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Purpose of the Study

The study measured and compared the philosophies of education of OSU graduates who are experienced teachers of vocational education and undergraduate vocational teacher trainees on an essentialist-progressive scale at OSU.

The objectives of this study were to (1) determine if experienced teachers of vocational education and undergraduate vocational teacher trainees indicate significantly different philosophical bases, and to (2) determine if education coursework in the philosophy subject area significantly alters philosophical direction.

Design of the Study

The sample consisted of forty-one (41) participants enrolled in the sophomore block teacher education program
during the winter term of the 1974-75 academic year, and thirty-one (31) graduate students enrolled in the Educational Professional Development Act (EPDA) program of OSU during the 1973-74 and 1974-75 academic years.

During the first week of winter term 1974 a pretest was administered to a section of field-based students at OSU. The pretest instrument was the Inventory of Viewpoints on Education (IVE). This instrument consisted of sixty-five (65) pairs of opinions, beliefs, and proposed actions in educational situations. Scores reflected an essentialist (0) philosophy or a progressive (65) philosophy.

During the beginning of the academic years 1973-74 and 1974-75, experienced teachers of vocational education enrolled in the OSU EPDA program were also tested using the IVE instrument as the pretest. Upon termination of the program the same instrument was administered as the posttest.

Treatment of the data was designed to explore the hypothesis that there were no significant philosophical mean score differences between teaching experienced vocational instructors and undergraduate teacher trainees in vocational and general education. Samples used in the analysis were assumed to represent those groups which were studied at OSU.

The statistical analysis chosen to provide data on the hypothesis was the analysis of covariance. The pretest score was considered as the covariant (independent) factor and the posttest score was the dependent variable.
Findings of the Study

The hypothesis was retained. It was concluded that there were no significant differences between the mean scores of the experimental groups at OSU.

Conclusions of the Study

1. Students in graduate and undergraduate education programs have similar educational philosophical opinions.

2. Students in graduate and undergraduate education programs indicate a progressive philosophy when relating to essentialist and progressive indicators.

3. Because undergraduates usually do not have a formal knowledge foundation of the philosophy of education, study in the philosophy area might allow their understanding to expand.

4. Teacher education programs should continue to evaluate and change if they are going to have a contemporary effect on the philosophy of students.

5. The heart of teacher education is the human interaction between the teacher and the student.

Suggestions for Further Study

1. Culturally different students compose an important part of the educational system. Therefore, a study should be conducted to investigate the philosophical bases of educators from a multi-cultural setting.
2. The teacher's behavior is intimately involved in what he/she values. A future study should investigate the teacher's value clarification system.

3. The student's behavior is intimately involved in what he/she values. It is recommended that a future study investigate the student's value clarification system.

4. Competencies and accountability have focused upon the cognitive and psychomotor domains. The affective domain should be researched with equal emphasis.

5. It is suggested that a study be conducted to assess comparisons among educators within various institutions of higher education using the IVE instrument.

6. Every study has some limiting parameters such as sample environment or time restraints, and this study was no exception. A similar study could further test the validity of the reported findings.
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A COMPARISON OF PHILOSOPHIES OF OREGON STATE UNIVERSITY GRADUATES WHO ARE EXPERIENCED TEACHERS OF VOCATIONAL EDUCATION AND UNDERGRADUATE VOCATIONAL TEACHER TRAINEES ON AN ESSENTIALIST-PROGRESSIVE SCALE AT OREGON STATE UNIVERSITY

I. INTRODUCTION

Society has had to cope with problems of change since the very beginning of time. All of these changes are based upon individual values. Change is not only causing our national attention to focus on the way we live, but also on how we make and prepare for our livelihood. These values include individual philosophies of teaching. Smith and Kapfer (70) tie education and society together.

The main purpose of school, of course, is to engage students in meaningful activities that result in significant learning. The principles of behavior modification thus far work very effectively in the development of facilitative behaviors and in the elimination of disruptive behaviors. The same principles are also used with some success in "motivating" learning.

Any type of reinforcement that is programmed by the teacher or the school, however, will be discontinued eventually (for example, when the student leaves school). Thus, the student must perceive some intrinsic value to learning, or self-motivated learning can be found outside of school and applied to the school environment.

In recognizing the forces affecting society and its schools, the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (2) asserts that it must take a position and accept a major responsibility for the improvement of teacher education programs. First on the list of problems confronting society is the underlying rationale of this study.
The affecting of curriculum and instruction changes, at both undergraduate and graduate levels, adequately reflect the societal needs and realities with which schools and teachers should be concerned.

Drumheller (24) reinforces the curricular emphasis.

Formerly the school was guardian of the "3 R's" competencies of the citizenry. Now it must complement the family, neighborhood, and other public educational agencies in developing the functional behaviors of the child.

Not only is society looking for answers to the education dilemma, but teacher educators themselves are having a difficult time finding a direction. Silberman (68) points this out.

There is probably no aspect of contemporary education of which there is greater unanimity (sic) of opinion than that teacher education needs a vast overhaul. Virtually, everyone is dissatisfied with the current state of teacher education, even the educationalist establishment itself.

Society has given educators indicators for direction. The Gallup Poll of Public Attitudes (29) toward education during the past three years have indicated skills which parents feel teachers and schools need.

The good school has ... teachers who are interested in their work and in their students, teachers who make their classes interesting and relevant, variety in curriculum to meet the needs of all students, not just college bound, discipline and respect for authority with up to date teaching methods.

The prime object of teacher education has been to turn out individuals skilled in helping students learn. Even
though the approach has varied within universities and within departments, there has been constant concern for the changing of teacher preparation programs. Combs (14) helps to illustrate the intricacies of the problem.

The task of our schools must extend beyond skills ... the sheer volume of information precludes any possibility that we can ever again hope to construct a common curriculum for everyone.

Statement of the Problem

The primary focus of this study was to determine if significant philosophical differences existed between experienced teachers of vocational education enrolled in the Oregon State University Vocational Leadership Program (EPDA) during the 1973-74 and 1974-75 academic years and undergraduate vocational teacher trainees enrolled in the Oregon State University School of Education's Theory and Practicum II (TP-II) program during the 1974-75 academic year.

The teacher education, reflected by society, continues to be caught up in the throes of change. Adaptability and survival are based upon the ability to change. Our philosophies must reflect the flexibility to accept and function within our environment of change, or we will become one of the endangered species.

Toffler (79) refers to the speed of change as "future shock" when he says that the school of the future must prepare the future citizen for living with and adjusting to
change.

The educational society seems to consider varying emphases regarding philosophy. Those protecting special areas promote one direction of specialization, while generalists protect the broad-based concept. This leads to problems as indicated by Hamilton (38) when she says, "Duplication of efforts cross departments. Even general education courses are ordinarily segregated by occupation field (e.g., The Philosophy of Education for Agriculture Teachers)."

Much of our educational dilemma stems from the traditional. Drumheller (24) states:

Our teachers are traditionally oriented to passing on discipline-based knowledge through a lock-step textbook medium. And you can't get there directly from here. The textbook and the discipline are a security blanket for both the teachers and the students. One cannot take it away without an extensive re-education program and the substitution of another security blanket.

The sensitive teachers must then be flexible enough to meet the needs of the individuals. Randhawa (63) states this well.

The task of teachers is to keep an eye on the behaviors exhibited in their classrooms and adapt instruction to meet the needs indicated. The alert sensitive teacher who can depart from the discipline to minister to an individual's needs makes a school curriculum vital.

The problem then begins to focus on a one-to-one basis, the teacher and the learner. Is teacher preparation restricting our citizens by directing society towards the tra-
ditional, or is society directing individuals toward the status quo? One way to look at this situation is to look at students entering teacher preparation as compared to the individuals that have gone through the process of teacher preparation and have been exposed to working within the "teaching environment."

The American educational system have been subjected to increased attacks from the public and from within their own ranks. This study looks at these attacks as bearing on individual philosophies of education. These attacks upon education can best be understood as symptoms of a society that is undergoing transformation—a transformation that produces conflict.

Objectives of the Study

The major objectives of the study were to (1) determine if experienced teachers of vocational education and undergraduate vocational trainees indicate significantly different philosophical bases, and to (2) determine if educational coursework in the philosophy subject area significantly alters philosophical direction.

Definition of Terms

The following definitions are included for the purpose of clarification within the study. Many of the def-
Definitions come from the Dictionary of Education edited by Good (33). Definitions of other terms or phrases used in the study are considered to be self-explanatory.

**Educational Professional Development Act (EPDA)** - A Federally funded program with the major aim to prepare selected participants from vocational teaching with broad professional knowledge and competencies as leaders to effect comprehensive vocational education throughout the nation.

**Essentialism** - The doctrine that there is an indispensable common core of culture (certain knowledges, skills, attitudes, ideas, etc.) that can be identified and should be taught systematically to all, with rigorous standards of achievement, it being regarded as a definite adult responsibility to guide education in this direction; presupposes not that individual pupil freedom is to be dismissed but rather that such freedom is to be made an aim or achievement instead of a means of education.

**General Education** - Those phases of learning which should be the common experience of all men and women; education gained through dealing with the personal and social problems with which all are confronted; and in this study, lower division students yet to be accepted into the School of Education's formal teacher education program.

**The Inventory of Viewpoints on Education (IVE)** - An instrument developed by Swanson designed to place viewpoints
of individuals and professional educators on a scale of essentialist-progressive.

**OSU - Oregon State University**

**Progressivism** - The theory that education is an instrument in the service of man, that academic values are primarily extrinsic and therefore functional, that content and subject matter should be modified as man's knowledge of himself and his world changes, and that all expressions of absolutistic thinking are impediment to process.

**Teaching experienced vocational graduates** - Secondary and post-secondary instructors who have taught in the vocational education area within public or private schools.

**Theory and Practicum II (TP-II)** - A teacher preparation program based on the notion that teacher preparation is more than the acquisition of classroom techniques and skills. The program, composed of campus and field-based experiences, involves an active commitment to the principle of inquiry into schools, learning and larger processes of education and socialization. The program encourages students to experience the nature of schools, the processes of learning, and the philosophical bases and values implicitly in human behavior.

**Theory and Practicum II students** - Students enrolled in the TP-II program during the 1974-75 academic year. This program offers a field-based teacher education experience at the sophomore level.
Undergraduate vocational teacher trainees - Students who have identified themselves within one of the five categories identified as vocational education and who were enrolled in the TP-II section.

Vocational Education - A program of education organized to prepare the learner for entrance into a particular chosen vocation or to upgrade employed workers; including Trade and Industrial Education, Health Education, Agriculture Education, Business Education, Distributive Education and Home Economics Education.

Vocational Instructor - An individual who has identified his or her primary teaching responsibility to be in one or more of the specialized divisions of vocational education through a degree program or by occupational experience in lieu of a degree.
II. RELATED LITERATURE

Pressures from educators and the public are causing turmoil between educational planning and traditional direction. Hard and fast criteria are expected to be developed for accountability, yet many claim that teaching is an "art" and cannot thus be classified.

By using the soundingboards of newspapers, school board meetings and budget elections, the public has voiced support of both conservative and liberal issues. Recall petitions have flowered, administrators have resigned and teachers have sought the security of unionism.

Morris (54) says,

There can be little question that in America today one of the areas of greatest confusion and uncertainty is education; in a troubled time we are drummed by competing voices on the proper schooling of our young.

Can we agree upon what is the proper schooling of our young? We tie our actions into functional behavior with abstract goals and tradition. Drumheller (24) mentions that many teachers make a lifelong commitment to a profession and try to resolve ambiguities, but only end up frustrated. They may teach the old way and yet know of a better way but not want to make the adjustment or quit. Unless this chasm can be bridged, accountability efforts will be doomed to frustration and failure.
One of the articles by Goodlad (34) supports the confused issues.

But the education scene today remains confusing. Put on one pair of glasses and the schools appear to be moving posthaste toward becoming centers of intense, exciting learning, marked by concern for the individual. Put on another, and they appear to be mired in tradition, insensitive to pressing social problems, and inadequate to the demands of learning.

Education still remains confusing. The vision seems to be altered by the perspective. Some see education as new and exciting when working within the educational environment, yet the public may be seeing a bogged-down bureaucracy.

**Rationale of the Study**

The very emphasis of change has been paramount throughout the educational history of this country. There have been many stages of development in trying to evolve a common philosophy on which to legitimately base our educational system. Voices that were advocating change were often lost as radical, of limited use, or as passing fancies. The identifying fact was that change was the consideration, not the individual direction that was promoted. The very survival of society, and education itself, promotes change. Goldhammer and Taylor (32) state,

Since the curriculum is handed down by tradition and relates to the structure of knowledge, not to the life needs of students, its function, one must presume, is not to be relevant to their needs and
concerns. The schools are steeped in the academic tradition which emphasize scholarship, not effectiveness in performing one's roles. The stated objectives of the schools relative to human growth and development have become pure verbiage, for the curriculum of the school persists without a basic concern for them.

In looking at the current educational dilemma, we can refer to current terminology among students when they say, "Where are you coming from?" This slang expression expresses the concern by individuals in knowing from what basis a person is speaking. Such concerns may clarify communications or establish boundaries that allow someone to feel comfortable within. Similar examples may be found when discussing politics, religion or cultural backgrounds.

Has the educational system promoted the essentialist direction through teacher education, or do we foster a progressive attitude. Maybe we are emphasizing the academic without equally considering human relations for a problem that may never appear just "black" or "white".

On the negative side of the ledger, Heilbroner (40) offers one view,

Perhaps even more important among these topical causes for our pessimistic frame of mind has been yet another development of the recent past--the failure of the present middle aged generation to pass its values along to its children.

The responsibility, however, of educating our society comes back to the educators. We may very well state our case
when Kinzer (49) says, "We are lost, but we're making good time!"

One approach to "finding our way" is to establish a baseline for comparison. By using the instrument, Inventory of Viewpoints on Education (Appendix A), we would be able to place teaching experienced graduates and undergraduate vocational teacher trainees and general education students on an essentialist-progressive scale for comparison.

The question, then, is whether there are significant differences in philosophy among undergraduate vocational teacher trainees and general education teacher trainees and experienced teachers of vocational education. Any such philosophical differences are important. Drumheller (24) says it this way.

We want to know why teachers teach and administrators administer and way they do. And, make no mistake, no matter how much teachers and administrators may affect innocence about things philosophical, their behavior patterns in the school are outgrowths of the philosophical and policy positions they individually hold, whether they realize it or not.

By focusing on two aspects of the philosophical scale, essentialist and progressive, we will be able to measure with reliability what direction educators "are coming from." When we establish where we are, then we will be able to find out where we want to go, and hopefully, we can plan for the future with a positive direction.
Controversy in American Education

The craggy outlines of the new society are emerging from the mists of tomorrow. Yet, even as we speed closer, evidence mounts that one of our most critical subsystems—education—is dangerously malfunctioning.

(Toffler, Future Shock)

The freedom of a democratic system promotes controversy, so education is now faced with a new problem. Full (28) adds to the controversy when he speaks of Dewey,

What is it that is worthy of the name education? This was no rigid standard that he was proposing, but one flexible enough to meet changing conditions and situations.

Education may be the promoter of education, and the merry-go-round may be run by tradition. Is the system promoting the status quo? How successful have we been? Venn (83) states:

Education has been too successful in doing what society has expected it to do. Two centuries of success tend to keep pressure on the schools to do more and better what they are presently doing. When weaknesses appear, the response is to increase the effort. The generally accepted belief is that more of the same will result in continued success.

Legal issues have begun to surface to make the problems more intense. The accountability aspect has begun to awaken conscientious planning administration. As the system tries to move to justification, some people feel that the movement is too slow while others feel neglected altogether. Just recently two newspaper articles focused on the legal aspects.
The Sunday Oregonian (60) printed an article labeling education as the "classic example" of consumer fraud. It would appear that the question would be: Are we delivering what we are advertising? The article concluded by stating, "the education system turns out automatons, with the process beginning in kindergarten and continuing through the next 12 years."

Higher education is also feeling some of the intensity through consumer action. As mentioned in the Chronicle of Higher Education (66), a woman enrolled in a teacher education program was required to take a course and claimed that it was "worthless". She is seeking a refund of tuition plus the cost of books and legal fees.

A strong condemnation of education came from Velie (82) through the Reader's Digest. He said, "the slowest learners in our schools are not the pupils. They're the educators who run them."

Even from within comes the attack. Goldhammer and Taylor (32) tarnish the traditional system by saying that the primary legitimation in scholarship is an end in itself designed to screen out of the system the academically unfit. "Applications to life and life's problems are purely coincidental."

Taba (75) likes the security of the discipline of the past; the nature of the content determines what process to
use and how it is to operate. Can this essentialistic approach stand up?

Brubacher (10) says that traditionally man has sought stability in the faith that there are permanent traits in reality.

Consequently, in a flux where some things alter more slowly than others, one can achieve a not inconsiderable measure of stability by viewing the flux from the standpoint of those things having a low probability of changing either soon or often.

If we interpret Brubacher's "reality" as society, then it would seem that our school system is reflecting our society and doing what it has been called upon to do. If the school is to represent society, does the school change at the same rate as society, or are the school and society one and the same? In "The School as a Model of Society" Grannis (35) says,

Every school presents to its students a model of society and its possibilities. In the very composition of the students and teachers, in the authority and decision-making structure of the school, in the ways that people talk with one another, and in the expectation the school holds for its students--in all these ways, and more, the school instructs about society.

As the school represents society, is the picture realistic or is it a mere sample? Society starts to emphasize accountability or performance contracting and compromises individual freedoms. How do we balance the requirements of society and the individual?
Von Hilshheimer (84) does not agree with Grannis. He seems to see schools as models that are not reflective of society but rather are idealistic models.

It seems that we cannot focus our efforts. Mistakes are made and we struggle along as best we can. With the educational pressures for change swinging from the content area to the individual, or at least a dual emphasis, Gardner (30) adds similar support to Goodlad.

What we must reach for is a conception of perpetual self-discovery, perpetual reshaping to realize one's best self, to be the person one could be. This is a conception which far exceeds formal education in shop. It includes not the intellectual but the emotions, character and personality. It involves not only the surface, but deeper layers of thought and action. It involves adaptability, creativeness and vitality.

As the individual begins to receive more notice and attention from the critics of education, the educational process should consider adaptations if the criticism is valid. The need for change needs to be reflective of society, and our teacher education planning should consider the validity of items brought to the surface by critics.

**Education is Change**

Education is change—sometimes subtle, sometimes cataclysmic—in the consciousness of man ... and thus in the structures Man has evolved to define and extend himself. Education doesn't happen through bureaucratic teaching. Through perfunctory learning. Education has to do with Man becoming Aware.
To learn
To take effective action
To improve the condition of human beings in
The world and one's self.
But since
The world is large. History is long. And the
Sum total of human knowledge is infinite.
Disciplined understanding is essential
To change
The world
And ourselves.
We begin
With respect
For ourselves
For each other
And
For all that can be learned.

(Goddard College)

The educational emphasis should not focus upon just
the delivery, but should strive for a product that relates
to process application. This application, then, needs to
proceed along a route of "disciplined understanding," plan-
ning for change.

As we develop the planning, the foremost consideration
should be towards the learners involved. This planning per-
meates the education function through the teacher. Planning
should, therefore, strive to eliminate educational barriers.
As Peterson (58) says, the world will demand:

... a person with genuine flexibility and freedom,
a person who thrives on sensing and solving problems
as complex as subtle and new as the technological
environment of tomorrow. In this new world, rigid-
ity may actually be a greater barrier to progress
than ignorance.

The educational delivery may become less important when
we observe the need for considering change. Bebell (4) says,
... the goal of education, if we are to survive, is the facilitation of change and learning. The only man who is educated is the man who has learned how to learn; the man who has learned how to adapt and change; the man who has realized that no knowledge is secure, that only the process of seeking knowledge gives a basis for security.

Because of the difficulties of meeting the needs of our society in general and for individuals specifically, the planning for change tries to bring the two together.

As society is changing, doubt reflects the need for planning for change. The security of tradition should be bent but not broken. We need the strength of tradition with the flexibility of change. At times this has been stated as not throwing away what we can use from the past, but not being blind as to what we can use in the future. As Berkson (5) would say, "Doubt is a first step in freedom of the mind and is often constructive."

The road of educational change has not been smooth nor has the traveling been swift. For this reason, many experts have been uncomfortable and have voiced their criticism. Pucinski and Hirsh (61) speak of public education.

Public education, for the most part, has been long on rhetoric and short on results. Many of the most stalwart, aggressive, inventive change agents have eventually found themselves "killed off" by the system—victims of bureaucratic freezeouts ... scorn and apathy from colleagues and superiors, opposition from the public, or sheer exhaustion from the magnitude of the task. Discouraged at extending so much energy with such disappointing results many have ended up modifying their dreams or retreating to other areas. This tragic trend must be halted; we must develop the courage to change.
Anderson (3) says that much of the blame for education's resistance to change has been the teachers. Many ideas and programs brought into the schools have been rejected without adequate trial. It is, therefore, essential that programs of teacher education prepare teachers for the schools of the future rather than for those of the past.

The emphasis on teacher education surfaces at the point of delivering a philosophy of change from generation to generation within society.

Change is survival, and if teacher education is to survive, then we need to change teacher education as society changes. But the problem still is not this easy. Horton (42) says,

We have a propensity for seeking easy answers rather than asking hard questions. If there is a crisis in the classroom; if we are suffering from future shock; if there is a greening of America in the form of a new consciousness and awareness; and if there is wisdom in deschooling society we are forced to deal with new realities demanding new priorities if teacher education is to survive in a recognizable form.

Educators many times have good intentions that falter because of poor implementation. The implementation may be hindered by goal conflicts, philosophy conflicts, or procedural emphasis. Smith (69) says that we indulge in such conflicts in supporting individualized instruction, and yet we do not reduce class sizes or add support staff.
We promote new instructional methods and deliver through the lock-step classroom. Is this not true?

There is hope, but it is about time that we do something to turn around our present direction. The emphasis has to come from within. Courtney (21) does not see us improving very much.

Our universities are still turning out teachers who perceive their roles as being dominators of learners. In contrast, the teacher of the future will necessarily be an affectively-oriented person whose major role will be to facilitate, rather than dictate learning experiences. Like the tideland animal, he will be characterized as being very flexible and quite adaptive to his changing environment. He will reflect the changing society of which he is a part.

As we perceive the multitude of problems, the answers and solutions may be varied and unclear. The philosophers themselves have diverse views as to where we are headed, or "where we are coming from".

Levine (50) begins to clarify one problem when he says, "the problem, then, is how to rethink philosophy without causing further fragmentation."

One of the major approaches to the situation identified by Levine has been to move towards humanizing the educational approach. This approach begins to focus on the learner rather than the content. This is quite similar to the definition this study refers to for progressivism. Bebell (4) says,
"Humanizing the Curriculum--the Person in the Process" was the theme for the 1967 convention of the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development. The emphasis throughout the meeting was clear: the purpose of education is the fullest practicable development of the individual, and this can only take place when he is valued by those who would educate him.

Yes, the professional meeting and educational get-togethers still stimulate the discussion that teaching is an "art" rather than a "science". Bork and Burnstyn (8) respond.

Often a successful teacher can by the very strength of his personality carry students as a group with him through the curriculum. This is the teacher who is "born, not made." However, with the growing emphasis on learning rather than teaching an individual group activities, this kind of success is no longer so important. Today, a teacher needs to be successful in understanding the guiding of the individual student.

The humanistic approach tries to internalize the motivation for learning. It also stresses the relationships between one another. A few years ago results of studies were publicized mentioning that most occupational terminations were the results of human relation problems rather than a lack of skill on the job. We need to know ourselves and how we relate to society for our own survival. Hamachek (37) says,

Most of our personal and interpersonal problems arise not from disagreements about reality, but from distortions and misperceptions of reality.
Iannone and Carline (47) add the product to Hamachek's statement. They say that teacher education's most important product would be the teacher who is true to his feelings and knows how to help children realize their potential.

As we start to dissect the humanistic approach, we look at the delivery system. This system is usually centered around the individualized approach. In order for the teacher to work in this environment effectively, it is often necessary to develop an adaptable philosophy. Smith and Kapfer (70) support this when they state, "... learning packages, whether used in individualized settings or in group instructional situations, require student behaviors that usually differ from traditional expectations."

It is still important to remember that the teacher is the orchestrator and conductor for the educational delivery system. The personal contact with the learner may or may not be the motivational factor to stimulate or terminate learning formally.

The change in education, therefore, is attitudinal. Changes in individuals whether they are learners, teachers, administrators or members of society must be considered. We need to allow for differences, and in fact, search out the direction for exploring differences. The plan should allow for these differences through the flexibility of change.
The words from the song "People's Park" reflect this individual philosophy.

If you aren't the way you want to be
It may depend on the way you see
And if there's anything that you want to be, the change
lies in your hands you'll see
We're the keepers with the keys
We're the makers of all confusion, we're the planters
with the seeds

The Education of Teachers

Wiggins (86) identifies the major element of teacher education.

If we are agreed upon anything at all about education in America, it is that the quality of teaching is the most important single factor in the value of schooling. The education of teachers, then, is the central issue in American Education.

If the central issue in education is agreed upon, it is entirely another problem in determining an approach to solving the dilemma. The approaches are varied and yet similar, new and yet traditional, hard to prove and yet tried, and extremely difficult to get a consensus upon. Rogers (64) says that the facilitation of learning rests upon certain attitudinal qualities which exist between the teacher and the learner, not in textbooks, audio-visual aids or programmed learning.

Silberman (68) looks at our problem from another direction. He says that we need to have our teachers develop a philosophy of education. This means developing teachers'
ability and their desire to think seriously, deeply, and continuously about the purposes and consequences of what they do.

As was mentioned earlier, once we decide upon the question, possible approaches come into the conflict. Cook and Leeds (19) mention this.

There is considerable disagreement in education circles relative to a variety of topics involving the relationship of teachers and pupils. These topics are still largely matters of opinion with little reinforcement from scientific evidence.

Like the tideland animals changing for survival mentioned by Courtney, Iannone (46) sees a need for educators to change, not only because of changing truths, but also because of society. Survival is a strong motivator.

Whether the change is immediate or slow in coming, education may need to consider the philosophical basis from which planning and decision-making is taking place.

Teacher decisions, assumptions, methodology, and objectives depend upon theoretical framework based upon philosophy. Therefore, says Wirsing (88), a conscious linkage between philosophical belief and teaching practice needs to be sought from the outset of one's professional preparation.

Figure #1 illustrates the formation of a methodology pyramid. Wirsing (88) says that this concept focuses on the actions that an educator would take.
METHODOLOGY "Pyramid"

(Figure 1)

What should be clear at this juncture is that there should be no separation between a teacher's total philosophy of life, his philosophy of education, his learning theory, and his methodology.

As we said before, in order to understand learners, we need to be able to understand ourselves. The philosophical basis may be an indicator that would allow educators to understand their actions. A person's philosophy is transmitted through relating experiences. To the students without similar foundations, it may be confusing.

Another approach may be more diagnostic. Randhawa and Fu (63) suggest that we should take the time to look at the classroom learning environment as an interaction phenomenon; is it important for a developmental history of each member of the group?

Iannone (45) suggests that we get teacher trainees involved. We should offer more human experiences. Considerations could include alternative types of education, counseling experiences and the opportunity for prospective teachers to get their senses involved.

As we start to get a handle on the problem, Rogers (65) says that he doesn't believe that we can teach teachers. He says that, "anything that can be taught to another is relatively inconsequential, and has little significant influence on behavior."

In trying to read between the lines and ferret out the truth between Rogers and other experts, a compromise offered
by Patterson (57) may bring us back to an operational basis. He says that the problem in education is that we do not deal with people. Coladarci (13) seems to agree with Patterson using different words. He attacks the process; content and procedures of teacher education demonstrate no relevance to actual teaching.

Like the wounded shark, we see teacher education attacking itself. Shaffer (67) says that if we continue to prepare future teachers as if their preparation consists primarily of learning isolated facts and skills, then they will view their own work as imparting them.

The educational system perpetuates itself. As the United States is a relatively "new" country, King (48) gives us a little bit of history for reflection.

Most of the subject specialists teaching in academic schools of the continental tradition (which are after all more 'normal' throughout the world than anything to be found in Anglo-Saxon countries) perform more of a lecturing role than would be permissible in the most modestly progressive school in English-speaking countries. It is the ambition of most of them to attain a university lecturing appointment, and this is indeed the way in which most university teachers on the continent are recruited.

Educators relate that students teach like they have been taught rather than the way we taught them to teach. If this is a fault, then it should be corrected. With the strong influences of the teachers in the classroom, Silberman's (68) statement is important.
What educators must realize, moreover, is that how they teach and how they act may be more important than what they teach. The way we do things, that is to say, shapes values more directly and more effectively than the way we talk about them.

It would appear difficult to separate product and process in some of the education courses. However, both the delivery and the curriculum give hints to philosophical bases. Could this be the common thread? Van Til (81) says,

An education which takes into account the individual, his society, and his values--an education which builds upon the soundest possible scholarship derivative from psychological, social, and philosophical foundations--is imperative in developing a curriculum appropriate for twentieth-century man.

We need not neglect one aspect of the educational process in favor of the other. Nolte's (55) concept of children describes rhetorically one person's feelings for this consideration.

If a child lives with criticism,  
  He learns to condemn.  
If a child lives with hostility,  
  He learns to fight.  
If a child lives with ridicule,  
  He learns to be shy.  
If a child lives with shame,  
  He learns to be guilty.  
If a child lives with tolerance,  
  He learns to be patient.  
If a child lives with encouragement,  
  He learns confidence.  
If a child lives with praise,  
  He learns to appreciate.  
If a child lives with fairness,  
  He learns justice.  
If a child lives with security  
  He learns to have faith.
If a child lives with approval,
He learns to like himself.
If a child lives with acceptance and friendship,
He learns to find love in the world.

The influence of philosophy is being felt in teacher education by the trends that affect curriculum. As the influences of controversy build, teacher education curriculum trends are changing. Wooten (89) mentions a few of these trends for the decade of 1964-1974. More of a humanistic approach to curriculum development is being utilized, individualized instruction is more noticeable, and alternatives and opinions are being sought.

Major words that appear in educational writings relate to change as "new," "modified," and "emerging." This itself would lend support to a progressive direction in our curriculum development.

Berman (6) supports the "new trend" ideas. She said that curriculum should deal with two major characteristics: (1) Its major concern is with the ongoingness rather than the staticism of life; and (2) the substance is related to human processes.

Mitzel (53) coins a new phrase for this kind of education; adaptive education. This would be the tailoring of subject matter presentations to fit the special requirements and capabilities of each learner.

We still return to the major ingredient of teacher education--the teacher. One Oregon State University study
by Watson (85) reinforces this. He states that students appear to consider teachers more effective if they are open-minded, flexible, and concerned about their students.

Among various influences on teacher education, one direction seems to be in vogue--getting prospective teachers involved with students early. Randebaugh and Johnson (62) show this to be true with experienced teachers as well.

Another major difference appears to be that excellent teacher actions are designed to stimulate student actions. There was a tendency for the excellent teachers to ask students to evaluate, students to work problems, and students to follow rules, while the non-excellent teachers themselves tended to work problems, evaluate student responses, and give student rules to follow.

Educational research does not itemize a nice clean simplistic set of criteria for a "good" or an "excellent" teacher, but Combs, Avila, and Purkey (16) give some indication.

It was found that good teachers wanted to perceive their students with desirable traits. It was a positive approach rather than negative. It proved to be helpful rather than a hinderance.

Educators are continuously faced with teacher education selection problems. In order to screen the "appropriate" people for teachers, many programs have instituted early contact with students so that individual career goals
can be influenced. Mager (51) says, "our success in influencing future performance is in part a function of our success at sending students away with tendencies to approach, rather than avoid, the things we want them to think about, feel about, and do about." This early field exposure can take many forms, but the objectives are often quite similar.

Cooper and Sadker (20) balance Mager somewhat.

Besides helping the prospective teacher discover earlier in his career whether or not he really wants to teach, the field experiences also enable him to approach the rest of the teacher curriculum from a reality perspective.

The student related experience seems to be working. Birm's (7) research reflects this. By using the interview technique, he said that eighty percent of the teacher trainees involved in his study said that direct interaction with children altered their attitudes.

The purpose and rationale of the field experience program at Oregon State University (TP-II) stress similar outcomes as Combs. The Theory and Practice II Field Experience Handout (76) states:

Purpose and Rationale: This section of Theory and Practice II is based on the notion that teacher education is more than the acquisition of classroom techniques and skills. It is our belief that teaching must involve an active commitment to the principles of inquiry into schools, learning, and larger processes of education and socialization.

Without an early field exposure, the learner in a teacher education program may not decide his or her fate until
late in his or her educational life after a major commitment of time and finances. One example of this is related by the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (2).

It is said of the student that he is a bundle of quivering nerves at this late date in his pre-career, right up to the deadline and on his mettle, so he just has to succeed at this one chance. And his main preoccupation during his student teaching must be to reconcile, if at all possible, the respective philosophies of his cooperating teacher and his college supervisor.

In some situations the teacher education curriculum may be cross departmentalized. As identified by the Oregon State University Bulletin Catalog (56), undergraduate courses in Philosophy of Education covering "application of current philosophical methods to educational problems" would have to be taken through the College of Liberal Arts.

The planning of the teacher education institutions may relate to change, but the basis for accountability might be hard to identify. By using a statewide sample for a vocational study, Spaziani (71) mentions the greater emphasis on individualized instruction, teaching at individual learning rates, and the writing of performance objectives.

Again referring to Oregon State University, a report by Dale and Kline (22) dealing with TP-II stated:

Six "content" areas were delineated by the TP-II staff, but it is interesting to note that only three teams seemed to clearly establish outlines for addressing each of the content areas. Even within the framework of the course outlines it is difficult to determine if each area was treated with equal depth or was, in fact, treated at all.
As the goals become unclear, so do the outcomes. We say that we produce teachers, but is this really the outcome? DeNevi (23) says that we really do not produce teachers but rather try to develop individuals that have the ability to stimulate learning in others.

Teacher education may be more than just the undergraduate levels. Trends concerning retraining have been mentioned. Hamilton (38) and others mention that there is a growing awareness of the importance of staff development. Retraining may be one alternative to our educational dilemma.

Regardless of the direction and level of teacher education, Tuckman (80) suggests the advent of the student-centered curriculum, should it ever come to pass, would require some basic changes in the instructional system. Butts (12) is more forceful when he says,

My conclusion is that education and teacher education must somehow blend an empirical regard for hard facts with conceptual frameworks that will organize and generalize relevant knowledge in such a way as to be useful for helping to solve the critical problems that face the civilization of the world ... I can find no other way to say it: The only antidote within reason for these Powers is Educational Power.

We will continue to see many variations for educating educators. The critics will remain in the same environment as Haberman (36).

As an integral part of the university structure, schools of education and their teacher education
program cannot support dramatic changes in lower schools or in themselves—regardless of social need, professional ethics, or the dean’s rhetoric.

Teacher educators are not deliberately malevolent. Pressures from politicians and the public accountability coupled with the financial squeeze in teacher education institutions have caused educators to seek easy answers rather than to confront difficult philosophical issues. In the quest for simple solutions to complex social problems, it is understandable that an institution sometimes has difficulty resolving problems. Perhaps a good teacher education program cannot be defined.

The educational philosopher may be the person similar to the King in the parable by Horton (42).

In a certain ancient country the crops came in and they were poisonous. Anyone who ate them became insane. The king said, "There is but one thing to do. We must eat the grain to survive, but there must be those among us who remember we are insane."

**Summary**

Changes in society constantly bombard educational planning necessitating looking into the future from the basis of the past. Toffler (79) is concerned that we are not adequately looking into the future. This change is as valid for education as it is for industry or government. We should be concerned. Education is hope that will allow
society to shift into the future tense.

This educational revolution is noted by Bruner (11) as he says that education must be the rudder for our future survival. It will not be easy, but what option do we have?

About the only conclusion we can get from our options says Bracht (9), is that some students will be more successful with an alternative instructional program.

Our options rely on flexibility and change. A degree of planning must be incorporated into the process of change. Change and progress are not identical says Wiggins (86). Finding the key to solving the problems is not easy. Wirsing (88) mentions that "very different sets of answers exist for every conceivable question about classroom teaching."

Each of us functions to a degree within an organizational structure. This structure may or may not promote our individual philosophy. Therefore, we should be aware of multiple variables. Gardner (30) says that most organizations have a structure that was designed to solve problems that no longer exist.

Change threatens status. Individuals have set down procedures, and new ideas cause discomfort for those attached to the status quo. Depending upon the personality and location of change agents within the organization, changes may be seldom or frequent, easy or difficult, progressive or regressive.
Educators are aware of the need for changes within teacher education. They are promoting criterion-referenced testing, individualized instruction, new methods of measuring and reporting progress, and involvement of greater numbers of consumers into the educational decision-making process. Renewed emphasis has re instituted traditional values and standards. Education seems to have made a full cycle.

We need to clarify the goals and responsibilities of education. Will (87) says that the development of the prospective teacher as a person is an essential responsibility of any teacher education program.

There does not seem to be a mold for producing teachers. Combs (17) says,

The good teacher is not one who behaves in a given way ... His methods must fit the goals he seeks, the children he is working with, the philosophy he is guided by, the immediate conditions under which he is working, to say nothing of his own feelings, goals, and desires.

Some changes are occurring. The Center for Vocational and Technical Education at Ohio State University (26) has rearranged its curriculum through a self-study to emphasize occupational orientation courses for educators to be. Many colleges have gone to the field-based undergraduate models for teacher education. Process has come under more scrutiny with less emphasis on content.

Some improvements in education can be brought about by spending more money, by building better schools, and by
introducing new courses of study, new standards, or new equipment. But really important changes will come about only as teachers change.

Maybe we are looking in the wrong direction. Another avenue may be open to us. McCluskey (52) gives us a hint.

Perhaps we have been looking in the wrong place. Perhaps the way to discover what makes a good teacher is not to look at the teacher at all. Perhaps we should rather be looking at the pupils.
III. DESIGN OF THE STUDY

This study was conducted to determine whether significant philosophical differences existed between experienced teachers of vocational education and undergraduate vocational teacher trainees. In addition, comparisons were made to determine whether significant philosophical differences were found to exist between teacher trainees entering teacher preparation programs identified as vocational education and those entering teacher preparation programs identified as general education.

Selection of the Research Instrument

The instrument used in the research was the Inventory of Viewpoints on Education (IVE - Appendix A) developed by Robert Swanson of Stout State College. This instrument is designed to place viewpoints of individuals in education on a scale of essentialist-progressive. The Inventory of Viewpoints on Education consists of a series of sixty-five (65) pairs of opinions, beliefs, and proposed actions in educational situations.

The instrument measures a number of elements associated with educational philosophical activities. Teacher activities based on educational philosophy include:

1. Teachers formulate or accept objectives.
2. Teachers formulate or accept student experiences (content) to accomplish these objectives.

3. Teachers arrange for pupils to experience content - method.

4. Teachers evaluate growth toward objectives.

5. Teachers reappraise objectives, experiences and methods.

Levels of activities within each of the above were incorporated into statements of application, analysis, synthesis, and evaluation.

The scale of the instrument is of the equidistant interval type with the essentialist's polarity being exemplified by several conditions, including the philosophical assumptions that (1) things never change, (2) the teacher knows best what the learner needs to learn, and (3) it is content centered.

Progressive polarity is exemplified by (1) needs of the person, (2) plays heavily upon student interest, and (3) wants to know how well the person dealt with the problem.

The scale values for the instrument range from 0 - 65 as shown below:

0 - essentialist
progressive - 65

The instrument was validated through the use of a jury of experts who stabilized the content against an operational philosophy,
Randall (1957) established reliability indices for the instrument using the method described by Hoyt and Stunkard (43) which consists of an analysis of variance procedure. This method provides a straightforward solution to the problem of determining internal consistency reliability. Randall used reciprocal averages in his procedures with the items being differentially scored in order to maximize reliability. The technique weighted the items heaviest which agreed with the total score and he continued this iteration process until the reliability stabilized. With the IVE instrument, four (4) iterations were required for obtaining maximum reliability.

**Dependent Variable**

The dependent variable in this study was the score assigned to the respondent according to the posttest on the IVE. Even though uniformity was stressed throughout this study, initial differences existed between the groups involved. The analysis of covariance adjusts for uncontrolled factors using regression procedures. Analysis of covariance was used to adjust for initial statistical differences in the data using pretest score results. By making these adjustments, sampling error was reduced and precision was increased.
The treatments involved three groups; namely, EPDA, TP-II (vocational) and TP-II (general education). In the case of the EPDA program, the treatment consisted of academic and intern participation aimed at developing the broad knowledge and competencies required of professional leaders in education. The Final Report of the Professional Vocational Leadership Development Program (27) says,

The method was field oriented. This was accomplished through coordination of participant internship assignments with the State Department of Education, centers in public secondary schools, intermediate education districts, community colleges, programs for students with special needs and the disadvantaged, and with four-year colleges and universities.

The TP-II treatment consisted of a field experience within junior high and elementary schools. This field-based program included the following goals as stated by the OSU Handbook for Student and Cooperating Teachers (39):

Enable students to clarify his/her value system, beliefs and philosophy involving children, education, learning and the schools through the methodology of critical analysis.

Develop students' abilities to observe the institution of education in terms of schools as a social institution, goals of education, what goes on in classrooms and what schooling does for and to children.
Sample Selection

Three groups were utilized in this study to identify the existence of philosophical differences. One group consisted of 31 graduate students in vocational education selected to participate in the OSU EPDA program for the 1973-74 and 1974-75 academic years by their individual states. Their educational viewpoint scores were compared with the educational viewpoint scores of 41 students in lower division courses who had yet to be accepted into formal teacher education programs, but who had enrolled in the TP-II program during the winter term of 1974-75 academic year at OSU. Of these 41 students, 9 were identified as vocational and 32 as general education. The matrix for the sampling plan is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pretest</th>
<th>$E_1$ (EPDA)</th>
<th>$E_2$ (Gen Ed)</th>
<th>$E_3$ (Voc Ed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n=31</td>
<td>n=32</td>
<td>n=9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posttest</td>
<td>n=31</td>
<td>n=32</td>
<td>n=9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Figure 2)

The EPDA program ($E_1$) is described in the Final Report of the Professional Vocational Leadership Development Program (27) as having the following objectives and aims:
The major aim of this project was to prepare selected participants with broad professional knowledge and competencies as leaders to affect comprehensive vocational education programs in the nation.

Specific proficiencies for the participants were as follows:

1. Conceptualizing community education by participation in various community cultures and identifying the various roles of the parent, the peer, the power group, and the public change agent.

2. Perceptualizing the comprehensive occupational task by being in constant contact with living examples where career education is liberal education and also practical.

3. Learning to live with ambiguity in administration by perceiving and having it demonstrated that the administrator is a change agent.

4. Sensitizing research to all groups by case studying actual problems of the disadvantaged and the problem of inflexibility of some service areas and college bound.

5. Counseling in career context by applying the career ladder approach under the direction of a competent counselor.

6. Cooperating with a highly competent supervisory staff by proceeding into the unknown with vigor toward a goal-oriented program.

7. Emulating a comprehensive teacher education program by observing and participating in a field-oriented teacher preparatory program.

8. Coordinating occupational offerings by developing a proposal that requires articulation with local communities, State Department of Education and OSU.

9. Reinforcing the competencies participants bring to the program by involving university and state staffs with local communities and subculture groups.
10. Delineating specific competencies essential to participant goals by studying and organizing the material in four nation-wide studies relative to vocational leadership.

Oregon State University and the public schools provide students in teacher education with an organized sequential set of classroom teaching/observing/aide experiences. In the field-based component of TP-II, the students were provided an opportunity to work with public school teachers and children as aides or tutors for approximately three hours a day for one term. The goals of this practicum are explained in the OSU Handbook for Students and Cooperating Teachers (39) as:

1. Provide the student an opportunity to develop questions, perceptions and a basis for the on-campus program during the following term as well as subsequent years.

2. Provide an opportunity for the student to observe interactions between teachers and learners and the characteristics of individual students (social, psychological, physical, and intellectual).

3. Provide field experience that will allow the student, through an introspective process, to know more of his/her personal philosophy, values, and beliefs and their relation to teaching.

4. Provide field experience that will provide the environment in which students can develop into "hypothesis testers" who are able to approach the school as a social institution, the learning process and their role as a teacher in an analytical manner rather than in a manner based on an untested belief system.
Statistical Design

A. The Covariance Analysis

The basic design employed in this study was the Experimental-Control Group (Pretest-Posttest) Design utilizing unequal cell sizes. The following procedures were used:

1. The respondents (n=31) for the experimental group (E_1) consisted of students enrolled at OSU during the 1973-74 and 1974-75 academic years in the EPDA program.

2. The respondents for the experimental group in general education (E_2) were selected from the total number of students enrolled in section 210-A during the winter term of the 1974-75 academic year in the TP-II program at OSU.

3. The respondents for the experimental group in vocational education (E_3) were selected from the total number of students enrolled during the winter term of the 1974-75 academic year in section 210-A of the TP-II program at OSU.

4. The three groups were pretested using the IVE instrument and the mean pretest score was established as the covariant for the groups.

5. The EPDA experimental group (E_1) was exposed to the independent variable (Professional Vocational Leadership Development Program) and the experimental groups (E_2 and
were exposed to the "practicum" or field-based component of the TP-II program.

6. Following the three treatments, the three groups were given a posttest; the mean posttest scores for all groups were computed.

7. An analysis of covariance was utilized to determine if significant differences existed between EPDA experimental (E2 and E3) group mean scores in terms of the effect of the treatments.

The F statistic was used for testing for significant differences between adjusted mean scores. All samples were assumed to represent the OSU groups from which they came. The resulting ratio tested the hypothesis that the adjusted mean scores for the three groups did not differ significantly on the philosophical viewpoints scale scores.

The following hypothesis was tested through the covariance portion of the study's design:

$$H_0 : \mu E_1 = \mu E_2 = \mu E_3$$

The hypothesis decision utilized tabular F values with \( \alpha = .05 \) and \( df = 2, 70 \). The critical F was 3.13.

The following analysis of covariance table established the model for testing of significance between the adjusted mean scores.
### Table 1

**ANOVA Layout with Adjusted Sources of Variation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>Adjusted</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>ss</th>
<th>ms</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A/2</td>
<td>$\frac{MS_A}{MS_B}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within (Error)</td>
<td></td>
<td>68</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B/68</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>70</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The degrees of freedom have been adjusted to accommodate the covariance design and are based upon a total $n$ of 72 for the $E_1$, $E_2$ and $E_3$ samples.
IV. RESULTS AND CONCLUSIONS

The first section of this chapter presents the statistical data obtained from the analysis of the objectives of this study as outlined in Chapter I. The data were analyzed using the analysis of covariance technique to determine if significant differences existed among group mean scores in terms of the effect of the treatment. The F statistic was used for significance testing of differences between adjusted mean scores.

The second section of the chapter presents the conclusions obtained from the analysis of the material utilized in this study. The formulations presented focused on determining whether experienced vocational educators and undergraduate teacher trainee scores indicated significant alteration of philosophical direction.

Statistical Analysis and Findings

The hypothesis which was of primary interest to the research was that there are no significant philosophical mean score differences between teaching experienced vocational instructors and undergraduate teacher trainees in vocational and general education.

The analysis of covariance was used in testing the hypothesis. The analysis of covariance utilizes both analysis of variance and regression procedures. The present
problem was involved with covariance analysis and it was used to adjust treatment means of the dependent variable for differences in the independent variable score. For this study, the pretest score was considered as the covariant (independent) factor and the posttest score was the dependent variable. The computed F value generated by the analysis of covariance was found to be greater than the tabular F value at the .05 level of significance, the hypothesis was rejected. If the computed F value was found to be less than the tabular F value, the hypothesis was retained.

The analysis of covariance results are shown in Table 2. The computed F value generated by the analysis of covariance was determined to be .363 and the tabular F value at the .05 level of significance was 3.13. Hence, because the computed F value was smaller than the F value, the null hypothesis was retained.

Because the hypothesis was retained, it was concluded that there were no significant differences existing among the mean scores of the three experimental groups. Table 3 reflects the means for the groups.
### TABLE 2

ANALYSIS OF COVARIANCE Layout with Adjusted Computed Values

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>XX*</th>
<th>XY</th>
<th>YY**</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Adjusted SS***</th>
<th>MS****</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Groups</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1118.396</td>
<td>593.014</td>
<td>317.023</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>19.153</td>
<td>9.576</td>
<td>.363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error (within)</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>2829.589</td>
<td>1093.555</td>
<td>2076.629</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>1657.001</td>
<td>24.367</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>3947.981</td>
<td>1686.569</td>
<td>2396.652</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>1676.154</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Factor M is pretest
** Factor Y is posttest
*** SS = Sum of Square
**** MS = Mean Square

Tabular F

\[ \alpha = .05 \]

\[ df = 2, 68 = 3.13 \]

\[ H_0: \mu_{E_1} = \mu_{E_2} = \mu_{E_3} \]

\[ (E_1) \quad (E_2) \quad (E_3) \]
### TABLE 3

**MEAN SCORES with Adjusted Posttest Scores**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Observations</th>
<th>Mean X*</th>
<th>Mean Y**</th>
<th>Adjusted Mean Y</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experimental 1 (EPDA)</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>46.935</td>
<td>49.387</td>
<td>47.667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimental 2 (Gen Ed)</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>38.593</td>
<td>44.906</td>
<td>46.410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimental 3 (Voc Ed)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>41.000</td>
<td>46.777</td>
<td>47.352</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* X Factor is pretest  
** Y Factor is posttest
The experimental group adjusted mean scores of the posttest were 47.667, 46.410 and 47.352 respectively for E₁ (EPDA), E₂ (Gen Ed) and E₃ (Voc Ed). No groups experienced significant mean gains or losses. Thus, it was concluded that the experimental treatments did not cause significant differences to occur among groups.

Conclusions

The present research was designed to study the philosophical educational effects on students involved in teacher education. The problem involved three major dimensions:

1. Involvement of three groups of students in teacher field-based programs.
2. The assignment of a score to each student group indicating philosophical preference on an essentialist-progressive scale.
3. The statistical analysis of the data in order to identify similarities or differences among philosophical indications within groups.

Regardless of what research method we use, we may never have a complete procedure guaranteeing good teachers; such is the case when working with people. Actions usually speak louder than words, and teachers' actions are based upon their philosophy of education.
Implications

During the course of the investigation, all three groups indicated a move toward the progressive philosophy. Appendices B, C, and D illustrate this transposition.

Using the review of literature, the data analysis, and its conclusions, the following statements are projected as having significant implication for teacher preparatory programs at OSU.

1. Students in graduate and undergraduate education programs have similar educational philosophical opinions. Although no statistical tests were made for differences between sex, age or individual differences, this study supports the philosophical similarities. Similar studies listed in the Final Report of the Professional Vocational Leadership Development Program (27) mention that group mean scores from 1971-75 taken from five institutions using the IVE indicated a range from 41.5 to 50.5. However, when looking at scores taken during 1955, a group mean score of 38.6 was noted. With the limited information available concerning the earlier study, it can only be noted that the group mean score was lower.

2. Students in graduate and undergraduate education programs indicated a progressive philosophy when
relating to essentialist and progressive indicators. The listing from the Final Report (27) indicates to ten groups, including OSU, and shows a preference for the progressive end of the scale with low group mean score being 38.6. Spindler (72) graphically illustrates this by showing a continuum ranging from traditional values to emergent values. He notes some students slightly closer to the traditional values, while the older teachers and some of the students lean towards the emergent values.

As a progressive emphasis is noted, educational leaders could benefit from this trend by knowing what direction staff are generally moving. This may be useful in reference to decision-making situations.

The instrument used in the study measures five activities based upon educational philosophy and we are able to consider these items when looking at teaching methodology. Rather than contrast the essentialist and progressive activities, this study watched the progressive direction as indicated by the information gathered from the sample.

One of the main components of the education delivery system centers on the teacher's objectives. The progressive emphasis focuses upon the individual.
Students needs dictate objectives as well as establish activities. Such as individual teachers using a similar method of establishing objectives whether he is within one discipline area or is moved from discipline to discipline. The educational environment, whether strongly conservative or liberal, may make the instructor successful or unsuccessful, secure or unsecure, happy or unhappy. It is anticipated that a strongly progressive teacher may be uncomfortable with a strongly essentialist administrator or within an ultra-conservative community.

The educational experience has definite bearing upon the educational development of the student. As in the above, the focus is upon the student. Experiences are aimed at meeting individual needs that students have expressed. Students within the educational situations must respond to the teacher in order to maximize student growth potential. Student motivation emerges as a major factor in curriculum development and delivery.

Evaluation procedures have always been difficult to perfect. Various methods have strengths and weaknesses, most are open to attack, and all elude the consensus of educators. With the individual emphasizing the objectives, the evaluative procedures center on the
question of how well he dealt with the problem. Rather than this study getting into the dilemmas of educational testing, grading, and interpretations, we leave this for other studies to research.

We can see the influence of educational philosophy by tying together part of this educational process. The teacher is dictated by their philosophy in establishing course or program objectives, experiences, methods of delivery, evaluation, and reappraisal of the process. Therefore, instruction consists of statements and actions about the above and deals with application, analysis, synthesis and evaluation of the same.

3. As undergraduates usually do not have a formal knowledge of the philosophy of education, study in the philosophy area might allow their understanding to expand. Silberman (68) mentions that the central task of teacher education is to provide teachers with a sense of purpose, with a philosophy of education.

4. Teacher education programs should continue to evaluate and change if they are going to have a contemporary effect on the philosophy of students. Courtney (21) supports this when he says that the teacher of the future will reflect the changing society of which he is a part. Spaziani (71) reinforces with additional support for personal delivery methods.
Teacher education is aimed at meeting the demands of public education. Public education is dictated by society. As changes in society cause conflict, educators try to be aware of these changes. Spindler (73) mentions that educators have been subjected to attacks from society and from within concerning change. These symptoms of society in transformation—a transformation that produces conflict, are necessary for growth.

5. The heart of teacher education is the human interaction between the student and the teacher. DeNevi (23) re-affirms this by stating that we need to educate our teachers for the ability to stimulate learning in others. The progressive teacher is one hope for meeting the needs identified by DeNevi. The student is the focus, and the teacher delivery system, based upon philosophy, can help to make a better society.

Suggestions for Further Study

One emphasis of the study was to stimulate the investigation into the inquiry concerning philosophy in education. It was aimed at assisting students, teachers and teacher educators by bringing to their attention one approach to identifying the fact that philosophy has an effect on actions, whether in teaching, administration or in education generally.
The following recommendations are generated for information gained during the process of investigation.

1. This inquiry dealt with Caucasian educators and students operating in a predominately Caucasian environment. Further studies should investigate the philosophical base of educators in a multicultural setting.

2. The teacher's behavior is intimately involved in what he/she values. A future project should investigate the teacher's value clarification.

3. The student's behavior is intimately involved in what he/she values. A future study should research the student's value clarification.

4. Competencies and accountability have focused upon the psychomotor and cognitive domain. The affective domain should be researched with equal emphasis.

5. Since the instrument (Inventory of Viewpoints on Education) has been utilized for program evaluations with various institutions, an institution-wide philosophical study could be initiated. Therefore, it is recommended that a study be conducted to assess comparisons among educators between various institutions of higher education using the Inventory of Viewpoints on Education instrument.

6. Every study has some limiting parameters such as sample environment, cultural bias, sample size, time restraints,
and prior research, and this study is no exception. Therefore, a similar study should be made to further test the validity of the reported findings.
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APPENDIX A

INVENTORY OF VIEWPOINTS ON EDUCATION

Form A
INVENTORY OF VIEWPOINTS
ON EDUCATION

FORM A

ROBERT SWANSON
STOUT STATE COLLEGE, MENOONIE, WISCONSIN

DIRECTIONS: This inventory consists of a series of pairs of statements of opinions, beliefs, and proposed actions in educational situations. Read each pair carefully. You may not fully agree or disagree with either statement. The choice that you generally accept may represent a more extreme viewpoint than you would propose. Decide which statement represents an emphasis most nearly like yours. Then, on the answer sheet, blacken the letter (a or b) that corresponds to your choice. Some of the statements may seem ambiguous; interpret them for the general situation and in a sense most logical to you. Please react to all items.

1. a. The elements of content in a subject area remain about the same, regardless of course objectives.
b. The objectives for a course determine what should be considered elements of subject matter.

2. a. The teacher should serve as an authority in the subject. It is his job to bring facts and skills to the pupil.
b. The teacher should serve as a fellow investigator, though perhaps as a leader in the investigation.

3. a. The subjects of science, math, English, and history are basically more valuable than vocational subjects.
b. The high school has a duty to offer vocational preparation even at the expense of some science, math, English, and history.

4. a. A beginning course must include the same fundamentals regardless of whether it is a terminal course or one preparing for further work in the subject.
b. The content of a course for terminal purposes should be basically different from that in a course preparing for further work.

5. a. Objectives should not be claimed until it can be shown that they can be achieved.
b. Objectives are something to be striven towards; they derive value and generality of attachment from them.

6. a. Content most immediately useful to students in solving their problems should be taught first.
b. Content found to be most frequently useful in later learning should be taught first.

7. a. Problem solving is impossible without the possession of certain mental processes and skills; the principal job of the school is to build these basic elements.
b. Problem solving is possible and desirable at all levels of learning because it is the problems that indicate the elements to be taught.

8. a. Objectives require constant re-evaluation against changing conditions.
b. Constant re-statement of objectives is often a waste of time; it would be better to spend the time in a more careful study of the content and new scientific developments in it.

9. a. Knowledge of educational psychology is important in determining objectives.
b. Educational psychology is important in selecting teaching methods but not particularly in specifying objectives.

10. a. There should be relatively fixed standards to be attained before issuing a high school diploma.
b. Even minimum standards are not desirable because of the varying needs and abilities of students.
11 a. Facts and skills are either correct or incorrect.
   b. What is regarded as correct is determined somewhat by the use that is to be made of facts and skills.

12 a. Objectives serve as general guides to the selection of content, but specific items of content are determined from within the content itself.
   b. Objectives function in determining what should be taught and how it should be taught.

13 a. Standards based upon group achievement, even of large groups, are basically unsound; standards must come from a scientific study of the subject matter.
   b. Standards must be based on the use to be made of the subject matter.

14 a. Objectives serve as general guides to the selection of content, but specific items of content are determined from within the content itself.
   b. Objectives function in determining what should be taught and how it should be taught.

15 a. A comprehensive evaluation program can be a valuable aid to revising both objectives and content.
   b. An evaluation program tells only what the student learned, not what he should learn.

16 a. In a good test the answers will be definitely either “right” or “wrong.”
   b. One “answer key” cannot be used to mark all tests if the materials are at all complicated.

17 a. The score on an evaluative device should in no way reflect the personal opinion of the teacher.
   b. There should be subjectivity to evaluation; it is just a question of how much.

18 a. Honest student opinion of achievement is at least as valuable as teacher evaluation because the student can judge in terms of his needs and interests.
   b. Even conscientious self-evaluation by the student has questionable value because the student is not in the “expert” position of the teacher.

19 a. Uniform standards of achievement throughout a school are desirable.
   b. Uniform standards are neither desirable nor practical because of the individual needs and abilities of the students.

20 a. The most efficient evaluation of student achievement will be in terms of ability to recall important facts and skills.
   b. Facts and skills have little meaning and value outside of their use in solving problems.

21 a. Individual differences among students call for variations in teaching methods but not in the basic content and objectives.
   b. The same content and objectives cannot apply for all students or even for a large majority of them.

22 a. After the basic skills of reading, writing, and arithmetic have been taught, practically all other content should be organized in terms of problems to be solved.
   b. The most efficient way to teach (and learn) is to analyze the basic essentials and teach them, drill them if necessary.

23 a. The elective system allows each student to select a program suited to his needs.
   b. The elective system has merit largely because it increases student interest; otherwise it would be just as well to have a carefully planned curriculum for all.

24 a. The main worth of the school’s content is in solving life problems.
   b. There is some very “impractical” content that should be included in the curriculum.

25 a. A curriculum based on a careful study of the needs of youth twenty years ago would probably be quite different from a curriculum based on a careful study of the needs of youth today.
   b. A study of the needs of youth today may reveal new approaches to teaching and new problems to be solved but the fundamentals of subject matter would probably not be changed much.

26 a. The best way to improve teaching is to give teachers more advanced work in their subject fields even to the elimination of many of the “education” courses.
   b. Study of ways of teaching and organizing subject matter is more fruitful in improving teaching than increased formal study of subject matter.

27 a. That which is easiest to learn should be taught first.
   b. What should be taught first must be determined by the subject matter.

28 a. If artificial incentives, such as marks, contests, etc., aid the student to master the fundamentals they should be employed.
   b. Ordinarily, it will not be necessary to employ artificial incentives if the content is worthwhile.

29 a. Content that cannot be shown to be useful rather immediately should be dropped.
   b. Much worthwhile content cannot be shown to be useful, at least very directly.
30. With most subjects, after a teacher has taught a course several times few changes will be needed in content and organization though new illustrations and problems should be incorporated.

b. Variable needs and conditions call for frequent changes in content and organization in most courses nearly every time they are taught.

a. Knowledge has no inherent value; its value is determined by its usefulness.

b. Usefulness is no index of the worth of knowledge; knowledge is either true or false.

32. Except for the cost, it would be a good idea to have a different curriculum for almost every student.

b. The school should act as a stabilizing influence by giving students a common background.

33. High school objectives in California should be quite similar to those in Maine or Wisconsin.

b. Different localities may require different sets of educational objectives.

34. It is inefficient for students to work out “solutions” to problems if the answers are known; the teacher should teach what is correct and make sure that the students learn it.

b. Many important objectives are attained by working out problem solutions even if fewer facts are learned.

35. Modernizing a curriculum is mainly a process of incorporating current problems as devices to illustrate the fundamentals.

b. The “essentials” to be taught change with changing conditions.

36. Even though perfectly objective methods of evaluating the “intangible” objectives are not available, attempts should be made to evaluate their attainment and they should be factors in marking.

b. It is more justifiable to mark almost entirely on the basis of facts and skills learned.

37. A periodic reappraisal of objectives and content is necessary not so much because the basic elements have changed but because our knowledge of them has been refined and extended through scientific discovery.

b. A periodic reappraisal of objectives and content is necessary because the needs of students and society may have changed and altered the purposes served by the school.

38. Science functions mainly to uncover knowledge.

b. Science, by opening new avenues to learning, actually aids in the creation of knowledge.

39. Objectives must keep close pace with social development.

b. The important objectives of education do not change with changing conditions.

40. Authorities on subject matter cannot do a good job of specifying content if they are not aware of the nature of the learners.

b. The selection of course content is a technical job, requiring a subject matter expert; a knowledge of the learner affects method of teaching, however.

41. Conscientious adult opinion is an important factor in revising objectives and content for a school system.

b. Revisions of any scope must be the products of careful scientific investigation by experts; public relations should be considered in reviewing community opinion, however.

42. Though students lack knowledge of subject matter they do know their needs and interests and therefore should have a significant voice in the selection of what should constitute a course.

b. There are certain basic elements that must be taught; there is little point in student selection of content if they are unfamiliar with the elements.

43. It is possible to know something without necessarily being able to make use of it.

b. What the student knows and what use he can make of his knowledge are practically the same thing.

44. Amount of content may be reduced if it is found that students are not mastering it, but the standards of attainment should remain the same.

b. Standards must vary with the needs and abilities of the learner.

45. Much student investigation of problems tends to lead students to doubt the existence of facts; whatever works is true.

b. Students should question “facts” because what can be considered a fact depends upon the use to which it is put.

46. Readiness of the student to learn is a very important factor in deciding what should be taught.

b. Learner readiness is important, but it is a factor in the method of teaching rather than in the selection of content.

47. Marks should take into account the relationship between students' abilities and their achievements.

b. Marks should be calculated against rather than fixed standards; otherwise they have no meaning.
a. Individual differences are best handled by providing for student selection of content under the guidance of the teacher.
b. Individual differences are better handled by objective subjects; what is included in the objectives should be decided by authorities in the field.

49
a. A follow-up of students should have a large part in revising a school's objectives.
b. The basic skills and knowledges do not change over a period of time; a follow-up does not change objectives.

50
a. Problems should be used as the bases for selecting and organizing content.
b. Problems are too numerous and specific to form the bases for organizing content; content must be reduced to fundamental skills and knowledges.

51
a. The main job of the school is to build a foundation of basic skills and knowledges.
b. The school must concern itself with present problems for they determine what should be taught.

52
a. After the skills of communication in a field have been taught, the remaining content should be conceived as a series of hypotheses to be proposed and tested.
b. Most subject matter is composed of elements of skill and knowledge; once these have been mastered it is a matter of applying them to problem situations.

53
a. There is a satisfaction which comes from knowledge for its own sake; the school should build on this kind of satisfaction.
b. There is little value in knowledge outside of the use that can be made of it.

54
a. The only kind of investigation worthy of the name is factual scientific experimentation.
b. There is much in education that should be investigated in a "practical" sense, i.e., does it work?

55
a. Good moral habits should be "drilled into" students without always analyzing the reasons for them.
b. Good moral habits cannot be acquired effectively without an understanding of the reasons for them; if the reasons change, the habits should be changed.

56
a. Teachers should teach students, not subject matter.
b. The former is largely a glib statement; unless the teacher imparts subject matter he has taught nothing.

57
a. It stimulates students to allow them to explore subject areas even if they do not discover the essential elements; however, the teacher should make sure that the essentials are pointed out and learned before the subject is left.
b. The importance of exploration is to develop methods and habits of investigation; the facts uncovered are of lesser importance.

58
a. In order to make objectives more explicit and useful it is necessary to state the kinds of behavior that will characterize the student who achieves them.
b. A more useful method of defining objectives is to list the content that must be covered to attain the objectives.

59
a. A carefully prepared textbook provides an excellent basis for organizing and teaching a course.
b. At best, books are never more than references because each class is different.

60
a. Complexity of subject matter determines what should be taught first; simple, elemental units must precede the more complex.
b. Complexity of subject matter is determined from within the student; what is complex for one student may be simple for another.

61
a. Vocational specialization can best be achieved in a vocational school or on the job; the high school should offer a common core of general subjects.
b. The high school must provide for some degree of specialization.

62
a. Psychological factors within the student are the best determiners of the order of instruction.
b. The content itself determines largely what should be taught first; it is the teacher's job to prepare the learner for what is to be taught.

63
a. Students should be encouraged to critically evaluate content against individual and social needs.
b. There is an inherent value to some content that cannot be determined by its use, at least very directly.

64
a. Objectives should be developed by the persons who are to use them, teachers and pupils.
b. Objectives should be derived by careful study by experts.

65
a. Subject matter should be organized around problems, each acquiring a different structure of facts for its solution.
b. Most subject matter is built of progressively more complex elements, each related to the previous.
INVENTORY OF VIEWPOINTS ON EDUCATION

ANSWER SHEET—Form A

| 1. a b | 2. a b | 3. a b | 4. a b | 5. a b | 6. a b | 7. a b | 8. a b | 9. a b | 10. a b | 11. a b | 12. a b | 13. a b | 14. a b | 15. a b | 16. a b | 17. a b | 18. a b | 19. a b | 20. a b | 21. a b | 22. a b | 23. a b | 24. a b | 25. a b | 26. a c | 27. a b | 28. a b | 29. a b | 30. a b | 31. a b | 32. a b | 33. a b | 34. a b | 35. a b | 36. a b | 37. a b | 38. a b | 39. a b | 40. a b | 41. a b | 42. a b | 43. a b | 44. a b | 45. a b | 46. a b | 47. a b | 48. a b | 49. a b | 50. a b | 51. a b | 52. a b | 53. a b | 54. a b | 55. a b | 56. a b | 57. a b | 58. a b | 59. a b | 60. a b | 61. a b | 62. a b | 63. a b | 64. a b | 65. a b |
## Experimental Group #1 Pre- and Post-Test Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student I.D. #</th>
<th>Pretest Score</th>
<th>Posttest Score</th>
<th>Differences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>+ 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>+ 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>+ 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>+ 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>+ 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>+ 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>+ 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>+ 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>- 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>- 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>- 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>+ 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>+ 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>+ 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>+ 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>+ 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>+ 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>- 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>+ 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>+ 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>+ 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>+ 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>- 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>+ 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>+ 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>+ 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>- 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>+ 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Unadjusted Means 46.9 49.3 + 2.4
### APPENDIX C

**Experimental Group #2 Pre- and Post-Test Scores**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student I.D. #</th>
<th>Pretest Score</th>
<th>Posttest Score</th>
<th>Differences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>+18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>+9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>+12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>+9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>+6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>+7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>+6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>+7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>+9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>+10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>+10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>+6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>+13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>+9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>+4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>+5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>+27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>+10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>+9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>+7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>+2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>+9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>+14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>+9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Unadjusted Means**

- Pretest: 38.5
- Posttest: 44.9
- Differences: +6.3
# Experimental Group #3 Pre- and Post-Test Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student I.D. #</th>
<th>Pretest Score</th>
<th>Posttest Score</th>
<th>Differences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>+ 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>+ 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>+ 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>- 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>+ 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>+ 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>+ 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>+ 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>+ 4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Unadjusted Means 41.0 46.7 + 5.7