

## TEACHERS FOR WHOM? A STUDY OF TEACHER EDUCATION PRACTICES IN CATHOLIC HIGHER EDUCATION

JOHN WATZKE

*University of Notre Dame*

*This article presents the results of a study of teacher education practices at 80 Catholic colleges and universities. The impetus for this work was the many Church documents in support of Catholic schools and the cooperative work of diocesan superintendents and educational leaders in the matter of teacher education. The goal of the study was to investigate questions fundamental to the role of Catholic higher education in the preparation of teachers: From where will the next generation of teachers to serve Catholic schools come? How does the preparation of teachers in Catholic institutions of higher education relate to the unique opportunities Catholic schools afford their communities? Do these programs serve Catholic schools? Given the dearth of research and professional literature specific to these questions, the study and data analysis were exploratory with the goal of identifying themes and issues for continued research, dialogue, and professional action.*

“Of the educational programs available to the Catholic community, Catholic schools afford the fullest and best opportunity to realize the...purpose of Christian education among children and young people [message, community, service, worship]” (National Conference of Catholic Bishops, 1972, p. 28).

### LITERATURE REVIEW: THE PREPARATION OF TEACHERS IN CATHOLIC HIGHER EDUCATION

The literature on Catholic K-12 education has focused upon a variety of issues: reduced enrollments, the shift to laity in staffing, change in the demographic trends of students and teachers, and a myriad of finance issues (Bryk, Lee, & Holland, 1993; Convey, 1992; Hunt, Joseph, & Nuzzi, 2001, 2002; Youniss & Convey, 2000). The decline in enrollments that has characterized Catholic schools since 1960 leveled off in the mid-1990s. Since 1994, enrollments have increased in each subsequent academic year (NCES, 2000).

Contemporary data on Catholic K-12 education provide a snapshot of general trends in national enrollments and staffing as of the 2000-2001 school year (McDonald, 2001). The 8,146 Catholic schools across the United States enroll 2,647,301 students. Forty-four percent of these schools have a waiting list for admission. The majority of enrolled students (86.4%) are Catholic and a quarter (25.6%) are minorities. A teaching force that is predominantly lay (93.5%) and Catholic (84%) educates these students.

Given the immense losses of students, staffing, and schools over the past 50 years, the preparation of teachers who will serve Catholic schools is critical to building upon the more recent growth in Catholic education. Who will serve as the next generation of teachers in these schools? How will they be prepared? What institutions or programs will prepare these teachers? The professional literature on teacher education practices in Catholic higher education is limited and presents conflicting views on a central purpose for the preparation of teachers for service in Catholic schools. This issue reflects continued debates on the existence and maintenance of Catholic schools and the need for a distinct focus in teacher education on the recruitment and preparation of teachers for Catholic schools. Definitive answers are not found in the literature and, as revealed in this study, many issues come forth in conflict with the central mission in service of K-12 Catholic schools.

One interpretation is that of a directive to focus on the revitalization of the Catholic school system. In 1980, the United States Catholic Conference challenged institutions of Catholic higher education to create programs specifically for Catholic educators (Helbling, 1993). The 1990 Apostolic Constitution, *Ex Corde Ecclesiae*, called upon these institutions to infuse Catholic identity into all university activities (John Paul II, 1990). In 1997, the Congregation for Catholic Education of the Vatican released *The Catholic School on the Threshold of the Third Millennium* (Congregation for Catholic Education, 1998). This document reaffirmed the call for an ecclesiastical nature to education.

Other proposals in the professional literature suggest a broader educational mission and more cautious approach. Under a proposed dual mission within Catholic higher education, drawing from the intellectual traditions of Catholicism and the world of modern knowledge (Turner, 1998), the preparation of teachers would serve a constituency beyond the Catholic school system. Pragmatic issues, such as institutional fiscal health and enrollment fluctuations, also place pressure on Catholic higher education to expand its mission beyond service to Catholic schools (Larréy, 1998). Additionally, an outright questioning of the need for Catholic schools in an American society that has accepted Catholicism into politics and broader communities has characterized discussions since the 1960s (Bryk, Lee, & Holland, 1993). These themes contrast with an overt mission to serve Catholic education.

The notion of a greater mission of service to all of education, inclusive of

Catholic schools, presents a serious problem in the practice of teacher education—the loss of emphasis on the needs of Catholic schools. Recent study of this problem has focused on recruitment and retention of teachers in Catholic schools and descriptive statistics of the work force and work place (Cook, 2002). It has been over 25 years since this problem has been studied on a national scale. In 1976, the National Catholic Educational Association (NCEA) completed a survey of teacher education practices in Catholic colleges and universities (NCEA, 1977). Although it was found that 71% supported the idea of special preparation for teachers entering Catholic schools, only 43% of the teacher education programs were self-described as “uniquely Catholic” and only 46% provided curricular or experiential components in the service of Catholic schools. Of the institutions surveyed, only 14% conducted research concerned with issues of Catholic education.

The context of a dual purpose in teacher education, one that serves all students while inclusive of the needs of Catholic schools, is explored by this study. It is with the premise that Catholic higher education has a role to play in the prosperity of Catholic schools that this work was carried out. The results highlight a vital component to Catholic education—programs that prepare teachers.

## **STUDY METHODOLOGY**

### **RESEARCH QUESTIONS**

The study of teacher education practices in Catholic institutions of higher education was informed by the literature review and the professional experience of its authors. Three research questions were:

1. How are K-12 Catholic schools served through teacher education practices in Catholic institutions?
2. What are the challenges to these programs in support of K-12 Catholic education through teacher preparation and outreach programs?
3. What are the demographic characteristics of these institutions and programs in relation to their service to K-12 Catholic education?

### **SURVEY DEVELOPMENT AND DISTRIBUTION**

An e-mail survey was developed based on the literature, interviews, discussions, and piloting with administrators of teacher education programs in Catholic higher education and superintendents of dioceses. Sources for item development were the 1976 NCEA study, literature on teacher characteristics in Catholic schools, and discussion and interviews with Catholic school administrators, particularly those originating at the annual conference of the Chief Administrators of Catholic Education (CACE). A focus group consisting of representatives from Catholic higher education and K-12 education

read versions of the survey and suggested revisions as a piloting process. The resulting survey was original in its final form. It consisted of three sections of open-ended questions: (1) mission of the institution and program (five questions); (2) demographics of the institution and program (three questions); and (3) curriculum and outreach of the institution and program (three questions) (see Appendix). The nature of the survey format did not lend itself to reliability measures.

The survey was distributed via e-mail to the department chair or director of 173 identified teacher education programs in Catholic colleges and universities in the spring of 2001. These individuals were selected through direct phone contact with each institution that first established the presence of a teacher education program and then identified the appropriate contact. Seven follow-up contacts by e-mail and phone were conducted through the spring of 2002 to non-responding institutions for a full-year effort in data collection.

## **DEMOGRAPHICS OF RESPONDENTS**

This study did not survey a random sample of the Catholic institutions certifying teachers. Rather, all 173 institutions involved in the preparation of teachers were surveyed. After the initial distribution and seven follow-up contacts, a total of 80 responses yielded a response rate of 46.2%. These respondents were compared to all institutions by size of undergraduate population and geographic region to gauge response bias (see Table 1). CACE initially determined the geographic region categories. These 14 regions were collapsed into larger East, Midwest, South, and West regions to ensure the anonymity of responding institutions. Chi-square analysis found no significant difference between the responding institutions and total sum of institutions according to region and size. The majority of institutions were in the lowest student population categories. In terms of geographic region, institutions from the East and Midwest represented greater percentages, reflective of the traditional predominance of Catholic higher education institutions in these two regions.

The CACE school regions were collapsed into geographic regions in the following way. The East region comprised CACE school regions 1 (Connecticut, Maine, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, New Hampshire, and Vermont), 2 (New York and Puerto Rico), 3 (Pennsylvania and New Jersey) and 4a (Delaware, District of Columbia, Florida, Georgia, and Maryland). The Midwest region comprised CACE regions 6 (Michigan and Ohio), 7 (Illinois, Indiana, and Wisconsin), 8 (Minnesota, North Dakota, and South Dakota) and 9 (Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, and Nebraska). The South region comprised CACE regions 4b (North Carolina, South Carolina, Virginia, Virgin Islands, and West Virginia), 5 (Alabama, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, and Tennessee), and 10 (Arkansas, Oklahoma, and Texas). The West region comprised CACE regions 11 (California, Hawaii, and Nevada),

12 (Alaska, Idaho, Montana, Oregon, and Washington) and 13 (Arizona, Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming).

**Table 1**  
**Comparison of Sample to All Institutions by Demographic Categories**  
**of Size of Undergraduate Population and Geographic Region**

	Sample		All Institutions	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
<b>Institution Size†</b>				
<i>Small</i> (< 2,000)	45	56.3	97	56.1
<i>Medium</i> (2,000-4,000)	21	26.2	53	30.6
<i>Large</i> (> 4,000)	14	17.5	23	13.3
Total	80	100.0	173	100.0
<b>Geographic Region††</b>				
<i>East</i>	34	42.5	76	43.9
<i>Midwest</i>	32	40.0	61	35.3
<i>South</i>	6	7.5	17	9.8
<i>West</i>	8	10.0	19	11.0
Total	80	100.0	173	100.0

Note: Chi-square tests for differences by institution size and region between the sample and all institution categories were not statistically significant:

$$\dagger X^2 = 1.97 < 5.99 (X2.05, df=2)$$

$$\dagger\dagger X^2 = 1.79 < 7.81 (X2.05, df=3)$$

Additional data were collected from the responding institutions for size of teacher education program faculty, size of program (number of students in a certification program), and number of annual graduates completing a teacher certification program (see Tables 2 and 3). The lower categories in these demographic variables were most represented. The average program employed 16.1 faculty members. Over 80% of programs were comprised of a total full- and part-time faculty of 25 members or less. The enrollment size of these programs was predominantly in the two categories representing ranges of 50-250 and 251-500 students. In terms of size as measured by number of annual graduates, these general trends were found: An even majority of institutions graduate less than 50 students and between 50 and 100 students; the remaining quarter of institutions graduate more than 100 students.

**Table 2**  
**Demographics of Responding Institutions: Size as Number of Faculty and Enrolled Students**

<b>Size of Program Faculty (full- and part-time)</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent</b>
< 5 total faculty	7	8.8
5-25	60	75.0
26-50	10	12.5
51-75	1	1.3
76-100	1	1.3
> 100	1	1.3
Total	80	100.0

  

<b>Size of Program (total students)</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent</b>
< 50 students	1	1.3
50-250	37	46.3
251-500	35	43.8
501-750	5	6.3
751-1,000	1	1.3
> 1,000	1	1.3
Total	80	100.0

Note: Total percentages may exceed 100.0 due to rounding. The mean for size of program faculty was calculated to be 16.1 members.

### **ANALYSIS OF DATA**

Analysis of responses to the survey's open-ended questions consisted of categorical assignment of responses, identification of trends in responses, and Chi-square tests of categorical and ordinal contingency tables. Initial analysis of the response data consisted of a three-step process based on grounded-theory procedures and techniques of qualitative research (Strauss & Corbin, 1990). Two researchers and one research assistant read each returned survey. All responses for each survey item were listed and compiled into a comprehensive list detailing the variety of answers. The research team worked together to collapse these comprehensive lists by survey item into categories that encompassed all of the responses and provided a structure for additional analysis. Each survey was then reread by the research team and responses placed into the reduced categories. The team met and resolved any questions of reassignment of the original responses to these reduced categories. Frequencies and percentages were derived and Chi-square analysis was conducted based on these categories. The survey responses underwent a final

**Table 3**  
**Demographics of Responding Institutions: Size as Number of Annual Graduates from Certification Program**

<b>Annual Graduates (undergraduate and graduate)</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent</b>
< 25	7	8.8
25-50	23	28.8
51-75	19	23.8
76-100	10	12.5
101-125	3	3.8
126-150	10	12.5
151-175	2	2.5
176-200	1	1.3
> 200	5	6.3
Total	80	100.0

  

<b>Annual Graduates by Collapsed Categories</b>		
Small (< 50)	30	37.5
Medium (50-100)	29	36.3
Large (> 100)	21	26.3
Total	80	100.0

Note: Total percentages may exceed 100.0 due to rounding.

reading to develop a narrative based on trends in responses, representative statements by responders, and findings derived from the categorical analysis. Results of this study are based on this analysis.

## RESULTS

The results are organized by themes related to the research questions: mission, faculty, the job market, curriculum and outreach, obstacles, and demographic relationships.

### **MISSION: TEACHERS FOR PUBLIC (AND CATHOLIC) EDUCATION**

As in the NCEA survey of 1976, the majority of respondents (67.5%) indicated that the preparation of teachers for Catholic schools was part of their mission as a teacher education program (see Table 4). Fifteen percent responded that this was a foundation of their program. Twelve percent stated that this was reflected through course offerings or education-related experiences, such as service projects and student teaching, focused on Catholic

schools. By qualifying their answers, many respondents indicated that Catholic education was part of their programmatic mission, but not fundamental to the preparation of teachers. For example, one respondent wrote:

Yes, although our primary commitment is high quality teacher preparation for a variety of settings. Several of our courses have a school component in parochial schools (along with placement in public schools). Some of our graduates take jobs in parochial schools. Our department mission statement does not single out Catholic schools.

**Table 4**  
**Response Categories: Do You See Preparing Catholic School Teachers as Part of Your Mission as a Teacher Education Program?**

<b>Catholic K-12 Education Mission</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Yes	32	40.0
Yes—It is the foundation of the teacher education program	12	15.0
Yes—Provide some courses and/or related experiences	10	12.5
Subtotal	54	67.5
Prepare students for diverse experience without a focus on Catholic education	21	26.3
No	5	6.3
Subtotal	26	32.6
Total	80	100.0

Note: Total percentages may exceed 100.0 due to rounding.

### **Mission in Broader and Public Educational Settings**

Nearly one-third of the respondents (32.6%) did not affirm a Catholic mission in their program. Six percent stated that providing teachers for Catholic schools was not part of their program mission. The larger proportion of respondents (26.3%) stated that the fundamental mission was to prepare teachers for a variety of education settings without a particular focus on Catholic schools. Many statements accompanying affirmative answers to the question of mission held the preparation of teachers for a variety of settings as paramount.

We see preparing teachers who can be effective in any setting as our mission, with a particular emphasis on urban schools.... We...support the idea of preparing teachers who can work with all children, within any specific type of school or school system.



This foreshadows a program of teacher education coursework and practical experiences limited to public education. Respondents qualified their answers to the question of mission to an academic program making no distinction between public and Catholic school teacher preparation: "Catholic school teachers are prepared in the same manner for certification as are public school teachers."

Another respondent echoed this sentiment:

We prepare students to become teachers in all schools, public and private. We do not offer special programs or courses for teaching in Catholic schools. We do not distinguish between preparing students for Catholic schools and public schools. Our mission, which flows from the mission of the college, is to prepare students who are "competent, caring, human, professionally active teachers dedicated to meeting the needs of all learners, to addressing changing demographics in urban and suburban schools, and to collaborating with families for the growth and development of their children."

## **LIMITED FACULTY EXPERIENCE IN CATHOLIC EDUCATION**

In the demographics section of the survey, respondents were asked to provide the total number of faculty with Catholic school experience (as a student, teacher, or administrator) and to gauge the percentage of faculty who support the preparation of teachers for Catholic schools as part of the programmatic mission. Responses to the latter question of support were deemed unusable because of the sparseness of responses and subjective nature of the question. The question of faculty experience in Catholic schools provided a nearly complete set of responses for analysis. Table 5 presents the distribution of responses. The programs averaged a rate of 32.3% faculty with some experience in Catholic schools. The majority of the programs (82.3%) employed a faculty in which 50% or less had experience in Catholic schools.

### **Catholic Education as Professionally Limiting and Sheltering**

It is interesting to note that none of the accompanying commentary in responses presented experience in Catholic schools as enriching or broadening to the professional development of pre-service teachers (undergraduate or graduate teacher candidates). Public education was the standard for the preparation of teachers. Many respondents described pre-service teaching experience in Catholic schools as professionally limiting. One respondent suggested that such experience makes teachers less employable—an attitude

**Table 5**  
**Response Categories: [What Percentage† of Your] Faculty Have Experience with the K-12 Catholic School System (as Teachers, Administrators, or Graduates of Catholic Education)?**

<b>Faculty w/ Catholic School Experience</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Few (0-25 %)	23	25.3
Some (26-50%)	25	57.0
Many (51-75%)	15	15.2
Most (76-100%)	11	2.5
Subtotal	74	100.0
Not Answered	6	††
<b>Total</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>††</b>

Note: †The survey asked for raw numbers. The percentages in this table have been calculated based on raw numbers provided by respondents regarding total number of faculty and total faculty with Catholic school experience. The responding institutions as a whole employed faculty of which 32.3% had experience in Catholic schools (mean of 16.1 total faculty and 5.2 faculty with Catholic school experience).

††The six non-respondents accounted for 7.5% of the total 80 responding institutions.

that would seem absurd during the present time of national teacher shortages: “We encourage our students to student teach in public schools for a utilitarian reason. Parochial schools will hire someone who has taught in a public school, but our experience has found that many public schools will not hire someone who student taught in a parochial school.” Other respondents voiced concerns that Catholic schools would provide a sheltered experience for teacher candidates:

Public schools perceive us as “sheltering” students in Catholic schools and preventing them from having “real world” experiences in public schools.... We think our students are more employable with public school teaching experience. We have to do all we can to make our students employable in a competitive job market in a high-cost-of-living area.

## **ORIENTATION TOWARD THE PUBLIC SCHOOL JOB MARKET**

The orientation toward public education reflected in limited faculty experience and attitudes toward the professional benefit to pre-service teacher experience in Catholic schools is supported by a focus on the public school job market. The proportion of employment opportunities in Catholic schools

is small in a market in which approximately 90% of K-12 students attend public schools (NCES, 2000). Respondents to this survey were asked to provide an estimate of the percentage of graduates who work in Catholic schools. Table 6 presents the distribution of responses. Not surprisingly, the vast majority of graduates from these institutions do not enter into employment in Catholic schools. Only 2.6% of the respondents reported more than half of their recent graduates as teaching in a Catholic school.

### **Reasons for a Public School Orientation**

Some respondents noted an orientation toward the public school job market. First, programs recognize that a majority of their students will seek employment in public schools: "We do encourage our graduates to consider parochial education as an option as they complete our program. However, most are interested in public education." Second, there is the realization that in preparing students for a competitive job market, a public school orientation provides an efficient model to meet the needs of a majority of students and local demands for teachers: "Right now, there is competition for our teacher graduates among the private schools, ...[local]...public schools, and some of the suburban districts." Another respondent stated:

We are too small to have a specialized program, or program component, specifically to prepare teachers for Catholic schools. We prepare students for licensure by the state which prepares them for teaching in any school requiring such a teaching credential.

Finally, discrepancy in pay between Catholic and public schools was cited as a reason for public school orientation:

One of the dilemmas is that the Catholic schools pay less than public schools and since our institution is private, our students graduate with sizable loan payments to make and frankly can't afford to teach in some of the Catholic schools.

## **CURRICULUM AND OUTREACH OF TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAMS**

### **Pre-service and In-service Teacher Curriculum Components**

Two survey questions asked whether the teacher education program's curriculum and outreach included elements of Catholic education. In terms of curriculum, 56.3% of programs included such a component, often in multiple ways (see Table 7). The most frequent responses were required coursework

**Table 6**  
**Response Categories: Approximately What Percentage of Your Graduates Go Into Catholic Education?**

<b>Graduates Teaching in Catholic Schools</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent</b>
>0-10%	45	57.0
>10-20%	13	16.5
>20-30%	11	13.9
>30-40%	6	7.6
>40-50%	2	2.5
>50-60%	1	1.3
>60-70%	0	0.0
>70-80%	1	1.3
>80-90%	0	0.0
>90-100%	0	0.0
Subtotal	79	100.0
Not answered	1	†
Total	80	†
<b>Graduates by Collapsed Categories</b>		
Very Few (0-5%)	20	25.3
Few (6-25%)	45	57.0
Some (26-50%)	12	15.2
Many (51-75%)	2	2.5
Most (76-100%)	0	0.0
Subtotal	79	100.0
Not answered	1	†
Total	80	†

Note: †The one non-respondent accounted for 1.3% of the total 80 responding institutions. Total percentages may exceed 100.0 due to rounding.

for all pre-service teachers (18.8%), followed by courses and workshops for students who had indicated a desire to teach in Catholic schools (17.5%). Educational experiences taking place in Catholic schools (practicum, student teaching, and volunteer programs) were cited by 12.5% of the respondents. A number of programs (12.5%) also provided professional development instruction to in-service (practicing) teachers in Catholic schools. A large portion of the respondents (43.8%) reported no curriculum component relat-

ing to work in Catholic schools. Another respondent stated: "Unfortunately, parochial schools pay much lower than public schools in our area, so most of our graduates aspire to teach in public schools."

**Table 7**

**Response Categories: Is There Any Element(s) Within Your Teacher Education Curriculum That Is Specifically Designed for Catholic School Teachers (Coursework, Workshops, Specific Track, etc.)?**

**Curriculum with K-12 Catholic Component**

<b>Pre-service teachers:</b>	<b>Frequency†</b>	<b>Percent†</b>
Courses required for certification of new teachers	15	18.8
Courses, workshops, or programs for pre-service teachers intending to teach in Catholic schools	14	17.5
Volunteer work, practicum, or student teaching in Catholic schools	10	12.5
<b>In-service teachers:</b>		
Courses, in-services, or tuition reduction for certification or graduate studies for current Catholic school teachers	10	12.5
None	35	43.8

Note: †Total may exceed 80 (f) and 100.0 (%) due to multiple answers. Compensating for multiple answers, 56.3% of responding institutions offer at least one of the curricular components presented in Table 7.

**Pre-service and In-service Teacher Outreach Components**

Numerous forms of outreach to Catholic schools were reported by respondents (see Table 8). Specific to pre-service teachers were partnerships with local schools involving practicum or student teaching experiences (27.5%), partnerships focused on improved student learning, such as student volunteer and tutoring programs (21.3%), and programs to encourage employment in Catholic schools, such as recruiting and informational meetings with school and diocesan personnel (7.5%). Other outreach initiatives included grant and partnership programs (21.3%), professional development programs for in-service teachers, such as workshops (21.3%), and tuition reduction or waivers (15.0%). Smaller proportions of respondents cited advisory or consultative service to Catholic schools in the form of curriculum, financial planning, and academic standards development (13.8%), the employment of Catholic school teachers and administrators as adjunct instructors (6.3%), and administration of a campus or lab school (3.8%) as forms of outreach. A smaller

portion of respondents (16.3%) cited no form of outreach in comparison with non-affirmative responses in curricular components.

**Table 8**  
**Response Categories: Is There Any Special Relationship**  
**Between Your Teacher Education Program and**  
**the K-12 Catholic Schools in Your Area?**

<b>Relationship with Area K-12 Catholic schools</b>	<b>Frequency†</b>	<b>Percent†</b>
<b>Pre-service teachers:</b>		
Partnership program related to practicum and/or student teaching	22	27.5
In-school programs to benefit student learning (tutoring, reading)	17	21.3
Program to encourage employment in Catholic schools	6	7.5
<b>Other initiatives:</b>		
Unexplained grant or partnership program	17	21.3
In-service/workshops for current Catholic school teachers	17	21.3
Tuition reduction or academic program for current Catholic school teachers and administrators	12	15.0
Advisory/consultative	11	13.8
Employ Catholic school teachers and administrators as adjunct instructors	5	6.3
Lab/campus school	3	3.8
None	13	16.3

Note: †Total may exceed 80 (f) and 100.0 (%) due to multiple answers. Compensating for multiple answers, 83.8% of responding institutions offer at least one of the forms of outreach presented in Table 8.

### **OBSTACLES TO PRE-SERVICE TEACHER EDUCATION CURRICULUM AND OUTREACH BASED IN CATHOLIC SCHOOLS**

The ways in which pre-service undergraduate and graduate students are introduced to the possibility of work in Catholic schools are important at this formative stage in a career in education. To what extent do teacher education programs familiarize students with the needs and possibilities in Catholic education? Responses to the questions of curriculum and outreach were re-categorized to reflect whether a program included a focus on pre-service

teachers (see Table 9). The results demonstrate the discrepancy between mission, curriculum, and outreach affecting new teacher candidates. Approximately one-third of the respondents (36.3%) reported a pre-service curricular component oriented toward Catholic education and 57.5% reported a pre-service outreach component in cooperation with Catholic schools.

**Table 9**  
**Teacher Education Curriculum and Outreach Responses**  
**Re-Categorized by Pre-Service Teacher Focus (Yes vs. No)**  
**on Catholic School Experience**

<b>Program Component Focused on Pre-service Experience in K-12 Catholic Schools</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent</b>
<b>Curriculum</b>		
Yes	29	36.3
No	51	63.8
Total	80	100.0
<b>Outreach</b>		
Yes	46	57.5
No	34	42.5
Total	80	100.0

Practicum and student teaching experiences were the most frequently reported forms of outreach (see Table 8). The question of whether programs place students in Catholic schools was asked in the curriculum section of the survey. Response categories are presented in Table 10. Most institutions place students who are fulfilling their practicum experience (82.5%) and student teachers (73.8%) in Catholic schools as a general practice. Some respondents qualified a positive response with the statement that such placements were part of a shared or split experience with public schools (10.0% for practicum and student teaching) or that such placements depended on the request of individual students (10.0% for practicum and 8.8% for student teaching). As one respondent qualified, "We do not seek to place [student or practicum] teachers in Catholic schools unless they ask because we try to place students in the school system where they wish to obtain a teaching position."

**Table 10**  
**Response Categories: Do You Place Practicum Students**  
**and Student Teachers in Catholic Schools? If Not, Why?**

	Practicum Student		Students Teachers	
	Freq.	Percent	Freq.	Percent
Yes	50	62.5	44	55.0
Yes—split between Catholic and public schools	8	10.0	8	10.0
Yes—upon student request	8	10.0	7	8.8
Subtotal	66	82.5	59	73.8
No—because of state requirements/law	6	7.5	11	13.8
No	2	2.5	3	3.8
Rarely	3	3.8	2	2.5
No—other experiences in Catholic schools provided	2	2.5	3	3.8
No—reduces employability	1	1.3	2	2.5
Subtotal	14	17.6	21	26.4
Total	80	100.0	80	100.0

Note: Total percentages may exceed 100.0 due to rounding.

### Obstacles to Placement in Catholic Schools

In addition to a lack of interest by some students for pre-service teaching in Catholic schools, several obstacles were identified by respondents who answered non-affirmatively to placement of practicum students (17.6%) and student teachers (26.4%) (see Table 10). Prohibitive state laws was the most frequent response (7.5% for practicum and 13.8% for student teaching). Respondents explained that such laws recognize practice teaching in only state-accredited schools and that some Catholic schools do not meet these criteria: “[Our]...state requires all practicum and student teaching experience to be completed in a public school environment or in a school that has been accepted by the State Department of Education as an appropriate environment.” Another respondent stated: “We make every effort to place our student teachers in public schools in order to earn state certification.” Some respondents commented that state education law specifically prohibited student teaching in non-public schools, accounting for the smaller percentage of this experience in Catholic schools: “As student teachers pursuing state credentials...training is done only in public schools.”



Other issues compounded the problem of state laws. Geographic location, the fact that state-accredited Catholic schools or Catholic schools in general were situated at a great distance from the program, was a prohibitive factor: "There is one accredited high school...120 miles from here." Additionally, some state laws also required specific curricular components in practice teaching not available in Catholic schools according to respondents: "We do not typically place students in Catholic schools for student teaching. Catholic schools do not ordinarily follow the curriculum frameworks upon which certification regulations for prospective teachers are based." Another respondent stated: "We do not [place student teachers in Catholic schools] in our undergraduate program. The primary reason is the need for a student teacher to have involvement in the special education program in a K-12 district."

The expanded response categories and additional commentary on the question of practicum and student teaching placement describe the underlying complexity of providing formative school experience in Catholic schools. Although the majority of responding institutions place pre-service teachers in Catholic schools, there is evidence to suggest that few require this. More likely is the practice of limited Catholic school placements in light of the predominance of public education. For example, one respondent explained that student teachers are placed in Catholic schools "if [a] student wishes to do so and approximately 15% do." When describing curriculum components related to Catholic education (see Table 7), only 18.8% described required courses and 12.5% practice teaching. Respondents seem to be saying that, while they support the idea of practice teaching in Catholic schools, it is not common in the preparation of new teachers.

## **RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN INSTITUTIONAL DEMOGRAPHICS AND RESPONSES**

To explore the relationship between the demographic characteristics of responding institutions and responses to the survey, a series of Chi-square analyses were conducted. Table 11 presents the results and notes of these analyses. Three types of analyses were conducted. First, contingency tables were developed comparing demographic variables and response variables. Program size was represented in terms of annual graduates from the teacher certification program and by the collapsed variables small, medium, and large described in Table 3. Each of the response variables, excluding "% of Graduates Going into Catholic Education," was represented by a dichotomous yes or no variable. The second analysis explored the relationship between the level of the percentage of graduates working in Catholic schools and both demographic and response variables. The third analysis explored the relationship between the program's mission (whether it supports the preparation of teachers for Catholic schools) and demographic and response variables. Analysis results (Chi-square statistics, degrees of freedom, significance level) are summarized in Table 11 with statistically significant tests

Table 11  
Relationships Between Demographics and Responses: Chi-Square Tests

	Response Variables					
	Mission	Curriculum (Pre-service)	Outreach (Pre-service)	Practicum Students	Student Teachers	% Graduates in CE
<b>Demographic Variables</b>						
Institution Size	$X^2 = .762$ df = 2 p = .683	$X^2 = 9.09$ df = 2 p = <b>.011*</b>	$X^2 = 5.93$ df = 2 p = .052	$X^2 = .445$ df = 2 p = .800	$X^2 = .314$ df = 2 p = .855	$X^2 = 6.77$ df = 6 p = .342
Region	$X^2 = 4.98$ df = 3 p = .174	$X^2 = 6.78$ df = 3 p = .079	$X^2 = 7.54$ df = 3 p = .057	$X^2 = 5.88$ df = 3 p = .118	$X^2 = 13.51$ df = 3 p = .004**	$X^2 = 12.92$ df = 9 p = .166
% Faculty with Cath. School Experience	$X^2 = 2.05$ df = 3 p = .561	$X^2 = 1.71$ df = 3 p = .635	$X^2 = 4.54$ df = 3 p = .209	$X^2 = 2.66$ df = 3 p = .447	$X^2 = 1.04$ df = 3 p = .791	$X^2 = 8.53$ df = 9 p = .482
Program Size (graduates)	$X^2 = 1.79$ df = 2 p = .408	$X^2 = .939$ df = 2 p = .625	$X^2 = 4.38$ df = 2 p = .112	$X^2 = 1.63$ df = 2 p = .442	$X^2 = .023$ df = 2 p = .989	$X^2 = 5.97$ df = 6 p = .427
% Graduates in CS	$X^2 = 4.01$ df = 3 p = .261	$X^2 = 8.29$ df = 3 p = <b>.040*</b>	$X^2 = 4.61$ df = 3 p = .203	$X^2 = 5.85$ df = 3 p = .119	$X^2 = 3.02$ df = 3 p = .389	—
Mission	—	$X^2 = 9.25$ df = 1 p = <b>.002**</b>	$X^2 = 4.56$ df = 1 p = <b>.033*</b>	$X^2 = 5.30$ df = 3 p = <b>.021*</b>	$X^2 = 2.85$ df = 1 p = .091	$X^2 = 4.01$ df = 3 p = .261

Note: \*p<.05, \*\*p<.01

highlighted. Individual contingency tables for significant results are presented in each summary section.

See the following tables for descriptions of variables and corresponding categories used in the analyses: Institution Size – Table 1; *Region* – Table 1; *% of Faculty with Catholic School Experience* – Table 5; *Program Size (graduates)* – Table 3 (collapsed categories); *% of Graduates in CE (Catholic Education)* – Table 6 (collapsed categories); *Mission – Do you see preparing teachers for Catholic schools as part of your mission?* – Table 4 (collapsed into yes/no variable); *Curriculum (pre-service)* – Table 9 (collapsed); *Outreach (pre-service)* – Table 9 (collapsed); *Practicum Students Placed into Catholic Schools* – Table 10 (collapsed into yes/no variable); *Student Teachers Placed into Catholic Schools* – Table 10 (collapsed into yes/no variable).

Before discussing significant results, it should be emphasized that the majority of tests were not found to be significant. In other words, the trends described in the preceding sections tend to cut across all institutional demographics. Three findings in the areas of curriculum, mission, and region point to specific issues for further study.

### **Pre-service Curricular Components**

Three of the analyses produced significant results in terms of whether the teacher education curriculum included components orienting pre-service teachers to Catholic education. Table 12 presents the curriculum by institution size contingency table. This table shows that larger institutions, those with undergraduate enrollments greater than 4,000, are more likely to include such curriculum components in their programs. Table 13 presents the contingency table comparing curriculum to the percentage of graduates working in Catholic education. This table demonstrates an association between curriculum and employment. A greater proportion of graduates who had completed programs with a Catholic education curriculum component teach in Catholic schools. Table 14 presents the contingency table comparing curriculum to the mission of the teacher education program—whether the preparation of teachers for Catholic schools is considered part of the program's mission. This comparison shows that those institutions with Catholic education curricular components in a greater proportion consider Catholic schools in their mission to prepare teachers.

### **Mission as Reflected in Curriculum, Outreach, and Practicum**

The purpose for comparing mission with demographic and other response variables was twofold. First, there was the question of whether general characteristics of institutions and programs, such as size and percentage of faculty with Catholic school experience, were associated with mission. The second, and equally important, question was whether the statements made by

**Table 12**  
**Chi-Square Contingency Table: Curriculum (Pre-service)**  
**by Institution Size**

Curricular Component(s) with Focus on Pre-Service Teachers		Institution Size			
		Small	Medium	Large	Total
Yes	Count	13	6	10	29
	Row %	44.8	20.7	34.5	100.0
No	Count	31	14	4	49
	Row %	63.3	28.6	8.2	100.0
Total	Count	44	20	14	78
	Row %	56.4	25.6	17.9	100.0

Note:  $X^2 = 8.57$ ,  $df = 2$ ,  $p = .014$

**Table 13**  
**Chi-Square Contingency Table: Curriculum (Pre-service) by**  
**Percentage of Graduates into Catholic Education**

Curricular Component(s) with Focus on Pre-Service Teachers		% of Graduates into Catholic Education				Total
		Very Few	Few	Some	Many	
Yes	Count	4	16	7	2	29
	Row %	13.8	55.2	24.1	6.9	100.0
No	Count	16	27	5	0	48
	Row %	33.3	56.3	10.4	0.0	100.0
Total	Count	20	43	12	2	77
	Row %	26.0	55.8	15.6	2.6	100.0

Note:  $X^2 = 8.16$ ,  $df = 3$ ,  $p = .043$

**Table 14**  
**Chi-Square Contingency Table: Curriculum (Pre-service) by Mission**

		<b>Mission—Prepare Teachers for Catholic Schools</b>		
		<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>Total</b>
<b>Curricular Component(s) with Focus on Pre-Service Teachers</b>	Yes	Count 26	3	29
		Row % 89.7	10.3	100.0
No	Count	27	22	49
	Row %	55.1	44.9	100.0
Total	Count	53	25	78
	Row %	67.9	32.1	100.0

Note:  $X^2 = 9.99$ ,  $df = 1$ ,  $p = .002$

respondents regarding programmatic mission actually accounted for differences in the structure of these programs. The Chi-square analyses produced significant results in terms of curriculum, outreach, and practicum. Tables 15, 16, and 17 present the contingency tables comparing mission with whether a program includes a Catholic schools component focused on pre-service teachers in its curriculum and outreach efforts and whether they place practicum teachers in Catholic schools. These tables demonstrate that those institutions that described their mission as including the preparation of teachers for Catholic schools did indeed have corresponding components in their curriculum, outreach, and placement in greater proportions than those institutions whose mission did not.

**Table 15**  
**Chi-Square Contingency Table: Mission by Curriculum (Pre-Service)**

		<b>Curricular Component(s) with Focus on Pre-Service Teachers</b>		
		<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>Total</b>
<b>Mission—Prepare Teachers for Catholic Schools</b>	Yes	Count 26	27	53
		Row % 49.1	50.9	100.0
No	Count	3	22	25
	Row %	12.0	88.0	100.0
Total	Count	29	49	78
	Row %	37.2	62.8	100.0

Note:  $X^2 = 9.99$ ,  $df = 1$ ,  $p = .002$

**Table 16**  
**Chi-Square Contingency Table: Mission by Outreach (Pre-Service)**

<b>Mission—Prepare Teachers for Catholic Schools</b>		<b>Outreach with Focus on Pre-Service Teachers</b>		
		<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>Total</b>
Yes	Count	36	17	53
	Row %	67.9	32.1	100.0
No	Count	10	15	25
	Row %	40.0	60.0	100.0
Total	Count	46	32	78
	Row %	59.0	41.0	100.0

Note:  $X^2 = 5.48$ ,  $df = 1$ ,  $p = .019$

**Table 17**  
**Chi-Square Contingency Table: Mission by Practicum Students**

<b>Mission—Prepare Teachers for Catholic Schools</b>		<b>Practicum in Catholic Schools</b>		
		<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>Total</b>
Yes	Count	49	6	55
	Row %	89.1	10.9	100.0
No	Count	17	8	25
	Row %	68.0	32.0	100.0
Total	Count	66	14	80
	Row %	82.5	17.5	100.0

Note:  $X^2 = 5.30$ ,  $df = 3$ ,  $p = .021$

### **Regional Differences and Student Teaching**

Table 18 presents the contingency table for region and the placement of student teachers in Catholic schools. This table demonstrates regional differences in this programmatic component with smaller proportions of institutions in the East and West placing student teachers in Catholic schools. The previous sections described several obstacles to this practice that may account for these differences by region of the country. The following discussion expands on these results and proposes questions for continued research.

**Table 18**  
**Chi-Square Contingency Table: Region by Student Teachers**

**Student Teachers in Catholic Schools**

<b>Geographic Region</b>		<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>Total</b>
East	Count	19	15	34
	Row %	55.9	44.1	100.0
South	Count	6	2	8
	Row %	75.0	25.0	100.0
Midwest	Count	30	2	32
	Row %	93.8	6.3	100.0
West	Count	3	3	6
	Row %	50.0	50.0	100.0
Total	Count	58	22	80
	Row %	73.1	26.9	100.0

Note:  $X^2 = 13.51$ ,  $df = 3$ ,  $p = .004$

## **DISCUSSION: LIMITATIONS AND QUESTIONS**

This study reports the results of a current survey of practices in Catholic higher education concerning teacher education. The findings identify major issues facing these programs in the preparation of a teacher workforce dedicated to serving Catholic schools: institutional and student orientation toward the public school job market, a questioning of the appropriateness of the Catholic school setting for pre-service teacher experience, limited curriculum components oriented toward Catholic education, and various obstacles to pre-service teaching in Catholic schools. Additionally, it provides evidence of a dominant practice that focuses on public education as a means for preparing pre-service teachers for future employment in a variety of educational settings, including Catholic schools. These issues directly reflect the differing views in the professional literature on the mission and approach to change facing Catholic higher education. They expand this dialogue and open the discussion to greater issues of the effects of predominant practices and approaches in teacher education on K-12 Catholic schools.

## LIMITATIONS TO THE STUDY

Before further discussion of the results, it is important to mention several limitations relating the results to interpretation. First, the open-ended design of the survey instrument presents a challenge to data summary. The intense process of multiple readings and classification of responses to establish trends is intended to take advantage of the rich variety of responses gained from the survey instrument. In contrast to multiple choice or rating scales, such an open-ended instrument and subsequent data analysis rely on respondents providing thoughtful responses and the researcher providing appropriate interpretation. One item was excluded from analysis precisely because neither of these two criteria was met. This subjective element cannot be disregarded in the interpretation of results.

A second limitation is the use of Chi-square analysis in the identification of trends. Whereas insignificant results in Table 11 allow for the conclusion that differences between percentages among variables are random or potentially due to chance, significant results generally point to the necessity for further research. Care must be taken not to project intuitive interpretations as conclusive results or causal relationships in reading contingency Tables 12-18. For example, the association of region to placement of student teachers in Catholic schools presented in contingency Table 18 does not definitively identify any one of the four regions as indicative of this trend. Rather, the table indicates that differences exist among regions and that follow-up research is required to determine which regions differ significantly and why. Similarly, the association between curriculum and the percentage of graduates in Catholic schools presented in contingency Table 13 does not suggest that revision of curricula in teacher education programs will lead to a larger Catholic teacher workforce. This study identified many factors potentially contributing both to curriculum and job market trends that indicate a more complex association.

A final limitation relates to response rate and instrument design. The question of response bias has been addressed by a large response rate from the respondents and the comparison by region and size of the responding institutions. However, the need for seven follow-up surveys indicates a reluctance to participate in the study and opens the question of self-selection in response. The topic of this survey is not popular in the literature, which may indicate one underlying reason for the need for multiple follow-ups. There remains the question of whether the trends identified in this survey present an accurate description of practices in Catholic institutions or whether they mask more extreme trends. Further research would support the findings of this study.



## **DOES A FOCUS ON PUBLIC EDUCATION SERVE CATHOLIC SCHOOLS?**

Despite the fact that the majority of K-12 education takes place in public schools, many teacher education programs include curriculum and outreach components focused on Catholic schools. Those programs that consider as part of their mission the preparation of teachers for Catholic schools (67.5% of respondents) tend to include such components (36.3% in pre-service curriculum and 57.5% in pre-service outreach). For the majority of those responding "no" to the question of mission, preparing good teachers rather than providing teachers for a specific educational setting was the ultimate goal. It is likely that this idea drives the mission of a greater proportion of institutions, thus explaining the large gap in responses between mission and its realization in curriculum and outreach. Does such an approach, which focuses on public education, serve Catholic schools? The evidence suggests that it probably does not. The only variable in this study associated with an increased percentage of graduates working in Catholic schools is a pre-service curriculum component targeting Catholic education, which is part of just over one-third of teacher education programs. A focus on public schools, according to respondents, provides a broader, more diverse field experience for pre-service teachers in terms of student populations and curriculum. Additionally, respondents perceived that state laws requiring practicum and student teaching placements in state-accredited schools and state-mandated curricula favor public schools as the preferred environment for field experience. One of the many sources of such a perception, beyond state law, may be the faculty teaching in these programs. It is conceivable that a disinterest or indifference for Catholic schools and a priority on the many problems facing public education is the result of limited faculty experience in Catholic education and limited curriculum and pre-service teaching in these schools.

Several points for continued research would clarify this issue. First, the study of how state law affects the ability of programs to provide Catholic school experiences to pre-service teachers and the ways programs work around these laws is needed. Many states are implementing broader programmatic requirements in conjunction with praxis tests as a final determinant for certification. This has allowed for pre-service teaching in a variety of instructional settings. An in-depth study of current education laws for regulations vis-à-vis programmatic practices would better address this issue in terms of obstacles or attitudes.

Second, study of the employment and work experiences of teacher education graduates who completed pre-service teaching in Catholic schools would examine the employability issues cited by the survey respondents. Do these graduates experience more difficulty finding work? Are they sheltered

or in any way inhibited if they choose to work in public schools upon graduation? Is there indeed a negative perception by potential public school employers? How many K-12 Catholic school teachers leave Catholic education in any given year for teaching positions in public schools? What percentage of public school teachers have Catholic school experience? The answers to these questions would provide valuable information for discussion and action on this issue.

### **CAN PROGRAMS AFFORD TO FOCUS ON CATHOLIC SCHOOLS?**

Respondents cited several pragmatic reasons for a focus on public education over Catholic education. The encompassing theme was economic: serving students' preferences for employment, an efficient model for serving the most students, the demand for teachers in public schools, and superior pay structures in public schools. In this context, it is not surprising that size of an institution is associated with whether a program offers curriculum components based in Catholic education (see Table 12). This suggests that larger institutions have the resources to offer a more directed curriculum or electives for students wishing to teach in Catholic schools. It may be the case that these larger institutions are located in urban areas where the number of Catholic schools, particularly those in diverse settings, is greater, thus providing more opportunities for coordinated curriculum components. Further research would serve to investigate the economic pressures on institutions to graduate students with an orientation toward the public school job market. Besides size of institution, what other factors contribute to this pressure? How and why do some smaller institutions overcome this pressure? Does outside funding, state or federal grants for example, affect this orientation? How do programmatic decisions affect enrollments? There remains a demand for teachers in Catholic schools. This research is vital if the economic pressures cited by respondents are a major deterrent to teacher education for the service of Catholic schools.

### **ARE THERE REGIONAL DIFFERENCES?**

The analysis identified a difference among regions of the country in the practice of placing student teachers in Catholic schools (see Table 18). The general trend was that of the eastern and western regions having lower rates of placement. The commentary from respondents offered such reasons as state law and limited Catholic schools by region. It might be that a greater proportion of the institutions in these two regions are smaller colleges facing the economic pressures previously described. However, more research is needed to answer this question. As a focused line of research, detailed information on placement practices of pre-service practicum and student teachers would not only reaffirm potential differences by region, it would also distinguish

between those programs open to the possibility of placement in Catholic schools (who answered "yes" in the survey) and those that actually require it as a programmatic component. As with other significant associations, the notion that differences exist by region is an indication of the need for more research into the underlying issues related to this finding.

### **CAN A FOCUS ON CATHOLIC SCHOOLS SERVE PUBLIC EDUCATION?**

Only 2.5% of responding institutions reported that more than half of their graduates seek work in Catholic schools (see Table 6). Responses make clear that there are many graduates who complete a teacher education program with curricular and pre-service teaching components in Catholic education and subsequently work in public schools. Can a teacher education program orient teacher candidates to Catholic education while providing for possible careers in public schools? Are these two completely separate institutions for which serving one essentially usurps the other? We know there are many Catholic schools, both urban and rural, that provide ideal settings for the broadest of teacher education experiences without sheltering teacher candidates from the realities of the classroom. The proposal put forward by the National Conference of Catholic Bishops that these schools are to be a place in which the ideas of message, community, service, and worship are put into practice is certainly not a deterrent to work in public education. Rather, it models education as a career vocation—more than a profession, a way of life, a calling.

As teacher candidates continue the process of discernment through their education coursework and experiences, such a positive and healthy perspective on a career in teaching can only serve to better all forms of education (Palmer, 1998). This question is worthy of research for it not only touches upon the many pragmatic deterrents to a focus on Catholic education, it gets to the very heart of mission as a driving force of teacher education. Besides the study of graduates' experiences in the job market and workplace, it would be valuable to explore both Catholic and public school employers' perceptions and experiences with new teachers graduated from various Catholic institutions. Are there aspects of the education of recent graduates that are lacking for employment? For teaching? One wonders whether the answers would be different or similar for public and Catholic school employers.

### **CONCLUSION**

The findings of this study suggest marked differences between a vision of Catholic education and practices in teacher education. In many cases, mission does not translate to practice with respect to Catholic schools. To summarize:

- The majority of respondents (67.5%) report that their program supports the preparation of teachers for K-12 Catholic schools; 56.3% report a curriculum component and 83.8% a form of outreach in support of Catholic education.
- Nearly one-third (32.6%) of respondents stated that the programmatic mission does not specifically support preparing teachers for Catholic schools. The accompanying respondent commentary focused on the theme of preparing effective teachers for any educational setting, making no programmatic distinction between Catholic or public education.
- In terms of faculty, less than one-third (32.2%) working in the respondents' teacher education programs have experience in Catholic schools (as a student, teacher, or administrator).
- In the preparation of pre-service teachers (new teacher candidates), there exists a pervasive orientation toward the public school job market. Most recent graduates of the responding teacher education programs do not work in Catholic schools. The majority of programs (81.6%) reported less than 25.0% of recent graduates working in these schools. Fewer teacher education programs include formative pre-service curriculum (36.3%) and outreach (57.5%) components based in service to Catholic schools.
- Respondents identified several reasons for an orientation to public education: attitudes suggesting Catholic pre-service teaching experiences are professionally limiting or sheltering, the fact that a majority of their graduates will seek work in public schools, public education as the most efficient way of serving the majority of students' professional goals, and the discrepancy in pay between public and Catholic schools.
- A high proportion of respondents reported that their program places student teachers (73.8%) and practicum students (82.5%) in Catholic schools. This conflicts with lower rates of pre-service teaching reported in curriculum components (12.5%) and described in respondent commentary. The respondents identified several obstacles to the placement of pre-service teachers in Catholic schools: lack of student interest, prohibitive state education law, non-accredited Catholic schools, geographic location of Catholic schools, and lack of Catholic school curriculum aligned with state mandates.
- Several relationships were found between institutional demographics and survey responses suggesting more research is needed on these issues: (1) whether a program included pre-service curriculum components based in Catholic schools was associated with larger institutions, those in which more recent graduates worked in Catholic schools, and whether the programmatic mission supported the preparation of teachers for Catholic schools; (2) programmatic mission was also associated with pre-service curriculum, outreach, and practicum components focused on Catholic schools; and (3) responding institutions in the East and West were less likely to place student teachers in Catholic schools.

This study has outlined an agenda for the study of these and related questions. Research, discussion, and action on teacher education and its effects on K-12 Catholic schools will help.

## REFERENCES

- Bryk, A., Lee, V., & Holland, P. (1993). *Catholic schools and the common good*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Congregation for Catholic Education. (1998). The Catholic school on the threshold of the third millennium. *Catholic Education: A Journal of Inquiry and Practice*, 2(2), 4-14.
- Convey, J. J. (1992). *Catholic schools make a difference: Twenty-five years of research*. Washington, DC: National Catholic Educational Association.
- Cook, T. J. (2002). Teachers. In T. C. Hunt, E. A. Joseph, & R. J. Nuzzi (Eds.), *Catholic schools still make a difference: Ten years of research 1991-2000* (pp. 57-72). Washington, DC: National Catholic Educational Association.
- Helbling, M. (1993). Formation of Catholic educational leadership throughout the twentieth century. *Religious Education*, 88(4), 543-563.
- Hunt, T. C., Joseph, E. A., & Nuzzi, R. J. (2002). *Catholic schools still make a difference: Ten years of research 1991-2000*. Washington, DC: National Catholic Educational Association.
- Hunt, T. C., Joseph, E. A., & Nuzzi, R. J. (2001). *Handbook of research on Catholic education*. Westport, CT: Greenwood.
- John Paul II. (1990). *Apostolic constitution Ex Corde Ecclesiae of the Supreme Pontiff John Paul II on Catholic universities*. Washington, DC: Office for Publication and Promotion Services, United States Catholic Conference.
- Larréy, M. F. (1998). Clouded horizons: Catholic higher education in the coming decade. *Catholic Education: A Journal of Inquiry and Practice*, 1(4), 414-426.
- McDonald, D. (2001). *United States Catholic elementary and secondary schools 2000-2001*. Washington, DC: National Catholic Educational Association.
- National Catholic Educational Association. (1977). Survey report on teacher education in Catholic colleges and universities. *Occasional Papers, Summer*, 4-6. Washington, DC: Author.
- National Center for Educational Statistics, U. S. Department of Education. (2000). *Digest of Education Statistics 1999*. Washington, DC: United States Government Printing Office. NCES 2000-031.
- National Conference of Catholic Bishops. (1972). *To teach as Jesus did: A pastoral message on Catholic education*. Washington, DC: United States Catholic Conference.
- Palmer, P. J. (1998). *The courage to teach*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Strauss, A., & Corbin, J. (1990). *Basics of qualitative research: Grounded theory procedures and techniques*. Newbury Park, CA: SAGE
- Turner, J. (1998). The Catholic university in modern academe: Challenge and dilemma. *Catholic Education A Journal of Inquiry and Practice*, 1(3), 252-262.
- Youniss, J., & Convey, J. (2000). *Catholic schools at the crossroads*. New York: Teachers College Press.

*Portions of this study were presented at the 2001 conference of Chief Administrators of Catholic Education (CACE), Savannah, Georgia, and the 2002 conference of the American Association of Educational Research (AERA), New Orleans, Louisiana. Dr. Joyce Johnstone, director of educational outreach, and John Schoenig, associate director of educational outreach, at the Institute for Educational Initiatives, University of Notre Dame, were instrumental in the development and ongoing work on this study.*

*John Watzke is the coordinator of field teaching, ACE, M.Ed. at the University of Notre Dame. Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Dr. John Watzke, Coordinator of Field Teaching, ACE, M.Ed., Fellow, Institute for Educational Initiatives, ACE-112 Badin Hall, University of Notre Dame, Notre Dame, IN 46556-5660.*

## APPENDIX

### SURVEY INSTRUMENT

### TEACHER EDUCATION SURVEY

#### **Mission**

1. Does your Catholic college or university have roots in Catholic education? If so, how?
2. Do you see preparing Catholic school teachers as part of your mission as a teacher education program?
3. Approximately how many teachers graduate from your teacher education program each year?
4. Approximately what percentage of your graduates go into Catholic education?
5. In what dioceses do graduates of your program traditionally teach?

#### **Institutional Demographics**

1. What is the approximate size of the undergraduate population at your institution? What is the size of your teacher education program?
2. How many faculty members do you have in your teacher education program? How many of these faculty members have experience within the K-12 Catholic school system (as teachers or as products of Catholic education)?
3. What is the approximate percentage of the teacher education faculty at your institution that supports the preparation of Catholic school teachers as part of the mission of your program?

#### **Curriculum**

1. Is there anything within your teacher education curriculum that is specifically designed for Catholic school teachers (i.e. coursework, workshops, specific track, etc.)?
2. Do you place practicum students within Catholic schools? If not, why not? Do you place student teachers within Catholic schools? If not, why not?
3. Is there any special relationship between your teacher education program and the K-12 Catholic schools in your area?

Copyright of *Catholic Education: A Journal of Inquiry & Practice* is the property of Catholic Education: A Journal of Inquiry & Practice and its content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use.