19(17.74)	314
Total	74	279	81	26	460

Part b Deviations Between Obtained Frequencies and Theoretical Frequencies (f_o-f_t) and Weighted Squared Deviations $\frac{(f_o-f_t)^2}{f_t}$

Note: Weighted squared deviations are shown in parentheses

	Most Important	Yes	No	Omitted	Total
College Supervisors	.88(0.10)	5.29(0.94)	1.63 (0.31)	.77(.21)	1.56
Principals	4.40(1.24)	9.17(1.43)	13.08(10.02)	.48(.04)	12.73
Teachers	3.51(0.24)	12.45(0.81)	14.41 (3.76)	1.26(.09)	4.90
Total	1.58	3.18	14.09	.34	19.19

Chi square = the sum of the weighted squared deviations

Chi square = 19.19

P = .004

TABLE 17--Continued

 Second Question, "Is This Done?"

 Part c Obtained Frequencies (f_o) and Theoretical
 Frequencies (f_t)

Note: Theoretical frequencies are shown in parentheses

	Yes	No	Omitted	Total
College Supervisors	24 (25.03)	19 (20.98)	6 (2.98)	49
Principals	79 (49.55)	14 (41.54)	4 (5.90)	97
Teachers	132(160.41)	164(134.47)	18(19.11)	314
Total	235	197	28	460

 Part d Deviations Between Obtained Frequencies and Theo-
 retical Frequencies (f_o-f_t) and Weighted Squared
 Deviations $\frac{(f_o-f_t)^2}{f_t}$

Note: Weighted squared deviations are shown in parentheses

	Yes	No	Omitted	Total
College Supervisors	1.03 (0.04)	1.98 (0.19)	3.02(3.06)	3.29
Principals	29.45(17.50)	27.54(18.26)	1.90(0.61)	36.37
Teachers	28.41 (5.03)	29.53 (6.48)	1.11(0.06)	11.57
Total	22.57	24.93	3.73	51.23

Chi square = the sum of the weighted squared deviations

Chi square = 51.23

P = .000001

TABLE 18

CHI SQUARE TABLE FOR STATEMENT 18, "THE PRINCIPAL, AS THE NEED ARISES, OFFERS SUGGESTIONS TO THE COLLEGE SUPERVISOR CONCERNING THE WORK OF THE STUDENT TEACHERS."

First Question, "Is This Appropriate?"

Part a Obtained Frequencies (f_o) and Theoretical Frequencies (f_t)

Note: Theoretical frequencies are shown in parentheses

	Most Important	Yes	No	Omitted	Total
College Supervisors	1 (2.98)	44 (39.09)	4 (3.70)	0 (4.15)	49
Principals	3 (5.90)	85 (77.38)	1 (5.48)	8 (8.22)	97
Teachers	24(19.11)	235(250.52)	21(17.74)	31(26.62)	314
Total	28	367	26	39	460

Part b Deviations Between Obtained Frequencies and Theoretical Frequencies (f_o-f_t) and Weighted Squared Deviations $\frac{(f_o-f_t)^2}{f_t}$

Note: Weighted squared deviations are shown in parentheses

	Most Important	Yes	No	Omitted	Total
College Supervisors	1.98(1.32)	4.91(.62)	.30(0.02)	4.15(4.15)	6.11
Principals	2.90(1.43)	7.62(.75)	4.48(4.53)	.22(0.01)	6.72
Teachers	4.89(1.25)	12.52(.63)	3.26(0.60)	4.38(0.72)	3.20
Total	4.00	2.00	5.15	4.88	16.03

Chi square = the sum of the weighted squared deviations

Chi square = 16.03

P = .014

TABLE 18--Continued

Second Question, "Is This Done?"

Part c Obtained Frequencies (f_o) and Theoretical Frequencies (f_t)

Note: Theoretical frequencies are shown in parentheses

	Yes	No	Omitted	Total
College Supervisors	30 (31.42)	16(11.93)	3 (5.65)	49
Principals	78 (62.21)	14(23.62)	5(11.18)	97
Teachers	187(201.37)	82(76.45)	45(36.18)	314
Total	295	112	53	460

Part d Deviations Between Obtained Frequencies and Theoretical Frequencies (f_o-f_t) and Weighted Squared Deviations $\frac{(f_o-f_t)^2}{f_t}$

Note: Weighted squared deviations are shown in parentheses

	Yes	No	Omitted	Total
College Supervisors	1.42(0.06)	4.07(1.39)	2.65(1.24)	2.69
Principals	15.79(4.01)	9.62(3.92)	6.18(3.42)	11.35
Teachers	14.37(1.03)	5.55(0.40)	8.82(2.15)	3.58
Total	5.10	5.71	6.81	17.62

Chi square = the sum of the weighted squared deviations

Chi square = 17.62

P = .002

TABLE 19

CHI SQUARE TABLE FOR STATEMENT 19, "THE PRINCIPAL PARTICIPATES WITH THE SUPERVISING TEACHER AND THE STUDENT TEACHER IN THE EVALUATION OF THE STUDENT TEACHING EXPERIENCE."

First Question, "Is This Appropriate?"

Part a Obtained Frequencies (f_o) and Theoretical Frequencies (f_t)

Note: Theoretical frequencies are shown in parentheses .

	Most Important	Yes	No	Omitted	Total
College Supervisors	4 (4.05)	22 (23.01)	22 (18.00)	1 (3.94)	49
Principals	10 (8.01)	63 (45.54)	15 (35.64)	9 (7.80)	97
Teachers	24 (25.94)	131 (147.44)	132 (115.36)	27 (25.25)	314
Total	38	216	169	37	460

Part b Deviations Between Obtained Frequencies and Theoretical Frequencies ($f_o - f_t$) and Weighted Squared Deviations $\frac{(f_o - f_t)^2}{f_t}$

Note: Weighted squared deviations are shown in parentheses

	Most Important	Yes	No	Omitted	Total
College Supervisors	.05(.00)	1.01(0.04)	4.00 (0.89)	2.94(2.19)	3.12
Principals	1.99(.49)	17.46(6.69)	20.64(11.95)	1.20(0.18)	19.31
Teachers	1.94(.14)	16.44(1.83)	16.64 (2.40)	1.75(0.12)	4.49
Total	.63	8.56	15.24	2.49	26.92

Chi square = the sum of the weighted squared deviations

Chi square = 26.92

P = .0001

TABLE 19--Continued

Second Question, "Is This Done?"

Part c Obtained Frequencies (f_o) and Theoretical Frequencies (f_t)

Note: Theoretical frequencies are shown in parentheses

	Yes	No	Omitted	Total
College Supervisors	11 (15.77)	33 (30.15)	5 (3.09)	49
Principals	55 (31.21)	36 (59.68)	6 (6.12)	97
Teachers	82(101.03)	214(193.18)	18(19.79)	314
Total	148	283	29	460

Part d Deviations Between Obtained Frequencies and Theoretical Frequencies (f_o-f_t) and Weighted Squared Deviations $\frac{(f_o-f_t)^2}{f_t}$

Note: Weighted squared deviations are shown in parentheses

	Yes	No	Omitted	Total
College Supervisors	4.77 (1.44)	2.85(0.27)	1.91(1.18)	2.89
Principals	23.79(18.13)	23.68(9.40)	.12(0.00)	27.53
Teachers	19.03 (3.58)	20.82(2.24)	1.79(0.16)	5.98
Total	23.15	11.91	1.34	36.40

Chi square = the sum of the weighted squared deviations

Chi square = 36.40

P = .000005

TABLE 20

CHI SQUARE TABLE FOR STATEMENT 20, "THE PRINCIPAL PROVIDES OR ARRANGES TIME FOR THE SUPERVISING TEACHER TO HAVE CONFERENCES WITH THE STUDENT TEACHER."

First Question, "Is This Appropriate?"

Part a Obtained Frequencies (f_o) and Theoretical Frequencies (f_t)

Note: Theoretical frequencies are shown in parentheses

	Most Important	Yes	No	Omitted	Total
College Supervisors	12 (7.77)	29 (27.69)	8(10.43)	0 (3.09)	49
Principals	7(15.39)	75 (54.82)	9(20.67)	6 (6.12)	97
Teachers	54(49.83)	156(177.48)	81(66.89)	23(19.79)	314
Total	73	260	98	29	460

Part b Deviations Between Obtained Frequencies and Theoretical Frequencies ($f_o - f_t$) and Weighted Squared Deviations $\frac{(f_o - f_t)^2}{f_t}$

Note: Weighted squared deviations are shown in parentheses

	Most Important	Yes	No	Omitted	Total
College Supervisors	4.23(2.30)	1.31 (0.06)	2.43(0.57)	3.09(3.09)	6.02
Principals	8.39(4.57)	20.18(13.19)	1.67(0.13)	.12(0.00)	17.89
Teachers	4.17(0.35)	21.48 (2.60)	14.11(2.98)	3.21(0.52)	6.45
Total	7.22	15.85	3.68	3.61	30.36

Chi square = the sum of the weighted squared deviations

Chi square = 30.36

P = .00003

TABLE 20--Continued

Second Question, "Is This Done?"

Part c Obtained Frequencies (f_o) and Theoretical Frequencies (f_t)

Note: Theoretical frequencies are shown in parentheses

	Yes ^o	No	Omitted	Total
College Supervisors	24 (26.52)	19 (19.81)	6 (2.66)	49
Principals	72 (52.51)	21 (39.22)	4 (5.27)	97
Teachers	153(169.97)	146(126.97)	15(17.07)	314
Total	249	186	25	460

Part d Deviations Between Obtained Frequencies and Theoretical Frequencies (f_o-f_t) and Weighted Squared Deviations $\frac{(f_o-f_t)^2}{f_t}$

Note: Weighted squared deviations are shown in parentheses

	Yes	No	Omitted	Total
College Supervisors	2.52(0.24)	.81(0.03)	3.44(4.45)	4.72
Principals	19.49(7.22)	18.22(8.46)	1.27(0.31)	15.99
Teachers	16.97(1.69)	19.03(2.85)	2.07(0.25)	4.79
Total	9.15	11.34	5.01	25.50

Chi square = the sum of the weighted squared deviations

Chi square = 25.50

P = .00004

TABLE 21

CHI SQUARE TABLE FOR STATEMENT 21, "THE PRINCIPAL MAKES AVAILABLE TO THE SUPERVISING TEACHER PROFESSIONAL LITERATURE RELATING TO STUDENT TEACHING."

First Question, "Is This Appropriate?"

Part a Obtained Frequencies (f_o) and Theoretical Frequencies (f_t)

Note: Theoretical frequencies are shown in parentheses

	Most Important	Yes	No	Omitted	Total
College Supervisors	4 (1.59)	39 (37.60)	4 (6.39)	2 (3.41)	49
Principals	0 (3.16)	81 (74.43)	9 (12.65)	7 (6.74)	97
Teachers	11 (10.23)	233 (240.96)	47 (40.95)	23 (21.84)	314
Total	15	353	60	32	460

Part b Deviations Between Obtained Frequencies and Theoretical Frequencies ($f_o - f_t$) and Weighted Squared Deviations $\frac{(f_o - f_t)^2}{f_t}$

Note: Weighted squared deviations are shown in parentheses

	Most Important	Yes	No	Omitted	Total
College Supervisors	2.41 (3.65)	1.40 (.05)	2.39 (0.89)	1.41 (.58)	5.17
Principals	3.16 (3.16)	6.57 (.58)	3.65 (1.05)	.26 (.01)	4.80
Teachers	.77 (0.06)	7.96 (.26)	6.05 (0.89)	1.16 (.06)	1.27
Total	6.87	.89	2.83	.65	11.24

Chi square = the sum of the weighted squared deviations

Chi square = 11.24

P = .082

TABLE 21--Continued

Second Question, "Is This Done?"

Part c Obtained Frequencies (f_o) and Theoretical
Frequencies (f_t)

Note: Theoretical frequencies are shown in parentheses

	Yes	No	Omitted	Total
College Supervisors	14 (22.37)	25 (23.33)	10 (3.30)	49
Principals	55 (44.28)	36 (46.18)	6 (6.54)	97
Teachers	141 (143.35)	158 (149.49)	15 (21.16)	314
Total	210	219	31	460

Part d Deviations Between Obtained Frequencies and Theo-
retical Frequencies ($f_o - f_t$) and Weighted Squared
Deviations $\frac{(f_o - f_t)^2}{f_t}$

Note: Weighted squared deviations are shown in parentheses

	Yes	No	Omitted	Total
College Supervisors	8.37(3.13)	1.67(0.12)	6.70(13.60)	16.85
Principals	10.72(2.60)	10.18(2.24)	.54 (0.04)	4.88
Teachers	2.35(0.04)	8.51(0.48)	6.16 (1.79)	2.31
Total	5.77	2.84	15.43	24.04

Chi square = the sum of the weighted squared deviations

Chi square = 24.04

P = .00008

TABLE 22

CHI SQUARE TABLE FOR STATEMENT 22, "THE PRINCIPAL ENCOURAGES THE SUPERVISING TEACHER IN PROFESSIONAL GROWTH."

First Question, "Is This Appropriate?"

Part a Obtained Frequencies (f_o) and Theoretical Frequencies (f_t)

Note: Theoretical frequencies are shown in parentheses

	Most Important	Yes	No	Omitted	Total
College Supervisors	7 (6.60)	41 (38.56)	0(0.75)	1 (3.10)	49
Principals	11(13.07)	80 (76.33)	0(1.48)	6 (6.12)	97
Teachers	44(42.32)	241(247.10)	7(4.78)	22(19.79)	314
Total	62	362	7	29	460

Part b Deviations Between Obtained Frequencies and Theoretical Frequencies (f_o-f_t) and Weighted Squared Deviations $\frac{(f_o-f_t)^2}{f_t}$

Note: Weighted squared deviations are shown in parentheses

	Most Important	Yes	No	Omitted	Total
College Supervisors	.40(.02)	2.44(.15)	.75(0.75)	2.10(1.42)	2.34
Principals	2.07(.33)	3.67(.18)	1.48(1.48)	.12(0.08)	2.07
Teachers	1.68(.07)	6.10(.15)	2.22(1.03)	2.21(0.25)	1.50
Total	.42	.48	3.26	1.75	5.91

Chi square = the sum of the weighted squared deviations

Chi square = 5.91

P = .434

TABLE 22--Continued

 Second Question, "Is This Done?"

 Part c Obtained Frequencies (f_o) and Theoretical
 Frequencies (f_t)

Note: Theoretical frequencies are shown in parentheses

	Yes	No	Omitted	Total
College Supervisors	33 (38.88)	8 (6.60)	8 (3.52)	49
Principals	90 (76.97)	3(13.07)	4 (6.96)	97
Teachers	242(249.15)	51(42.32)	21(22.53)	314
Total	365	62	33	460

 Part d Deviations Between Obtained Frequencies and Theo-
 retical Frequencies (f_o-f_t) and Weighted Squared
 Deviations $\frac{(f_o-f_t)^2}{f_t}$

Note: Weighted squared deviations are shown in parentheses

	Yes	No	Omitted	Total
College Supervisors	5.88(0.89)	1.40(0.30)	4.48(5.70)	6.89
Principals	13.03(2.21)	10.07(7.76)	2.96(1.26)	11.23
Teachers	7.15(0.21)	8.68(1.78)	1.53(0.10)	2.09
Total	3.31	9.84	7.06	20.21

Chi square = the sum of the weighted squared deviations

Chi square = 20.21

P = .0004

TABLE 23

CHI SQUARE TABLE FOR STATEMENT 23, "THE PRINCIPAL TAKES THE INITIATIVE TO PROVIDE SUITABLE AND ADEQUATE INSTRUCTIONAL MATERIALS FOR THE USE OF THE SUPERVISING TEACHER AND THE STUDENT TEACHER."

First Question, "Is This Appropriate?"

Part a Obtained Frequencies (f_o) and Theoretical Frequencies (f_t)

Note: Theoretical frequencies are shown in parentheses

	Most Important	Yes	No	Omitted	Total
College Supervisors	7 (6.71)	30 (27.91)	11 (9.69)	1 (4.69)	49
Principals	10(13.28)	67 (55.25)	10(19.19)	10 (9.28)	97
Teachers	46(43.00)	165(178.84)	70(62.12)	33(30.03)	314
Total	63	262	91	44	460

Part b Deviations Between Obtained Frequencies and Theoretical Frequencies (f_o-f_t) and Weighted Squared Deviations $\frac{(f_o-f_t)^2}{f_t}$

Note: Weighted squared deviations are shown in parentheses

	Most Important	Yes	No	Omitted	Total
College Super- visors	.29(.01)	2.09(0.16)	1.31(0.18)	3.69(2.90)	3.25
Principals	3.82(.81)	11.75(2.50)	9.19(4.40)	.72(0.06)	7.77
Teachers	3.00(.21)	13.84(1.07)	7.88(1.00)	2.97(0.29)	2.57
Total	1.03	3.73	5.58	3.25	13.59

Chi square = the sum of the weighted squared deviations

Chi square = 13.59

P = .035

TABLE 23--Continued

Second Question, "Is This Done?"

Part c Obtained Frequencies (f_o) and Theoretical Frequencies (f_t)

Note: Theoretical frequencies are shown in parentheses

	Yes	No	Omitted	Total
College Supervisors	18 (22.90)	23 (22.16)	8 (3.94)	49
Principals	60 (45.34)	27 (43.86)	10 (7.80)	97
Teachers	137(146.76)	158(141.98)	19(25.26)	314
Total	215	208	37	460

Part d Deviations Between Obtained Frequencies and Theoretical Frequencies ($f_o - f_t$) and Weighted Squared Deviations $\frac{(f_o - f_t)^2}{f_t}$

Note: Weighted squared deviations are shown in parentheses

	Yes	No	Omitted	Total
College Supervisors	4.90(1.05)	.84(0.03)	4.06(4.18)	5.26
Principals	14.66(4.74)	16.86(6.48)	2.20(0.62)	11.84
Teachers	9.76(0.65)	16.02(1.81)	6.26(1.55)	4.01
Total	6.44	8.32	6.35	21.11

Chi square = the sum of the weighted squared deviations

Chi square = 21.11

P = .0004

TABLE 24

CHI SQUARE TABLE FOR STATEMENT 24, "THE PRINCIPAL KEEPS HIMSELF INFORMED ABOUT CURRENT EDUCATION PROGRAMS IN TEACHER EDUCATION."

First Question, "Is This Appropriate?"

Part a Obtained Frequencies (f_o) and Theoretical Frequencies (f_t)

Note: Theoretical frequencies are shown in parentheses

	Most Important	Yes	No	Omitted	Total
College Supervisors	8 (8.84)	38 (36.43)	1(0.21)	2 (3.52)	49
Principals	15(17.50)	76 (72.12)	0(0.42)	6 (6.96)	97
Teachers	60(56.66)	228(233.45)	1(1.37)	25(22.52)	314
Total	83	342	2	33	460

Part b Deviations Between Obtained Frequencies and Theoretical Frequencies (f_o-f_t) and Weighted Squared Deviations $\frac{(f_o-f_t)^2}{f_t}$

Note: Weighted squared deviations are shown in parentheses

	Most Important	Yes	No	Omitted	Total
College Supervisors	.83(.08)	1.57(.07)	.79(2.95)	1.52(.66)	3.76
Principals	2.50(.36)	3.88(.21)	.42(0.42)	.96(.13)	1.12
Teachers	3.44(.03)	5.45(.13)	.37(0.10)	2.48(.27)	.53
Total	.47	.41	3.47	1.06	5.41

Chi square = the sum of the weighted squared deviations

Chi square = 5.41

P = .539

TABLE 24--Continued

 Second Question, "Is This Done?"

 Part c Obtained Frequencies (f_o) and Theoretical
 Frequencies (f_t)

Note: Theoretical frequencies are shown in parentheses

	Yes	No	Omitted	Total
College Supervisors	22 (37.50)	13 (5.22)	14 (6.28)	49
Principals	81 (74.23)	11(10.33)	5(12.44)	97
Teachers	249(240.28)	25(33.45)	40(40.27)	314
Total	352	49	59	460

 Part d Deviations Between Obtained Frequencies and Theo-
 retical Frequencies (f_o-f_t) and Weighted Squared
 Deviations $\frac{(f_o-f_t)^2}{f_t}$

Note: Weighted squared deviations are shown in parentheses

	Yes	No	Omitted	Total
College Supervisors	15.50(6.41)	7.78(11.64)	7.72(9.49)	27.54
Principals	6.77(0.62)	.67 (0.04)	7.44(4.45)	5.11
Teachers	8.72(0.32)	8.45 (2.13)	.27(0.00)	2.45
Total	7.35	13.81	13.94	35.10

Chi square = the sum of the weighted squared deviations

Chi square = 35.10

P = .000005

TABLE 25

CHI SQUARE TABLE FOR STATEMENT 25, "THE PRINCIPAL MEETS AND WELCOMES THE STUDENT TEACHERS UPON THEIR FIRST ARRIVAL AT THE SCHOOL."

First Question, "Is This Appropriate?"

Part a Obtained Frequencies (f_o) and Theoretical Frequencies (f_t)

Note: Theoretical frequencies are shown in parentheses

	Most Important	Yes	No	Omitted	Total
College Supervisors	7 (7.14)	41 (38.45)	1(0.85)	0 (2.56)	49
Principals	12(14.13)	79 (76.12)	0(1.69)	6 (5.06)	97
Teachers	48(45.73)	241(246.42)	7(5.46)	18(16.38)	314
Total	67	361	8	24	460

Part b Deviations Between Obtained Frequencies and Theoretical Frequencies ($f_o - f_t$) and Weighted Squared Deviations $\frac{(f_o - f_t)^2}{f_t}$

Note: Weighted squared deviations are shown in parentheses

	Most Important	Yes	No	Omitted	Total
College Supervisors	.14(.01)	2.55(.17)	.15(0.02)	2.56(2.56)	2.75
Principals	2.13(.32)	2.88(.11)	1.69(1.69)	.94(0.17)	3.06
Teachers	2.27(.11)	5.42(.12)	1.54(0.43)	1.62(0.16)	.76
Total	.44	.40	2.14	2.89	5.87

Chi square = the sum of the weighted squared deviations

Chi square = 5.87

P = .438

TABLE 25--Continued

Second Question, "Is This Done?"

Part c Obtained Frequencies (f_o) and Theoretical
Frequencies (f_t)

Note: Theoretical frequencies are shown in parentheses

	Yes	No	Omitted	Total
College Supervisors	40 (43.35)	5 (3.30)	4 (2.34)	49
Principals	91 (85.82)	1 (6.54)	5 (4.64)	97
Teachers	276(277.82)	25(21.16)	13(15.02)	314
Total	407	31	22	460

Part d Deviations Between Obtained Frequencies and Theo-
retical Frequencies (f_o-f_t) and Weighted Squared
Deviations $\frac{(f_o-f_t)^2}{f_t}$

Note: Weighted squared deviations are shown in parentheses

	Yes	No	Omitted	Total
College Supervisors	3.35(.26)	1.70(0.88)	1.66(1.18)	2.32
Principals	5.18(.31)	5.54(4.69)	.34(0.03)	5.03
Teachers	1.82(.01)	3.84(0.70)	2.02(0.27)	.98
Total	.58	6.27	1.48	8.33

Chi square = the sum of the weighted squared deviations

Chi square = 8.33

P = .084

TABLE 26

CHI SQUARE TABLE FOR STATEMENT 26, "THE PRINCIPAL TELLS THE STUDENT TEACHER SOMETHING OF THE SPECIAL INTERESTS AND STRENGTHS OF THE SUPERVISING TEACHER."

First Question, "Is This Appropriate?"

Part a Obtained Frequencies (f_o) and Theoretical Frequencies (f_t)

Note: Theoretical frequencies are shown in parentheses

	Most Important	Yes	No	Omitted	Total
College Supervisors	0(1.07)	27 (27.80)	18(13.63)	4 (6.50)	49
Principals	3(2.11)	59 (55.04)	27(26.99)	8(12.86)	97
Teachers	7(6.83)	175(178.16)	83(87.37)	49(41.64)	314
Total	10	261	128	61	460

Part b Deviations Between Obtained Frequencies and Theoretical Frequencies ($f_o - f_t$) and Weighted Squared Deviations $\frac{(f_o - f_t)^2}{f_t}$

Note: Weighted squared deviations are shown in parentheses

	Most Important	Yes	No	Omitted	Total
College Supervisors	1.07(1.07)	.80(.02)	4.37(1.40)	2.50(0.96)	3.45
Principals	.89(0.37)	3.96(.28)	.01(0.00)	4.86(1.84)	2.49
Teachers	.17(0.01)	3.16(.06)	4.37(0.22)	7.36(1.30)	1.59
Total	1.45	.36	1.62	4.10	7.53

Chi square = the sum of the weighted squared deviations

Chi square = 7.53

P = .277

TABLE 26--Continued

Second Question, "Is This Done?"

Part c Obtained Frequencies (f_o) and Theoretical
Frequencies (f_t)

Note: Theoretical frequencies are shown in parentheses

	Yes	No	Omitted	Total
College Supervisors	7 (17.36)	31 (22.90)	11 (8.73)	49
Principals	51 (34.37)	40 (45.34)	6(17.29)	97
Teachers	105(111.27)	144(146.76)	65(55.97)	314
Total	163	215	82	460

Part d Deviations Between Obtained Frequencies and Theo-
retical Frequencies (f_o-f_t) and Weighted Squared
Deviations $\frac{(f_o-f_t)^2}{f_t}$

Note: Weighted squared deviations are shown in parentheses

	Yes	No	Omitted	Total
College Supervisors	10.36(6.18)	8.10(2.87)	2.27(0.59)	9.64
Principals	16.63(8.05)	5.34(0.63)	11.29(7.37)	16.05
Teachers	6.27(0.35)	2.76(0.05)	9.03(1.46)	1.86
Total	14.58	3.55	9.42	27.55

Chi square = the sum of the weighted squared deviations

Chi square = 27.55

P = .00002

TABLE 27

CHI SQUARE TABLE FOR STATEMENT 27, "THE PRINCIPAL MAKES AVAILABLE TO THE SUPERVISING TEACHERS THE INFORMATION ON THE STUDENT TEACHERS FURNISHED BY THE COLLEGE."

First Question, "Is This Appropriate?"

Part a Obtained Frequencies (f_o) and Theoretical Frequencies (f_t)

Note: Theoretical frequencies are shown in parentheses

	Most Important	Yes	No	Omitted	Total
College Supervisors	3 (5.86)	42 (35.68)	4 (4.37)	0 (3.09)	49
Principals	4(11.60)	79 (70.64)	6 (8.63)	8 (6.12)	97
Teachers	48(37.54)	214(228.67)	31(27.99)	21(19.80)	314
Total	55	335	41	29	460

Part b Deviations Between Obtained Frequencies and Theoretical Frequencies (f_o-f_t) and Weighted Squared Deviations $\frac{(f_o-f_t)^2}{f_t}$

Note: Weighted squared deviations are shown in parentheses

	Most Important	Yes	No	Omitted	Total
College Supervisors	2.86(1.40)	6.32(1.12)	.37(.03)	3.09(3.09)	5.64
Principals	7.60(4.98)	8.36(1.00)	2.65(.81)	1.88(0.58)	7.37
Teachers	10.46(2.91)	14.61(0.93)	3.01(.32)	1.20(0.07)	4.23
Total	9.29	3.05	1.16	3.74	17.24

Chi square = the sum of the weighted squared deviations

Chi square = 14.58

P = .0008

TABLE 27--Continued

Second Question, "Is This Done?"

Part c Obtained Frequencies (f_o) and Theoretical
Frequencies (f_t)

Note: Theoretical frequencies are shown in parentheses

	Yes	No	Omitted	Total
College Supervisors	34 (34.62)	12(11.72)	3 (2.66)	49
Principals	79 (68.53)	13(23.20)	5 (5.27)	97
Teachers	212(221.85)	85(75.09)	17(17.07)	314
Total	325	110	25	460

Part d Deviations Between Obtained Frequencies and Theo-
retical Frequencies (f_o-f_t) and Weighted Squared
Deviations $\frac{(f_o-f_t)^2}{f_t}$

Note: Weighted squared deviations are shown in parentheses

	Yes	No	Omitted	Total
College Supervisors	.62(0.01)	.28(0.01)	.34(.05)	.07
Principals	10.47(1.60)	10.20(4.48)	.27(.01)	6.09
Teachers	9.85(0.44)	9.91(1.31)	.07(.00)	1.75
Total	2.05	5.80	.06	7.91

Chi square = the sum of the weighted squared deviations

Chi square = 7.91

P = .095

TABLE 28

CHI SQUARE TABLE FOR STATEMENT 28, "THE PRINCIPAL STUDIES
ALL THE INFORMATION FURNISHED BY THE COLLEGE
REGARDING THE STUDENT TEACHERS."

First Question, "Is This Appropriate?"

Part a Obtained Frequencies (f_o) and Theoretical
Frequencies (f_t)

Note: Theoretical frequencies are shown in parentheses

	Most Important	Yes	No	Omitted	Total
College Supervisors	3(1.06)	38 (35.68)	8 (6.82)	0 (5.43)	49
Principals	4(2.11)	81 (70.64)	5(13.50)	7(10.75)	97
Teachers	3(6.83)	216(228.67)	51(43.68)	44(34.81)	314
Total	10	335	64	51	460

Part b Deviations Between Obtained Frequencies and Theo-
retical Frequencies ($f_o - f_t$) and Weighted Squared
Deviations $\frac{(f_o - f_t)^2}{f_t}$

Note: Weighted squared deviations are shown in parentheses

	Most Important	Yes	No	Omitted	Total
College Super- visors	1.94(3.55)	2.32(0.15)	1.18(0.20)	5.43(5.43)	9.33
Princi- pals	1.89(1.69)	10.34(1.51)	8.50(5.35)	2.25(0.47)	9.02
Teachers	3.83(2.15)	12.69(0.70)	7.32(1.23)	9.19(2.43)	6.51
Total	7.39	2.36	6.78	8.33	24.86

Chi square = the sum of the weighted squared deviations

Chi square = 24.86

P = .0008

TABLE 28--Continued

Second Question, "Is This Done?"

Part c Obtained Frequencies (f_o) and Theoretical
Frequencies (f_t)

Note: Theoretical frequencies are shown in parentheses

	Yes	No	Omitted	Total
College Supervisors	24 (26.63)	15(14.81)	10 (7.56)	49
Principals	79 (52.72)	13(29.31)	5(14.97)	97
Teachers	147(170.65)	111(94.88)	56(48.47)	314
Total	250	139	71	460

Part d Deviations Between Obtained Frequencies and Theo-
retical Frequencies (f_o-f_t) and Weighted Squared
Deviations $\frac{(f_o-f_t)^2}{f_t}$

Note: Weighted squared deviations are shown in parentheses

	Yes	No	Omitted	Total
College Supervisors	2.63 (0.26)	.19(0.00)	2.44(0.79)	1.05
Principals	26.28(13.10)	16.31(9.08)	9.97(6.64)	28.82
Teachers	23.65 (0.32)	16.12(2.74)	7.53(1.17)	.4.23
Total	13.68	11.82	8.60	34.10

Chi square = the sum of the weighted squared deviations

Chi square = 34.10

P = .000005

TABLE 29

CHI SQUARE TABLE FOR STATEMENT 29, "THE PRINCIPAL APPROVES THE ASSIGNMENT OF THE STUDENT TEACHERS IN THE SCHOOL."

First Question, "Is This Appropriate?"

Part a Obtained Frequencies (f_o) and Theoretical Frequencies (f_t)

Note: Theoretical frequencies are shown in parentheses

	Most Important	Yes	No	Omitted	Total
College Supervisors	1 (3.62)	40 (38.13)	6 (1.92)	2 (5.33)	49
Principals	8 (7.17)	78 (75.49)	1 (3.80)	10(10.54)	97
Teachers	25(23.21)	240(244.37)	11(12.29)	38(34.13)	314
Total	34	358	18	50	460

Part b Deviations Between Obtained Frequencies and Theoretical Frequencies (f_o-f_t) and Weighted Squared Deviations $\frac{(f_o-f_t)^2}{f_t}$

Note: Weighted squared deviations are shown in parentheses

	Most Important	Yes	No	Omitted	Total
College Supervisors	2.62(1.89)	1.87(.04)	4.08(8.72)	3.33(2.08)	12.73
Principals	.83(0.10)	2.51(.08)	2.80(2.06)	.54(0.03)	2.27
Teachers	1.79(0.14)	4.37(.08)	.71(0.04)	3.87(0.44)	.70
Total	2.13	.20	10.82	2.55	15.70

Chi square = the sum of the weighted squared deviations

Chi square = 15.70

P = .008

TABLE 29--Continued

Second Question, "Is This Done?"

Part c Obtained Frequencies (f_o) and Theoretical
Frequencies (f_t)

Note: Theoretical frequencies are shown in parentheses

	Yes	No	Omitted	Total
College Supervisors	36 (38.88)	7 (4.47)	5 (5.65)	49
Principals	87 (76.97)	6 (8.86)	5(11.18)	97
Teachers	242(249.15)	29(28.67)	43(36.18)	314
Total	365	42	53	460

Part d Deviations Between Obtained Frequencies and Theo-
retical Frequencies (f_o-f_t) and Weighted Squared
Deviations $\frac{(f_o-f_t)^2}{f_t}$

Note: Weighted squared deviations are shown in parentheses

	Yes	No	Omitted	Total
College Supervisors	2.88(0.21)	2.53(1.43)	.65(0.07)	1.71
Principals	10.03(1.31)	2.86(0.92)	6.18(3.42)	5.65
Teachers	7.15(0.21)	.33(0.00)	6.82(1.29)	1.50
Total	1.73	2.35	4.78	8.86

Chi square = the sum of the weighted squared deviations

Chi square = 8.86

P = .065

TABLE 30

CHI SQUARE TABLE FOR STATEMENT 30, "THE PRINCIPAL ASSISTS THE STUDENT TEACHERS IN SECURING LIVING QUARTERS IN SITUATIONS WHERE ASSISTANCE IS NEEDED."

First Question, "Is This Appropriate?"

Part a Obtained Frequencies (f_o) and Theoretical Frequencies (f_t)

Note: Theoretical frequencies are shown in parentheses

	Most Important	Yes	No	Omitted	Total
College Supervisors	1(0.43)	26 (23.01)	18(13.95)	4(11.61)	49
Principals	3(0.84)	54 (45.54)	15(27.62)	25(22.98)	97
Teachers	0(2.73)	136(147.44)	98(89.42)	80(74.40)	314
Total	4	216	131	109	460

Part b Deviations Between Obtained Frequencies and Theoretical Frequencies ($f_o - f_t$) and Weighted Squared Deviations $\frac{(f_o - f_t)^2}{f_t}$

Note: Weighted squared deviations are shown in parentheses

	Most Important	Yes	No	Omitted	Total
College Supervisors	.57(0.74)	2.99(0.39)	4.05(1.18)	6.39(3.52)	5.83
Principals	2.16(5.56)	8.46(1.57)	12.62(5.77)	2.02(0.18)	13.08
Teachers	2.73(2.73)	11.44(0.89)	8.58(0.09)	5.60(0.42)	4.13
Total	9.03	2.85	7.04	4.12	23.04

Chi square = the sum of the weighted squared deviations

Chi square = 23.04

P = .0008

TABLE 30--Continued

Second Question, "Is This Done?"

Part c Obtained Frequencies (f_o) and Theoretical
Frequencies (f_t)

Note: Theoretical frequencies are shown in parentheses

	Yes	No	Omitted	Total
College Supervisors	14(12.89)	28 (22.69)	7(13.42)	49
Principals	37(25.52)	43 (44.92)	17(26.57)	97
Teachers	70(82.60)	142(145.40)	102(86.01)	314
Total	121	213	126	460

Part d Deviations Between Obtained Frequencies and Theo-
retical Frequencies (f_o-f_t) and Weighted Squared
Deviations $\frac{(f_o-f_t)^2}{f_t}$

Note: Weighted squared deviations are shown in parentheses

	Yes	No	Omitted	Total
College Supervisors	1.11(0.10)	5.31(1.24)	6.42(3.07)	4.41
Principals	11.48(5.16)	1.92(0.08)	9.57(3.45)	8.69
Teachers	12.60(1.92)	3.40(0.08)	15.99(2.97)	4.97
Total	7.18	1.40	9.49	18.07

Chi square = the sum of the weighted squared deviations

Chi square = 18.07

P = .001

TABLE 31

CHI SQUARE TABLE FOR STATEMENT 31, "THE PRINCIPAL INTRODUCES THE STUDENT TEACHERS TO THE PUPIL GROUPS IN THE SCHOOL IN SUCH A WAY AS TO GIVE THE STUDENT TEACHERS STATUS OF TEACHERS."

First Question, "Is This Appropriate?"

Part a Obtained Frequencies (f_o) and Theoretical Frequencies (f_t)

Note: Theoretical frequencies are shown in parentheses

	Most Important	Yes	No	Omitted	Total
College Supervisors	7 (7.35)	37 (26.41)	4(10.44)	1 (4.79)	49
Principals	19(14.55)	44 (52.30)	27(20.67)	7 (9.49)	97
Teachers	43(47.10)	167(169.29)	67(66.90)	37(30.72)	314
Total	69	248	98	45	460

Part b Deviations Between Obtained Frequencies and Theoretical Frequencies (f_o-f_t) and Weighted Squared Deviations $\frac{(f_o-f_t)^2}{f_t}$

Note: Weighted squared deviations are shown in parentheses

	Most Important	Yes	No	Omitted	Total
College Supervisors	.35(1.67)	10.59(4.25)	6.44(3.97)	3.79(3.00)	12.89
Principals	4.45(1.36)	8.30(1.32)	6.33(1.94)	2.49(0.65)	5.27
Teachers	4.10(0.14)	2.29(0.03)	.10(0.00)	6.28(1.28)	1.45
Total	3.17	5.60	5.91	4.93	19.61

Chi square = the sum of the weighted squared deviations

Chi square = 19.61

P = .003

TABLE 31--Continued

Second Question, "Is This Done?"

Part c Obtained Frequencies (f_o) and Theoretical
Frequencies (f_t)

Note: Theoretical frequencies are shown in parentheses

	Yes	No	Omitted	Total
College Supervisors	27 (23.86)	17 (19.81)	5 (5.33)	49
Principals	63 (47.23)	27 (39.22)	7(10.54)	97
Teachers	134(152.90)	142(126.97)	38(34.13)	314
Total	224	186	50	460

Part d Deviations Between Obtained Frequencies and Theo-
retical Frequencies (f_o-f_t) and Weighted Squared
Deviations $\frac{(f_o-f_t)^2}{f_t}$

Note: Weighted squared deviations are shown in parentheses

	Yes	No	Omitted	Total
College Supervisors	3.14(0.41)	2.81(0.40)	.33(0.02)	.83
Principals	15.77(5.27)	12.22(3.81)	3.54(1.19)	10.27
Teachers	18.90(2.34)	15.03(1.78)	3.87(0.44)	4.56
Total	8.02	5.99	1.65	15.66

Chi square = the sum of the weighted squared deviations

Chi square = 15.66

P = .004

TABLE 32

CHI SQUARE TABLE FOR STATEMENT 32, "THE PRINCIPAL SAFEGUARDS THE WELFARE OF THE STUDENT TEACHERS BY SEEING THAT THEY ARE NOT USED TO PERFORM MENIAL TASKS OR ASSUME RESPONSIBILITIES WITH WHICH THEY CANNOT COPE."

First Question, "Is This Appropriate?"

Part a Obtained Frequencies (f_o) and Theoretical Frequencies (f_t)

Note: Theoretical frequencies are shown in parentheses

	Most Important	Yes	No	Omitted	Total
College Supervisors	13 (7.45)	31 (30.36)	3 (5.11)	2 (6.07)	49
Principals	21(14.76)	68 (60.10)	0(10.12)	8(12.02)	97
Teachers	36(47.78)	186(194.54)	45(32.77)	47(38.91)	314
Total	70	285	48	57	460

Part b Deviations Between Obtained Frequencies and Theoretical Frequencies (f_o-f_t) and Weighted Squared Deviations $\frac{(f_o-f_t)^2}{f_t}$

Note: Weighted squared deviations are shown in parentheses

	Most Important	Yes	No	Omitted	Total
College Supervisors	5.55(4.13)	.64(0.01)	2.11 (0.87)	4.07(2.73)	7.74
Principals	6.24(2.64)	7.90(1.04)	10.12(10.12)	4.02(1.34)	15.14
Teachers	11.78(2.90)	4.54(0.11)	12.23 (4.56)	8.09(1.68)	9.25
Total	9.67	1.16	15.55	5.75	32.13

Chi square = the sum of the weighted squared deviations

Chi square = 32.13

P = .00003

TABLE 32--Continued

Second Question, "Is This Done?"

Part c Obtained Frequencies (f_o) and Theoretical Frequencies (f_t)
 Note: Theoretical frequencies are shown in parentheses

	Yes	No	Omitted	Total
College Supervisors	25 (30.78)	17(11.72)	7 (6.50)	49
Principals	86 (60.94)	7(23.20)	4(12.86)	97
Teachers	178(197.27)	86(75.09)	50(41.64)	314
Total	289	110	61	460

Part d Deviations Between Obtained Frequencies and Theoretical Frequencies (f_o-f_t) and Weighted Squared Deviations $(f_o-f_t)^2$
 Note: Weighted squared deviations are shown in parentheses

	Yes	No	Omitted	Total
College Supervisors	5.78 (1.09)	5.28 (2.38)	.50(0.04)	3.51
Principals	25.06(10.31)	16.20(11.31)	8.86(6.10)	27.72
Teachers	19.27 (1.88)	10.91 (1.58)	8.36(1.68)	5.14
Total	13.28	15.27	7.82	36.37

Chi square = the sum of the weighted squared deviations

Chi square = 36.37

P = .000001

TABLE 33

CHI SQUARE TABLE FOR STATEMENT 33, "THE PRINCIPAL STUDIES THE QUALIFICATIONS OF THE FACULTY OF THE SCHOOL AND, USING THE CRITERIA FURNISHED BY THE COLLEGE, SELECTS TEACHERS TO RECOMMEND AS GOOD PROSPECTIVE SUPERVISING TEACHERS."

First Question, "Is This Appropriate?"

Part a Obtained Frequencies (f_o) and Theoretical Frequencies (f_t)

Note: Theoretical frequencies are shown in parentheses

	Most Important	Yes	No	Omitted	Total
College Supervisors	12 (7.67)	28 (30.15)	5 (3.30)	4 (7.88)	49
Principals	15(15.18)	68 (59.67)	3 (6.54)	11(15.60)	97
Teachers	45(49.15)	187(193.18)	23(21.16)	59(50.51)	314
Total	72	283	31	74	460

Part b Deviations Between Obtained Frequencies and Theoretical Frequencies (f_o-f_t) and Weighted Squared Deviations $\frac{(f_o-f_t)^2}{f_t}$

Note: Weighted squared deviations are shown in parentheses

	Most Important	Yes	No	Omitted	Total
College Supervisors	4.33(2.44)	2.15(2.15)	1.70(0.36)	3.88(1.91)	6.86
Principals	.18(0.01)	8.33(1.16)	3.54(1.92)	3.40(0.74)	3.83
Teachers	4.15(0.35)	6.18(0.20)	1.84(0.16)	8.49(0.08)	.79
Total	2.80	3.51	2.44	2.73	11.48

Chi square = the sum of the weighted squared deviations

Chi square = 11.48

P = .062

TABLE 33--Continued

Second Question, "Is This Done?"

Part c Obtained Frequencies (f_o) and Theoretical
Frequencies (f_t)

Note: Theoretical frequencies are shown in parentheses

	Yes	No	Omitted	Total
College Supervisors	30 (29.93)	10 (9.48)	9 (9.59)	49
Principals	76 (59.24)	13 (18.77)	8 (18.98)	97
Teachers	175 (191.81)	66 (60.75)	73 (61.43)	314
Total	281	89	90	460

Part d Deviations Between Obtained Frequencies and Theo-
retical Frequencies ($f_o - f_t$) and Weighted Squared
Deviations $\frac{(f_o - f_t)^2}{f_t}$

Note: Weighted squared deviations are shown in parentheses

	Yes	No	Omitted	Total
College Supervisors	.07 (0.00)	.52 (0.03)	.59 (0.04)	.07
Principals	16.75 (4.74)	5.77 (1.77)	10.98 (6.35)	12.86
Teachers	16.81 (1.47)	5.25 (0.45)	11.57 (2.18)	4.10
Total	6.21	2.25	8.57	17.03

Chi square = the sum of the weighted squared deviations

Chi square = 17.03

P = .001

TABLE 34

CHI SQUARE TABLE FOR STATEMENT 34, "THE PRINCIPAL ENCOURAGES THE SUPERVISING TEACHER TO TRY NEW WAYS OF TEACHING."

First Question, "Is This Appropriate?"

Part a Obtained Frequencies (f_o) and Theoretical Frequencies (f_t)

Note: Theoretical frequencies are shown in parentheses

	Most Important	Yes	No	Omitted	Total
College Supervisors	4 (5.43)	40 (31.53)	2 (5.65)	3 (6.39)	49
Principals	10(10.75)	68 (62.42)	6(11.18)	13(12.65)	97
Teachers	37(34.81)	188(202.05)	45(36.18)	44(40.95)	314
Total	51	296	53	60	460

Part b Deviations Between Obtained Frequencies and Theoretical Frequencies ($f_o - f_t$) and Weighted Squared Deviations $\frac{(f_o - f_t)^2}{f_t}$

Note: Weighted squared deviations are shown in parentheses

	Most Important	Yes	No	Omitted	Total
College Supervisors	1.43(.38)	8.47(2.28)	3.65(2.36)	3.39(1.80)	6.82
Principals	.75(.05)	5.58(0.50)	4.82(2.08)	.35(0.01)	2.64
Teachers	2.19(.14)	14.05(0.98)	8.82(2.11)	3.05(0.23)	3.46
Total	.57	3.76	6.55	2.04	12.92

Chi square = the sum of the weighted squared deviations

Chi square = 12.92

P = .045

TABLE 34--Continued

Second Question, "Is This Done?"

Part c Obtained Frequencies (f_o) and Theoretical
Frequencies (f_t)

Note: Theoretical frequencies are shown in parentheses

	Yes	No	Omitted	Total
College Supervisors	24 (29.83)	15(13.10)	10 (6.07)	49
Principals	79 (59.04)	10(25.94)	8(12.02)	97
Teachers	177(191.13)	98(83.96)	39(38.91)	314
Total	280	123	57	460

Part d Deviations Between Obtained Frequencies and Theo-
retical Frequencies (f_o-f_t) and Weighted Squared
Deviations $\frac{(f_o-f_t)^2}{f_t}$

Note: Weighted squared deviations are shown in parentheses

	Yes	No	Omitted	Total
College Supervisors	5.83(1.14)	1.90(0.28)	3.93(2.54)	3.96
Principals	19.96(6.75)	15.94(9.79)	4.02(1.34)	17.88
Teachers	14.13(1.04)	14.04(2.35)	.09(0.00)	3.39
Total	8.93	12.42	3.88	25.23

Chi square = the sum of the weighted squared deviations

Chi square = 25.23

P = .00005

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

- Adams, Harold P., and Dickey, Frank G. Basic Principals of Student Teaching. New York: American Book Company, 1946.
- American Association of Teachers Colleges. School and Community Laboratory Experiences in Teacher Education. Oneonta, New York: American Association Teachers Colleges, 1948.
- Bureau of Educational Research, College of Education, Michigan State University. You're In For A Surprise. East Lansing, Michigan: College of Education, Michigan State University, 1960.
- Ferguson, George A. Statistical Analysis in Psychology and Education. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1959.
- Haines, Aleyne Clayton. Guiding the Student Teaching Process in Elementary Education. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1960.
- McNemar, Quinn. Psychological Statistics. Second Edition. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1955.
- Peters, Charles C., and Van Voorhis, Walter R. Statistical Procedures and Their Mathematical Bases. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1940.
- Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools. Proceedings of the Sixty-Sixth Annual Meeting. Atlanta, Georgia: Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools, 1961.
- Stratemeyer, Florence B., and Lindsey, Margaret. Working With the Student Teacher. New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1958.

- The Association for Student Teaching. Off-Campus Student Teaching: Thirtieth Yearbook. Edited by Morton S. Malter and Troy L. Sterns. Lock Haven, Pennsylvania: The Association for Student Teaching, 1951.
-
- . Ways of Working: Thirty-First Yearbook. Edited by Erwin H. Sasman. Lock Haven, Pennsylvania: The Association for Student Teaching, 1952.
-
- . Curriculum Trends and Teacher Education: Thirty-Second Yearbook. Edited by Jesse A. Bond and John A. Hockett. Lock Haven, Pennsylvania: The Association for Student Teaching, 1953.
-
- . Functions of Laboratory Schools in Teacher Education: Thirty-Fourth Yearbook. Edited by Alexander F. Perrodin. Lock Haven, Pennsylvania: The Association for Student Teaching, 1955.
-
- . Four Went To Teach: Thirty-Fifth Yearbook. Edited by Margaret L. Carroll and others. Lock Haven, Pennsylvania: The Association for Student Teaching, 1956.
-
- . Guidance in Teacher Education: Thirty-Sixth Yearbook. Edited by Herbert J. Klaus, Meier and others. Cedar Falls, Iowa: The Association for Student Teaching, 1957.
-
- . Improving of Instruction in Professional Education: Thirty-Seventh Yearbook. Edited by Clyde L. Martin and others. Cedar Falls, Iowa: The Association for Student Teaching, 1958.
-
- . The Supervising Teacher: Thirty-Eighth Yearbook. Edited by Ernest J. Milner. Cedar Falls, Iowa: The Association for Student Teaching, 1959.
-
- . Evaluating Student Teaching: Thirty-Ninth Yearbook. Edited by Andrew D. Rippey. Cedar Falls, Iowa: The Association for Student Teaching, 1960.
-
- . Teacher Education and the Public Schools: Fortieth Yearbook. Edited by C. M. Clarke. Cedar Falls, Iowa: The Association for Student Teaching, 1961.
-
- . The Outlook in Student Teaching: Forty-First Yearbook. Edited by Aleyne C. Haines. Cedar Falls, Iowa: The Association for Student Teaching, 1962.
-
- Wiggins, Sam P. The Student Teacher In Action. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1957.

Wingo, Max G., and Scharling, Raleigh. Elementary School Student Teaching. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1960.

Woodruff, Asahel D. Student Teaching Today, AACTE Study Series, Number 5. Washington, D. C.: The American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1960.

Bulletins and Periodicals

Applegate, Invane. "Many People Affect the Student Teaching Program," Educational Administration and Supervision, XLIV (July, 1958), 205-12.

Batchelder, Howard T., and others. A Guide to Planning For Off-Campus Student Teaching. Bulletin No. 11. Cedar Falls, Iowa: Iowa State Teachers College, The Association for Student Teaching, 1959.

Blair, Lois C. and others. The Purposes, Functions, and Uniqueness of the College-Controlled Laboratory School. Bulletin No. 9. Cedar Falls, Iowa: The Association for Student Teaching, 1958.

Blanchard, B. Eulard. "Criteria for Selecting Student Teaching Centers: An Approach," Educational Administration and Supervision, XII (April, 1955), 234-37.

Brown, William B., Nashland, Mildred, and Dedleick, Nellie. "Los Angeles City Schools - Partners in Teacher Education," The Journal of Teacher Education, XII (March, 1961), 60-65.

Curtis, Dwight K. "Pre-service and In-service Education of Elementary and Secondary School Teachers," Review of Educational Research, XXVIII (June, 1958), 208-21.

Duker, Sam. "The Elementary School Principal and the Student Teacher," Educational Administration and Supervision, 41 (December, 1955), 467-74.

Hughes, Otto. The Role of the Campus Elementary School. Bulletin of the School of Education, Indiana University, Vol. 35, No. 2, Division of Research and Field Sciences. Bloomington, Indiana: Indiana University, 1959.

- Johnstone, Oliver P. "The Principal's Role in Student Teaching," California Elementary Administrator, Vol. XXV, No. 4 (May, 1962), 27.
- Journal of Teacher Education. Vols. III - XII (June issues, 1952-1956; September issues, 1957-1961).
- Lingren, Vernon C. "Help Needed and Received by Student Teachers," Journal of Teacher Education, X (March, 1959), 22-27.
- Perrodin, Alex F. "The Principal and the Student Teacher," Educational Administration and Supervision, XLIII (March, 1956), 149-52.
- Phi Delta Kappa. Research Studies in Education. (Bloomington, Indiana: Phi Delta Kappa, Inc., 1954-1960).
- Williams, H. V. "Should the State Subsidize the Student Teaching Program?" Educational Administration and Supervision, XLI (April, 1955), 224-28.

Manuals and Guides

- Appalachian State Teachers College. Handbook for Student Teaching. Boone, N. C.: Appalachian State Teachers College, 1954. (Mimeographed)
- Christenbury, E. S. Tentative Policies and Procedures for Student Teaching. Knoxville, Tennessee: The University of Tennessee, 1959. (Mimeographed)
- College of Education, University of Alabama. Handbook for Co-operating Teachers in Secondary Student Teaching, University, Alabama: College of Education, University of Alabama, 1962. (Mimeographed)
- College of Education, University of Illinois. A Guide to Student Teaching. Urbana, Illinois: College of Education, University of Illinois, 1952. (Mimeographed)
- Department of Elementary Education, University of Alabama. Student Teaching in Tuscaloosa City and County Elementary Schools: Agreements and Understandings. University, Alabama: Department of Elementary Education, University of Alabama, 1962. (Mimeographed)

- Fink, Ross T., and Cardwell, Jesse F. A Report on the Student-Teaching Program. Nashville, Tennessee: George Peabody College for Teachers, 1949.
- Norton, M. S. The Principal and Cooperative Responsibility for Student Teaching. Austin, Texas: Metz Elementary School, (Not dated). (Ditto material)
- Schooler, Virgil E., Strom, Ingrid M., and Whitaker, Prevo L. A Guide for Student Teaching. Bloomington, Indiana: School of Education, Indiana University, 1959.
- School of Education, Auburn University. Auburn University Student Teaching Handbook. Auburn, Alabama: School of Education, Auburn University, 1961. (Mimeographed)
- School of Education, The Florida State University. "Guidance Materials for Principals," Tallahassee, Florida: School of Education, The Florida State University, 1960. (Mimeographed)
- School of Education, The Woman's College of the University of North Carolina. Tentative Guide to Student Teaching. School of Education, The Woman's College of the University of North Carolina, 1962.
- Troy State College. Secondary Student Teaching Handbook. Troy, Alabama: Troy State College, 1960. (Mimeographed)
- Smith, Emmitt D. Report: The Role of the Cooperating School and the Role of the College in Providing Laboratory Experiences in Teacher Education. (A composite report taken from reports of twelve area conferences and the Annual Conference of the Texas Association for Student Teaching.) Canyon, Texas: West Texas State College, 1959. (Mimeographed)
- University of Mississippi. Laboratory Experiences for Prospective Teachers. Oxford, Mississippi: University of Mississippi (Not dated). (Mimeographed)