UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHAMPTON

Traditional and Alternative Student Teaching Experience: Dyad Group

Perceptions Concerning the Purpose of Self and Others.

By

John Rhys Jones, Ed.S

Ph. D Dissertation

Submitted to the Faculty of Social Sciences, Research and Graduate
School of Education.

July, 2000

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHAMPTON

ABSTRACT

FACULTY OF SOCIAL SCIENCES

RESEARCH AND GRADUATE SCHOOL OF EDUCATION

Doctor of Philosophy

Traditional and Alternative Student Teaching Experience: Dyad Group

Perceptions Concerning the Purpose of Self and Others.

by John Rhys Jones

This qualitative investigation describes and analyzes the perceptions of four student teaching dyad groups; two working in a traditional site and two in an alternative design. The major research question focused on dyad group perceptions concerning the purpose of the mentor/cooperating teacher (M)CT and student teacher (ST). Seven (M)CTs and eight STs working in the two sites (N = 30) teaching health and/or physical education provided data.

Major emergent findings derived from interview data indicated both (M)CT groups perceived self purpose to involve encouraging ST professional decision - making and pedagogical ideas. STs linked (M)CT purpose with opportunities for self direction in terms of ST experimentation and problem - solving.

Observer feedback in both sites was primarily focused on the correction and improvement of ST teaching performance. Written feedback which STs related to improved self reflection and professional development was perceived to be more important by STs than by the (M)CTs.

In terms of ST responsibilities, planning was identified by the (M)CT groups as very important; particularly, in the alternative site. Further, the alternative site STs were also more unified than the traditional STs in identifying personal proaction as a responsibility they owed to their (M)CTs.

Both (M)CT groups wanted ST achievement to include becoming more self confident, insightful, knowledgeable teachers. Likewise, ST perceptions also went beyond the idea of a skilful practitioner located solely in the classroom. However, while all dyad groups did identify ST achievement as also involving improved pedagogical skills, ST groups identified evaluation criteria that related more toward a personal orientation rather than a practical/technical. Lesson planning and children's learning were two important areas identified as ST evaluation criteria. Further, all the dyad groups acknowledged that STs should also recognize the differences in children that influence their learning responses.

Finally, study findings and implications are discussed in relation to several areas including mentoring characteristics, professional isolation and community, accountability, concern for self, others and the influence of student teaching site design on dyad perceptions. Recommendations for future school - based teacher education research and development are also provided.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS - <u>Continued</u>

LIST OF TABLES

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Chapter One

Introduction

The global picture during the 1990s has been one of political, social and economic change. Examples of such change include the collapse of communism, the move toward European unity (Nugent, 1994) and periods of world-wide economic recession and growth (Krugman, 1995). Major international events such as these influence nations to engage in increased self analysis; particularly, with regard to their own ability to compete at the international level.

Carney (1996) indicates that with economies having to adjust to new economic conditions, the education sector which is critical in the application of knowledge and information to production has now become a focus of great attention. In fact, Lindsay (1990) indicates that it is education which has been used by governments, for example, in England, Australia and the United States, "...to maintain and enhance domestic and international economic conditions" (p. 872).

During the 1990s, the need to develop national work forces capable of meeting the increasing demands of rapidly changing technological and information - based societies has grown globally. Apple (1992) has said that it is during times of social and economic concern that relationships between a nation's education system and its political power groups become much more apparent. Further, Whitty (1997) has pointed to increased school choice, private sector involvement and accountability mechanisms within education internationally, as examples of national concerns.

Consequently, there has been increased emphasis in the 1990s on producing teaching forces capable of engendering in a nation's youth, the necessary skills to meet complex societal changes (e.g., Teaching and America's Future, 1996). In fact, governmental interest in teacher education has been demonstrated internationally during the last decade of the twentieth century via a variety of reports. For example, in

England there have been the teacher training circulars (DFE 1992; 1993; DFEE 1997; 1998). The Australian Department of Education, Employment and Training has reported on teacher education (DEET, 1992) along with the Chalk Circle (1995). Also, within the United States the government supported Holmes Group (1990; 1995) has focused its attention on potential developments in schools of education.

The reports highlighted have mainly been critical of the traditional approaches to teacher education in their countries. Yet, these governments have differed in terms of the level of directive that they have issued in response to perceived teacher education inadequacies. For example, government in England has mandated major changes in teacher education. Here there has been an increased emphasis on school - based training with specific competences for prospective teachers to attain (DFEE 1998). However, governmental teacher education changes proposed in Australia and the United States have been more advisory than directional in nature, due to these federal governments having less control over their states' teacher education processes (Chadbourne, 1997).

This era of change in teacher education influenced by both government agencies and sponsored groups has met with varying responses from teacher educators. In England, Evans (1990) warned of the Conservative Government's willingness to "...intervene directly..." (p. 42) in the direction of both school and teacher education. Gilroy (1992) in the strongest terms referred to the possible changes in initial teacher education in England and Wales as "...political rape" (p. 5). Likewise, in the United States, Wise (1991) cautioned that the interference by political forces in teacher education may lead to the de-professionalization of this preparatory enterprise.

However, as Evans (1990) pointed out, this climate of change "...may not be all bad news..." (p. 42) for teacher educators. Externally driven forces intervening in the area of teacher education may provide the impetus for teacher educators themselves to reflect on their own beliefs, actions and views for future teacher preparation developments.

For example, one area that is receiving particular attention in the teacher education debate focuses on the knowledge and ideas (Doyle, 1990) that are informing and guiding teacher preparatory development. In fact, the present study (which was initiated during the early 1990s) was undertaken to provide research - based data which would add to this debate on the knowledge and perspectives that influence teacher education in the United States.

The idea and the reality of greatly increased school - based teacher education has become particularly prominent internationally during the 1990s (Bullough & Kauchak, 1997). However, various reports (which post date the present study research design and, therefore, only assist in the present methodological and result interpretation), particularly, in the United States (e.g., Knop, LeMaster, Norris, Raudensky & Tannehill, 1997) on university and school - based teacher education courses have been mainly programme descriptions rather than research focused (Bullough & Kauchak, 1997).

Consequently, data were gathered for the present study from practicing and student teachers. In particular, this research examined participants' perceptions within the culminating student teaching practice with regard to self and others' purpose. Further, these perceptions were gathered from participants working in two differently designed student teaching experiences, both, set within a traditional four year teacher education programme provided by one university in the United States.

Generating the present study research - based data is important because as Schubert (1989) indicates, it is the particular perspectives held by participants in the teacher preparation process that actually energize various approaches to, and components of this enterprise. In an era of increased teacher and teacher educator accountability, there is a need to know if the school - based changes in preparatory approach (nationally and politically mandated in countries such as England; more university driven as in the United States) do actually lead to differences in participants' professional attitudes, beliefs and actions

(Furlong, Whitty, Whiting, Miles, Barton & Barrett, 1996). Further, such knowledge may also help teacher educators to continue to develop a knowledge base that leads to a more unified and informed profession; particularly, in the debate with other groups focused on change in teacher education.

1. Paradigms Within Education

In terms of enquiry in the field of education, three paradigmatic traditions have been highlighted and defined by Holland, Clift, Veal Johnson and McCarthy (1992); the empirical, hermeneutic and critical. The empirical tradition with its basis in positivist science includes the study of the observable elements within the teaching - learning environment, and the instructional methods utilized. Empirical data driven descriptions are often correlated with teacher competence and student outcomes within this perspective. The technical approach has a long tradition in teacher education (Carr & Kemmis, 1986; Popkewitz, 1987). Dewar and Lawson (1990) suggest that proponents of this approach to teacher education believe a model can be fully developed to further guide future teacher education.

However, from the perspective of the hermeneutic approach, meaning and knowledge are not found resident only in observable events or gathered data. Rather, such factors are felt to develop out of involved individuals interpretations of contextual events and/or data; interpretations which are influenced by individuals prior knowledge and presuppositions (Walker, 1971). Consequently, the hermeneutic viewpoint offers teachers the opportunity to examine their own 'educational platforms' as a way of improving personal understanding about one's own teaching (Walker 1971; McElvague & Salters, 1992).

The critical perspective holds that the goal of inquiry is to highlight the power/political relationships that exist in social situations. Such inquiry, it is held, makes it possible to examine how relationships involve the (mis)use of power, leading to the oppression or elevation of certain groups (Carr & Kemmis, 1986). From this perspective teachers are seen as needing to recognize the place that personal, institutional and

societal values occupy within the teaching process (Hartnett & Naish, 1993). Smythe (1985) suggests that critical awareness by teachers enables them to become active participants in the creation and dissemination of knowledge.

While acknowledging the influence of these three major paradigms in education as highlighted by Holland, et al., (1992), there is general agreement that the empirical paradigm has been dominant; particularly, in the research focus on teacher education (Tinning, 1990). For example, Doyle (1990) talks about the influence of 'technical-rationality' in teacher education and cites Smith (1971) who suggests this perspective aims to train teachers to "...conform to acceptable patterns" of teaching behaviour.

Dewar and Lawson (1990) see the technical approach as preparing new teachers with instructional skills that enable them to fit comfortably into already existing school practices and programmes. Furlong (1992) suggests that from an English perspective, technical - rationality is the platform by which 'educational conservatism' strives to influence teacher education; particularly, to produce competent teachers who are capable of efficiently implementing government policy in the schools. Consequently, the technical approach to teacher education is seen as producing teachers who will work in social, educational contexts that are taken as already given (Sparkes, 1993).

However, a number of teacher education researchers (Dewar & Lawson, 1990; Evans, 1990; Tinning, 1990; Sparkes, 1993) in physical education have called for a wider paradigmatic perspective to be adopted in their field. A wider teacher educator viewpoint it is suggested may encourage reflection and social critique on the part of prospective physical educators. Sparkes (1993) contends that such an expansion in viewpoint would encourage prospective teachers to place their developing technical teaching skills within a conceptual framework (i.e., with skills viewed as a means rather than an end).

Yet, as Beyer (1988) indicates, the development of a critical perspective within teacher education is a difficult task given the political

support the technical viewpoint has received outside the teaching profession. As Evans (1990) suggested, the English Conservative government's directives emphasized practice over theory in teacher education via an increase in the school - based practical component. In 1992, Gilroy highlighted the Secretary of State for Education's call for as much as 80% of the B.Ed and PGCE teacher preparation programmes in England and Wales to be school - based.

Likewise, in the United States as Wise (1991) indicated, alternative routes to teacher certification have emphasized more practical school - based experience at the expense of college - based theory courses. Similarly to England, political motivation seems to have driven the development of these alternative routes to teacher certification in the U.S.A. (James & McNiece, 1991). Former Governor Keane of New Jersey indicated that the New Jersey alternative certification route bypassed the 'red tape' of college course work found in traditional teacher education (cited in Smith, 1991). Critics have, however, suggested alternative certification denies the complexity of teachers' work (Feiman - Nemser, 1990).

Yet, as Schubert (1989) indicates, a fundamental question remains to be addressed in teacher education irrespective of underlying theoretical paradigms, political orientations or the knowledge of individuals involved in the teacher education debate. Shubert states "...the fundamental curriculum question of what is most worthwhile for teachers to know and experience must be addressed" (p. 28). Consequently, the present study gathered data concerning dyad (see 'Definitions' in Chapter 1 - section 9) participants perceived purposes related to student teacher development. In particular, data was gathered concerning what participants perceived was both worthwhile for student teachers to know and do, and how supervisory teachers could support such a process.

2. Conceptual Orientation Within Education

With the apparent emphasis identified in the theoretical literature on the technical approach to teacher education, it might have been

assumed that all traditional undergraduate teacher preparation programmes in the United States are similar in construction and orientation (Feiman-Nemser, 1990). Yet, in a study of five American teacher education programmes, Kennedy (1991) found clear differences in programme structure and orientation, including the kinds of teachers they hoped to produce. Kennedy's findings suggest that graduating teachers seemed to be influenced more by the conceptual orientation of their programme than by its structural arrangement.

Feiman - Nemser (1990) states that 'conceptual orientation' refers to a set of ideas concerning the essential outcomes of teacher education and the means to achieve them. Zeichner (1983) has argued that conceptual orientations have the force of paradigms. This is because such orientations define for certain groups involved in teacher education the essential meaning of the process, the goals for achievement and how the preparatory programme itself is actualized. It is also possible that these orientations exist side by side (ie., residing in different teacher educators) within the same programme.

In her paper on guiding structural and conceptual orientations in teacher education, Feiman - Nemser (1990) proposed five orientations based on previous conceptual analyses (e.g. Joyce, 1975; Kirk, 1986; Zimpher & Howey, 1987). These orientations are the academic, practical, technological, personal and critical/social.

In the academic orientation the teacher is seen as primarily a transmitter of knowledge, a subject matter expert (O'Hear 1988; Lawlor, 1990). Improvement in teaching is perceived as being generated by increasing the academic content (ie., teaching subject matter) within teacher education programmes (Doyle, 1990). Supporters of this orientation are often suspicious of the rigour of pedagogical courses (e.g., Lyons, 1979) and have directed criticisms at teachers concerning a perceived lack of expertise with regard to subject matter. As an example primary/elementary teachers in England have been perceived by certain groups as lacking subject knowledge related to the new National Curriculum (Alexander, Rose & Woodhead,

1992; Bennett & Carre, 1993).

Proponents of the academic orientation call for field experiences that are designed to help student teachers relate concepts presented in college courses with actual classroom practice. However, teacher educators such as Shulman (1986) suggest that content knowledge by itself is not enough. Instead, he suggests that teachers need to be able to combine both subject knowledge and pedagogical understanding. Shulman refers to this as 'pedagogical content knowledge'; the ability to present content appropriately based on how children learn.

The terms 'craft' and 'artistry' have been associated with the practical orientation toward teacher preparation (Feiman - Nemser, 1990). Doyle (1990) suggests that this orientation toward teacher education, concentrates on the skills involved in management and instruction. Further, the practical approach depends to a major extent on field experiences and apprenticeship with a master teacher. Proponents of this orientation would acknowledge the context - based, often conflicting nature of teaching. However, they would also agree with Schon (1983; 1987) that teachers need the ability to engage in on - the - spot reflection; a key experiential behaviour in the process of learning a professional activity such as teaching (Bushweller, 1995).

Critics (e.g. Arnstine, 1975) of the practical apprenticeship approach point to its encouraging the imitation and maintenance of the status quo. Further, they are concerned that the apprenticeship mode may also socialize student teachers into the culture of a particular school, rather than developing prospective teacher understanding as an outcome of teacher preparation.

The technical orientation emphasizes knowledge and skills associated with effective teaching. Competence is judged on performance with the scientific study of teaching providing the principles and practices for prospective teachers to learn. Within this orientation, teacher education is quite prescriptive. Proponents (e.g. Gage, 1978; Berliner, 1985) believe that teaching should be built upon an accumulating body of teaching effectiveness research that can be

taught to prospective teachers.

However, in relation to criticism of the technical approach with its emphasis on the mastery of discrete predominantly observable skills, a more cognitively focused model within the technical orientation has been advanced. This model focuses on 'intelligent skill knowledge' (Elliot, 1986). Within this approach prospective teachers are encouraged to exercise knowledge and judgment concerning the reasons and purposes for their emerging practical skills in relation to situations met.

With the personal orientation, teacher self development is a central component in the development of teachers. Emphasis is placed on helping prospective teachers understand both theories of learning, and the conditions that help promote human potential and achievement. For proponents such as McIntyre (1993), rather than prescribing what prospective teachers should be able to specifically perform instructionally, emphasis in the personal approach is placed on clarifying personal educational values, meanings and styles of teaching.

Field experiences are advocated (e.g. Combs, 1978) that allow student teachers to interact with teacher educators who work as facilitators. In particular, such facilitation encourages prospective teachers to confront and solve problems in their own terms. However, advocates of the personal orientation face a difficult problem. The problem is to find the balance between promoting effective teaching, and allowing prospective teachers to find both their own meanings and instructional approaches (Hirst, 1990).

The critical - social teacher education conceptual orientation has also been associated with such terms as 'progressive education' and critical pedagogy.' For Carr and Kemmis (1986) the process is a moral activity requiring complex judgments from teachers; judgments which can be brought to a conscious level. Within this orientation developing teachers are asked to analyze the role of education in encouraging a more just and democratic society. The critical - social orientation looks

at the way in which the use of power in social situations influences the progress or the limitations placed on specific groups.

However, as Beyer (1984) indicates, this critical orientation is extremely difficult to find actualized in teacher education. In the United States, the University of Wisconsin student teaching experience has been reported (Zeichner & Liston, 1987) as being designed to foster prospective teachers' critical reflection and pedagogy; particularly, through the use of personal journals and action research. Yet, research at Wisconsin (Tabachnick & Zeichner, 1985) indicates only limited impact on student teachers' perspectives through this critical - socially orientated approach.

The differences in conceptual orientation toward teacher education exist because those involved hold differing views concerning the purpose of school curriculum, teachers and teacher preparation programmes. This, therefore, suggests (Doyle, 1990) that teacher educators and preparation programmes are often eclectic in nature (i.e., elements of different orientations may be found interrelating through the work of individuals within the same programme). However, irrespective of the orientations that might be used to direct the work of educators, as Eisner (1979) points out:

   . . .orientation harbors an implicit conception of educational virtue

   . . .each orientation serves both to legitimize certain educational

   practices and to negatively sanction others (p. 70).

Therefore, despite the claimed dominance of the technical paradigm in teacher education (Smith, 1971; Doyle, 1990; Tinning, 1990), the highlighted diversity that exists in individuals' conceptual orientation suggests the complex environment in which prospective teachers learn to teach. Clearly, conceptual orientations provide a source of ideas and practices that are available for teacher educators to consider and draw upon.

3. Student Teaching Experience

Student teaching has been referred to as the ". . .one indisputably essential element in professional education" (Conant, 1963) and ". . .the

heart and mind of teacher preparation" (Haberman, 1983). Research indicates the vital influence that this component of teacher preparation has on classroom teachers (e.g., Book, Beyers & Freeman, 1983) and physical educators (e.g., Locke, 1984). Consequently, because of its history and acknowledged importance in teacher preparation, student teaching remains a critical area for on - going research (Goodlad, 1990).

In fact, field experience is perceived as so important, that, for example in England, government has become directly involved with this issue. Governmental directives (e.g., DFE, 1992; DFEE, 1998) have ensured that the majority of English initial teacher preparation is now designed for and delivered in the school setting, with collaboration from higher education institutes (Furlong & Maynard, 1995). Further, such directives (DFE, 1992; DFEE 1998) also indicate a large number of specified competences that all teacher education students are required to demonstrate, irrespective of where their preparation is based (Furlong, et al., 1996).

Not surprisingly, as both a vital and the oldest form of teacher preparation (Applegate, 1987), student teaching has received considerable attention in classroom research. However, in the area of physical education it is only during the 1980s that a body of knowledge has begun to develop focused on student teaching (Jones, 1989). In particular, research has identified the influence of cooperating teacher viewpoints on preservice physical educators' attitudes (Templin, 1981; Tinning & Siedentop, 1985). Consequently, the investigative process in physical education student teaching has now focused more on participants' views within the student teaching triad (i.e., university supervisor, cooperating and student teacher).

This particular focus would seem to be vital because as Garner (1973) suggests, participants in the student teaching experience take up certain positions with expectations for their own behaviour and that of the triad participants with whom they interact. Clearly, discrepant views concerning beliefs and purposes between triad participants may

interfere in their interactions (Corrigan & Garland, 1966; Tabachnick & Zeichner,1984). This, in turn, may lessen the impact of the student teaching experience for the student teacher and negate some of the teacher preparation programme emphases.

Therefore, recognizing the need for common goals for achievement to assist in teacher development the 1980s heard calls for more meaningful school - university interaction in teacher preparation (Martinek & Schempp, 1988). In fact, the call for significant change in the purpose of field experience in teacher preparation has been strong (e.g. Lanier, 1982; Beyer, 1984; Zeichner & Liston, 1987). Further, Goodman (1988) suggests that rather than concentrating only on technical adjustments, field experiences should now be designed to emphasize student teacher reflection, experimentation and responsible decision - making.

Consequently, within this atmosphere of change in teacher education field experience, Slippery Rock University Department of Physical Education (situated in Pennsylvania (PA) initiated the concept of the student teaching Teaching Centre. The purpose of this alternative approach to student teaching set within a traditional four year preparatory programme, was to allow student teachers (as Goodman, 1988 had called for) greater decision - making and responsibility in their own student teacher development (Jones, 1993).

4. Relevance of the Study

The present research study which focuses on the perceptions of participants working within a traditional and an alternative health - physical education student teaching setting at Slippery Rock University, relates to a vital need identified by Dodds (1988). She has called for increased effort to discover how school and university - based teacher educators can interact to develop the best, mutually acceptable and workable practical field experiences for prospective teachers. Traditional physical education student teaching has seen most administrative and organizational decisions made by others for student teachers who usually work with two cooperating teachers (ie., one each

half of the teaching practice). However, at the Teaching Centre the student teacher is given the opportunity to choose three practicing teachers with whom they wish to work concurrently.

In fact, research by Niday (1996) suggests that student teacher self selection of their mentor teachers enhances the relationship between student and field based teacher. In the centre the student teachers make this matching assessment themselves based on observation and conversation with the teachers involved in the student teaching process.

According to Dodds (1989) allowing student teachers to make conscious choices about their own teaching enriches the impact of field experience for them. Further, Graber (1989) also indicated that without research into the perceptions of participants in the teacher education process, it would not be possible to assess the influence of different approaches in teacher preparation.

Consequently, the aim of the present study was to investigate the perceptions of health/physical education mentor - cooperating (see 'Definitions' - Chapter 1, section 9) and student teachers involved in a traditional and alternative student teaching experience. In particular, qualitative data were gathered to allow both description and analysis of perceptions related to dyad participants' purposes within the two research sites. Further, 'between site' dyad group analysis was also undertaken to describe and discuss major perceptual similarities and differences, and the potential influence of site design.

5. Statement of the Purpose

The purpose of this study was to describe and compare the perceptions of dyad participants working in a traditional and alternative student teaching experience. Specifically this study described and compared mentor - cooperating and student teacher perceptions concerning the purpose of self and others within the student teaching experience.

6. Research Question

While one major research question was used to guide this study, a

further six subquestions helped to provide in more specific detail the precise focus of the major research question. Development of the sub - questions also allowed detailed comparative analyses of participant group perceptions both within and between research sites (subquestions are outlined in Chapter 3, section 7). The major research question was as follows:

What do mentor - cooperating and student teachers in a traditional and alternative student teaching site perceive to be their own purpose, and that of their school - based colleague during the student teaching experience?

7. Delimitations

This descriptive exploratory research utilized a semistructured interview approach with open - ended questions to investigated the perceptions of dyad group participants. The focus was on participant perceptions of self and others' purpose working in a traditional and alternative student teaching experience. These two sites provided student teaching experiences for specialist K-12 health and physical education prospective teachers from Slippery Rock University in Pennsylvania.

8. Limitations

The present study centred on Slippery Rock University health and physical education mentor - cooperating and student teachers working in a traditional and an alternative student teaching experience. Due to limited researcher time, finances and location this investigation was specific to two selected school - district sites in southwest PA. Consequently, study findings are specific to the participant groups involved at these two sites. Generalization to other cooperating and student teachers via research design was not an aim of this study. However, the nature of qualitative data with its detailed presentation affords the reader opportunity to draw their own conclusions about the applicability of the present study findings to their own contexts.

9. Definitions

To assist reader understanding with regard to the present study, the

following definitions are provided for key terms utilized in this investigation that have not been explained in Chapters 1 or 3:

Dyad

The term 'dyad' as used in the context of the student teaching experience refers to the two participants working within the student teaching triad (i.e., triad refers to the university supervisor, cooperating and student teacher) who are specifically school - based (i.e., dyad refers specifically to the cooperating and student teacher).

Further, with reference to the specific use of the word 'dyad' in the present study, it is simply used to identify the two involved school - based participant groups (i.e., mentor - cooperating and student teachers). The term is not used to imply a specific dyad working relationship between any one mentor - cooperating and student teacher working in the present research sites at the time of the data collection.

Student Teacher

'Student teacher' is the title conferred on a prospective teacher undertaking what is traditionally in the United States the final component in the teacher preparation process. It is the only experience that traditionally allows the prospective teacher to work for an extended period of time (i.e., from 10 weeks to a full 16 week semester) under the guidance of a practicing teacher and university supervisor in a school setting.

The student teacher is expected to learn about the teacher's role through observation, assisting and the eventual assumption of a full-time teaching load. Further, they are also expected to practice the planning, evaluatory and grading procedures associated with effective instructional performance. Traditionally, the student teacher has also been expected to assume the administrative duties (e.g. monitoring study hall, library, lockerooms, bus lines etc.,) undertaken by the full-time teacher to whom they have been assigned.

Mentor - Cooperating Teacher

'Cooperating teacher' has traditionally been the title conferred on the

certified, school - based practicing teacher to whom the student teacher is assigned by the school - district for student teaching. The cooperating teacher is expected to help develop the student teacher's under - standing and ability to perform the practicing teacher's role. This involves learning to perform the teacher's instructional, managerial and administrative duties. To this end, the cooperating teacher is expected to utilize a mix of student teacher observation, assisting and eventual full - time teaching. Reading materials, supervisor assistance and possibly inservice education may all be provided by the university.

However, the mentor - cooperating teacher situation is different in the alternative Teaching Centre approach to student teaching. Mentor - cooperating teacher selection is undertaken by the student teachers themselves, rather than their being assigned to a teacher. Further, most mentor - cooperating teachers work with their student teachers for the majority of the student teaching semester, in contrast to only half a semester in the traditional approach. Mentor - cooperating teachers may also work with up to three student teachers at the same time, rather than with one individual in the traditional mode. Consequently, these centre teachers share responsibility at the same time with their colleagues for helping an individual student teacher develop.

Administratively, the teacher who is selected by a student teacher in the Teaching Centre to provide the majority of their teaching time is referred to as the 'mentor' teacher. The other two teachers selected for lesser amounts of teaching time by a student teacher are still referred to as 'cooperating teachers.'

Purpose

The term 'purpose' is used in the following manner within the present study. Purpose refers to mentor - cooperating and student teacher perceptions of attitudes and behavioural characteristics that both groups feel they and their dyad colleague should demonstrate or develop, during the student teaching experience. In particular, purpose is related to dyad participants' views of others' actions, feedback focus, personal responsibility, achievements and child perceptions.

Chapter Two

Review of Literature

As chapter one indicates, teacher education has been caught in the global climate of change stimulated by social, economic and political events during the 1980s and 90s. One of the major areas of change in teacher preparation has been the movement from theory - based course work, towards greater focus on practical application and experience for prospective teachers. In fact, there has been an increased emphasis motivated both by political (e.g., DFEE 1998) and educational (e.g., Chalk Circle, 1995; Holmes 1995) groups internationally, to outline what should be acquired in terms of skills, knowledge and competences by prospective teachers via completion of their preparatory programme.

National education reports internationally (e.g. DEET, 1992; Holmes, 1995; DFEE, 1998) and alternative teacher preparation approaches (Smith, 1991) have emphasized the influential role of practice in preparing teachers. However, teaching practice does not occur in a vacuum. The conceptual orientations that guide teacher educators' views and actions are influential in creating both the form that teacher preparation takes, and the type of teacher that emerges (Zeichner, 1983; Kennedy, 1991; Dunne, 1996).

Consequently, the present study investigated the perceptions of participants working in a traditional and an alternative student teaching experience. In particular, this study described and compared the perceptions of participants regarding the purpose of self and others related to student teacher development. This investigation is therefore in accord with the calls (Graber,1989; Bullough & Kauchak, 1997; Veal & Rickard, 1998) for research into the influence of differently designed components of the teacher preparation process; vital analysis if teacher education development is to progress.

The review of literature undertaken in this chapter moves from a

general to a more specific focus concerning student teaching. First, literature is presented that outlines and discusses (beyond information provided in the first chapter) the present investigation's traditional and alternative student teaching approaches. Second, literature is cited focusing on the views of cooperating and student teachers, initially as individuals and then as participants in an interactive dyad. Third, research is reviewed highlighting the impact of the student teaching experience on dyad participants; particularly on student teachers.

Further, the description and discussion that occurs in chapter two is also related to Doyle's (1990) idea of student teacher development. He has suggested that such teacher development is closely related to the conceptual orientations which shape and limit the philosophy and practice of those involved in the teacher preparation process.

Therefore, the review of literature relevant to the major focus of the present study is divided in to the following sections:

1. Traditional Student Teaching
2. Alternative Student Teaching
3. Prospective Student Teacher Perceptions
4. Student Teacher Perceptions
5. Cooperating Teacher Perceptions
6. Dyad Role Perceptions
7. Dyad Concerns
8. Student Teaching Impact
9. Summary of Literature Review Implications

Before beginning this literature review, two cautionary points should be emphasized. First, as Zeichner and Gore (1990) indicate in their analysis of teacher socialization, caution must be exercised when using literature derived from different countries. Although due to the setting of the present study the majority of the literature cited in this chapter is from the United States, the warning of Tabachnick (1988) needs to be recognized. He warns that research results generated in different countries are often grounded in very different environments and processes. Consequently, care must be taken when using data from

different nations. Thus, while such data may provide some useful considerations for the present research, it should not be used to draw what may be potentially misleading, generalized conclusions.

Second, caution should also be exercised when using literature from classroom - based research and applying it to a health and physical education analysis; even if it comes from the same country. Possible differences in participant personality, background, training (e.g. philosophy, environment and processes) and investigation site context, can, again lead to potentially misleading generalizations.

Further, as indicated earlier, no specific research could be located that investigated traditional four year teacher preparation programmes that were using concurrent, yet procedurally different approaches to health and physical education student teaching. However, the selected literature did provide interesting insights into participants' beliefs and behaviour within the traditional student teaching process.

1. Traditional Student Teaching

Student teaching has historically been shown to have a vital influence on prospective teachers (Andrews, 1964; Conant, 1963; Veal & Rickard, 1998). This is indicated by teachers consistent ratings of the over - riding impact of this teacher education component on their development (Appleberry, 1976; Haring & Nelson, 1980). In fact, it is the dominating influence of the student teaching experience within teacher preparation that adds emphasis to the need for continued research into this vital preparatory experience.

Zeichner (1987) believes that there is much variation with regard to the conceptual orientation that underpins the student teaching process. In fact, Feiman - Nemser and Buchmann (1983) have suggested that it is because of unclear programmatic orientation in preparatory field experiences that student teaching is often seen as a craft orientated, experiential process rather than theory guided (Guyton & McIntyre, 1990).

However, Zeichner, Liston, Mahlios and Gomes (1987) have also pointed to the difficulty for teacher educators of preparing student

teachers in primary/elementary and secondary schools where teacher education is not seen as a priority. In such situations university supervisors have no power to influence their student teacher's environment, and often cooperating teachers feel overly burdened with both teaching and supervisory duties. Programmatic orientations and concerns in such situations may rarely be discussed by cooperating teachers and university supervisors. This, in turn, may lead to triad participant stresses and frustrations. In fact, lack of triad interaction regarding student teaching perceptions and approaches may have negative effects on student teacher development (Garner, 1973; Tabachnick & Zeichner, 1984; Kaufmann, 1992; Darling - Hammond, Bullmaster & Cobb, 1995).

Research (Sparks, Steffen & Carlisle, 1990; Tannehill & Goc-Karp, 1992) has been conducted nationally that begins to describe the traditional physical education student teaching process in American teacher preparation. Tannehill and Goc - Karp (1992) found that for the majority of their investigation's respondents, the College of Education was the body most frequently responsible for the placement of student teachers with cooperating teachers. Only 25% of physical education departments reported they were responsible for the placement of their own student teachers. Tannehill and Goc - Karp suggested their data indicated that the need for large numbers of cooperating teachers, overshadowed the importance of selecting "good" cooperating teachers. Further, the placement of physical education student teachers with trained cooperating teachers was not the case in the majority of situations they examined.

Teacher educators (Goodlad, 1990; Tannehill & Goc - Karp,1992; Templin, Sharpe & Savage, 1997; Welch, 1998) have suggested that there is a fundamental need for establishing groups of university personnel and school - based practitioners, who are committed to the development of teacher educator collaboration. These groups it is suggested are more likely to build an integrated approach leading to improved student teaching experiences.

At the present study teacher preparation institution, Slippery Rock University in western PA, the physical education department directs the majority of its student teachers to three alternative Teaching Centres each academic semester. However, Bethel Park School - District located in a southern suburb of Pittsburgh, PA has also been identified by physical education department teacher educators as an effective traditional student teaching site. Consequently, this district has been receiving between three and five student teachers each academic semester for more than seven years.

From an investigative standpoint, it was important to describe and analyze the perceptions and orientations of experienced, traditionally sited cooperating teachers. As indicated earlier, continual selection by a teacher preparation department of a specific student teaching placement site for an extended number of years is rare in physical education. Such selection appears to be much more haphazard (Tannehill and Goc - Karp, 1992). Therefore, Bethel Park represented a rich source of traditional - based student teaching data for description and comparisons. Consequently, this school - district was selected as the traditional site for the purpose of the present investigation.

2. Alternative Student Teaching

As indicated, there appears to be only minimal data driven literature (Bullough & Kauchak, 1997) which describes alternatively designed student teaching approaches set within traditional four year teacher preparation programmes. Consequently, the Slippery Rock University Department of Physical Education Teaching Centre approach appears based on published literature to offer a potentially unique opportunity for study. This fact, in and of itself, suggests the importance of increasing the health and physical education teacher education data - base; in particular, by describing and analyzing the perceptions of participants working in this alternative student teaching context.

School - districts originally invited to become Teaching Centres were selected based on a number of criteria. These included similarity between university and school - based teacher educator perspectives

on student teacher development, and school health and physical education curriculum. Further such school - districts had to indicate a desire to become more continuously involved in the teacher preparation process. However, there were no financial arrangements made with the centres beyond those given to traditional sites; simply a stipend given to the mentor - cooperating teachers to recognize their supervisory work.

Teachers had to recognize that by accepting the centre concept, they would be committing to using a varying amount of their original instructional time to act as teacher educators. These teachers also had to accept that they would no longer have total responsibility in the traditional sense for a student teacher assigned to them. Now, within the centre design they would be required to share with at least two other health and/or physical education district teachers in a student teacher's development.

Pilot centre research (Jones, 1993) indicated that mentor - cooperating teachers felt they benefited from their involvement. They suggested that having student teachers each semester provided them with on - going ideas for content and methodology. Some teachers also felt that having student teachers kept them 'on their toes' acting as effective role models. Such benefits were felt to have a positive impact on the district's health and physical education programme. The student teachers indicated (Jones, 1993) that their mentor - cooperating teacher selections (made after ten day observations at the start of the process) were based on various criteria. For example, criteria included: prospective teacher compatibility with potential mentor - cooperating teachers in terms of instructional styles and personal characteristics; desire to select role models who they wished to emulate; as a means to teach more of a particular subject (i.e., physical education vs., health), or teach more at a particular school level (e.g. elementary vs. high school).

As Feiman - Nemser (1990) indicated, different conceptual orientations can exist within the same teacher education programme,

including the student teaching setting. Therefore, by working concurrently with three experienced teachers in the centre process, student teachers may have had the opportunity to compare and analyze potentially different orientations demonstrated by their selected teachers (both toward teaching children and teacher development). Teaching Centre student teachers, therefore, may have the opportunity to develop their own teaching approach based on a potentially diverse conceptual and pedagogical student teaching environment.

Further, student teachers (Jones, 1993) indicated that the centre process encouraged self initiated behaviour, organization and professional communication; behaviours suggested as important to teacher development (Friend & Cook, 1990; Hudson & Latham, 1996; Wade, 1997). However, both groups of respondents did indicate the difficulty of arranging dyad conferences; particularly, with the cooperating teacher due to the hectic nature of a centre student teacher's schedule (Jones, 1993).

The positive response obtained from the pilot study (Jones, 1993) pointed to a need for more in depth investigation into this alternative approach to student teaching. Such data would add to the knowledge - base in health and physical education student teaching in two potentially unique ways. First, it provided a rich description and analysis of dyad group perceptions set within an alternative approach to student teaching grounded in a traditional teacher preparation programme. Second, the centre data was used in comparison with data gathered in a continually utilized traditional student teaching site. These comparisons were also related to the potential influence of site design on dyad group perceptions.

3. Prospective Student Teacher Perceptions

Before reviewing the literature on student teacher perceptions it is important to note that prospective teachers' views regarding the teaching - learning process do not emerge solely during the student teaching experience. Prior to this school - based experience

prospective student teachers already hold perceptions about teaching and learning, and their personal part in this process (Pajares, 1992). Recognition of this situation is vital because as Solmon and Ashy (1995) suggest, the knowledge that prospective student teachers bring with them acts as a filter through which future teacher education information and practical experience must be interpreted.

As examples of initial prospective student teacher beliefs, Schwartz (1987; as cited in Price, 1998) has indicated that some students in teacher preparation have highlighted non material rewards as the dominant reasons for their entering teacher education. Such reasons included prospective teachers' desire to work with children, make a contribution to society and join the teaching profession. Also, Price (1998) indicated that prospective teachers entered into teacher preparation with strong views (based upon personal observations as former pupils); in particular, concerning classroom practice and teaching.

In fact, research (e.g., Placek, & Dodds, 1988; Kagen, 1992; Doolittle, Dodds and Placek, 1993) would support both the contention regarding the strength of prospective teachers initial views, and the suggestion that prospective teachers existent beliefs are quite resistant to change. In fact, Feiman - Nemser and Featherstone (1992) found that many students left their formal teacher preparation programmes with most of their original perceptions about teaching still intact.

Further, according to Weinstein (1989) prospective teachers often enter teacher preparation with a very 'me - centred' perspective; one that translates into the attitude ' if it worked for me it will be good for you'. Yet, more recent research by Price (1998) into the perceptions of prospective teachers working in a college - based teacher education component, found, persistently held concerns (derived from students own former school experiences) about poor teaching methods and teacher discrimination amongst pupils. Within physical education, Templin (1979, 1981), also highlighted that prospective teachers prior to entry into student teaching, generally, held more humanistic attitudes

toward children and teaching.

Clearly, the literature indicates that prospective student teachers already hold views concerning the teaching - learning process, before their entry into student teaching. Although the present study was not designed to assess prospective student teacher attitudes and perceptions before entry into student teaching, such prior views are important to recognize. The present study did allow description of student teacher perceptions related to humanistic and self concerns. In particular, student teacher perceptions were identified regarding effective teaching and their understanding concerning children in the educational process.

4. Student Teacher Perceptions

Whatever the conceptual orientations of participants in teacher preparation most would agree that their focus should be on producing student teaching experiences that maximize the positive development of the student teacher. Consequently, research has already provided teacher educators with some useful insights into the perceptions of student teachers undertaking the traditional student teaching experience.

According to Glickman and Bey (1990) the student teacher's role has been fairly much predetermined by university student teaching regulations. These regulations are enforced by the cooperating teacher and university supervisor. However, these two triad participants can have differing perceptions regarding the focus of student teaching (Tanner, 1986; Kaufmann, 1992). Therefore, student teachers can find themselves caught between the differing perceptions and directives of the two other triad members (Dunne, 1996).

Effective cooperating teacher practices identified by student teachers (Whitehead, 1984) included, use of a more indirect supervisory style utilizing freeing (i.e., questioning) rather than binding (i.e., directing) interactive behaviours. As Feiman - Nemser (1990) has suggested, all conceptual orientation proponents would probably claim to encourage student teacher reflection. This emphasis is clearly

important because student teachers themselves appear to identify more closely with cooperating teachers who practice this reflective approach.

To encourage student teacher reflection there needs to be input from the other triad participants. Student teachers appear to recognize this need. In fact, the concept of feedback seems of vital importance to prospective teachers (Jones, Reid & Bevins, 1997). Both student teachers and university supervisors have indicated (Pfister & Newcomb, 1984) the need for more cooperating teacher feedback on lesson planning and teaching performance. Physical education student teachers have also shown appreciation for cooperating teachers who provide large amounts of specific information in a timely manner (Brunelle, Tousignant & Pieron, 1981). However, when rarely provided with feedback related to personal teaching performance physical education student teachers have also exhibited clear concern (McBride, 1984).

Student teacher perceptions regarding feedback focus also appear to embrace criteria that are foundational to two of the five conceptual orientations outlined in the first chapter; the practical and technical orientations. Feedback on planning, content presentation and class management would be of primary concern to these two orientations in teacher preparation. Likewise, these factors have also been identified (Helison, 1992) by physical education student teachers as leading foci for cooperating teacher feedback.

In terms of attitude, Dodds (1989) and Templin (1979; 1981) have suggested that the student teacher move from a humanistic to a more controlling, directive focus (Templin, 1979; Locke, 1984) during student teaching may be related to cooperating teacher views. This view is supported by recent research Hynes - Dusel (1997) that indicates student teacher concerns are influenced by their cooperating teachers' actions and words. In fact, such conservative perspectives may work against dyad consideration of factors from more non traditional conceptual orientations in teacher development such as the personal

and critical. Further, conformist teacher attitudes may also work against cooperating teachers acting as facilitators of student teacher growth. Instead, such teachers may rely more on the directing of prospective teachers with a focus on what the cooperating teacher believes to be important for the student teacher to know and do.

Student teachers also demonstrate anxiety over factors such as pupil discipline, motivation, evaluation and individualization of instruction (Cruickshank, Kennedy & Meyers, 1974). However, the major concern relates to prospective teachers' ability to manage and control children (Fuller & Brown, 1975; Schempp, 1985). In physical education, Boggess, McBride and Griffey (1985) found that student teacher concern about child management did not lessen over the entire student teaching experience. Relatedly, Jones (1992b) found that pupil off - task behaviour was the most identified determinant leading prospective physical educators to question their career choice.

In fact, physical education student teachers appear to have more concern for self than for children during the student teaching experience (Arrighi & Young, 1987; Hynes - Dusel, 1997). This finding is clearly a concern for teacher educators, irrespective of their orientation, who want to see student teacher development. Student teachers who are continuously preoccupied with their own survival in terms of child management, are unlikely to focus on the development of personal meanings, critical analysis, or even effective instructional technique. Rather, their focus is likely to centre on the technical skills needed to master class organization and control.

Consequently, the present study gathered data that allowed description and analysis of student teacher perceptions within each of the two research sites in relation to the reviewed research. For example, would the present student teachers demonstrate conflict with their triad colleagues as had past prospective teachers (Webb, 1979; Hardy, 1997a)? Would these student teachers express satisfaction with or the need for more observation and understanding from their university supervisors (Johns & Cline, 1985)? Further, would these

prospective teachers indicate a need for more indirect supervision (Whitehead, 1984; Veal & Rickard, 1998)?

Finally, all teacher preparation orientations would probably support the importance of supervisory feedback in student teacher development. Lack of supervisory feedback has drawn negative reaction from student teachers (McBride, 1984; Pfister & Newcomb, 1984). Prospective physical educators have indicated they prefer feedback from cooperating teachers that focuses on planning, presentation, class management and professional demeanour (Helison, 1992). Consequently, the present study sought to describe dyad perceptions toward feedback in terms of its usefulness, method, foci and mode of presentation.

5. Cooperating Teacher Perceptions

Cooperating teacher perceptions are important in terms of how they may influence triad participant interaction and student teacher development (Yee, 1969; Copeland, 1980; Koehler, 1984; Dunne, 1996; Veal & Rickard, 1998). Yet, despite their influential role, Gregory (1971) suggested that cooperating teacher selection has been quite arbitrary and based on factors such as interest, teaching experience and degrees held. Haberman & Harris (1982) indicated that only two of fifty states had specific cooperating teacher certification requirements. In the 1990s,Tannehill and Goc - Karp (1992) described cooperating teacher selection in physical education as still being mainly a haphazard affair.

However, irrespective of selection method, for Emans (1983) and McIntyre (1984) the cooperating teacher has as much if not more impact on the student teacher than any other factor in student teaching. The research (e.g. Garner, 1973; Mott, 1976; Copeland, 1982; Rickard & Knight, 1997) indicates that cooperating teachers have an influential impact on student teacher behaviour. Student teachers have mirrored activities in which their cooperating teachers engage (Feiman - Nemser & Buchmann, 1987). They have also demonstrated similar verbal behaviours to those used by their cooperating teachers (Nickel, 1970;

Bowers, 1971; Mintz, 1972).

Yet, student teachers have also been shown to be cognizant of what they deem to be effective and ineffective actions demonstrated by cooperating teachers (Brunelle, Tousignant & Pieron, 1981). Physical education student teachers (Marrs & Templin, 1983) have demonstrated that they will select specific elements of their cooperating teachers behaviour to adopt. For example, Fernandez - Balboa (1988) found student teachers were clearly influenced by their cooperating teachers' behaviour in terms of the way in which they themselves came to address pupil misbehaviour.

Dodds (1988) suggests that the influence of physical education cooperating teachers may be intensified due to the nature of the environment in which this subject dyad works. Often, the isolation of the gymnasium coupled with moving equipment and monitoring children between classes, means less opportunity for prospective physical educators to mingle and talk professionally with other teachers. The cooperating teacher therefore becomes the physical education student teachers only real professional contact, and therefore, a potentially powerful socializing agent.

Consequently, cooperating teacher conceptual orientation concerning what a prospective teacher needs to know and demonstrate, appears to be a vital factor to consider in student teaching. This view receives support from the research of Godfrey (1995) which indicated that cooperating teacher educational philosophy significantly influences student teachers; particularly, regarding the student teacher's degree of support for a teacher directive educational philosophy.

However, regardless of the conceptual orientation of cooperating teachers toward teacher preparation the majority would likely support the importance of supervisory feedback. Research (eg., Glickman and Bey, 1990; Jones, et al., 1997; Wright & Bottery, 1997) has indicated that feedback from cooperating and mentor teachers plays an important role in student teaching. Yet, some physical education

research (Tannehill & Zakrajsek, 1990) has suggested that the actual amount of observation and feedback provided by secondary level cooperating teachers is minimal with few dyad conferences being held. Any cooperating teacher feedback observed focused on planning, management, instructional behaviour and support for the student teacher. Again, this foci represents the practical, technical feedback that some teacher educators (Tinning, 1988,1990; Doyle, 1990) have suggested dominates the recent approach to teacher preparation.

Overall, previous research (eg., Copeland, 1980; Koehler, 1984; Furlong & Maynard, 1995) indicates cooperating teachers are influential in student teaching impacting student teachers' activities (Feiman - Nemser, 1987), verbalization (Bowers, 1971; Mintz, 1972) and managerial behaviour (Balboa, 1988). Therefore, the present study identified both similar and differing mentor - cooperating and student teacher perceptions concerning the purpose of self and others, in the two differently designed student teaching research sites.

Dodds (1988) has also suggested that the traditional physical education student teaching process may engender dyad participant feelings of isolation. Potentially, such isolation may intensify the cooperating teachers' influence on the student teacher. However, the alternative student teaching approach has already been linked (Jones, 1993) with the opportunity for increased mentor - cooperating and student teacher interaction beyond traditional site capabilities. Therefore, the present study also looked for potential suggestions of dyad participant isolation in relation to the design of the two student teaching research contexts.

6. Dyad Role Perceptions

Garner (1973) has indicated that participants involved in the student teaching process develop certain role expectations for themselves and others. Accordingly, Garner called for the examination of student teaching participants' behavioural and perceptual interactions. This was in contrast to treating triad participants as individuals whose perceptions and behaviour remained unaffected by others within the

student teaching process.

Analysis of participant interaction is vital because as suggested earlier, personal conceptual orientations frame the student teaching approach undertaken by individuals (Feiman-Nemser, 1990). Further, as Eisner (1979) has indicated, personal orientations in education serve not only to legitimize certain ideas and practices, but also limit and prohibit the introduction or use of different opinions and approaches. Consequently, the interface between triad participant perceptions can lead to smooth or disjointed interaction in student teacher development.

Four decades ago, Corrigan and Garland (1966) pointed to participant conceptual disagreements as leading to both triad relationship deterioration and reducing the positive impact of student teaching for the prospective teacher. This suggestion concerning the influence of student teaching participant interaction on student teacher development is still well supported by the more recent research (eg., Kaufmann, 1992; Hardy 1997a; Veal & Rickard, 1998).

However, research (Darst,1974; Hamilton,1974; Krause, 1988; Jones, et al., 1997) also indicates that when the cooperating teacher and university supervisor work as a team with a common approach, then significant change in student teacher instructional behaviour can be achieved. In fact, Coulon (1989) points out that if teacher education programmes are to achieve their goals through the student teaching process, then triad interaction must focus on collaboration; a view also supported by Veal and Rickard (1998).

Research during the 1980s and 1990s, (Czejdo, 1989; Ryan, 1989; Shippy, 1989; Kaufmann, 1992; Rothwell, Nardia & McIntyre, 1994) has, in particular, identified triad confusion over the university supervisor's role in the student teaching process. Such triad confusion is important to highlight because as research (eg., Krause, 1988; Jones, et al., 1997) has highlighted, student and cooperating teacher coalitions with clear university supervisor support are the most likely triad configurations to encourage student teacher development. However,

encouragement of student teacher development is difficult to generate when triad participants are unclear as to the purpose of the cooperating teacher and supervisor in triad interaction.

Clearly, as Castillo (1971) indicated three decades ago, teacher educators need to assess the impact of different student teaching triad emphases. Such assessment is vital in the on - going effort to move teacher education research beyond a continuous evaluation of the traditional student teaching process, useful as this has been. Yet, there is still minimal research contrasting alternative and traditional triadic student teaching approaches.

Therefore, the present researcher took the opportunity provided by Slippery Rock University to describe and compare two differently designed triadic student teaching approaches. In particular, the present research looked at dyad participants' perceptions of self and others related to the student teaching context, and at the potential influence such views may have had on participant relationships.

7. Dyad Concerns

As indicated in the previous section, student and cooperating teachers have exhibited perceptual differences. These differences may lead to potential participant concerns in such areas as student teaching aims and triad participants' purposes. Cruickshank, Kennedy and Myers (1974) have also highlighted dyad concerns focused on discipline, pupil motivation and individualizing instruction. In health and physical education, Jones (1992b) found student teachers concerned about class and individual off - task behaviour and unmotivated pupils; particularly, in relation to correct career choice.

Such dyad participant concerns have the potential for creating not only student teacher anxiety, but also intra triad conflict and dissatisfaction. For example, Smith (1981) found that for physical education student teachers, anxiety related negatively to instructional competence, dyad compatibility and overall satisfaction with the outcome of student teaching.

Further, a major concern for student teachers has centred around

supervisory feedback. Both cooperating teachers and university supervisors have been highlighted as failing to provide adequate feedback; particularly on lesson planning (Pfister & Newcomb, 1984). In physical education, cooperating teachers have been associated with infrequent observation which limits their student teacher feedback (McBride, 1984). Limited observation may actually lead to decreased dyad conferencing and student teacher development. Therefore, a perceived lack of feedback may also contribute to increased student teacher concern and dissatisfaction. In fact, Mears (1981) found that student teacher morale related positively to personal perceptions of dyad conferencing.

Student teacher concerns and needs may be a reason why university supervisors have indicated having so much trouble getting student teachers to try different pedagogical ideas during student teaching (Zimpher, DeVoss & Nott, 1980). Tinning and Siedentop (1985) have suggested that student teachers in an effort to decrease personal anxiety, go with 'what works' pedagogically; particularly to maintain pupil cooperation. Therefore, student teachers may model cooperating teachers' behaviour both for that individual's approval and because they feel such behaviours are more easily recognized and familiar to the pupils they teach.

Balancing cooperating teacher, university supervisor and pupil needs is clearly a complex task for student teachers. Such complexity and concern may be further heightened if cooperating teachers and university supervisors perceive student teachers' problems very differently (Nichols, 1980).

Various reasons have been presented as to why triad participants view student teacher problems and needs so differently. For example, participants' conceptual orientation towards school curriculum and teaching as Eisner (1979) indicates, may limit the degree to which participants recognize, accept and respond toward the concerns and needs of others. Further, the university supervisor may be too far removed from the student teacher's instructional environment in terms

of number and length of observations (Eltiste, 1989) to appreciate the intensity of student teachers' concerns. In fact, both cooperating teacher and university supervisor as experienced practitioners may not appreciate the severity of student teachers' concerns (McBride, 1984; Dunne, 1996; Hynes - Dusel, 1997); particularly, concerns about class management, dyad relationship and student teacher evaluation (Nichols, 1980).

Overall, the literature indicates that dyad concerns may have a debilitating influence on prospective teacher development. Therefore, the present study identified factors within the design of the traditional and alternative research sites, which appeared to influence both within and between site dyad group perceptual differences in terms of participant concerns.

8. Student Teaching Impact

Research (Clandinin, 1986; Calderhead & Robson, 1991) indicates that prospective teachers often enter student teaching with idealized beliefs about teaching and learning . However, investigation (Wiley, 1972; Templin, 1979; 1981) also suggests such student teacher attitudes become more moderated and/or more conservative over the duration of the student teaching experience.

Further, Tullis (1988) found that student teaching had an impact on the role expectations of prospective teachers. Student teacher personal role expectations have been demonstrated to moderate over the course of the student teaching experience. Schempp (1986) also found such moderation occurring in physical education student teachers' views during the student teaching experience; particularly, concerning personal responsibility for children's learning and failure. Likewise, Hynes - Dusel (1997) found that student teachers were more concerned about self rather than their impact by the end of student teaching.

Clearly, moderation in student teacher viewpoints may be a cause for concern amongst teacher educators. In particular, as such moderation appears linked to decline in both self and pupil expectations by student

teachers. Yet, triad influence in terms of student teacher performance and achievement has been found to relate to the level of explicitness of expectation amongst triad participants. For example, Webster and Graham (1989) found that clearly stated expectations provided in a business - like, yet cordial environment (as opposed to indirectly stated expectations), led to increased expectations and wider goals for student teacher achievement. Further, encouragement for student teachers to become more proactive within the triad has also been found to positively impact: student teacher development; their influence on children and an improved supervisory process (Hudson & Latham, 1996; Wade, 1997).

The present study was not designed to assess student teaching impact on prospective teachers observable teaching, or potential attitudinal changes demonstrated over the duration of the student teaching experience. However, the data generated by the present study did provide insights and comparisons into mentor - cooperating and student teacher expectations. In particular, those dyad expectations concerning the purpose of self and others, as well as expectations for student teacher responsibility, achievement and child understanding.

9. Summary of Literature Review Implications

A review of related literature predominantly from the United States indicates, that at best there is minimal research - based data available describing and comparing participant perceptions of traditional and alternative student teaching experiences. In fact, no research literature on this specific topic could be located in the field of health and physical education. However, there were a number of interesting considerations that emerged from the undertaken review of related literature which held implication for the present study:

1. Selection of physical education student teaching sites in the United States appears to be mainly haphazard (Tannehill and Goc - Karp, 1992). It is not common to find universities continually sending their student teachers to the same traditional sites each academic semester,

year after year. Consequently, the Bethel Park School - District utilized by Slippery Rock University physical education department as an on - going student teaching site, represented a rich source for gathering experienced traditional cooperating teacher data.

2. Pilot research (Jones, 1993) has indicated that the Slippery Rock University Department of Physical Education alternative Teaching Centre approach encourages the development of student teachers in a number of areas perceived as beneficial to professional development (eg., proaction, organization and professional communication). Consequently, such initial findings suggested a need for more indepth research into the influence of this alternative student teaching process.

3. The present research also allowed a comparison to be conducted between the traditional and alternative sites in terms of dyad participant perceptions concerning self and others' purpose related to site influence. Such rare, if not unique site data collection and comparison allowed findings to be generated that enhanced the health and physical education teacher preparation knowledge - base.

4. The literature (eg., Rickard and Veal, 1998) points to the confusion and disagreement that exists within triad groups concerning the objectives for student teaching and participant purposes. Eisner (1979) has indicated how participant orientations may act to guide and limit personal and others' actions. Consequently, the present research allowed identification and analysis of within and between site dyad group perceptual similarities and differences related to site design. In particular, gathered data focused on self and others' purpose within the student teaching process as well as the usefulness, focus and mode of supervisory feedback involved.

5. Although not a pre and post test attitudinal study the present research made comparisons between dyad group perceptions. The literature suggests the impact of the cooperating teacher on the student teacher (Dunne, 1996; Rickard and Veal, 1998) and has pointed to student teacher concern for self (Arrighi & Young, 1987) rather than their impact on children. Consequently, the present study analyzed

data in terms of dyad group perceptions related to student teachers' responsibilities, achievements and views about children. Again, site design was also a consideration in this analysis.

6. Research (Zimpher, Devoss & Nott, 1980) has indicated how dyad concerns may negatively influence the development of the student teacher. Therefore, the present study identified areas of concern for dyad groups in both sites. Further, dyad isolation has been suggested (Dodds, 1988) as a area related to participant concern and supervisory influence. Consequently, the present research also analyzed data for any potential dyad group isolation influence related to site design.

In conclusion, as indicated previously, the predominant focus of this chapter has been on literature based in the United States. References from other countries have been used to help provide an international context. However, while not focused directly on the research questions guiding the present study, the related American and foreign literature outlined has provided some interesting implications for this investigation. The following chapter now provides information concerning the present research assumptions, design, instrument, processes and analysis involved in the study.

Chapter Three

Methods

The purpose of this study was to describe and compare the perceptions of dyad participant groups working in a traditional and alternative student teaching experience. Specifically, this study described and compared mentor - cooperating and student teacher perceptions concerning self and others' purpose.

Therefore, the third chapter clarifies the framework and the methodology that guided the present study. In particular, this chapter indicates how the present researcher decided on both the specific research focus and the methodological design adopted. Also provided is a detailed description of the research participants, instrument and questions, as well as the data gathering and analysis techniques. Specifically, chapter three is divided into the following sections:

1. Researcher Profile
2. Research Design
3. Research Sites
4. Research Ethics
5. Research Participants
6. Research Instrument and Technique
7. Research Questions
8. Research Validity and Reliability
9. Data Collection
10. Data Analysis
11. Data Presentation

1. Researcher Profile

It is important to acknowledge both the role and influence of the researcher in qualitative investigation. Readers should feel that a researcher undertaking qualitative study has a contextual involvement and knowledge of the study topic. In particular, the researcher should have both a practical and theoretical knowledge concerning the

research context that aids their understanding of the meanings that emerge from their data analysis (Patton, 1987; Powney & Watts, 1987). Consequently, to increase reader awareness concerning the person who undertook this actual investigation, what follows is an outline of the present researcher's background as it relates to his involvement with this study.

In 1991 the researcher assumed a one year temporary full - time Assistant Professor's position in the physical education department at Slippery Rock University, PA. His primary responsibility was to work as a university supervisor in school districts providing student teaching experiences for specialist K - 12 health and physical education student teachers from the university. As indicated by their title, these prospective teachers were being prepared to teach both health and physical education to children across the American compulsory school age range of 5 to 18 years of age (ie., grades K - 12).

Student teaching as both an area of practice and a field of study had been of particular interest to the researcher since his arrival in the United States of America (U.S.A.) from England during the early 1980s. This personal interest was stimulated through research, project and coursework under - taken to complete both a Master of Arts (1985) and an Education Specialist (1988) degree at Kent State University, Ohio, U.S.A.

While studying and teaching full - time at Kent State University, the researcher gained five years of supervisory experience set within a traditional physical education student teaching component. However, the alternative Teaching Center approach utilized by the Department of Physical Education at Slippery Rock University represented a very different student teaching design compared to the traditional approach.

The Slippery Rock University Teaching Centre the researcher was assigned to was the Mars Area School - District. Due to working in this Teaching Centre and driven by the need for greater understanding of this alternative approach the researcher wrote a descriptive paper on this topic (Jones, 1993). The paper included researcher, mentor -

cooperating teachers and student teachers' perceptions regarding the benefits and disadvantages of the Mars Teaching Centre process. Interview data indicated that participants' perceptions were quite positive toward this alternative approach to student teaching.

Further, the researcher became aware of a number of issues that were being raised with regard to the student teaching process within the university physical education department. For example, there was concern that with more than half the department's student teachers now being directed to three Teaching Centres each semester, the department was losing contact with its traditional student teaching sites. The question was raised as to whether, in fact, moving away from a traditional student teaching approach was a trend the physical education department wanted to see? Especially, as this trend was based on unsupported notions that the centre approach encouraged the development of student teacher qualities beyond the scope of the traditional approach.

Consequently, it was against this background of department discussion concerning student teaching design and influence that the researcher decided to focus his doctoral proposal. In particular, the focus was placed on investigating the perceptions of dyad participants working in the traditional and alternative approach to health and physical education student teaching at Slippery Rock University.

Researcher Assumptions:

According to Patton (1987) the person(s) conducting qualitative research represents a critical factor in relation to investigatory validity, data meaningfulness and study credibility. Further, Guba (1978) and House (1980) indicate that readers of such research should be provided with the opportunity to gain some understanding of both how the researcher(s) involved arrived at such study involvement (ie., researcher profile) and the assumptions that they brought to their work. Clearly, such researcher assumptions may influence study outcomes so readers should have information related to the researcher's 'neutrality' (Patton, 1987); in other, words the level of impartiality

brought to the investigation by the researcher.

As indicated earlier, the present researcher was influenced by a number of factors (e.g., personal study, research - Jones, 1989; 1992a; 1992b; 1993 and student teacher supervisory experience) which led to the emergence of this particular topic for doctoral research. Therefore, again, it is important to identify some of the assumptions that the researcher held because such views helped to ground the study and influence the approach taken.

1. The researcher felt that the questions concerning student teaching raised by the Department of Physical Education at Slippery Rock University were important issues. There seemed to be both a practical (i.e., inform actual participant groups at the university and school level) and theoretical (i.e., make a unique contribution to the knowledge - base) need that would be served by researching the perceptions of mentor - cooperating and student teachers, working in the department's traditional and Teaching Centre approaches. As of yet, there is no research data (behavioural and/or perceptual) describing and comparing the similarities and differences demonstrated by participants in these two differently designed student teaching approaches.

2. Bethel Park School - District represents the only district within the researcher's experience, that, as a traditional student teaching site has a history of continually receiving student teachers each academic year (i.e., Fall and Spring semesters for seven years in succession). It is more usual for traditional sites to suffer from both inconsistent semester site and cooperating teacher selection. Consequently, the situation at Bethel Park offered the researcher the opportunity to study the perceptions of traditional cooperating teachers involved in a continuous student teaching experience.

3. Teaching Centre pilot research (Jones, 1993) had also intensified the present researcher's interest in investigating the perceptions of dyad participants working in a traditional student teaching approach. The question needed to be asked as to how the perceptions held by

dyad participants in these two differently designed experiences might correspond or differ. Further, were any dyad group perceptual differences potentially grounded in the two differently designed approaches to student teaching?

4. Having worked for a year as a university supervisor in both the present student teaching research sites the researcher already had some understanding and relationship with the mentor - cooperating teachers involved in the research. It was believed that these prior positive interaction experiences would help participant teachers feel more comfortable in talking with the researcher. Further, although confidentiality had been indicated in the letter inviting study participation, teacher confidence might also have been increased by the fact that the present researcher at the time of the interviews was no longer teaching at Slippery Rock University. This situation may have eased participant concerns about interview information somehow getting back to the university physical education department.

2. Research Design

For the purpose of this study a qualitative research design was utilized. As an investigation of complex field - based experiences the naturalistic approach allowed the researcher to frame the present inquiry in terms of investigation into an on - going multi - dimensional process, rather than as a variable to be studied (Patton, 1987).

Chapter two indicates that there is research on cooperating and student teachers' perceptions regarding dyad purposes, procedures, concerns and impact, etc. However, other than a descriptive pilot study (Jones, 1993) on the Teaching Centre design, there is no research - based analysis available describing this new student teaching approach. In particular, there is no indepth study into participants' perceptions of the purpose of self and others within the context of this alternatively designed student teaching process.

Consequently, due to this lack of data on the Teaching Centre approach the qualitative research design selected gave credence to and enabled the present research participants themselves, to provide

their own data. This type of research approach allowed the emergence of participant descriptions, explanations and meanings in response to the investigations research questions. Consequently, the emphasis in the present study was on the meanings derived from the language and discourse of those participants primarily involved with the research focus itself (LeCompte & Preissle, 1993).

The present investigatory approach was in contrast to trying to fit participant perceptions into already predetermined research categories. Again, the present research emphasis was on the perceptions of those who were most closely involved with the contextual processes under investigation. In particular, the researcher wanted to recognize and accord status to the present study participants for the contextual knowledge and understanding they possessed (Cherryholmes, 1988). Further, it was out of these personal participant perspectives that data was generated which provided the base both for the present analyses and the grounded hypotheses generated for future researchers to investigate.

As indicated earlier, there appeared to be no published research describing and comparing the perceptions of individual school - district intact groups of cooperating and student teachers. In particular, groups that were working in two differently designed student teaching experiences focused within a single, traditional four year teacher preparation programme. Consequently, the situation provided by the health and physical education student teaching programme at Slippery Rock University provided an extremely rare opportunity. Here was the chance to both describe and compare participants' perceptions grounded in simultaneous, on - going traditional and alternative designed student teaching processes; both 'housed' within a single traditional teacher preparation programme.

The unstudied nature and design of the present investigation clearly met the criteria for this research being designated as an exploratory - descriptive study (Babbie, 1989). As exploratory study the qualitative methods selected allowed the inductive emergence of grounded theory

involving the identification of indepth ideas, issues and concerns important to the participants working at the two research sites.

Further, Atkinson, Delamont and Hammersley (1988) have identified seven different types of approach related to qualitative research. These approaches include for example, symbolic interactionism (e.g., Scarth, 1987), anthropology (e.g., Jacobs, 1987), neo - Marxist ethnography (e.g., Bowe & Whitty, 1983) and Feminist research (e.g., Bowles & Duelli - Klein, 1983). However, in terms of the present research the comparative between site componential analysis involved most closely connected this approach to the concept of democratic evaluation. This type of research design and analysis emerged from within the discipline of curriculum evaluation (MacDonald, 1974; Elliott, 1986; Simons, 1987; Norris, 1991). Like democratic evaluation, the present study relied on qualitative methodologies and had as an intent to also provide information responsive to the needs of those involved with the research sites (i.e., student, mentor - cooperating teachers, university supervisors and the university physical education teacher preparation department).

As with a qualitative study focused on an unfamiliar, at best minimally researched area, there were no pre - existing research hypotheses to guide the present study. However, this study was guided by one major research question (outlined in Chapter 1, section 6) and six sub - questions (provided in Chapter 3, section 7). The research questions were developed in two ways. Initially, through the 'first - hand' experience of the present researcher who had worked as a university supervisor in the two selected student teaching research sites. Second, through reference to the trends, questions and implications raised by the theoretical and research literature as presented in the first and, particularly, second chapters of this study (see the research summaries related to present investigatory questions - Chapter 2 section 8).

3. Research Sites

Both the present investigation university and the two school - district sites are all situated in western PA. Specifically, the Mars district is just

north of the city of Pittsburgh and is a 45 minute drive from the
university. The Mars Teaching Centre was initiated in the Fall semester,
1991. The district is made up of five schools (i.e., three elementary, one
middle and one high school), and had approximately 2000 children
enrolled during the 1992-93 academic year. The Bethel Park district is
situated in the southern part of Pittsburgh and is a 90 minute drive from
the university. This district is made up of eight schools (i.e., six
elementary, one middle and one high school) and had approximately
4,600 children enrolled for the 1992-93
academic year.

Based on the Tannehill and Goc-Karp (1992) definition of catchment
areas by population (i.e., urban 1 = 100,000 people, to rural 3 = less
than 499 people), both Bethel Park and Mars would have been
classified as suburban areas. Both districts were predominantly
Caucasian in terms of their pupils' ethnic background.

4. Research Ethics

The present researcher approached both the Slippery Rock
University College of Education and the Department of Physical
Education to obtain permission to conduct this study. Having obtained
university approval the researcher then approached the two identified
school - district superintendents via an explanatory letter (see Appendix
A). They were informed about the purpose of the research and the
requirements that would be made on the teachers who volunteered to
participate.

On receiving both superintendents' approval, letters were then sent
to the identified mentor - cooperating teachers in the two sites informing
them of the purpose of the research, the confidentiality of their data and
an invitation to participate. This letter format was also the same
approach used with the identified student teacher participants (see
Appendix B).

While participant teachers' names were intentionally not used in the
study to maintain individual confidentiality, pilot research in the
Teaching Centre (Jones, 1993) had shown that an experienced group

of teachers were comfortable with the outcomes of their work receiving public acknowledgement. Consequently, it was decided to use the actual names of the school - districts involved in the present research, as a compliment to the dedication and efforts of these intact groups of student teaching field - based teachers.

5. Research Participants

Mentor - cooperating and student teachers involved in the Slippery Rock University Department of Physical Education student teaching process were the participants for the present study. Specifically, mentor - cooperating and student teachers working in the Bethel Park School - District traditional student teaching site, and the Mars Area School - District Teaching Centre provided interview data for this study.

There were eight mentor - cooperating teachers (i.e., 5 female, 3 male) involved at the Mars Teaching Centre. While three taught specifically at the high school level (i.e., grades 9 - 12, ages 15 - 18), two taught only physical education while the third taught health and adapted physical education. Two teachers taught physical education at the middle school (i.e., grades 6 - 8, ages 12 - 14). A further teacher taught health at the middle school and also provided physical education instruction at one of the three elementary schools (i.e., grades k - 5, ages 5 - 11). The remaining two teachers were responsible for sharing most of the health and physical education teaching at the three elementary schools.

In terms of the present study participants, seven Mars teachers volunteered to participate. The eighth teacher decided not to take part for personal reasons unrelated to the centre process. The seven participating teachers had between 5 and 28 years of teaching experience with an average of 17 years. In terms of the number of student teachers these centre teachers had supervised during their teaching careers, this ranged from a low of 6 to a high of 50; an average of 21 students per teacher. None of these mentor - cooperating teachers had received any formal education in supervising student teachers, other than reading the written information provided to them in

the university cooperating teacher's handbook.

At Bethel Park there were also eight (4 female, 4 male) teachers who worked as Slippery Rock University Department of Physical Education cooperating teachers. Four taught health and physical education at their own elementary schools. Three other teachers taught specifically physical education at the high school level. The one remaining teacher while also teaching high school physical education provided both health and physical education instruction at the middle school as well.

In terms of the present study, seven Bethel Park teachers volunteered to participate. The eighth teacher was unable to participate due to illness. The seven participating teachers had between 13 and 25 years of teaching experience with an average of 20.1 years. In terms of the number of student teachers these teachers had supervised, this ranged from a low of 3 to a high of 40; an average of 15.4 students per teacher. One of these seven teachers had received formal supervisory education while the rest had received only the written information contained in the university cooperating teacher's handbook.

Based on time, logistic and data generation considerations, it was decided to invite for interview all the student teachers who would teach in each of the two present research sites over two successive semesters (n = 16). To allow the student teachers time to become familiar with their school - district sites it was decided that no interview would be conducted until a student teacher had only three weeks or less left to go in their experience (i.e., the student teacher would have had at least 13 weeks student teaching before being interviewed).

Student teachers in the physical education department at Slippery Rock University undertake the student teaching component as their final requirement for graduation with an undergraduate degree (i.e., B.Sc.) in physical education. Actual Pennsylvanian certification as a specialist K - 12 health and physical education teacher is only granted to prospective teachers upon their successful completion of the National Teachers Examination which is externally written and assessed.The teacher education programme is built around course

work in liberal education studies, educational theory, health and physical education content and theory, and pedagogical theory and practice. Of the 16 student teachers in the present study, all were either 22 or 23 years of age; only two came from outside the state of Pennsylvania.

6. Research Instrument and Technique

The use of the interview technique as a method for gathering data from the respondent's perspective is not a new technique. Researchers have grown to appreciate the complex, multidimensional nature of environments within the social sciences. Consequently, they have come to the realization that respondent meanings cannot necessarily be investigated via purely quantitative means (Powney & Watts, 1987).

Interviews have played an important role in the gathering of psychological and psychiatric information (McBride, 1989). The original anthropological research into preliterate societies utilized this research tool as a part of the data gathering process (Biddle & Anderson, 1986). Interviews have also been used in the physical education environment in both a formal indepth and informal manner (Griffin, 1984; Placek, 1984; Tinning & Siedentop, 1985; Jones, 1993).

Patton (1982) has suggested that the purpose of the interview technique is to allow the researcher to inquire into "...what is in and on someone else's mind ...not put things in someone's mind" (p. 161). To enable qualitative researchers to explore respondents' minds, three broad categories of interview technique have been developed. These three interview categories are commonly referred to as the formal or structured (i.e., standardized); the semi-structured (i.e., nonscheduled standardized) and the informal or unstructured (i.e., nonstandardized) interview.

Denzin (1970) has attributed various characteristics to each of these three types of interview technique. With the structured interview because a standardized format is followed by the interviewer, potential interviewer effects are reduced. For example, the wording and the order of the questions remains the same for all respondents. This is an

especially important consideration if a number of interviewers are involved in the data gathering process. The weakness of the structured approach is that it is not flexible; it does not allow the interviewer to further pursue a respondent answer or an issue that was not anticipated.

The semi - structured interview allows the interviewer more latitude in terms of the wording and order of schedule questions. Consequently, the questions can be used more in relation to the characteristics and responses of the interviewee. Further, the interviewer has the opportunity to follow-up respondent answers that need clarifying or developing. Thus, this type of interview also requires that the interviewer be familiar with the content that provides the framework to the interview.

The unstructured interview does not use a set of prescribed questions. Consequently, this means there is no specific question order or wording. This method of interviewing allows the interviewer to create questions and probe issues as they appear to arise from the respondent's responses. With the unstructured approach, the respondent is more responsible for determining the issues that will become the focus for the interview. Even more so than with the semi-structured interview, the interviewer in the unstructured situation must be able to react to the information that is generated by the respondent by quickly formulating further related questions.

Clearly, the semi and unstructured interview approaches can lead to problems in data analysis. Due to being more flexible and individualized than the structured interview, semi and unstructured interviews can provide differing amounts of information for individual respondents. Further, the possibility of different questions having been directed to respondents (particularly, in the unstructured situation) can make analysis of the data complex; especially, with between group analysis.

The person to person interview has been referred to as a "...social exchange" by Dillman (1978). However, Benjamin (1981) suggests there are three specific phases to the actual interview; the intimation,

the development and the close.

In terms of the intimation, the interviewer should make the respondent aware of why he/she is involved in the interview. Further, the interviewer should also indicate how long the interview will take and the method of recording information (e.g., audiotape), including why such a method is being used.

In the development phase the interviewer should apply knowledge from past interviews and pilot experiences. In this phase, Benjamin (1981) has indicated that the interviewer should utilize verbal and non-verbal behaviours that are non suggestive and neutral. Word clarity is vital so technical jargon should be avoided unless it is clearly part of the respondent's language. Interviewers should also avoid emotional emphasis in the way in which they present questions, physically and verbally. A business - like, confident, personable and sensitive approach should be demonstrated.

In closing the interview both people should be aware that the interview is, in fact, coming to closure. In this phase the interviewer should avoid eliciting new information. The interviewer might generally summarize the information derived or have the respondent do this. Whichever method is used the interviewer should try to indicate at least in general terms the value of the information gained in relation to the purposes of the study. Finally, the respondent should be thanked for their participation.

Consequently, while acknowledging the potential difficulties that can arise through the use of the personal interview technique, the semi - structured interview was selected as the instrument best suited to gather data relevant to the purpose of the present study. As True (1983) suggested, when a researcher has some idea of the direction to take with regard to research focus, then the semi - structured interview utilizing a question schedule as a guide is an appropriate instrument. This is a particularly useful method if the research approach is of an exploratory nature.

Further, the questions for the present research interview schedules

were all open - ended. As Fowler (1988) suggested, this type of questioning allows the respondent to describe personal views in their own ways without researcher a priori limitations. A small number of closed - end demographic questions were also designed to elicit personal background information from the respondents for descriptive purposes. However, based on Patton's (1980) question categorization the majority of the present interview questions could be classified in three areas: Experience and Behaviour; Opinion and Value, and Knowledge.

7. Research Question

Clearly, a major factor related to the interview technique was the selection of the actual questions that were used to construct the schedules for the present research interviews. These questions became the initial interview stimulants that set in motion the generation of the research data. In the present study, the 6 sub - questions derived from the major research question were used as the basis for the two interview question schedules (see Appendix C for interview schedules).

The major research question that guided the present study was, in fact, developed by the researcher with reference to a number of sources:

1. A review of the themes that emerged from an analysis of the related literature (i.e., see Chapter 2, section 8).

2. Personal questions generated as a consequence of the supervisory experience gained by the present researcher in both selected research sites.

3. Participant perceptions recorded in a pilot study (Jones, 1993) conducted in the present investigation's alternative research site.

4. Questions raised by the Department of Physical Education at Slippery Rock University (i.e., see 'Researcher Assumptions' - Chapter 3, section 1).

As indicated, the following major research question (i.e., A) was used to guide the present study. The six research sub - questions (i.e., 1 - 6) provided the basis for the semi - structured interview schedule for both

the participating mentor - cooperating and student teachers:

A. **What do mentor - cooperating and student teachers in a traditional and alternative student teaching site perceive to be their own purposes, and those of their school - based colleague during the student teaching experience?**

1. What do mentor - cooperating teachers (M)CTs) perceive to be their specific purpose in relation to working with a) the student teacher (ST), and b) the university supervisor (US) during the student teaching experience?

2. What do STs perceive to be the (M)CTs specific purpose in relation to working with a) the ST, and b) the US during the student teaching experience?

3. What do (M)CTs perceive to be the STs specific purpose in relation to working with a) the (M)CT, and b) the US during the student teaching experience?

4. What do STs perceive to be their specific purpose in relation to working with a) the (M)CT, and b) the US as prospective teachers during the student teaching experience?

5. What do (M)CTs perceive to be the STs specific overall purpose for achievement as a prospective teacher during the student teaching experience.

6. What do STs perceive to be their specific overall purpose for achievement as prospective teachers during the student teaching experience?

8. Research Validity and Reliability

Guba and Lincoln (1981) have suggested that the basic concerns used in testing in scientific inquiry are also applicable to qualitative research. However, names perceived more appropriate to the qualitative paradigm have been assigned to the various test aspects. For example, Lincoln and Guba (1985) have used the term 'truth value' instead of internal validity and 'fittingness' in place of external validity.

Merriam (1988) indicates that internal validity concerns the question of how qualitative findings match reality. Clearly, when the researcher is

dealing with perceived emergent meanings derived from original data, there must be concerns about producing potentially misleading conclusions. Consequently, Merriam has listed six strategies to increase the truth value of derived findings. In relation to the present study the following Merriam methods were utilized:

1. Outlining the researchers' background and assumptions so that the reader can assess the abilities and potential biases brought by the investigator to the study.
2. Peer examination of the research instrument to assess the relevance and focus.
3. Pilot testing the research instrument to assess clarity and presentation technique.
4. Returning the research findings for participants' comments and validation.

While Erickson (1986) talked about 'concrete universals', Goetz and LeCompte (1984) referred to the idea of qualitative findings 'transferability' in relation to external validity/generalization. They argued that such transferability of research findings depends on the degree to which the context researched matches other situations in which the reader may be interested. According to Schofield (1989) and Locke (1989) this means providing the reader with substantial information about the context under investigation from which they can draw their own relationships. Therefore, the provision of details outlining the present research sites and participants along with findings that included quotations, was to enable the reader to draw their own relationships between the research findings and their own personal situations.

In terms of checking the present research instrument validity along with the reliability of both instrument and interview technique the following two phase process was used. First, approval was sought and received concerning the mentor - cooperating and student teacher interview question schedules from the three selected critics (i.e., Ph.D advisor and the two main Slippery Rock University Department of

Physical Education student teacher supervisors). Second, the researcher then successfully completed pilot interviews with a cooperating and student teacher not involved with the present study during March - April 1993.

In terms of interview schedule feedback from the three critics; comments were positive. Feedback indicated that the question schedules on paper were perceived to be clear and relevant. However, it was felt that some refinements might be needed when the schedules were actually subjected to the pilot interview process.

An experienced (i.e., 10 years teaching and three student teachers supervised) elementary physical education teacher was interviewed in her school office. The physical education student teacher was interviewed (three weeks before she finished her 14 week student teaching experience) in a university physical education classroom. Both interviewees were involved with the Kent State University physical education student teaching experience and had worked professionally with the present researcher. It was felt that this professional relationship would enable the two interviewees to feel more comfortable in informing the present researcher concerning any problems they might have had with the interview questions, or the technique used.

The interview with the cooperating teacher took 45 minutes, while the student teacher's took 50 minutes. These two interviews helped the present researcher to refine the two interview question schedules and test the tape recording equipment. The researcher also checked his own interview technique. Both interviewees indicated that they found the questions interesting and relevant to the student teaching process. They also indicated that the interview atmosphere was comfortable and that the interviewer's technique (verbal and non verbal) had not influenced their answers in a particular direction. The follow up questions asked were felt to have encouraged the interviewees to think more deeply about some of their initial answers.

During the interviews, whenever the interviewees asked for

clarification concerning a particular question, this was immediately noted by the interviewer. The question was then reworded and again asked to check for clear interviewee understanding. Because these two interviewees were working in a traditional student teaching setting the questions in both schedules which focused on the Teaching Centre process were not asked. However, any centre focused questions found to cause confusion during interviews with the present investigation's first actual mentor-cooperating and student teachers were immediately reworded for increased clarity. The two research interview schedules are provided in Appendix C.

9. Data Collection

To administer the entire 30 interviews for the present study the researcher made nine visits in total to the two research sites and the Slippery Rock University campus. A further five visits to the research sites and the university were also required over the duration of the data collection period. These were made to deliver participant cover letters, confirm participation and arrange interview dates/times. Data were collected over a 12 month period.

All interviews (n = 30) were audio tape recorded and then transcribed professionally by the Kent State University Research Bureau. Audio taping enabled the present researcher to concentrate on and probe interviewee responses without the distraction of paper and pencil recording. Also, tape recording meant that the interviews were not slowed down due to the interviewer trying to take notes. Interviews took between 50 and 75 minutes to complete.

It was decided not to include the interview question schedules with the research cover letter that each participant received. The present researcher purposely wanted to avoid participants feeling there were certain right answers to this inquiry. It was also hoped that the answers given at the actual interviews would be based on the information and ideas that were most meaningful and readily available to interviewees.

A total of 22 interviews were conducted during May, 1993 (ie., Spring semester). Fourteen mentor - cooperating teachers from the Teaching

Centre (n = 7) and traditional (n = 7) school - district sites were interviewed. Also interviewed were the eight student teachers who were currently undertaking their student teaching requirement at the centre (n = 4) and traditional (n = 4) sites. All the mentor - cooperating teachers were interviewed either in their own school offices or in empty classrooms.

The Teaching Centre student teachers were all interviewed individually during one evening in a room at Slippery Rock University. At the traditional site two of the four student teachers were interviewed in offices. However, the other two had to be interviewed individually while sitting on the practice football field seats. This was necessitated because of the noise/music pervading the physical education complex at the time of interviewing (despite a little wind vibration the audio tape statements were quite clearly recorded). All STs were interviewed approximately two weeks before the end of their student teaching experience.

During the Fall (i.e., Autumn) semester, 1993, the present researcher interviewed the four student teachers who were working in the Mars Teaching Centre. These four student teachers received the same cover letter as previous participants and were interviewed at the end of November, 1993; two weeks before the end of their student teaching experience. The four study participants were interviewed individually during the same day in an unused classroom at the Mars centre.

However, it was not possible to invite into the present study the student teachers working in the Bethel Park traditional site during the Fall semester, 1993. This was because mid way through the semester these student teachers were moved to another school - district, due to industrial action taken by Bethel Park teachers. The present researcher in consultation with the Ph.D advisor decided not to include these student teachers in the study. The rationale behind this decision was that these student teachers had only approximately eight weeks experience in the traditional research site. Further, their views could

have been biased by the political action that had occurred.

Consequently, the four student teachers who undertook their experience at Bethel Park the following semester, Spring, 1994, were invited to join the present study. These four students received the appropriate cover letter and were interviewed individually at the end of April, 1994; two weeks before the end of their student teaching. All were interviewed individually in a room at Slippery Rock University during a day the students were attending a student teacher seminar.

10. Data Analysis

In keeping with the qualitative nature of the instrument used to gather the research data in the present study a naturalistic analysis was employed. In particular, inductive analysis was used to allow participants' meanings to emerge from the data provided (Denzin, 1978). The present researcher copied the professionally transcribed interview transcripts so that he could carry out a cut and paste procedure, while still maintaining an intact copy of the original data.

Each interview transcript was identified by participant site descriptor (i.e., traditional or centre), gender, school level (i.e., elementary, middle and/or high school) and subject(s) taught. Further, each transcript was identifiable via its own designated number as was each answer on the respective cut and paste copy. This numbering system made it possible to trace data back to the original source (e.g., if a quotation was used) during the analysis and the writing of the findings.

Data was placed in four groups for analysis: traditional cooperating teachers; alternative mentor - cooperating teachers; traditional student teachers and alternative student teachers. Each group of participant answers was analyzed separately. Each individual respondent within the group had their transcript broken down (i.e., via cut and paste). Individual responses were itemized under the specific research sub-question that had produced that particular response via the relevant interview question(s). This itemization also included interviewee responses to further interviewer probes which had been stimulated by initial response to the original sub - question. The actual interview

questions for the mentor - cooperating and student teachers were stated in simple conversational terms using terminology pertinent to the particular site under discussion.

As indicated, the outlined analysis procedure above was conducted for every interviewee transcribed response within each of the four designated study groups. Then a taxonomic analysis (Spradley, 1979) was conducted on the interviewee responses to each interview question asked under the framework of a specific research sub - question. This inductive analysis involved the present researcher in reading and rereading each participant's response to each interview question asked. This process enabled the researcher to identify emergent words and themes (provided in bold type in the findings chapters) which best described an individual group's overall response to each interview question. The emergent elements identified under each research sub - question were then further analyzed and placed by the researcher under broader categorizations (ie., the underlined sub - headings provided in both the findings and componential analysis chapters). This categorizing allowed the grouping of participants emergent ideas under more embracing, descriptive themes and/or titles.

To assist in findings verification the researcher also referred back to the original data (ie., interview transcripts) to help confirm that the emergent meanings identified did in fact relate to the initial participant statements. According to Glaser and Strauss (1967) the categories identified by the researcher should 'fit' the original data. Clearly, therefore, identification of emergent meanings and their verification, in part, meant the researcher moving back and forth between reflection outcomes and original data.

The researcher then carried out a final level of inductive analysis. This was conducted on the broad descriptive categories that embraced the emergent ideas (ie., words and themes) identified from each group's responses to the interview questions. As indicated, the initial two classifications represented the findings for each group and focused

on the research sub - questions. However, this final level of analysis allowed the present researcher to write more concise, overall group findings summaries. In particular, these findings chapter summaries identified the pervasive descriptors, themes and issues that emerged from each group's response to the investigation's major research question.

Further, from within this final level of inductive analysis also emerged a general framework that facilitated both the within and between site componential analysis of dyad group findings. Overall, this framework evolved naturally from the group emergent findings, in part, due to the guiding research sub - questions and their supporting interview questions. The five descriptive areas were as follows:

1. Participant purposes.
2. Observer feedback.
3. Student teacher responsibilities.
4. Student teacher achievements.
5. Student teacher child understanding.

In keeping with taxonomic analysis of interview data the present researcher provided within each group's findings, participant examples and quotations that lent credence to the researcher's inductive depiction of a group's overall response. For Patton (1987) detailed description and quotation "...are the essential qualities of qualitative reports" (p. 163). Such detail enables the reader to understand the thoughts of the participants involved and the emergent meanings generated.

The number of participants associated with a particular group finding was also recorded. The reason for this simple quantification was to give a sense of how frequently a finding was expressed amongst a particular research group. This is an important point to clarify because the present study makes no claim for research design generalizability across all mentor - cooperating and student teacher populations. However, the sense of how many present group participants adhered to a particular finding did allow the researcher to present findings in an

order which moved from perceptions most indicated, to those with least participant identification.

Further, before the four sets of separate research group findings were accepted the summaries were sent to the relevant group participants for their validation (ie., Spring 1995). Participants were asked to read their group summary findings and to write any comments directly on to the script. In keeping with Locke's (1989) suggestion, participants were asked to identify any statements made with which they strongly disagreed, or any vital perception they felt was not included.

All thirty research participants were sent their relevant group summary findings. A follow up post card reminder was sent approximately one month after the initial posting. Since two years had already passed subsequent to the first series of interviews, some participants had moved out of state and could not be contacted. Further, all participants were no doubt very busy with their full - time positions so return response was low. Four (25% - 3 centre and 1 traditional) out of the 16 student teachers replied; six (43% - 4 centre and 2 traditional) out of the 14 mentor - cooperating teachers returned comments.

Generally the comments received were favourable toward the summaries. There were no major disagreements indicated, although it was pointed out by the alternative mentor - cooperating teachers that they had now changed part of the design in the Mars Teaching Centre with regard to student and cooperating teacher interaction. Instead of the student teacher working with two cooperating teachers one lesson per day throughout the semester, they now worked half a day (five days a week) with one cooperating teacher; half way through the semester they then changed to their second selected cooperating teacher for half the day. However, the interaction with the mentor teacher stayed the same as originally conceived (i.e., minimum three lessons daily throughout the semester). This new change was apparently made to address dyad participants' concerns with regard to the supervisory

problems faced particularly by the cooperating teacher; concerns actually identified in the present study.

11. Data Presentation

To assist reader interest and understanding concerning the detailed findings of the present study, the researcher undertook the following presentation format. Chapter 4 and 5 present the findings for the traditional cooperating and student teachers respectively. Chapter 6 provides a componential analysis of the traditional dyad group findings in terms of emergent perceptual similarities and differences. In particular, these analyses were undertaken in relation to both the major and sub research questions, and the related literature. Further, the conclusions and grounded hypotheses derived from the componential analyses are presented in Chapter 7. These hypotheses are provided as potential directions for future researchers' consideration regarding the traditional site.

Likewise, Chapter 8 and 9 respectively present the findings for the mentor - cooperating and student teachers in the alternative site. Chapter 10 undertakes a componential analysis of the alternative site dyad groups similar and differing perceptions; particularly as they pertain to the investigation's major and sub research questions and related literature. Finally, Chapter 11 presents the conclusions and grounded hypotheses (again, for future researchers to consider following up in the centres) derived from the componential analyses of the alternative dyad groups' findings.

It is Chapter 12 which presents a between site dyad group componential analysis. In particular, this analysis highlights between site dyad group perceptual similarities and differences, and relates these to the potential student teaching site design influences. Questions are also raised for future consideration in terms of site design and the potential influence on dyad participants. Finally, Chapter 13 presents an overall summary of the major research findings while Chapter 14 provides the research recommendations and evaluation.

Chapters (i.e., 6, 7, 10, 11 & 12) that discuss and compare individual

dyad group perceptual findings are primarily focused on the findings summaries (ie., Chs., 4, 5, 8 & 9). Consequently, the componential analysis chapters are presented in relation to the five descriptive areas (see Chapter 3, section 8 on Data Analysis) that were identified in the present researcher's final level analysis. Therefore, this investigation's findings and analyses are presented in the following order:

4. Traditional Site Cooperating Teacher Findings.
5. Traditional Site Student Teacher Findings.
6. Componential Analysis of the Traditional Site Dyad Findings
7. Traditional Dyad Group Findings: Conclusions and Hypotheses.
8. Alternative Site Mentor - Cooperating Teacher Findings.
9. Alternative Site Student Teacher Findings.
10. Componential Analysis of the Alternative Site Dyad Findings.
11. Alternative Site Dyad Groups: Conclusions and Hypotheses.
12. Traditional and Alternative Site Dyad Group Findings: Comparisons and Conclusions.
13. Major Research Findings and Implications.
14. Research Recommendations and Evaluation.

In the chapters presenting individual group findings (i.e., 4, 5, 8, 9), to help more specifically guide the analysis the major research question and the supporting sub - questions were worded so that they referred only to the dyad group under focus. These slight word changes involved only the removal of non applicable terminology. The specific intent of the questions remained the same as for the original major research question and supporting sub - questions (see Chapter 3, section 7).

Further, when the inductive analysis was undertaken to produce the findings for each of the four research groups, individual respondents were assigned a number (i.e., mentor - cooperating teachers in both sites 1 - 7; student teachers in both sites 1 - 8). This numeric system enables readers (should they so wish) to identify whether quotations presented within a findings section come from the same or different respondents within a specific group. This method avoided the present researcher in having to more directly identify respondents.

Finally, componential analysis in this present research was also made possible through the design of the research sub - questions which supported the major research question. As can be seen from a review of the six sub - questions, they are, in fact, paired. This pairing meant that both the mentor - cooperating and student teacher participants were each asked interview questions guided by three sub - questions with the same focus. Consequently, the present methodology enabled componential analysis of dyad group findings both within and across the two research sites.

Chapter Four

Traditional Site Cooperating Teacher Findings

This chapter presents the traditional site cooperating teacher (CT) findings derived from their interview responses related to this investigation's major research question:

A) What do CTs in a traditional student teaching site perceive to be their own purpose and that of their school - based colleague during the student teaching experience?

In particular, these findings provide specific answers to the three research subquestions which helped to guide both the data collection and analysis conducted within this investigation. First, the findings indicate what the CTs identify as their purpose in working with both the student teacher (ST) and the university supervisor (US). Second, they indicate what the CTs perceive as the purpose of the STs in working with the CTs and the US. Third, the findings identify what the CTs believe to be the STs overall purposes for achievement as prospective teachers. Further, the findings identified under each of the three research subquestions are also subcategorized based on the particular focus within which the finding falls.

1). <u>CT Perceptions of Self Purpose Related to Working with the ST and US</u>

Analysis of the seven Bethel Park School - District health and/or physical education CTs interview data, indicates a number of perceptions with regard to their purpose in working with the student teacher.

<u>CT Purpose</u>. Four of these traditional site - based CTs suggested that one of their purposes in working with the ST was to encourage STs' professional self **decision - making.** This was felt to be helpful to ST confidence and learning during student teaching. Letting ". . .them (STs) be their own person" (3), and allowing STs to do things

themselves, were perceptions that suggested some CTs felt it important to give the ST some leeway in decision - making. Further, one CT used a swimming metaphor to emphasize the need for STs to learn at times by themselves. This CT indicated that STs need to ". . . tread water sometimes, because that's the only way they're going to learn how to swim" (4).

Acting as a "**guide**" during student teaching was an overall descriptor used by three CTs. More specifically, three respondents referred to the importance of making' STs aware of what the health and physical education **teacher's role** entailed, including helping STs gain ". . .as much experience of the whole job . . .as possible" (2).

Also, in terms of CT student teaching purpose three CTs made reference to a sense of personal responsibility they felt toward **professional caretaking.** One of these CTs emphasized the idea of having a responsibility toward ". . .safeguarding the profession" (6). Another respondent indicated the need to ". . .perpetuate the profession" (1) through their work enabling only the best STs to be hired as qualified teachers. The third CT indicated the need to personally demonstrate to STs that teaching physical education was an important role to be performed.

Finally, in terms of perceived purpose, three CTs indicated that the active role of **feedback provider** to the ST was also important to identify. Specifically mentioned were the ideas that the CT provided positive and negative feedback, and indicated to the ST personal experiences that did or did not work for the CT over their years of teaching.

Supervisory Skills and Knowledge. A follow up question was asked of each CT concerning their perceptions of the types of skills and knowledge that they brought to bear on their work with the ST. A number of different ideas were highlighted by respondents. Five respondents highlighted the CTs' need to **analyze/identify effective teaching.** This CT knowledge and skill was seen as necessary in order

to help STs learn how to teach. As one respondent indicated, to be able to undertake this task the CT must, themselves, be able to teach to an objective, ". . .to be able to have discipline and run an organized classroom" (7).

Three CTs also emphasized the importance of demonstrating good **communication skills** with the ST. In other words, a CT needed not only to be able to work with children, but also to be able to ". . .deal with 21 year olds" (6), and to know how to talk to prospective teachers.

Further, three respondents indicated that another important purpose for the CT revolved around **knowledge of content.** It was felt that the CT should be ". . .updated on teaching physical education" (1), and should be knowledgeable about activity areas so that they could act as a resource to the ST.

As the research literature indicates, the provision of feedback during student teaching is important to both CTs and STs. The present study findings also point to feedback provision as a specifically identified CT purpose; a purpose which requires both CT knowledge and analytic skill if it is to be fulfilled effectively. Consequently, the researcher questioned the seven CTs further with regard to this specific focus on feedback.

Feedback Value. When asked what they thought was the purpose of the CT providing feedback to the ST, all seven CTs indicated first the **value of feedback** itself in the student teaching experience. For example, CTs stated the following: "I think we are creatures of feedback. . .we all need feedback" (1). "It's (feedback). . .very valuable" (2), "I think feedback is extremely important" (3). One CT described feedback as ". . .the whole student teaching" (7), while another felt it mattered ". . .a ton, and is probably the hardest part of the whole job" (6).

As to the reasons for providing the STs with feedback, a variety of views emerged. For example, two CTs stressed that ST's needed to know if they were observably demonstrating' **correct performance** or not. One of these CTs stated, "If I'm not providing them with feedback,

then they aren't knowing what they're doing right or wrong" (7). However, the other CT emphasized the influence of feedback in stimulating **ST thinking.** Feedback from this respondent's perspective was seen as encouraging STs to ask questions such as ". . .how can I change that? . . .What can I do differently?" (5).

Another respondent changed the focus from the idea of feedback's influence on the ST, to the disadvantages for children in classes taught by a ST who suffers from no feedback. As this CT indicated, ". . .if you (CT) don't communicate to your ST, your students are going to get the brunt of it in the end" (4). Finally, another CT attested to a need for the provision of continuous feedback, which for this CT involved a face - to - face dyad conference at least every other day during the student teaching experience.

Feedback Focus. With regard to the specific areas of ST performance that CTs focused their feedback on, a number of areas were identified by these seven traditional site respondents. Six CTs indicated that they were concerned to provide feedback on STs **instructional performance.** In particular, three CTs mentioned within this focus on instructional performance the importance of STs teaching specifically to the stated lesson objective(s). One CT' verbalized four personal focal points for ST instructional evaluation: clear points about the technique/concept; clear directions; clear check for understanding; clear start/stops to learning phases.

Four CTs stated very specifically that they looked at and evaluated the written **lesson/unit planning** of the ST. One respondent felt that this area of professional competence was a weak area for STs. Two of the other CTs felt this feedback focus helped them to see where the ST was attempting to go with the lesson, prior to teaching.

Four CTs also referred to providing feedback on **ST organization.** This focus on organization appeared to be more in reference to ST physical action in the teaching environment, than in terms of just having a written plan ready. One of these CTs referred to STs being organized

for the ". . .daily business" (4) of teaching; having everything ready before the class. Another CT felt that STs often needed feedback on how to be organized before classes. A further CT indicated observing with the intent to provide feedback on how the ST organized the class during the actual lesson.

Feedback Methods. Having asked the CTs about their purpose in terms of providing feedback to STs and the areas of ST development that they focused feedback on, they were now asked about the types of feedback method they used. The most identified methods used by these CTs were clearly **verbal** and **written** information.

All seven CTs indicated that they used both verbal and written feedback during ST supervision. Three CTs pointed to the benefits of writing down observed events during ST lessons so that the CT themselves would not forget points for later discussion with the ST. Two CTs pointed out this was particularly important if the dyad conference was not held directly after the observed lesson. Likewise, three CTs indicated that they at least on occasions also gave copies of their observations to the ST. This was done so that the STs had their own on - going written record of improvements and areas for further work. This physical sharing of written feedback was felt to assist STs review later what had been the focus of the post observation conference.

However, one CT indicated that from their perspective, "I just talk, I don't write. I think writing is threatening to them (ST)" (7). This CT did indicate though that observational information was written down if a problem was identified in ST performance. This was particularly so if this CT felt that a personal record was needed because the ST was perceived to be seriously struggling in their student teaching.

Feedback Mode. Respondents were also asked about the value of asking questions and giving directions when providing feedback to their STs. The seven CTs indicated that they did phrase feedback to STs, particularly verbal, in terms of questions rather than just directive

statements. However, only one CT specifically indicated they questioned in their written feedback.

Four CTs felt that questioning encouraged ST cognitive involvement. The CTs made statements regarding the use of question including, ". . .questioning gets them (STs) to think!" (2), and "I'm (CT) not going to be there forever, so they (STs) have to be able to figure out" (6).

Varied points were raised in relation to the value of directions within CT feedback. One CT felt that the use of directions ". . .restricts" (1) STs, while questions increased ST and CT communication. Another CT felt:

> . . .it's better if they (STs) come to the point where they see it, than if I tell them. . .I don't like to tell them; if I have to tell them then there's usually a problem (7).

However, two other CTs were more supportive of the use of directions as useful feedback to STs. One CT suggested that directions can give STs specific ideas that they can take away and try in their teaching. Another CT pointed out that, "I might go to a direct statement because they (STs) are floundering" (4). Further, this CT also indicated that the balance between a CT's use of questions and directions could be influenced by the amount of dyad conference time available at that particular moment:

> . . .if I have less time, then I've got to get to the heart of the matter, because I may perceive a serious problem, and I want to get it right then! (4).

Feedback Influence. When these CTs were asked about what they felt was the influence of these different methods of feedback on ST development, two perspectives emerged. Four CTs indicated that in general they saw a **positive response** by STs to CT feedback. Furthermore, ST improvement was likely to occur if the ST was encouraged to think through situations and problem - solve. However, this CT also felt that the majority of STs had difficulty in problem - solving themselves. Such STs were felt to need the assistance of a

more guided discovery approach by their CT (i.e., guided through questioning to the appropriate answer).

Another CT felt that STs were more influenced by verbal feedback during the initial weeks of student teaching as more general issues were focused upon. However, in the later stages of the experience as the dyad focused on more refined and critical issues, this was where the ST needed the written feedback to keep in front of them and reflect on.

However, three other CTs indicated that the degree of feedback influence was dependent on **ST personality.** If STs were ". . .open - minded" (6) and wanted the CTs help, then feedback could have some impact. In contrast, if ST's came with the attitude that they knew it all, then there would be minimal feedback impact. As one CT said:

> . . .it depends on the ST. If they think they're perfect coming in, it
> (feedback) has none. If they 're open and realistic then usually they
> do well (7).

Assisting CT Purpose. When asked if there was anything that the STs or the university could do to help the CTs in providing the type of ST feedback they wanted to provide, three themes emerged from the respondent data. Three CTs felt that they were assisted in providing feedback when they experienced **ST openness.** This was defined as the ST being prepared to tell the CT about their concerns and the areas they wanted feedback on. As one CT said:

> ". . .that's the way you learn, the give and take both ways" (5).

Three CTs also felt that the university could assist them in their work with the ST. In particular, assisting CTs by providing them with **ST personal/professional information** (e.g. provide an outline of the teacher preparation program the ST had experienced) before the student teaching experience began. Such information it was felt would assist the CT in their approach toward the ST; particularly in the initial student teaching stage. Further, two CTs also stated that they would like to see the university provide them with a **training workshop** on

how to observe STs to assist their supervisory ability.

US Purpose. Although not a primary purpose the present research also sought CT perceptions concerning the purpose of the US within the student teaching process. Four CTs indicated one of the US's purposes was to act as a **guide/resource** to the CT and the ST. Two of these four CTs pointed to the need for the US to provide CTs with personal and professional information about the ST.

Four CTs also emphasized the need for the US to work closely with, and act as a **CT support** during the CT's work with the ST. One of these CTs suggested that the US and CT should both observe the ST at the same time so that they could agree on what the CT should work on with the ST. Further, this CT also felt that the US should be responsible for awarding the ST grade; this it was felt would encourage increased US and CT interaction.

2). CT Perceptions of ST Purpose Related to Working with the CT and US

ST Responsibilities toward their CT. With regard to the responsibilities that the ST should demonstrate toward their CT, the seven respondents provided a variety of perceptions. Five CTs identified the need for the ST to have **prepared** for their classes (e.g. with lesson plans ready). Three CTs suggested that the STs should also see themselves as the **teacher**. As one CT said, ". . . as far as I'm concerned when they (ST) walk in the door, they're the teacher!" (7).

Another responsibility that three CTs perceived the STs should demonstrate toward them was open/honest **communication.** This was seen as a prerequisite for an effective dyad working relationship (3). Relatedly, two CTs suggested that the STs also had a responsibility to be open and **receptive** to CT suggestions for teacher development. Further, three CTs identified the need for STs to show self **initiated/ proactive** behaviour. Such behaviour would involve STs in taking ". . . risks" (1) in their teaching to try different things (e.g. methods). Also, this would help STs give the impression that they themselves are ". . .

taking hold" (2) of their student teaching experience.

ST Responsibilities toward their US. In terms of what the CTs perceived were the responsibilities of the ST toward the US, two perceptions emerged. Four CTs thought that the responsibilities the STs owed to their US were the **same responsibilities** as owed to the CT. One of these CTs indicated that the presence of the US, in fact, had the potential to reinforce the perceived responsibilities owed to the CT by the ST:

> . . .some (STs) believe. . .they only have a certain amount of
> time left (to graduation), and if they don't see their supervisor its an
> easy time for them (3).

Three other CTs felt there may be some **different responsibilities** the ST owed their US. Two of these CTs pointed out that STs had a responsibility to fulfill the academic requirements that had been set by the US. Also, further responsibilities were identified as being potentially related to the perceived influence of the US on the ST. For example, one CT felt the US lacked influence on STs due to having less ST contact opportunity than the CT.

3). CT Perceptions of the Overall Achievements for STs.

When asked what they perceived to be the overall purposes for ST achievement during student teaching, four purposes emerged from the seven CTs' responses.

ST Professional Achievements. Four CTs indicated that they wanted the STs to become as **knowledgeable/confident teachers** as possible over the duration of the student teaching experience. This involved the ST in being ". . .hopefully armed. . .with a lot of materials and different ways of doing things" (2), and being able to ". . .walk into an interview with their head up knowing that they could be a good teacher" (6).

Three CTs talked about the need for the STs to develop not only content knowledge, but an overall sense of **job appreciation**; ". . .what it means to be a teacher" (4). As another of these CTs said:

> I just hope they are able to teach my classes and be happy with

themselves . . .If they can take on a schedule with forty classes
a week at five different grade levels, health and physical education,
and do it well, then they're ready (7).

Three CTs also felt that it was important for the STs to have been
confirmed regarding **correct career choice** through the experiences
that they had during student teaching. "Well, I hope they will first of all
decide that they made the right choice in choosing this profession" (3),
stated one of these CTs.

The final perception also highlighted by CTs was the need for the
STs to have developed a sense of pride in, and **professional
responsibility** toward their field; in other words that STs feel what they
do is important. As summarized by one CT, ". . .if they think that its
important and they don't think it's an easy job, I've done my job" (6).

ST Actions and Influence. As a follow on to the question concerning
CT perceptions of the overall purposes for achievement by the ST, the
CTs were also asked what they focused on when they observed STs
teaching performance. The dominant response to this question centred
on the mechanics of **effective teaching**. All seven CTs described
behaviours (e.g. clear directions, questions, eye contact etc.), or areas
(e.g. lesson plans, motivational strategies, discipline and content

knowledge) associated with the effective involvement of students in the
learning process.

Clearly the teaching process from the perspective of ST action was
an important observational focus for all the CTs. However, three CTs
also identified the need to gauge whether children were **learning** in a
ST's class. One CT pointed out:

I put myself in the seat with the children; what are the kids seeing?
How are the kids going to respond to that? . . .so I just usually watch
the class as a child and see how it's going to affect my learning (6).

ST Understanding and Interaction with Children. The final interview
question directed to the CTs under the major research question
concerned what they hoped their STs would develop in terms of

attitudes toward, and understanding about children. Five CTs indicated that they hoped the STs would recognize and respond to **student differences.** One CT stated, ". . .kids are different, they learn differently, . . .at different rates. . .you need to teach differently to different kids" (1). Another CT pointed out that STs had to recognize that ". . .children have bad days like adults and that they (ST) should be flexible" (3) in teaching approach.

Related to the above observation four CTs also indicated that STs should be prepared to meet **student needs.** As one CT said, STs should try to "...meet the needs of each level (skill) of kid and know how to do that" (3). A CT pointed to the need for STs to be prepared to cope with both child problems and there causes. This view was supported by another CT who indicated that ST's should be concerned enough to go beneath the children's behaviour in the learning environment to locate the causes.

However, beyond acknowledging student differences and attempting to meet their needs, three CTs indicated that STs should also hold **students accountable.** In particular, the STs should expect children to come into the learning environment with the intention of learning. As one of the CTs suggested, the ST:

> . . .needs to let the kids know that they're also here to learn, and somehow you (ST) have to balance the fun with your expectation what they're going to do, achieve and perform (2).

Summary of Traditional Site CT Findings

Review of the interview - based findings of the seven Bethel Park School - District health/physical education CTs to the major research question, led to the emergence of five areas of student teaching focus; these areas are as follows: a) Participant Purposes; b) Observer Feedback; c) ST Responsibilities; d) ST Achievements; e) ST Child Understanding.

A). Participant Purposes

A variety of responses were suggested in relation to the purpose of

the CT in the student teaching experience. A majority of CTs identified the encouragement of STs professional decision - making. However, purposes such as acting as caretakers for the profession, demonstrating teacher role requirements and providing feedback to STs were also highlighted by a minority of CTs. The skills and knowledge that were felt needed by the majority of CTs to fulfill their purpose most effectively involved being able to identify and analyze effective teaching.

In terms of the US's purpose in the student teaching process, the majority of the CTs saw the role as one of acting as a guide and a resource to the CT and ST. Also a majority of the CTs felt that the US should support the work of the CT with the ST.

B). Observer Feedback

The provision of feedback to STs by the CT was only one of five descriptors/themes that the CTs identified as the purpose of the CT during student teaching. However, further support was given to the importance of feedback during student teaching. Feedback received emphasis through the three themes that emerged from CT responses on the skills/knowledge they required to carry out their purpose effectively. All three themes related to enabling CTs to give feedback effectively (i.e., personal ability to identify effective teaching, demonstrate communication skills and possess a good content knowledge).

All the CTs indicated that they felt feedback was vital if the student teaching experience was to have a positive effect on STs. Further, the majority of the CTs thought that feedback was influential on ST development. All CTs said they had provided both written and verbal feedback to STs.

All CTs indicated their feedback involved the use of questions and directions with STs. While some CTs pointed to the quick, specific ideas that directions could provide for STs, the majority of CTs pointed to the cognitive influence that questioning could have on ST thinking.

Most CTs identified feedback focus on STs' instructional

performance, lesson/unit planning and class organization. Further, the majority of CTs felt feedback had a positive influence on ST development. However, a minority did suggest that such influence depended on ST personality. Some CTs suggested that ST openness helped the CT in providing useful feedback. Yet, it was felt that the university could assist this process further by providing the CT with personal and professional information about the ST, and by holding CT supervisory training workshops.

C). ST Responsibilities

The CTs indicated that there were a number of perceived ST responsibilities in relation to working with the CT. The majority identified a responsibility toward the CT defined as the ST being prepared to teach. A minority of CTs identified ST responsibilities included communicating with the CT, and helping the feedback process by being honest and open with CTs. Also, some CTs indicated that STs had to be prepared to be 'the teacher.'

In fact, this purposeful ST assumption of the teacher's role was one of the CTs identified personal purposes (i.e., to show the ST the requirements of the teacher's role) and one of the overall purposes for ST achievement (i.e., to develop a job appreciation). Also, in terms of the responsibilities that the ST owed to their US, the majority of the CTs felt STs had the same responsibilities toward the US as to their CT.

D). ST Achievements

In terms of what the CTs hoped STs would achieve through the student teaching experience, the majority indicated a desire that these prospective teachers become effective, knowledgeable practitioners. However, three other factors (i.e., appreciate the job requirements, confirm one's career choice and develop a sense of professional responsibility) were also identified by a minority of CTs. These perceptions in combination seem to point to a need for STs to achieve a recognition of both the value and importance of the areas they are involved in teaching. This sense of subject importance was further

emphasized by a minority of CTs who indicated that one of their purposes in the student teaching process was to act as a professional gatekeeper.

E). ST Child Understanding

The majority of the CTs indicated that in relation to ST attitude and understanding toward children they wanted the STs to understand, appreciate and respond to children's differences. CTs wanted STs to recognize that children cannot all be treated using the same approach. The majority of the CTs referred to the need for STs to recognize the importance of teachers trying to meet the diverse needs of their students. A minority of CTs also pointed to the need to hold children accountable and defined accountability as children learning.

To conclude this chapter a table has been provided. Table 1 presents the leading CT perceptions concerning self and others' purpose as identified in Chapter 4. The next chapter now provides the findings derived from the responses of the present research STs who worked in the traditional student teaching site. Clearly, an understanding of these STs' perceptions with regard to the purpose of self and others within the student teaching process is vital. This is particularly important because as indicated in the reviewed literature (ie., Chapter 2), research has identified dyad confusion concerning the perceived purpose of triad participants. Furthermore, such participant confusion has also been linked to ST concern and stress, and the suggestion of less effective dyad relationships.

PARTICIPANT
PURPOSE

The MCT:
1 Encourage ST
  professional
  decision - making

The US:
1 Guide/Resource
2 CT support

OBSERVER FEEDBACK

The Focus:
1 ST instructional performance
2 ST lesson planning

Method and Mode:
1 Written and Verbal
2 Questions assist ST thinking

Table 1

Leading Traditional
Site Cooperating
Teacher *Perceptions
Concerning Self and
Others' Purpose

ST RESPONSIBILITY

To (M)CT:
1 Prepared for classes

To US:
1 Same as for CT

ST ACHIEVEMENTS

1 Knowledgeable, confident
  teacher

ST Evaluation Criteria:
*No major criteria identified

ST CHILD
UNDERSTANDING

1 Recognize - respond to child
  differences
2 Meet child needs

* All the above perceptions were identified by half or more participants in the group.

Chapter Five

Traditional Site Student Teacher Findings

This chapter presents the traditional site student teacher (ST) findings derived from their interview responses related to this investigation's major research question:

A) What do STs in a traditional student teaching site perceive to be their own purpose and that of their school - based colleague during the student teaching experience?

In particular, these findings provide specific answers to the three research subquestions which helped to guide both the data collection and analysis conducted within this investigation. First, the findings indicate what these STs identify as their CTs' purpose in working with both the ST and the US. Second, they indicate what the STs perceive as their purpose in working with the CTs and the US. Third, the findings identify what STs believe to be their overall purpose for achievement as prospective teachers. Further, the findings identified under each of the three research subquestions are also subcategorized based on the particular focus within which the finding falls.

1. <u>ST Perceptions of CT Purpose Related to Working with the ST and US</u>

Analysis of the eight Bethel Park School - District health and physical education STs' interview data, indicated two main perceptions concerning the purpose of the CT within the student teaching process.

<u>CT Purpose</u>. Five STs referred to the idea of the CT as a **guide.** In other words, someone who is there to provide suggestions on how to teach and to advise as to what works or does not. While only three of these STs mentioned explicitly the concept of the CT as a feedback provider this idea of the CT as **information provider** was implicit in all the respondents responses. Further, at least half the STs implied that CT information provided to a ST was based on the CT's experience, knowledge and example as an experienced teacher. Consequently,

such information was felt to be useful in directing ST development.

However, five STs also highlighted the importance of the CT's purpose as one that included providing the opportunity for the ST to **experiment** with their own ideas, ". . .not spoon feeding you" (4). This purpose involved affording STs the opportunity to experience for themselves the ". . .rights, wrongs, positives and negatives and then to learn from good and bad experiences" (7).

Feedback Role. Clearly the perception of CTs providing information to STs was important to these respondents. All indicated when asked about the part played by feedback in ST development, that it played an **important role.** As respondents stated, ". . it makes me a better teacher" (4), ". . .if I don't have it, then I don't know if I am doing it (teaching) at an acceptable level" (1). Five of these STs saw CT feedback as related to eventual **ST improvement.** Further, feedback was identified by individual STs as useful in praising and correcting ST performance, and decreasing pedagogical mistakes. Yet, it was also felt that feedback needed to be phrased carefully to avoid damaging ST self esteem.

As to whether these STs felt that the amount of CT feedback STs received should change over the duration of the student teaching experience, only one ST indicated that feedback provision should be maintained consistently throughout the experience; because STs learn everyday. Four other respondents indicated that there should be a **feedback decrease** over the experience. In particular, it was suggested that more feedback should be provided at the beginning of student teaching. This was because the ST being new to the student teaching environment generally had less pedagogical self confidence. However, as STs developed, it was indicated that there should, in fact, be less need for CT feedback because there ought to be less errors made by STs. Further, STs were also perceived as their experience developed to become more capable of learning from analysis of their own performance.

Feedback Focus. With regard to the areas of student teaching performance about which these respondents most appreciated receiving feedback, several main perceptual areas emerged. First, six STs commented on the importance of receiving feedback on their personal **instructional skills.** These respondents statements suggested that their concern was with what they should be doing to be effective in the teaching environment. Three of these STs mentioned the importance of feedback on their **planning**. Other skills identified for feedback focus included keeping children active, teacher movement, individualizing and clarity.

One specific aspect of instructional skill that four STs referred to related to effective teachers' **verbal communication.** In particular, this was defined as the ability to utilize language appropriate to the grade level being taught; to provide a clear lesson set and closure, ask information gathering questions, and yet still remain clear and concise.

Finally, four respondents also highlighted **classroom management** as another important area for observer feedback. It was indicated that STs need to learn how to organize and control classes. Further, it was felt that STs needed to learn how to deal with discipline problems that they are confronted by and to act consistently in this area. One of these respondents did indicate that STs lacked prior experience and preparation, particularly, with regard to classroom management.

Feedback Method and Value. In terms of the method that had been utilized by CTs and USs to provide feedback to these STs, all the respondents indicated that they had received both **verbal** and **written** feedback during their student teaching experience. When asked which of these feedback methods were most useful in their ST development, five respondents indicated that they liked to receive both verbal and written feedback to help them improve. However, with regard to verbal feedback four STs did mention the dangers of easily **forgetting** what an observer may have said about an observed performance (e.g., verbal feedback can go " . . .in one ear and out the other" (3).

Two STs commented on the value of verbal feedback from the

perspective that this method of communication allowed **immediate discussion** between the ST and the observer. Interestingly, while one of these STs stressed the influence of immediate verbal feedback following the observed ST performance, the other highlighted the need for STs to be good listeners if verbal feedback was to be effective.

Five respondents pointed to the value of written feedback in allowing the ST to **remember/reflect** on what the observer felt was important to consider. As one ST said, ". . .written feedback stays with you more, if you forget you can always go back and read it over again" (2).

Further, four STs linked written feedback with the basis it provided a dyad in terms of **discussion** of the observations that had been made. One respondent suggested that the usefulness of observer notes lay in the opportunity they provided a dyad to make ". . .five or six positives and negatives, and then . . .discuss them and decide how we could improve" (7).

Feedback Mode. When asked if they preferred to have feedback on their performance phrased in directive or questioning format, only two respondents indicated a preference for directions. Two other STs preferred to receive observer feedback in questioning form. However, the remaining four STs preferred a combination of these two approaches to phrasing feedback. Specifically, the usefulness of questioning in observer comments centered for six STs on forcing STs to **reflect** on their own actions, and arrive at their own conclusions. As one respondent indicated, "I like the questions because I think they kind of challenge. . .they keep you on your toes" (6).

In contrast, the six STs who mentioned direct feedback in a positive light, placed emphasis on the 'to the point' nature of this feedback. In particular, it was suggested that ideas could be provided quickly, areas for improvement highlighted immediately, and an opportunity given for STs to consider an experienced teachers approach. As one ST stated:

> . . .I like the directness, I like to be told whether I am doing it right or wrong. . .If you 're asking me what I did wrong, well obviously I

wouldn't have made that mistake if I would have known it was wrong. I think it is more effective just being direct and up front (3).

US Purpose. As previous research has indicated, there is some confusion amongst student teaching participants concerning US purpose. Consequently, the traditional site - based STs were asked about what they perceived to be the USs' purpose. Three main views emerged with regard to this question.

Five STs suggested a sense of the US as a type of **facilitator** who possessed the potential to encourage smooth dyad relationships. As one respondent stated, ". . .he's there to make sure everything is going smooth between the relationship of the ST and the CT" (4). Another respondent indicated that the US should ". . .come down and see us more often in the first couple of weeks to help ease us into communication with our co - ops" (3). Further, these respondents suggested that this facilitatory purpose involved the US in encouraging triad discussion of ST progress, and also ensuring that both dyad participants fulfilled their responsibilities to each other.

Five STs also felt that the US represented the **ST - university link.** USs were expected to keep STs informed with regard to information coming out of the student teaching and career offices (e.g., seminar dates, times, administrative requirements and career opportunities). Further, one respondent also indicated the need for the US to provide feedback to the university physical education faculty as to how their department STs were doing.

Four STs identified another US purpose as that of being an **evaluator.** This role was deemed to require the US to spend time on site specifically observing the teaching performance of STs. This, in turn, would enable the US to write an accurate report on ST progress. Two of these respondents indicated that they did not feel that the US spent enough time on site observing to be able to fulfill this evaluatory role adequately.

In fact, respondent perceptions of the US as an evaluator rather than as a ST performance feedback provider, may be supported by

further ST perceptions. For example, in terms of the ST responses to the inquiry concerning ways in which it was felt the US had helped STs' personally in their teacher development.

US Impact. Half the respondents felt that the US had only a **minimal influence** on their teaching development. As one ST stated, ". . .I think very little (influence)" (3); another of these respondents added, ". . .I think the co - op has a bigger impact on the ST than the supervisor does" (4). Again, lack of visitation time, the holding of unrealistic expectations for ST performance and the failure to listen to the ST were all respondent points linked to the US having only minimal ST influence.

However, four STs felt that the US had been **influential** in their teacher development. Two of these respondents emphasized the supportive nature of their US's actions; ". . .he has really kept me going; there was a time when I just wanted to throw it all away. I think they are there as a support system" (1). The other two respondents indicated that they had been influenced by the US's feedback on their teaching. As one ST stated, ". . .I feel he helped give me a lot of good ideas; helped me look at my teaching and evaluate how I can improve my teaching" (2).

CT Relationship with the US. The final question that these eight traditional site - based STs were asked in relation to the purpose of their colleagues in the student teaching process, concerned the CT's purpose in working with the US. Four STs generalized this purpose to simply one of helping the ST to improve. However, for four other respondents a more specific purpose of the CT in working with the US was to **inform** the supervisor; particularly, to provide details as to how the ST was developing during the student teaching experience.

Again, as emerged from earlier questions, two of these respondents felt that it was not possible for the US relying on infrequent visits to get a clear picture of the work and development of the ST. Further, three STs also expressed concern that from their experience, it did not appear that the CT and US communicated enough. As one respondent

suggested, ". . . they should communicate more between themselves to find out exactly what they want" (3).

2). <u>ST Perceptions of Self Purpose Related to Working with the CT and US</u>

In this section STs were asked to focus on themselves. In particular, to look at their responsibilities in relation to personal work with the other participants in the student teaching process.

<u>ST Responsibilities toward their CT</u>. Relative to their CTs three main ST responsibilities emerged from responses. Seven of the STs believed they had a responsibility to **meet CT demands/expectations.** Within this general category respondents provided a variety of examples. While three of these STs identified simply doing the best one could in teaching the CTs' classes, other respondents mentioned teaching any required material, keeping an open mind, fulfilling professional requirements (e.g., being on time; lesson plans in) and respecting their dyad colleague.

Three STs highlighted the responsibility of maintaining some **dyad teaching continuity.** This was defined as ". . .trying to continue the same way they (CT) are; like taking role the same ways. . .classroom management. You don't have to come in and totally change everything" (3). ST attempts to implement too many changes to class procedures, might it was felt confuse classes. Further, such changes might mean CTs could have difficulty getting children back to their original routines after the departure of the ST.

However, three respondents also pointed out that another responsibility owed by the ST to their CT was to be prepared to be **proactive;** to try some of their own ideas. As one ST said, ". . .to have my own ideas and if they are good ideas to implement them into the class" (7). This was also seen as a way for STs to share new pedagogical information from teacher preparation with their CTs.

<u>ST Responsibilities toward their US</u>. Similarly, with regard to ST responsibilities toward the US, the most identified factor was, as for their CTs, to **meet expectations.** Six respondents mentioned the

importance of fulfilling the US expectations; particularly, by completing written requirements. However, only one respondent mentioned meeting US expectations specifically related to teaching performance.

Four STs also felt a responsibility to **communicate** with the US. In particular, this meant explaining to the US how the student teaching experience was progressing and indicating problems that the ST might be confronting. One ST did indicate though that initiating discussion with the US required some self confidence:

> I think it has a lot to do with confidence. A lot of times I wanted to say things but figured I better lay low. I know I am just starting out teaching and I want to learn as much as I can. May be it's a bad attitude (8).

The final responsibility that emerged also came from four ST responses. This related to a respondent feeling that there should be **respect** shown for the US's position. Two respondents emphasized that respect was due to a person who was there to try and help STs. However, the two other respondents perceived the need to maintain the respect of others for the university as represented by the US. As one respondent suggested, "I represent the school (university), if I do a good job I am giving Slippery Rock a good name, or keeping their good name" (4).

3). <u>ST Perceptions of the Overall Purposes for Personal Achievement</u>

In this section STs were asked to outline what they believed they were trying to develop. In particular, what they wanted to demonstrate and achieve over the duration of the student teaching experience.

<u>ST Professional Achievements</u>. Concerning overall achievement, two main ST aims emerged. First, seven respondents not unnaturally wanted to feel they had become a **better teacher** through student teaching. As one ST said, "I hope that I am a better teacher than when I went in" (1). Better teachers were defined by three of these STs as demonstrating increased self confidence in front of children. Further, four respondents mentioned the importance of 'hands on' practical

teaching experience to achieve this aim of becoming a better teacher. As one of these STs indicated, ". . .you come in with little experience, then teaching everyday you find out what works and what doesn't work" (3).

The second aim to emerge from these STs' responses really continued to define more specifically this concept of the 'better teacher.' In particular, seven respondent comments related to STs learning and improving their **pedagogical knowledge/skills.** Four respondents highlighted a desire to improve their classroom management/organizational skills; particularly, their use of discipline procedures.

Further, four STs also indicated wanting to have achieved greater knowledge about their subject content and teaching procedures. One respondent indicated:

> I'm also taking in as much information as I can possibly get. . .
> granted, I don't teach every physical education sport they offer but
> I'm going and observing, and I'm finding out as much information as
> I can to make me a well rounded teacher (4).

When asked about the types of skills and abilities they had tried to develop in the class situation, all the STs identified **classroom management.** However, only two STs highlighted discipline specifically. Other respondents focused on setting standards, controlling and organizing children, being consistent in approach, holding student attention and keeping them on task. One ST summarized some of the above elements when saying, ". . .classroom management. . .like I said, I set the standards. You can't wait, you have to do it (manage) and be consistent at it" (6).

Not surprisingly, besides management, six STs also identified **instructional skills** as an area for personal demonstration and development. In particular, three STs talked about the need to move away from the lecture method in health lessons and toward methods that more actively involved children in the lesson content (e.g.,

cooperative learning). Two other respondents also mentioned the importance of selecting appropriate progressive drills and games for children in physical education. One ST specifically talked about the need to provide tests as an instructional skill that were appropriate to children's ability levels

Three respondents also clearly highlighted the use of their **voice** as another area for development. Improving one's speech was seen as important by one of these STs because, ". . .the kids think you are the top person and they are going to pick up your habits" (e.g., pronunciation) (1). Further, what might be described as **role - modeling** the learning expected was also highlighted by three STs. Here, the importance of setting a good example by the teacher was presented as an aim in relation to both ST use of voice/language, and as a lifestyle motivator (e.g. leading a healthy lifestyle).

ST Evaluation Criteria. When asked against which criteria they personally believed ST performance should be evaluated, a variety of areas were identified by these respondents. Interestingly, it was not ST action observed directly in the teaching environment (such as those factors highlighted in the responses to the two preceding questions) that were most identified by these respondents.

All the STs mentioned **lesson planning** ability as one evaluation criteria. Planning was seen as being representative of a ST's enthusiastic attitude toward teaching, of being accountable and prepared. One response summarized this feeling; "I feel planning is part of the attitude. . . being ready for class. . .if you're excited about teaching you'll be well planned for the class" (7).

Six respondents identified a variety of ST actions and attitudes that could be grouped under the description of **professionalism.** Evaluation criteria in this area it was suggested might include showing that you could be a ". . .leader throughout the school, not just in the classroom" (7). Further, that as a ST you ". . .take the job seriously and accept the responsibility " (1); you can research content that is to be taught, ". . .follow the curriculum" (4) and are ". . .dependable" (3) in

your actions, and ". . .consistent" (6) in producing positive results throughout the student teaching experience.

STs also referred to a criteria that could be classified under the broad heading of professionalism, yet was clearly an important factor to these respondents in its own right. Successful **ST - colleague(s) interaction** was highlighted by five respondents. This professional interaction referred not only to that within the dyad relationship, but also with other school teachers in general. As one ST suggested, including such a criteria might lead to more experienced teacher perspectives being taken into account in ST assessment:

> I feel your overall attitudes are shown by your reaction to other people, teachers. Maybe even the CT can ask other teachers how they see you, and get a little more feedback (7).

Five STs also identified the actions of their students rather than their own as criteria against which ST performance should be judged; in particular, did their **children learn?** As one ST said of children learning, ". . .that's what your (ST) there for" (8). In fact, a further comment by another of these respondents seemed to touch on the dilemma concerning how to assess teaching ability:

> The effectiveness of teaching. You might know a lot about the subject. You might have gotten a 4.0 (grade average) in college. However, can you relate it to the students? Students learn from your teaching. Do you meet your objectives?. . .a ST should be judged on the teaching aspects of the field. . .and are the students learning? (4).

ST Understandings Concerning Children. In response to the final question which concluded this section two main ST perceptual categories emerged. In particular, perceptions that related to the attitudes and understandings STs had developed toward children during their student teaching experience.

First, six respondents cited diverse ideas that related to increased awareness of what acts as **teacher - student response motivators.** Two STs felt that they had, in fact, become more positive and

personable in their attitude and understanding toward children because of the positive responses they had received from their students. Another respondent suggested that children, likewise, actually respond to the attitude demonstrated by the teacher. Further, two STs highlighted the importance of teachers learning (e.g., utilize school guidance information) about the personality and family backgrounds of their children. This information it was felt could help in finding ways to motivate specific students. Another factor that two respondents identified as having a motivating influence on the lesson response of children included helping students to be successful. Student success for one of these STs meant that children ". . .feel so much better in themselves and you (teacher) can see that you definitely have an effect on the kid" (2). Further, giving children ". . .a little control over what's going to happen in the classroom . . .give them responsibilities" (3) was also felt to encourage children's sense of self worth.

The second major perceptual category saw six STs highlighted ideas that indicated a greater personal understanding concerning **children's development,** and the influence such knowledge has on teaching. Three STs mentioned that in general, children differed characteristically both within and between grade level. One of these respondents felt ". . .that almost every grade level has a different personality" (4) to which a teacher must adapt.

Another three STs developed this idea of grade level differences by talking about some specific changes in children's development. Factors mentioned included children's social ability, concentration and appreciation of the need to apply oneself (i.e., practice/study to increase learning). These abilities were identified as all developing with student age.

<u>Summary of the Traditional Site ST Findings</u>

Review of the interview based findings of the eight Bethel Park School - District health/physical education STs to the major research question, led to the emergence of five areas of student teaching focus;

these areas are as follows: a) Participant Purposes; b) Observer Feedback; c) ST Responsibilities; d) ST Achievements; e) ST Child Understanding.

A). Participant Purposes

With regard to the perceived purpose of the CT, all the STs indicated that one purpose for the CT was to act as an information provider. In particular, some STs specifically referred to the CT as a feedback provider in terms of their ability to comment on STs actual teaching performance. A majority of the STs also felt that the term 'guide' was an appropriate descriptor that summarized the purpose of their dyad colleague. However, a majority of STs also felt that another purpose involved the CT in providing freedom for ST experimentation. In particular, with regard to allowing STs to try different pedagogical methods.

In terms of US purpose, half the STs expressed ideas that revolved around the US as an evaluator of the ST. However, the majority of the STs identified two further purposes for the US. One purpose was categorized as the US being a facilitator. In particular, a person who tried to assist the smooth interaction of the student teaching dyad. The other perceived purpose involved the US acting as the school - university link; specifically, helping to keep the ST informed concerning information provided by the university.

The STs were evenly split over the influence of the US during student teaching. Half the STs felt that the supervisor's influence was minimal, due in part to lack of visitation time and unrealistic expectations. However, half the STs also felt that the US had been influential for them through providing support and specific ideas.

Concerning the purpose of the CT in working with the US, half the STs suggested that this was generally to encourage ST improvement. More specifically, half the STs described actions by their dyad colleague that characterized the CT as a US informer. In other words, a person who because of their contact with the ST could provide the supervisor with a more detailed, balanced picture of the ST's progress;

a picture the US could not obtain just through several personal observations.

B). Observer Feedback

Although feedback was only mentioned by a minority of STs as a purpose for the CT, its role in ST development was seen as important by all when asked specifically about this particular area. A majority of STs felt that that the purpose of feedback was ST improvement; particularly, pedagogical. Relatedly, half the STs suggested that there should be a change in the provision of feedback over the duration of student teaching. Specifically, it was felt that the amount of feedback provided to STs should decrease over time and become more specific as STs progressed. This was because it was felt that the STs would make less teaching errors and became more proficient at assessing personal performance over time.

The majority of these STs indicated that they wanted feedback concerning their instructional skills. One area highlighted was the effectiveness of their verbal communication. Further, half the STs also expressed a need for observations on their classroom management abilities.

All the STs indicated that they had received both written and verbal feedback from their observers. However, the majority expressed a preference either for written, or a combination of both these feedback methods. STs emphasized the helpful nature of written information as both a discussion base and in assisting ST remembering and reflection. Likewise, the majority of STs pointed to the usefulness of questions as a mode of feedback to stimulate ST reflection. Yet, a majority of STs also felt that direct feedback was useful as well, due to its 'to the point' nature which helped to focus STs quickly.

C). ST Responsibilities

Meeting CT demands and expectations was identified by the majority of the STs as a responsibility that they owed toward their dyad colleague. However, there was a diverse array of perceptions provided under this theme. This category included the ST doing their best and

keeping an open mind. Further, some STs also felt that maintaining dyad teaching continuity to avoid confusing their CT's classes and showing ST proaction in terms of taking the initiative with ideas, were also responsibilities they should demonstrate.

Likewise, with regard to ST responsibilities toward the US, the majority of STs indicated the importance of meeting expectations. This was demonstrated, in particular, through the completion of US required written items. Half the STs also suggested that they were responsible for communicating with the US; informing the supervisor how they were progressing and generally showing a respect for the USs' position.

D). ST Achievements

Regarding overall achievements by STs during student teaching, not surprisingly the majority expressed goals that fell under the category of becoming a 'better teacher.' More specifically, this achievement involved simply experiencing greater practical teaching time and increased ST self confidence. Further, a majority of STs also identified specific achievements that while coming under the theme of increased pedagogical knowledge/skill, clearly, related to the concept of becoming a better teacher. For example, half the STs highlighted improving such areas as content knowledge, teaching procedure and classroom management.

When specifically asked about the teaching skills they had tried to demonstrate and develop in the gymnasium and classroom, all the STs highlighted classroom management. Often claimed as the basis for effective instruction, management for these STs went beyond just reactive discipline techniques. Also illuminated were proactive skills such as setting standards, consistency in teacher approach and maintaining childrens' attention.

Instructional skills were also identified by a majority of the STs as a further area on which they had focused. Specifically mentioned were instructional methods, particularly those in the health classroom; these went beyond the traditional lecture format to methods which more

actively involve children in the teaching - learning process. Also identified by some STs were their efforts to improve use of the voice as a tool for teaching, and to demonstrate teacher role modeling of expected learning outcomes.

When asked about criteria against which they felt a ST should be evaluated, STs demonstrated a diversity of opinion. The present researcher needed to develop four summarizing themes/categories to describe these ST perceptions. All the STs identified lesson planning ability as an evaluation criteria. This was felt to be indicative of a STs' enthusiastic attitude toward teaching. Three quarters of the STs also highlighted actions that fell under the umbrella of professionalism. Varied opinions here included a STs' leadership qualities, serious concern for the job, and dependability.

Effective ST - colleague interaction and children learning were two further areas identified by a majority of STs as appropriate evaluation criteria. Interestingly, these two criteria, particularly, children learning, moved the evaluation criteria focus away from the ST and to the actions of others as the assessment basis.

E). ST Child Understanding

As to the attitudes and understandings STs felt they held toward children, two main perceptions emerged. The majority of STs indicated that they now recognized elements that acted as teacher - student response motivators. Also, there was a sense of having developed an increased understanding concerning child development.

In terms of the response motivators, these included ST recognition of the way in which teachers and children's attitudes toward each other influenced their respective behaviour. Also, indicated was the observation of the positive effects demonstrated when children clearly experienced success. Further, the acknowledgment that children differed developmentally both within and between grade level also became much clearer for these STs; particularly, with regard to the areas of children's social, concentration and application abilities.

To conclude this chapter a table has been provided. Table 2

presents the leading ST perceptions concerning self and others' purpose as identified in Chapter 5. Further, Chapter 6 that now follows undertakes a componential analysis of both the traditional CT and ST group findings; in particular, looking at the similarities and differences in emergent group perspectives. Clearly, it is important to undertake such comparative analysis because dyad group disagreements have been linked to ST concern and stress, and the suggestion of less effective dyad relationships and student teaching outcomes.

PARTICIPANT PURPOSE

The CT:
1 Guide
2 Encourage ST experimentation
3 Information provider

The US:
1 Facilitator
2 School - Uni., link
3 Evaluator

OBSERVER FEEDBACK

The Focus:
1 ST pedagogic improvement

Method and Mode:
1 Written = remember & reflection
2 Questions = reflection

Table 2

Leading Traditional Site Student Teacher *Perceptions Concerning Self and Others' Purpose

ST RESPONSIBILITY

To CT:
1 Meet CT demand and expectations

To US:
1 Meet US expectations
2 Communication
3 Show respect

ST ACHIEVEMENTS

1 Better teacher
2 Improved pedagogical skills

ST Evaluation Criteria:
1 Lesson planning
2 Professionalism
3 Child learning
4 ST interaction with others

ST CHILD UNDERSTANDING

1 Teacher - student motivators
2 Understand child development

* All the above perceptions were identified by half or more participants in the group.

Chapter Six

Componential Analysis of the Traditional Site Dyad Findings

The purpose of this chapter is to analyze and discuss the findings (as presented in Table 3) derived from the interview responses of the traditional site - based dyad groups with regard to the major research question:

What do cooperating (CT) and student teachers (ST) in a traditional student teaching site perceive to be their own purpose and that of their school - based colleague during the student teaching experience?

Componential analysis is undertaken in relation to the five descriptive areas that emerged from the inductive analysis conducted on the interview responses of the participants in the study groups. The five areas which helped facilitate the componential analysis of the traditional site dyad group findings are as follows: 1) Participant Purposes; 2) Observer Feedback; 3) ST Responsibilities; 4) ST Achievements; 5) ST Child Understanding. Further, each descriptive area has been divided into subcategories which best define the themes that emerged from the componential analyses that were undertaken on the traditional dyad groups' data.

1. Participant Purposes

Previous research (Webb, 1979; Tanner, 1986) has indicated that triad participants have demonstrated differing, sometimes conflicting views with regard to self and others' purposes within the student teaching experience. However, in terms of the present study, dyad group perceptions appear to indicate both similarity and divergence with regard to the CTs' purpose.

ST as Self Initiator. A majority of the CTs pointed to one of their purposes as involving the encouragement of **ST professional decision - making**. In turn, a majority of the STs highlighted the need for CTs to provide the opportunity for **ST experimentation**. Clearly, it

Table 3

Comparative Model of the Leading Traditional Site Dyad Group *Perceptions
Concerning Self and Others' Purpose

Focus	CT	ST
Purposes a. CT.	1 Encourage ST professional decision - making	1 Guide 2 Encourage ST experimentation 3 Information provider
b. US	1 Guide/Resource 2 CT support	1 Facilitator 2 School - Uni., link 3 Evaluator
Feedback a. Focus	1 ST instructional performance 2 ST lesson planning	1 ST pedagogic improvement
b. Method and Mode	1 Written and Verbal 2 Questions assist ST thinking	1 Written = remember & reflect 2 Questions = reflection
ST Responsibility a. To CT	1 Prepared for classes	1 Meet CT demands /expectations
b. To US	1 Same as for CT	1 Meet US expectations 2 Communication 3 Show respect
ST Achievement	1 Knowledgeable, confident teacher	1 Better teacher 2 Improved pedagogical skills
ST Evaluation Criteria	*No major criteria identified	1 Lesson planning 2 Professionalism 3 Child learning 4 ST interaction with others
ST Child Understanding	1 Recognize and respond to child differences 2 Meet child needs	1 Teacher - student motivators 2 Understand child development

* All the above perceptions were identified by half or more participants in their group.

is possible to speculate a relationship between these two views. Both groups' perceptions require STs to become actively involved in producing their own answers to student teaching situations. Further, these dyad group views also place the onus on the ST who is seen as being responsible for providing potential ideas and making their own decisions.

CT as a Provider. The STs also highlighted two other perceived purposes for the CT. All the STs provided a sense of the CT being an **information provider.** In other words, a person to whom STs could go to receive information that would help them in their student teacher development. In fact, this sense of the CT as a person who could help the ST with useful information may be further supported by another identified CT purpose. A majority of the STs also used the term **'guide'** to describe the CT. Such guidance included the CT providing information and ideas to the ST. These findings appear to support the influential role that previous research (Copeland, 1980; Koehler, 1984; Collison & Edwards, 1994) has indicated CTs play for STs in the student teaching experience.

Interestingly, only two of the five categories that emerged from the CT responses actually suggested their purpose as emphasizing the provision of information to the ST. This was in contrast to the STs for whom two out of their three emergent CT purpose categories focused on the CT providing information to the ST.

Consequently, it might be speculated that the CTs did not perceive their purpose to involve acting primarily as sources of information for ST use. In contrast, the STs placed much greater emphasis on the CT as the person who possessed extensive teaching experience and knowledge. Therefore, CT information was perceived as being very important to receive by the STs. Such information may have been perceived to benefit STs by helping them to avoid over reliance on trial and error learning. A method of learning that could be perceived to be overly time wasteful and stressful for STs already working under pressure in unfamiliar environments.

These differences in dyad group perspectives may have emerged due to the different perspectives held by these dyad groups; in particular, the needs of the STs. On the one hand, we seem to have STs recognizing the value in terms of personal development of the experience and knowledge that their dyad counterparts possess. Previous research has shown STs to have mirrored CT activities (Feiman-Nemser, 1987), verbal behaviour (Mintz, 1972) and disciplinary approach (Balboa, 1988). However, in contrast, the majority of the CTs had identified the need for STs to become more competent in terms of professional self decision - making. This recognition may be based on these experienced CTs' knowing just how short a period of time the STs would have, in terms of access to their dyad counterparts.

In terms of the university supervisors' (US) purpose within the student teaching experience the CTs as a group seemed to demonstrate more agreement about this participant's purpose than their own. Interestingly, only one CT self highlighted purpose had been identified by a majority of the CTs; yet, two out of the three CT highlighted US purposes had received majority identification.

 US as Dyad/CT Support. While acting as a dyad **guide/resource** emphasized support by the US for both dyad participants, the other majority perception focused on the US as a **CT support**. Here the CTs' emphasis was on the US specifically supporting the CT in their work with the ST. These findings seem to lend some support to those of Pfister and Newcomb (1984) who found dyad groups believed that the US needed to act to a larger extent as a resource person to the CT.

The majority of the STs identified the USs' purposes as involving acting as a **facilitator.** The emphasis by the STs with regard to the US as a facilitator focused on the supervisor helping to establish and maintain a smooth relationship between the ST and the CT.

Comparison of dyad group perceptions concerning the purpose of the US suggests that both groups emphasized the usefulness of the US in assisting their interaction with the dyad colleague. The CTs seem to emphasize the US as a person who could reinforce their work with the

ST. However, the STs appeared to focus more on the capacity of the US to help create and maintain smooth dyad relationships.

ST Potential Isolation. Dodds (1989) has referred to the isolation in which physical education teachers often perform their role. It is possible that such isolation could extend beyond the role of teacher to that of CT as well. Consequently, it could be speculated that the present CTs might be acknowledging the need for a colleague with whom they could interact and share the responsibility for ST development. Thus, this may help to explain the emphasis on the US as a CT support.

Further, the majority of the STs suggested that the US could help provide a **school - university link**. The maintenance of this between site connection was apparently important to the majority of the STs. Like their CTs, these STs may also have been acknowledging a sense of potential isolation during their student teaching experience.

However, this may have been a different feeling of isolation for the STs than that potentially experienced by the CTs. In particular, rather than suggesting a sense of being isolated in terms of needing another person with whom to interact, the STs seem to be indicating the need to stay connected to the university environment (not just an individual supervisor). This is not an unexpected perspective, as the university is after all where the STs have undertaken most of their teacher preparation.

Further, much of what they may have been trying to do during student teaching may have been as an outcome of the university influence. Consequently, the STs could well feel a need for a link to their teacher preparation programme during what is often the most stressful teacher preparatory experience.

A minority of participants from both dyad groups indicated that lack of site visitation time by the US could impede the supervisors' ability to fulfill the purposes outlined above. Lack of US visitation time was also a concern expressed by physical education STs in a study by McBride (1984). Consequently, this may be a reason why half the present STs indicated that they felt one purpose of the CT in interacting with the US

was to act as a **information provider** to the supervisor. More specifically, it was felt that the CT should provide detailed information to the US on the progress of the ST.

However, a minority of STs also showed concern with what they perceived to be the lack of communication between the CT and the US. Thus, it could be speculated that this perceived lack of both US on-site visitation time and communication with the CT, influenced half these STs in their suggestion that the US had only minimal influence on ST development.

In fact, Eltiste (1989) had found that the US was perceived to be too far removed from ST concerns due to a lack of visitations and observations. Consequently, such a perceived lack of appreciation for ST concerns might reduce the influence of the US on ST performance. This is a worrying possibility when coupled to Webster and Graham's (1989) findings which indicated different degrees of explicit communication regarding triad participant expectations, did impact ST performance; particularly, in terms of focus.

US as Evaluator. Finally, in terms of student teaching participant purposes, it is interesting to note that despite the fact that STs are being formally assessed, only one purpose highlighted by half the STs referred to the idea of a triad participant as a **ST evaluator** (ie., US). This apparent lack of dyad perceptual concern regarding ST observers as evaluators may not be surprising. After all, these dyad groups did seem to focus more on the supportive actions of observer participants with STs; such actions included encouraging, guiding, facilitating and informing.

However, it is possible to speculate further that this sense of the US as, in part, an evaluator, may have had an inhibiting influence on the interactions of the STs with the US. Research (Hawkey, 1994) suggests tension can arise between STs and USs due to the interplay between the USs' role as a helper and an evaluator. Consequently, not only perceived lack of US visits, but also any potential ST inhibitory tension might further heighten the STs' sense of need for their CTs to inform

the US as to ST progress.

2. Observer Feedback

In relation to CT and US purpose the provision of feedback to STs was identified by only a minority of participants from both dyad groups. However, with regard to the perceived skills that CTs needed to effectively perform their purpose, the majority of the CTs highlighted the ability to **identify/analyze effective teaching.** Such ability is clearly needed to provide feedback to STs with regard to their teaching performance.

Impact and Influence of Feedback. All participants in both dyad groups when asked directly, indicated their belief in the importance of feedback in **ST development**. The majority of CTs felt that feedback was influential in terms of such development. However, some CTs pointed out that any impact depended to a large extent on the receptivity of the ST.

From the CTs perspective the majority focused their feedback on STs **instructional performance**, their **lesson/unit planning** and ability to **organize**. These findings were similar to those identified by Tannehill's (1989) physical education CTs. Likewise, the majority of the STs also indicated that they preferred observer feedback on their **instructional skills.** Further, half the STs pointed to the need for feedback on their **communication ability** and **class management.** Helison (1992) found similar feedback focus needs with his physical education ST research.

Dyad Interaction and Feedback. All dyad participants also reported having either provided (CTs) or received (STs) **verbal** and **written** feedback. A minority of the CTs defined the value of written feedback in relation to its usefulness in helping **observer memory** and **ST review**. Likewise, the majority of STs (while indicating a preference for a combination of written and verbal feedback) emphasized the value of written information in helping them to **remember** observer comments.

However, the STs also indicated the value of written feedback in helping their **self reflection** concerning what observer comments

meant in terms of personal teacher development. Further, half the STs indicated the value of written feedback in forming a basis for **dyad discussion**; particularly, if the dyad post observation conference was held well after the actual lesson(s) observed.

Dyad group participants (particularly half the STs) suggested that one weakness with observers only providing verbalized feedback was that it could easily be **forgotten**. However, a minority of the STs did suggest the value of verbalizing feedback lay in its usefulness for allowing **immediate discussion**. Clearly, this is important for dyads who have only minimal time between or after lessons in which to discuss observed ST performance.

ST Cognitive Involvement and Feedback. In relation to the above point on the immediacy of verbal feedback, all the CTs when asked about how they phrased their feedback to STs, indicated that they used directions as well as questions. However, while only a minority of the CTs referred to the use of directions in feedback as allowing **specific ideas** to be given quickly, the majority of the STs emphasized this point in terms of directions helping them to quickly focus on relevant ideas.

This is an interesting observation by the STs because in terms of their perceived purposes for the CT, a majority had identified the CT as an information provider. Again, it may be that the STs are inferring here that they can benefit from the direct suggestions of their experienced CTs. It could also be speculated that the importance of CT directions lies in that STs avoid predominantly trial and error learning which could lead to loss of both positive practice time and self esteem.

However, only a minority of STs indicated preferring solely question or direction oriented feedback. Half the STs indicated wanting a combination of these two modes of observer feedback. Yet, the majority of participants in both dyad groups pointed to the effectiveness of questioning in causing **ST thinking.** This emphasis on ST thinking is not surprising when considering these dyad groups leading perceptions of CT purpose. Most CTs highlighted the encouragement of ST ideas, while the majority of STs suggested the need for CTs to allow them the

opportunity to experiment. Both perceived CT purposes clearly require STs to cognitively involve themselves in producing answers to any questions that are posed.

Further, this finding may provide support for Dodds (1989) contention that STs who reflect on their teacher feelings and actions, increase personal opportunity to take control of the changes in their own teaching perspectives. For Dodds, STs need to be challenged regarding their educational beliefs by both the CT and US. Questioning would, therefore, seem a vital way of moving toward this goal. However, helping STs to achieve personally motivated changes in teaching perspective, also depends on the focus and depth of observer questioning.

3. ST Responsibilities

Concerning responsibilities it was perceived STs should demonstrate toward their dyad colleagues, only the idea of being **prepared for classes** was identified by a majority of the CTs. Likewise, for the STs only the general category of **meeting the CTs demands /expectations** was highlighted by a majority of these participants. From the CTs' perspective it is possible to speculate that they felt a personal responsibility not only to the STs, but also for the children in their classes. Therefore, the STs might have be seen as helping CTs to meet their personal responsibility to their children by being adequately prepared to carry out appropriate lessons.

ST as Reactor and Proactor. By identifying the ST responsibility of meeting the expectations of CTs, the STs seemed to be defining themselves as reactors to CT expectations. However, a minority of participants in both groups did indicate that another ST responsibility should be **proactive** behaviour. In other words, STs were expected to do things for themselves without being constantly directed by the CT. After all, both dyad groups had already mentioned the need for ST self decision - making (i.e., CTs) and experimentation (i.e., STs). Clearly, such ST self reflection would be one characteristic of prospective teachers who are decision - makers prepared to take some risks in their

teacher development.

Power of the US. With regard to the STs' responsibilities toward the US, meeting the **same responsibilities** as for the CT, and simply meeting the **US expectations** were identified by a majority of the CTs and STs respectively. However, half the STs also identified responsibilities requiring **communication** and **respect** toward the US. Again, the majority of STs' appeared to be demonstrating a sense of reacting to the requirements of another supervisory figure. However, unlike their perceptions regarding personal responsibilities toward CTs, half these STs also pointed to the responsibility of keeping the US informed about their student teaching progress.

This ST communication responsibility may have been particularly important to some STs. After all, a minority of STs had indicated earlier that there was a perceived lack of CT and US communication. Consequently, these STs may have perceived the need to ensure themselves that the US was kept up to date with regard to their progress. Further, this ST responsibility may have been perceived as even more pressing considering half the STs had already highlighted a US purpose as that of ST evaluator. Consequently, the earlier ST perception of the US as both an evaluator and school - university link may have generated this sense of respect owed by the ST to the US. In particular, a ST respect that acknowledged the power and connective nature of the US's position within the student teaching experience.

4. ST Achievements

As to what these dyad groups perceived were the achievements that STs should strive for during student teaching, there seemed to be one area of common ground. In terms of the most identified achievement, half the CTs highlighted STs becoming more **knowledgeable /confident teachers** while the majority of the STs pointed to what was termed becoming a **better teacher**. A better teacher from these STs' perspectives displayed increased self confidence and learned from all the available 'hands on' teaching they experienced.

ST Technical Achievements. Related to this idea of the better teacher

was the need to achieve improved **pedagogical knowledge/skill**; a personal attainment goal highlighted by a majority of the STs. In particular, half the STs identified managerial ability, content knowledge and teaching procedures as areas for ST achievement. Classroom management and instructional skills received further emphasis from the majority of STs when they were asked what they specifically focused on during personal teaching performance. Likewise, the majority of the CTs said that they focused predominantly on the mechanics of effective teaching when they specifically observed ST teaching performance. Clearly, both dyad groups were emphasizing the need for the STs to concentrate and improve their abilities in what Tinning (1990) has referred to as 'performance pedagogy' (technical elements of the teaching performance).

ST Personal Achievements. However, further CT perceptions concerning ST achievement moved from this technical focus to more of a sense of a personal job related professionalism. A minority of CTs also identified three themes, **job appreciation**, **career confirmation** and **professional responsibility** that suggested CT hope that STs would become aware of the importance and serious nature of their position.

As indicated, there does appear to be some agreement in terms of the most identified dyad perception for ST achievement. This focuses on the ST becoming a more effective teacher. For the STs the idea of becoming a better teacher seemed to consume their perspective. They went on to outline further criteria that directly related to improved teaching ability. However, in contrast, the CTs through their further perceptions seemed to want the STs to recognize two other factors as important to all round ST development. First, an awareness of the larger picture into which the STs were attempting to fit their professional lives. Second, that the STs had, in fact, made the correct career choice.

Like the school - based teachers in the research of Campbell and Horbury (1994) the present CT perspectives go beyond purely emphasizing the need for STs to improve their teaching skills.

Emphasis here was also on STs appreciating the different elements that constituted the role of the health and physical education teacher. Further, there was the sense that the STs should also understand the potential impact they could have as teachers, along with their subjects on the lives of children.

In fact, this CT desire to have STs achieve a recognition regarding their role and subject importance may have been linked to a previously identified CT purpose; that of professional gatekeeper. As gatekeepers, the CTs wanted to ensure that only the most motivated, skillful STs who recognized the value of their subject matter entered into the profession.

ST Practical Performance Assessment. Interestingly, when the STs were asked as to what criteria they felt they should be formally assessed on, out of the four categories identified by a majority of participants, only one was specifically related to effective teaching performance. This category was **lesson planning** which was highlighted by all the STs. However, a majority of STs also mentioned **professionalism, ST - colleague interaction** and **child learning** as criteria against which their student teaching performance should be assessed.

It can be speculated that these STs saw in lesson planning the basis to their effectively demonstrating appropriate instructional and managerial teacher behaviour. Likewise, a majority of the CTs had already indicated with regard to feedback that they also wanted to see and comment on ST lesson plans. Further, planning had also been linked by CTs with the ST responsibility of being prepared for their classes.

ST Personal Influence Assessment. However, the ST achievement of having children learn took the emphasis away from what the ST could be observed doing and moved more toward the influence of a teacher's actions on others. Other studies (Schempp, 1986; Pettigrew, 1988) have suggested the relative unimportance of childrens' learning to STs in physical education. However, the majority of the present STs felt children learning was a factor against which their performance could be

assessed.

This identifying of criteria by which STs felt their student teaching performance should be assessed led to an interesting observation. While the leading ST perceptions previously outlined regarding prospective teacher achievement focused on technical performance, they were not perceived as main ST assessment criteria. In fact, going outside ST technical lesson performance for assessment criteria was demonstrated via the majority of STs identifying areas related to more personal professionalism and successful ST - colleague interaction.
5. ST Child Understanding

In comparing what CTs hoped STs would come to understand about children with the actual attitudes and understandings that STs indicated, there does seem to be some dyad group similarity.

ST Professional Response to Children. The majority of CTs highlighted wanting STs to **recognize/respond to children's differences** and to try to actually **meet childrens' needs**. In turn, a majority of the STs pointed to an improved understanding regarding **child development.** Within this particular theme STs indicated appreciating the differences in children within and between grade levels. Further, the STs described specific areas of human development where such changes in children occurred.

A majority of the STs also indicated that they had become more aware of what was defined as **teacher - student response motivators.** Such motivators included the attitudes and actions on the part of the teacher and learner that had a positive stimulatory influence on the other party. In fact, previous research (Cruickshank, et al., 1974; Jones, 1992b) has identified the influence that children can have on STs.

In conclusion, Chapter 6 above has compared and contrasted the findings that emerged from the perceptual data provided by both the CTs and STs working in the present research traditional site. Table 4 is provided to help further summarize those areas that emerged from this componential analysis of dyad group findings. In particular, the table

highlights perceptual areas that demonstrate the most and least traditional dyad group perceptual similarity concerning self and others' purpose.

Chapter 7 that follows provides the researcher's conclusions with regard to the main issues that emerged from the componential analysis undertaken in Chapter 6. Grounded hypotheses are also presented within the chapter. The purpose of such hypotheses is to provide guidance for future researchers investigating the influence of traditional student teaching sites. Further, to assist such potential future study by others the present researcher also suggests some possible ideas for consideration in relation to each hypothesis identified.

Table 4

Comparative Model of the Leading Traditional Site Dyad Group Perceptions
Demonstrating Greatest and Least Similarity Concerning Self and Others'
Purpose

More Agreement	Less Agreement
1. CT purpose involves the encouragement of the ST as professional decision - maker and experimenter.	1. STs moreso than their CTs placed importance on the CT purpose of ST information - giver; a role based on the CT's knowledge and /experience and perceived as helping to direct ST professional action in terms of ideas to try.
2. US purpose can assist dyad participants interaction with each other.	
3. Feedback is important in ST development with a focus more on the technical/practical pedagogical skills.	2. STs placed more importance on the value of written feedback in ST development than did their CTs.
4. Feedback questioning plays an important role in terms of the cognitive involvement of STs in their own development.	
5. STs should aim to become more confident teachers improving their effective teaching abilities.	
6. STs should come to recognize the importance of understanding both the needs of children and the influences that impact their behaviour.	

Chapter Seven

Traditional Dyad Group Findings: Conclusions and Hypotheses

The purpose of this chapter is to present both conclusions and hypotheses derived from the traditional dyad group componential analyses undertaken in the five summary areas: 1) Participant Purposes; 2) Observer Feedback; 3) ST Responsibilities; 4) ST Achievements; 5) ST Child Understanding. The grounded hypotheses presented emerged from the interplay of dyad group findings that occurred during componential analyses. While potential answers to these hypotheses are suggested based on the present findings, each hypothesis does, however, remain as a guideline for future research by others investigating traditional student teaching settings.

1. Participant Purposes

In terms of the CT purpose most identified by both dyad groups, the concept of STs being able to demonstrate their own ideas is preeminent. CTs highlight the idea of encouraging ST self decision - making; STs point to being allowed the opportunity to try their own ideas. The importance of self in the learning process has already been highlighted by teacher educators as a critical factor (Zeichner, 1979; Graber, 1988). Therefore, both present dyad groups may at least implicitly be recognizing the importance of STs having some self direction in their own teacher development; particular, by the encouragement of ST personal action and cognitive involvement in the student teaching experience.

Although the traditional design in student teaching sees the STs' daily schedule fairly fixed before arrival, both present dyad groups seem to see the possibility and necessity for ST input into their own development. This finding suggests these dyad groups did not perceive dyad interaction as a one way process (ie., CT to ST) with the ST viewed as a complete novice; a perception Brooks, Fitch and Mountford (1994) suggest is not uncommon in student teaching.

The present traditional site participants' views were clearly more closely associated with what Mountford (1993) suggests is the "...need to acknowledge the role students (only) can play in their own professional development and learning" (p. 35). In fact, such views may relate to the suggestion (Mitchell Waldrop, 1992) that STs who show they have brought skills and ideas to the student teaching experience are more likely to get support and cooperation from colleagues, when it is needed.

While the CTs do not predominantly identify their own purpose as one of providing information to the ST, the STs are more focused on this activity as one befitting the purpose of the CT. Further, there may be a connection between the perception of the CT as an information provider, and another majority ST identified CT purpose i.e., allowing ST experimentation. After all, STs might recognize that they may never have a safer environment in which to try out their own ideas than that provided under the watchful, informative eye of their CT. However, if things do go wrong then information provided by CTs may help STs to modify their actions for the increased possibility of future success.

Speculatively, the CTs may have been less concerned and/or aware of their own expertise living professionally amongst teachers. The CTs may not necessarily have been encouraged to reflect on the value of their own knowledge and experience for others. However, STs coming from a university environment where all their peers were inexperienced teachers, may have felt that they could learn much from their dyad colleague. Further, it might be speculated that any CT guidance that STs obtain, may help reduce the amount of variation in the decision - making STs have to undertake, thus reducing their stress level.

Consequently, the following hypotheses emerged from analysis of the findings concerning dyad participant perceptions of the CT's purpose.

a) There is a relationship between the dyad participants' views of the ST as decision - maker and experimenter, and their perceptions of the CT's purpose.

b) There is a relationship between ST perceptions of the CT's purpose as that of information provider, and their perception of the impact of the CT during the student teaching experience.

The findings of this study suggest with regard to traditional dyad perceptions of the CTs' purpose that there is agreement concerning the need for STs to play an active, cognitively involved part in their own development. In fact, the cited research along with the perceptions of the present participants provide a sense that only the STs themselves can provide certain input in to the student teaching experience; input without which a ST cannot develop to their fullest potential.

However, there appears to be less dyad agreement concerning the emphasis placed on the CT acting as an information provider. Speculatively, this contrast may be more a matter of dyad participant background, experience and self awareness, than outright philosophical disagreement. The CTs seem to be concerned with not making the STs dependent and potentially clones of themselves. Yet, the STs appear to feel that a balance of both CT input and challenge is feasible.

With regard to the purpose of the US, research (Ryan, 1989; Shippy, 1989) has suggested that there has been particular triad confusion concerning this participant's purpose within student teaching. However, in the present study there appears to be more similarity between perceptions of the dyad participants than disagreement. In particular, the US purpose is perceived by both dyad groups as one that is meant to be supportive of the student teaching experience.

The CTs two most identified US purposes focus on guiding and supporting the dyad; in particular, supporting the work of the CT with the ST. The STs, likewise, pointed to the importance of the US facilitating a smooth relationship within the dyad. It could be speculated that both these dyad groups may be presenting their perceptions from the perspective of feeling isolated. Dodds (1989) has referred to the isolation of the physical educator as they perform their teachers role. However, it is possible that such isolation may also be felt by both dyad

participants during student teaching.

From the CTs' perspective, there may be a strong feeling of responsibility for the successful development of the ST. Conversely, there may also be a fear for the CT of their ST performing unsatisfactorily. It is not unrealistic, therefore, to suggest that CTs may feel they deserve some of the praise or blame for their ST's performance. Consequently, it could be speculated that a CT might feel isolated in their supervisory role and, hence, would look to receive support for their work from the university which prepared the ST (ie., in the form of the US)

From the STs' perspective, they have spent the majority of their formal teacher preparation time in the university setting. Universities expect that their STs will demonstrate some of the college acquired knowledge, skills and behaviours while out on student teaching. Therefore, it is not surprising that having been placed in an unfamiliar environment to 'student teach,' STs might look for support for their performance from their teacher preparation programme (i.e., the US). This need may be particularly strong where STs felt that the approaches highlighted by the university are not necessarily those encouraged by the school departments in which they are teaching.

Consequently, the following hypotheses emerged from analysis of the findings concerning dyad perceptions of the USs' purpose.

a) There is a relationship between dyad participants' feelings of isolation and the perceived opportunity to interact with the US.

b) There is a relationship between dyad participants' sense of isolation from the US and their perception of the impact of the US on the ST.

The findings of this study suggest that any sense of potential isolation for the STs may have been magnified; particularly, for the minority who perceived a lack of communication between their CT and US. Speculatively, such feelings of isolation would have been very disconcerting for any STs having dyad relationship difficulties and/or who perceived their US to need CT information to make an accurate ST

evaluation. In fact, such a perceived lack of CT - US interaction may have been a possible source for half the STs suggesting that the US had only a minimal influence on their development. While lack of US communication had not been specifically mentioned by the CTs, lack of US visitation time was identified by a CT minority. Consequently, for CTs feeling the responsibility of their position, a perceived lack of communication with the US may have been a frustrating and stressful situation feeding any sense of supervisory isolation.

2. Observer Feedback

Glickman and Bey (1990) have suggested that the concept of CT feedback is a vital one in terms of the impact that student teaching may have on ST development. Interestingly, the specific provision of feedback as a CT purpose, was only identified by a minority of participants in the two present traditional dyad groups. Speculation might suggest that CTs may have been going beyond the idea of the giving of actual feedback; in particular, to what they may have perceived as being more important, the outcome of CT feedback. For these CTs such outcomes may have been closely related to the CT purpose of encouraging ST personal decision - making.

From the STs' perspective, the CT was predominantly identified as a guide and an information - provider. However, reading the STs' responses provided a sense that feedback was only a part of the CTs' informational purpose. Therefore, the demand for feedback that was plentiful, directly focused on the lesson and very specific (McBride, 1984; Pfister & Newcomb, 1984) does not seem to have dominated either of the present dyad groups' focus with regard to CT purpose.

Yet, when asked directly, all dyad participants did indicate that feedback played an important role in the student teaching process. The majority of CTs had, in fact, already emphasized this importance indirectly. This had occurred by CTs identifying those supervisory skills that would allow specific feedback to be provided on ST lessons (i.e., the ability to analyze/identify effective teaching).

It might be suggested (Beyer, 1988; Wright & Bottery, 1997) that this

CT focus on identifying/analyzing effective teaching skills as supervisory skills is an outcome of the dominant technical paradigm in teacher education . However, it can also be speculated that it is, in fact, very difficult to observably define CT skills/abilities (particularly during interviews) that go beyond technical lesson analysis. Therefore, it may have been easier for dyad participants to describe observable teaching factors as supervisory skills, rather than define those supervisory qualities involved in areas other than the technical. However, while factors beside the technical may be very difficult for CTs to clearly verbalize in research, this does not mean they ignore such areas in their actual ST supervision. As Campbell and Horbury (1994) found, school - based teachers do want to support their STs beyond just classroom and craft knowledge.

Obviously, the concept of feedback being linked predominantly to technical lesson analysis does receive support from present dyad participants' answers. In particular, with regard to the question which asked where participants preferred to focus (ie., CTs) or receive feedback (ie., STs) in terms of ST performance. All dyad emergent categories were directly focused on the presentation of the ST's lesson, just as had been indicated in previous research (O'Neal, 1983a; Tannehill, 1989; Helison, 1992).

Goodman (1988) has lamented that rather than concentrating on the technical aspects of teaching, field experiences should be designed to emphasize ST reflection, experimentation and decision - making. Interestingly, the traditional dyad groups in this study despite their technical feedback foci, did specifically identify all three of Goodman's emphases for ST development as both CT purposes and a reason for the indirect mode (ie., questioning) of feedback.

Consequently, the following hypothesis emerged from analysis of these findings concerning ST feedback related to the perceived purposes of the CT.

a)There is a relationship between CT emphasis on effective teaching and their perceptions of a broader personal purpose within

the student teaching experience.

From the findings of the present study it can be asked whether dyad focus on technical skills necessarily precludes STs from being cognitively challenged to produce their own answers to questions raised. This research suggests that these two areas of student teaching focus do not have to be mutually exclusive.

Admittedly, it is not possible to assess whether the present STs were challenged by their CTs to critically analyze programmatic goals as called for by Kirk (1986). However, as Dodds (1989) suggests, if the 'self' is an important factor in learning to teach, then STs do need to be challenged to take risks with different ideas. Interestingly, the way that such challenges are initially determined or focused (e.g., technical, social or critical) may not be the limiting factor in terms of empowering ST thought and development. Rather, as the present dyad groups recognize, participants in the student teaching process themselves need to show both an awareness of, and the desire to provide ST challenges of the status quo.

The idea of challenging STs cognitively to move beyond their present understanding is further highlighted in dyad findings concerning the method and mode of feedback used in the traditional site. All dyad participants indicated that they had been involved with verbal and written feedback. However, the findings suggested that the STs were more concerned with the concept of written feedback than their CTs. Although half the dyad participants were concerned that verbal feedback was easily forgotten by STs, only a minority of the CTs felt that written feedback was of use to observer memory and ST review. In contrast, the majority of STs felt such feedback helped them to remember observer comments and encouraged self reflection. Further, half the STs also pointed to written comments assisting dyad conference discussion.

Consequently, the following hypothesis emerged from analysis of these findings concerning the idea of CT feedback method related to STs' perceived needs and development.

a) There is a relationship between STs' perceived need for written observer feedback and their perceptions of positive ST development.

As indicated, researchers (Zeichner, 1979; Graber, 1988; Dodds, 1989) have pointed to the potential part played by the 'self' in learning how to teach. The present findings indicate that these traditional sited STs clearly valued their CTs' comments. They wanted to be able to remember and reflect on such comments, and to discuss them with their CTs. Consequently, there was a sense that written feedback assisted STs to move beyond their present level of development. In particular, through ST personal reflection/action based on experienced and knowledgeable CT feedback. Again, this may be a further example of the present STs support for Mountford's (1993) suggestion that those involved in the student teaching process need to "...acknowledge the role students (only) can play in their own professional development and learning" (p. 35)

In terms of the mode of delivery (i.e., direct and indirect) regarding verbal and written feedback, dyad participants were asked for perceptions concerning the usefulness of CT directions and questions in assisting ST development. A previously highlighted difference again emerged between dyad groups over this issue. All the CTs indicated using both modes of feedback. However, with regard to directions only a minority of CTs suggested that these were useful in providing specific ideas to the STs. In contrast, the majority of the STs pointed out that directions were, in fact, helpful for quickly focusing them on relevant ideas. Again, here was the sense that STs could learn from the direct experience and knowledge of their CTs.

Speculation might also suggest that the STs saw directive feedback as helping them to avoid an over reliance on trial and error learning. A method which can take time and slow down progress. As research (Andrews, 1964; Haring & Nelson, 1980) indicates, student teaching has a vital influence on prospective teachers. Consequently, it may have been that these STs felt that a CT's informative directions in terms of specific ideas would help them to benefit most from the time available

for student teaching.

Consequently, the following hypothesis emerged from the analysis of these findings concerning the idea of CT feedback methods and mode related to CT purpose.

a) There is a relationship between the method and mode of CT feedback and dyad perceived purposes of the CT.

The findings of the present study suggest that specific CT provided ideas may also help reduce ST stress levels and, therefore, directly relate to the earlier ST identified purpose of the CT as an information provider. STs had already indicated needing the directive experience of their CTs. Further, research (Tinning & Siedentop, 1985) has pointed to the fine balance STs have to maintain in meeting CT, US and children's demands. Therefore, CT directions might be viewed as directly helping to alleviate two (i.e., CT and children) of the three identified pressure group demands on STs. Also, by meeting CT and children's demands it could then be speculated that STs were also meeting US demands related to listening to and acting on CTs' advice.

These findings concerning the CTs perceived use of directions and questions, again, may relate back to previous dyad recognitions. Dyad participants had already predominantly identified CT purposes as involving the encouragement of ST self decision - making and experimentation. Most dyad participants had also pointed to the effectiveness of CT questions in stimulating STs to think about what they had been observed doing. Consequently, this idea of STs being cognitively involved with their own development appears to be an underlying theme in this traditional site - based research. In particular, ST involvement related to both perceived CT purpose and observer feedback.

For the STs, it may have been that written feedback was seen as a means by which the most identified dyad perceived CT purposes could be fulfilled. In particular, written feedback was perceived to allow potentially longer and deeper ST reflection for both direct and indirect modes; in part, due to the more lasting nature of the information.

3. ST Responsibilities

The research says little about the specific responsibilities health and physical education dyad participants perceive are owed by STs to their triad colleagues. However, such responsibilities may relate to the smooth interaction of the student teaching dyad. For the majority of the CTs, ST responsibility was closely connected to their being prepared for their classes. Clearly, CTs are being asked by university teacher preparation programmes to help prepare STs. However, often CTs still naturally feel a primary responsibility to their classes (Zeichner, et al., 1987) in terms of their children receiving appropriate instruction. This potential concern by CTs for their classes may now be even greater as school curricula and outcomes are increasingly being subjected to outside school scrutiny (Jones, 1992a).

Consequently, the following hypothesis emerged from the analysis of the findings concerning the idea of ST responsibility toward their CT.

a) There is a relationship between STs meeting the needs of their children in lessons and dyad participant sense of the ST fulfilling a personal responsibility toward their CT.

This sense of STs' responsibility toward CTs linked to the education of the children in their classes may be supported by the research. Studies (Cruickshank, et al., 1974; Jones, 1992b) have shown the strong influence of children on STs. Therefore, further speculation might suggest that ST concern with children would increase; in particular, for those who were aware of CTs' sense of responsibility toward their own classes. Tinning and Siedentop (1985) have referred to the fine balancing act STs perform meeting the demands of their CTs, children and US. Thus, being able to meet childrens' needs, may, speculatively be a demonstration of the present STs' responsibility in meeting the demands of their CTs in terms of being prepared for their classes (i.e., a CT majority identified responsibility for the STs).

As suggested already, it might be speculated that some of the present ST perceptions concerning personal responsibility do relate to CT views concerning ST responsibilities. For example, a minority of

CTs highlighted one ST responsibility as maintaining open communication with the CT and being receptive to their comments. In other words, the ST was, in part, expected to listen to what the CT had to say and to act in some way on what had been outlined. Research (Templin, 1979; Locke, 1984) has suggested that STs do move closer to the views held by their CTs during the student teaching experience. Consequently, CT expectations for ST responsibility might also encourage the learning loop of 'look, listen and try.' Therefore, dyad interaction of this nature occurring over a number of weeks, may, encourage some ST movement toward CT perspectives and actions. After all, these STs had already indicated the value of feedback based on their CTs' experience and knowledge in helping their development.

Consequently, the following hypothesis emerged from the analysis of these findings concerning the idea of ST responsibility related to CT influence.

a) There is a relationship between CTs' perceptions of ST responsibilities toward the CT and STs' behaviour and attitudes.

This relationship between CT perceptions of ST responsibility and ST behaviour and attitude might be strongly impacted by what Dodds (1988) has referred to as the isolation of the student teaching dyad. Such potential isolation may magnify the ability of the CT to influence the ST. Consequently, Dodds view coupled with the present sense of ST responsibility in meeting CT demands, particularly, concerning being prepared for their classes, would suggest a potentially strong CT influence on ST behaviour and attitude.

Regarding ST responsibility toward the US the most identified dyad perceptions were similar to those most identified for the CT. The majority of CTs felt ST responsibilities were the same for both CT and US. The majority of STs, again, saw themselves as needing to meet expectations; this time the US's.

However, half the STs suggested two further responsibilities they owed to the US. These were to communicate with and show respect for the US's position. This finding is interesting because half the STs had

also indicated that the US had only minimal influence on their development. The reason for this apparent contrast between ST perception of US influence on self and their perceived responsibilities toward the supervisor may relate to previous research. For example, Johns and Cline (1985) found that STs highlighted the importance to themselves of both US observations and understanding. Such need for US understanding may, therefore, relate to the present STs perceived responsibility to communicate with and show respect for the US.

Yet, such present ST perceived responsibility, may, speculatively have little to do with perceptions of the USs' influence on their professional teacher development. Rather, STs may have been more concerned with the perceived power of the US in terms of their overall student teaching evaluation. Afterall, an earlier ST identified purpose for the US had been that of evaluator.

Consequently, the following hypothesis emerged from the analysis of these findings concerning the idea of ST responsibility related to US influence.

a) There is a relationship between ST perceptions of personal responsibilities toward the US and the perceived purpose of the US within the student teaching experience.

STs' own highlighted responsibility to communicate with the US may, in fact, have been related to a natural self - serving desire. In particular, a desire to make sure that the US as the perceived evaluator was kept informed about the progress that the STs considered themselves to be making. Therefore, this perception would not unnaturally stimulate STs to show both respect for and communicate with their US.

However, beyond being an evaluator the US was also identified by STs as being both a facilitator and a school - university link for the ST. Consequently, it is possible to speculate that there is a mixture of ST feelings represented here toward the US's position. Such feelings appear to influence STs' perceptions of their responsibilities toward the US. Beyond being seen as purely an evaluator there does appear to be a ST appreciation for the potential help the US can provide as a

facilitator, and as a school - university link. This is opposed to the notion of the US as a direct influence on the pedagogical development of the ST. An aim which may be very difficult to achieve given the suggested influence of the CT and the perceived lack of US visitation.

4. ST Achievements

For CTs the concept of ST achievement revolved around a number of perspectives. The ST perceptions were more focused and dominated by the idea of becoming a 'better teacher.' In terms of the factors identified by STs in becoming the better teacher the focus was very much on improved pedagogical skills. Similarly, the CTs leading identified achievement for STs was for them to become more knowledgeable and confident teachers. Clearly, the CTs wanted the STs to become effective teachers in the classroom/gymnasium. This was to be expected as all the CTs had previously identified the mechanics of effective teaching as their focus when observing STs teaching.

It is not unreasonable for STs to relate personal achievement and being a better teacher, with their demonstrated ability in the teaching environment. After all, much publicity has been given to the perceived failure of teacher preparation programmes to prepare teachers capable of providing instruction relevant to children approaching the 21st century (Doyle, 1990). Likewise, school teachers have also come under increased scrutiny with regard to the outcomes they have produced in the classroom (e.g., America 2000: An Educational Strategy, 1991). Consequently, it is understandable if the present CTs may have felt pressure to focus on STs' behaviour in the teaching - learning environment.

This technological focused orientation (Feiman - Nemser, 1990) to teaching is grounded in the perception that teaching can be improved and, in particular, improved if built on the accumulating body of teaching effectiveness research (Berliner, 1985). The present STs had come through a programme that introduced them to the concept of effective teaching in several of their university - based teacher

preparation courses. Consequently, it is logical to suggest that these STs might have felt their observers were looking for specific elements of expected performance (ie., skills that the STs related to becoming a 'better teacher').

Interestingly, the STs did not focus predominantly on their technical performance when it came to outlining what they felt their summative evaluation should be based on. It might have been expected that based on their goals for ST achievement, effective teaching would have been emphasized. Yet, like Isele (1989) found in his study, effective teaching in the present research was not the dominant mode of summative ST assessment. Lesson planning, which might be described as the basis for effective teaching was highlighted by all the STs. However, three further perceptions not specifically related to observable effective teaching behaviour were also identified by the majority of STs (i.e., children learning, professionalism, and ST - colleague interaction) as potential summative ST assessment criteria.

Consequently, the following hypothesis emerged from the analysis of these findings concerning dyad perceptions of ST overall achievements.

a) There is a relationship between STs' perceptions of the criteria for summative ST assessment and how they fully define the 'better teacher.'

The present study findings, in part, contradict previous research (Schempp, 1986; Pettigrew, 1988) which has indicated that physical education STs place more emphasis on controlling and managing children; they are less concerned with children learning. In contrast, the present STs indicated a concern that the 'better teachers' performance should, in part, be evaluated on whether or not they helped children to learn. Speculation might suggest that children learning is a natural outcome of the STs' focus on effective lesson planning and their goal of being a 'better teacher.'

Further, it is possible that one characteristic of being a professional is that such a person has an influence on the lives of others. Recognizing

that they had an impact on children's lives is, in fact, what a minority of the CTs had wanted STs to achieve, in terms of professional responsibility. Consequently, it could be further speculated that personal influence on others is what these STs are recognizing here. In particular, by their highlighting personal impact both on children's learning and their colleaguial interactions. In other words, ST summative assessment criteria were potentially linked to the definition of the 'better teacher'.

5. ST Child Understanding

In terms of what it was hoped that STs would come to acknowledge about children the majority of dyad participants focused on STs recognizing the differences displayed by children. For the CTs, recognition of such differences was closely linked to responsive teacher action; the majority of CTs emphasized teachers trying to meet the varied needs of children. However, the majority of STs also highlighted a further emphasis involving recognition of what motivates both teachers and students in their interaction with each other.

As indicated earlier, it is natural that CTs should be concerned with their classes receiving positive experiences from STs. The positive development of children is, after all, what teachers are paid for. Consequently, the ability to recognize developmental differences in children and how these influence their social and academic response, would be an understandable CT goal for STs.

Again, the majority of CTs wanted STs to recognize the importance of actually reacting to the perceived needs of different children. However, this CT perception seemed to relate less to ST child developmental knowledge and more to their recognition of the problems that children often encounter in their everyday environments. Some CTs felt that STs needed to be aware of non school influences, and to take these into consideration when deciding how to interact with individual children.

From a ST perspective, research (Cruickshank, et al., 1974; Jones, 1992b) has shown the influence of children on the perceptions of STs.

The majority of STs in the present study demonstrated this awareness of children's influence in their perceptions. For example, the STs identified factors that motivated the positive response of children and, likewise, children's actions/attitudes that directly motivated ST response. Some STs pointed to a recognition of the cyclic nature of child - teacher response motivators and the benefits that both the teacher and children received. Such motivational factors were seen as encouraging teacher and student to respond more positively to each other for the benefit of both groups.

Consequently, the following hypothesis emerged from the analysis of these findings concerning dyad perceptions regarding ST attitudes toward and understandings about children.

a) There is a relationship between dyad participants' understandings concerning the reaction and needs of children and the STs' concern for self and child.

The findings of the present study raise the question as to what degree dyad participant perceptions appear to correspond in terms of ST understanding and recognition about children? Some research (Templin, 1979) has indicated that dyad group views become more closely aligned, and that STs become less humanitarian and more custodial in their outlook towards children during student teaching.

Present dyad groups do seem to agree on the need for STs to recognize child differences. Yet, like the STs in Arrighi and Young's (1987) research, so the present STs seemed to show some concern for self in terms of personal actions and feelings being influenced by children's responses. However, it is interesting to note that non of the dyad perceptions provided on this question suggested a pressing need for STs to control children. This focus might have been expected if as Templin (1979) indicated, STs become more custodial in attitude toward children and as Schempp (1986) highlighted, STs are preoccupied with the control of children.

This difference between previous research findings (Schempp, 1986; Arrighi & Young, 1987; Pettigrew, 1988) and the present study may lie

in the amount of student teaching time that the STs experienced. Previous research groups (Schempp, 1986; Arrighi & Young, 1987; Pettigrew, 1988) had only 8 - 10 weeks in student teaching. The present STs had 16 weeks in the field. Such extra student teaching time, speculatively, may have allowed the present STs to move beyond what Furlong and Maynard (1995) refer to as the predominant ST concern for self and children's social reaction.

In fact, increased student teaching time may have allowed the present STs to become more comfortable with the control of their classes. Consequently, they were more able to focus on the needs and concerns of others. The CT concern was more with the recognition by STs of the influence of child development and the importance of responding to children's needs. Therefore, the extra time the CTs also enjoyed with the present STs compared with the shorter traditional student teaching experiences of the past, may have allowed the present CTs to focus on other areas rather than predominantly a concern with ST ability to manage children.

To conclude this chapter a table has been provided. Table 5 highlights the main conclusions and hypotheses that emerged from the componential analysis of the traditional dyad participant groups' findings as presented in Chapter 7. Further, the next section that follows, beginning with Chapter 8, now places the present research focus on dyad participant perceptions grounded within the alternative Teaching Centre approach to student teaching.

Table 5

Summary of Main Conclusions and Hypotheses derived from the Traditional Dyad Group Findings

---

There is a relationship between the:

<u>Participant Purposes</u>

1) ...dyad participants' views of the ST as a decision - maker and experimenter and their perceptions of the CTs' purpose.

2) ...ST perceptions of the CT's purpose as that of 'information - provider' and their perception of the impact of the CT during student teaching.

3) ...potential dyad participant feelings of professional isolation and their perceived opportunity to interact with the US.

4) ...potential dyad participant feelings of professional isolation from the US and their perceptions of the impact of the US.

<u>Observer Feedback</u>

5) ...STs perceived need for written feedback from observers and their perceptions of positive ST development.

6) ...method and mode of CT feedback and dyad participant perceived purposes of the CT.

<u>ST Responsibilities</u>

7) ...STs meeting the needs of their children during lessons and their sense of fulfilling a personal responsibility toward the CT.

8) ...CT perceptions of ST responsibilities toward the CT and STs' behaviour and attitudes.

9) ...STs' perceptions of personal responsibilities toward the US and the perceived purpose of the US within the student teaching experience.

<u>ST Achievements</u>

10) ...STs' perceptions of the criteria for summative ST assessment and how they defined the 'better teacher.'

<u>ST Child Understanding</u>

11) ...dyad participants' understandings concerning the needs and reactions of children and the STs' concern for self and children.

Chapter Eight

Alternative Site Mentor - Cooperating Teacher Findings

This chapter presents the alternative site mentor - cooperating teacher (MCT) findings derived from their interview responses related to this investigation's major research question:

A) What do MCTs in an alternative student teaching site perceive to be their own purpose and that of their school - based colleague during the student teaching experience?

In particular, these findings provide specific answers to the three research subquestions which helped to guide both the data collection and analysis conducted within this investigation. First, the findings indicate what these MCTs identify as their purpose in working with both the student teacher (ST) and the university supervisor (US). Second, they indicate what the MCTs perceive as the purpose of the STs in working with the MCTs and the US. Third, the findings identify what MCTs believe to be STs overall purpose for achievement as prospective teachers. Further, the findings identified under each of the three research subquestions are also subcategorized based on the particular focus within which the finding falls.

1. MCT Perceptions of Self Purpose Related to Working with the ST and US

Analysis of the seven Mars Area School - District health and/or physical education MCTs' interview data indicated a number of perceptions with regard to their purpose in working with STs within the Teaching Centre.

MCT Purpose. Five MCTs described their overall purpose as acting as a **guide** to the ST. There was a sense that these MCTs saw themselves in a position to give direction to the efforts of STs. As one MCT specifically stated: "It's to guide them in the right direction . . .If they're off the right track, put them on the right track" (2).

Three MCTs indicated that their purpose in working with the ST was

also to act as a **resource.** These respondents saw themselves as providing information to help ST development. This included sharing what did or did not work for the MCT, giving suggestions regarding alternative approaches to situations and demonstrating MCT's preferred teaching styles.

Further, three MCTs felt that another purpose was to focus on the demonstrated teaching performance of the STs. These MCTs referred to a variety of specific elements of teaching on which they had focused and provided **feedback** (e.g., content clarity, positioning, organization, class management and lesson plans etc.).

In contrast to providing STs with direct information about their observable performance, five MCTs indicated the importance of **encouraging STs' pedagogical ideas.** These respondents suggested allowing STs some freedom in their teaching. They highlighted such factors as encouraging ST "creativity " (7) allowing them to ". . .learn from their mistakes" (5), and ". . .if they have good ideas try to encourage them" (2).

Supervisory Skills and Knowledge. With regard to the skills and knowledge that a MCT needs to effectively supervise STs these seven respondents identified eleven supervisory elements. Three respondents suggested the need for MCT knowledge regarding both **STs' preparatory experiences** and **student teaching outcomes.** This included understanding the types of college experiences that the STs had undertaken, and knowing the expectations that the college physical education department had for ST achievement. Three MCTs also referred to the need for **patience** in working with a ST. As one MCT stated even if some ST actions are irritating: "Everyone is different . . .so you (MCT) have to be patient" (4).

MT and CT Purpose. In relation to the design of the Teaching Centre as an alternative approach to traditional student teaching, the seven respondents were asked if they felt the purpose of the mentor teacher (MT) was any different to that of the cooperating teacher (CT)? Only one MCT indicated that there was **no difference** in the MT and

CT's purpose. The other six MCTs felt that the two roles did involve a certain **difference** in purpose. However, there was disagreement as to whether this was an original Teaching Centre design intention, or simply an outcome of the student teaching process as it evolved within the centre. For example, an MCT stated: "I don't think the original concept (MT - CT purpose) was meant to be, but I think because of the nature of the situation, it has to be" (1). Whereas, another MCT indicated ". . .by definition it (MT - CT purpose) has to be" (2)

Impact of Time on MCT Purpose. Five of the MCTs clearly emphasized the influence of **time** on the purpose of the MT and CT. There was strong agreement that the CT had difficulties because they did not have the supervisory time with the ST that the MT was afforded. A number of advantages and disadvantages were highlighted because of this dyad time variance. For example, two MCTs indicated that because the ST had at least three lessons with their MT during the day, this meant that the MT had the opportunity to see the ST demonstrate their teach and re - teach ability (i.e., teach the same grade level twice in succession to see if improvements identified initially were implemented in the second lesson). CTs did not have this opportunity (ie., teach - reteach situation) to see potential improvement in their STs.

Further, because STs only taught one lesson per day for their CTs, they were often ". . .flying in and out" (4) of CTs' classrooms/gymnasia. This made it very difficult for a CT and ST to find time to discuss the ST's development (". . .so there's no immediate feedback" (4). Dyad meeting times it was indicated had to be scheduled whenever the CT and ST could find time.

Another MCT indicated that because a ST had a block of three MT lessons during the day this enabled the ST to meet the MT usually at the start or end of the day, or sometimes during a planning period. This amount of dyad interaction time it was suggested meant that the MT was able to ". . . get across more information to them" (ST) (3). Further, because CTs did not see STs as often as the MT, two respondents felt

this meant that a MT took on more responsibility for their ST than the CT. One MCT suggested that ". . .I don't think you (CT) push them (ST) and expect as much as you do as a MT" (6).

Feedback Value. One perceived MCT purpose during student teaching which had been identified earlier by three respondents focused on providing feedback to STs. Feedback has also been identified in the research literature as being of importance to the traditional CT. Consequently, the present respondents were asked what they thought was the purpose of the MCT in providing feedback to the ST. All respondents initially indicated that they felt feedback played an **important role** in the development of STs. For example, comments were recorded such as "I think that's all there is to it (MCT purpose)" (1); ". . .feedback definitely has to occur" (4); ". . .it's essential" (7).

Three MCTs indicated that without feedback STs would lack awareness concerning **personal development** as prospective teachers. As these respondents suggested ". . .without feedback STs don't know how they're progressing" (1); ". . .feedback definitely has to occur so that they (STs) are able to evaluate themselves and grow" (4); ". . .you can't function without it, if you don't. . .they (STs) will never grow" (7). Consequently, by implication STs who do not receive feedback were felt more likely to fail in terms of achieving their fullest potential.

Four MCTs also pointed to the importance of providing ST feedback on areas that required **correction/improvement.** For example, one MCT stated, ". . .I think it's important. . .this is what you need to improve on, or this is what areas could be stronger" (5). Another MCT indicated how ". . .anxious for feedback" STs were and that they actually wanted to know what their MCTs thought about their teaching, ". . .am I doing this correct" (3).

However, three other MCTs emphasized the need to provide feedback that encouraged ST **thinking, self analysis** and **positive self esteem.** For example, one MCT said, ". . .my feedback . . .is so

that they can be thinking deeper and improving their skills as a ST" (6). Another MCT indicated ". . .eventually you want that ST to be able to critique and evaluate themselves; this is your MCT goal" (7). This MCT was suggesting that eventually the STs would no longer have an MCT working with them upon whom they could rely for feedback.

MCTs had already previously highlighted dyad difficulties related to the time that CTs had with their STs, in comparison to the MTs in the Teaching Centre design. Consequently, when questioned concerning MCT feedback three respondents pointed out that while acting in the CT role, providing the **appropriate amount** of feedback was difficult. One of these MCTs suggested that the CT situation was a hit or miss affair because the CT only had a single lesson per day to observe:

I don't think we have the opportunity to provide enough feedback

other than right on the spot. . .I don't think there's time to sit down

and specifically write out (feedback)" (5).

Feedback Focus. Continuing with this line on feedback purpose, MCTs were questioned on a related topic concerning the areas of ST performance they preferred to specifically focus their feedback on. Four areas emerged from the responses provided. Six MCTs referred to the importance of ST **lesson plans.** One respondent indicated that the plan allowed an MCT to follow the lesson as the ST taught. Two MCTs indicated that the lesson plan should show clearly how students would be organized. Three of these respondents also focused on the importance of the plan being written in a simplified, clear content focused and matching (e.g., objectives = procedures = closure) format.

A focus on effective **instruction** was mentioned by five MCTs. For these respondents examples of such instructional effectiveness included, outlining objectives, clear direction - giving, individual feedback/reinforcement and questioning. Outlining objectives was in fact mentioned by three of these MCTs. The emphasis for these respondents was on ensuring that students understood that STs had a relevant purpose(s) for asking students to undertake lesson tasks.

Five MCTs also identified the importance of STs receiving feedback on the area out of which effective instruction emerges; effective **classroom management.** Further, two of these MCTs specifically identified discipline as one aspect of classroom management in which STs lacked experience and, therefore, needed feedback on.

Feedback Methods. The topic of feedback in student teaching was further pursued by questioning the MCTs regarding the methods they used and the influence such feedback methods were felt to have on ST development. All seven MCTs indicated that they provided both **verbal** and **written** feedback to their STs. However, while three respondents suggested a preference for using written feedback, four preferred verbalizing.

In terms of the strength of written feedback for STs, one MCT stated:

I think they need written feedback in order to be able to take it away, concentrate on it. . .I think verbal is immediate, but it is not as lasting as the written word (1).

Frequency of written feedback varied between MCTs. One MCT indicated attempting to write down during each observed lesson, ". . .everything positive and everything that needs to improve" (7). However, at the other end of the scale two MCTs indicated writing comments for the ST once every week or two. In relation to MCT verbal feedback preference one MCT stated that by using ". . .basically verbal . . .I speak with them and tell them where they need to improve" (5). For this MCT it was often difficult to find time to write comments due to often being involved in the ST's actual lesson.

Feedback Mode. To delve further into the MCTs' perception of their dyad interactions they were asked whether they phrased their verbal or written ST feedback in the form of question and/or direction. All the respondents indicated that they had used both **question** and **directions** in their feedback interaction with STs. However, four respondents emphasized questioning rather than directing STs via their comments. While one of these MCTs indicated questioning to

personally understand why STs undertook certain actions, the three other MCTs emphasized the importance of having STs think through highlighted situations themselves. This was seen as particularly important, as STs would soon be on their own professionally without a MCT to ask:

> I don't want him to be a robot of what I am. They have to have their own style. . .I want that kid to think. . .because they're not going to be with me, they're going to be gone in two or three months. . .and they're out on their own (3).

In contrast, two MCTs placed greater emphasis on the use of directive statements but from different perspectives. One indicated, "I'm usually more of a command person; what's successful for me might be successful for you (ST)" (5). However, the other MCT used direct statements for:

> . . .praising STs for good things they did and maybe awareness
> . . .next week make sure you keep this a little bit better organized than you did (4).

Assisting MCT Purpose. In terms of the influence of the outlined feedback methods on ST development all seven MCTs thought this was positive. However, it was perceived that both Slippery Rock University and the STs could do more to help MCTs provide the type of feedback they would like during student teaching; two main ideas emerged. First, all the MCTs expressed a desire for **increased university guidance.** The MCTs asked for a clearer indication of what the university physical education department expected their STs to achieve during student teaching. Two MCTs suggested that a seminar might be provided where the university department could outline their ST expectations. Further, four MCTs also suggested that a written format would be useful in guiding MCT observation:

> May be have a guideline to see where I'm going. . .If they (university) had certain guidelines then I could just check off and see what. . .we're supposed to be looking for (2).

One MCT indicated that the present university student teaching handbook did not provide much specific guidance for the MCT. For one respondent having a specified set of criteria (e.g., outline of the STs' college experiences; expected lesson plan format and teaching methods that should be demonstrated) against which the MCT could observe and evaluate STs would provide more student teaching process consistency. In particular, it was felt that this directed guidance would reduce the diverse demands made on STs by their MTs and CTs who presently lacked such specific university student teaching guidance. Further, this guidance would encourage all groups involved in the Teaching Centre in ". . working towards the same end" (1).

From the perspective of what the STs could do to help the MCTs in their feedback provision, three respondents identified **open communication** as being important to dyad interactive effectiveness. Two of these MCTs emphasized that STs needed to initiate discussion; let their MCTs know how they felt their student teaching experience was progressing (i.e. successes and problems) and what they wanted feedback on. This ST proaction according to one respondent would help to focus the work of the MCT more. Also, such ST openness would motivate the MCT because ". . .I think when you know that the person (ST) genuinely cares about what they're doing, you (MCT) want to work even harder for them" (7).

US Purpose. MCTs were also questioned with regard to the perceived purpose of the university supervisor (US) in the student teaching process. Previous research as indicated in the literature review has often highlighted confused triad perceptions concerning the US's purpose.

Only one MCT expressed clear doubt as to the purpose of the US; ". . .purpose. . .I really don't know. I would say to come and give them feedback. . .I really don't know" (6). However, the US purpose of providing **ST feedback** was suggested by all the MCTs; ". . .they can really inspire those STs and give incredible feedback" (7). Three MCTs did point out though that the influence of US feedback related to the

amount of time the supervisor was able to be on site with the STs. As one of these MCTs said:

> If they're here and making suggestions. . .they need to be back to follow up. . .if they don't follow up, I don't think it's going to have any effect at all (4).

Further, three MCTs indicated that a related US purpose to that of providing feedback to the ST was as a provider of an **alternative perspective** to the MCT. As one of these MCTs stated, ". . .they (US) also can see something that I'm not seeing" (2). The US was thus seen as representing another professional with whom a MCT could discuss a ST's development. It was indicated that the US could be very helpful in providing perceptions on differing elements of a ST's daily performance.

Four MCTs also described the US purpose as being more an **overall director** for the ST. One MCT stated, ". . .I think they're (US) the one person that controls their (ST) destiny" (3). This respondent perception of overall US control may have arisen because as another of these MCTs indicated, ". . .they (US) have the power, they're going to give the grade" (7).

Open Relationship. To assist ST development five MCTs described professional actions and attitudes that defined the US - MCT relationship as one requiring **open communication - collaborative direction.** The US and MCT were seen as co - workers who ". . .should be going in the same direction with this ST, hand in hand" (4). The US was seen as a resource person with university - based knowledge of the ST who could assist the MCT to deal with ST problems. Further, it was felt that the US should be prepared to listen to the feedback from the MCT about ST progress and act on it if required. The MCT was described as having knowledge of ST progress that should be communicated to the US; "I think its the MCT's responsibility to let the US know if there's any weak areas that exist" (5). Further, the MCT it was suggested should check the US's focus for ST attainment to ". . see if their (US) goals are the same as our goals are" (2).

Four MCTs indicated that in reality this type of communicative, collaboratively guided US - MCT relationship did not always occur. Again, the problem of the CT having the free time to conference with the US was highlighted by one MCT. However, three MCTs also indicated (without expanding on this perception) that it was difficult to establish these types of relationship with some USs.

2). <u>MCT Perceptions of ST Purpose Related to Working with the MCT and US</u>

<u>ST Responsibilities toward their MCT</u>. Three main perceptions emerged when the respondents were asked to outline what they perceived to be the responsibilities that STs had in relation to working with their MCTs. Five respondents suggested the STs had a responsibility to show **professional respect** for their MCTs. This included being on time, prepared, appropriately dressed and willing to listen to their MCTs and to accept and act on their criticism. Further, it was indicated that STs also needed to understand the responsibility that the MCT had not only to the ST, but also to the pupils in their classes. As one MCT said:

> I think they need to be receptive to what we're trying to teach them and realize that when we make suggestions we're making the suggestion not only for the ST's development, but I also have a responsibility to the students in my class (3).

One element of 'professional respect' that received specific focus from the MCTs was the importance of being **prepared.** Six respondents identified this element of ST responsibility. Two of these MCTs highlighted the need for STs to be willing to have things set out before the lesson, ". . .as if they were on their own" (5). A further five respondents mentioned the importance of STs having their lesson plans in well before teaching actually occurred; ". . .their lesson plan . . .I want to see it before they show (teach) it" (2).

Four MCTs identified **open/honest communication** as a ST responsibility; "I think too they (ST) have to be willing to discuss things with you (MCT) that they might not agree with" (7). However, two of

these MCTs also felt that STs often lacked confidence to discuss things with their dyad colleagues. Yet this two - way communication was perceived to be vital to an effective dyad relationship in terms of helping MCTs understand the position and feelings of STs. For example, as one respondent indicated, ". . .if there's a problem in communication, if they (ST) feel that they don't understand something, make sure they tell me. I can't read their mind" (2).

ST Responsibilities toward their US. In terms of what the MCTs perceived ST responsibilities toward the US should be, two views emerged. First, four respondents felt that the ST was responsible for **meeting requirements** set by the US. "I know they (STs) have a lot of requirements they have to fulfill for the supervisor, and I think they should be very conscientious about that" (7). However, it was also mentioned that some of the US requirements placed on the ST were difficult to meet. This was because of the schedule demands on STs at the Teaching Centre.

Second, three respondents highlighted **open communication** as another ST responsibility toward the US. This was seen as particularly important if the US was to be able to help the ST. With not being on site all the time the US was felt to need feedback from STs concerning their personal successes and problems; particularly, if the supervisor was to gather a more complete picture of ST progress.

3). MCT Perceptions of the Overall Achievements for STs.

When asked about the overall purposes for attainment by the ST at the Teaching Centre, three perceptions were highlighted by the MCTs.

ST Professional Achievements. Five MCTs suggested one factor for achievement by STs concerned **professional self confidence/insight.** It was felt that by the time STs concluded student teaching, they should feel ". . .comfortable in being in front of a classroom" (4), and ". . . confident of getting a job; optimistic about their teaching profession and. . .have a positive attitude" (6). Further, it was suggested that STs should also recognize ". . .what their teaching strengths are and the areas they need further work on" (1).

In relation to the idea of STs being aware of their teaching strengths, five MCTs identified various **pedagogical skills** that they hoped STs would achieve some level of competency in before completing student teaching. Four of these respondents highlighted the ability to teach lesson content clearly so that children would be able to achieve a ST's lesson goals. Further, three MCTs referred to STs needing skill in class management /discipline, while two respondents also identified curriculum planning skills as areas for ST achievement of competence.

A statement by one MCT seemed to represent this general respondent sense that the pedagogical skills identified above, were important for achievement by today's STs; particularly, because of the perceived complex dynamics found in teaching:

> When they (STs) step into their classroom, the first day, they can say. . .they know how to handle many of the situations that come up, because kids are so unpredictable and they (ST) need to be able to draw from a cachet of experiences to handle those situations (7).

ST Actions and Influence. This sense of the diverse pedagogical skills STs need to be able to meet the demands of a complex teaching environment was expanded further. MCTs were asked to indicate what they concentrated on when watching the teaching performance of a ST. At least eleven pedagogical skills were identified by the seven MCTs.

The most commonly mentioned MCT observation focus for ST teaching performance focused on **effective content presentation.** Four MCTs highlighted this area indicating the importance of correct ST content knowledge and appropriate task sequencing; "I look to see if the information they are presenting is correct; that their learning sequences are challenging and. . .logical" (1). Such clear, careful instruction was linked to ST achievement of objectives; ". . .do they break down the concept of the skill that they're trying to teach. So professionally are they getting the objectives across to the students" (4).

There was a diversity of MCT opinion concerning specific criteria that they personally believed STs should be evaluated on at the conclusion of student teaching. However, only two MCTs mentioned that the actual university final evaluation used was useful; ". . .the rating form that we use is very good. . .the categories are well chosen" (1).

Criteria by which to Evaluate STs. While nine evaluatory criteria were actually identified by the MCTs, only three of these were identified by two or more respondents. **Lesson planning** as an evaluatory focus was highlighted by four MCTs who stressed both the importance of a plan's quality and its timely submission.

ST Understanding Concerning Children's Response. To complete data collection under the major research question MCTs were asked what they hoped STs would develop in terms of their attitude toward, and understanding about children. Four perceptions emerged from the responses. Five MCTs highlighted the importance of what could be defined generally as ST appreciation of the **teacher - student relationship.** This appreciation involved understanding that kids are naturally fun and exciting" (4) to be with. Yet, they bring to the learning environment a lot of ". . .garbage in their lives" (1). Consequently, it was suggested by one MCT that ". . .teachers can't get along with everyone" (2) in class, often due to student out of class influences. However, it was also indicated that STs should not become disillusioned by this situation.

One of these five respondents also suggested that it takes time to build a respectful two way relationship with children. Further, another respondent felt that recognizing appropriate expectations for students was important in establishing a successful teacher - student relationship. Within this general ST appreciation of the student - teacher relationship three MCTs pointed to the importance of STs recognizing **student differences.** However, it was also indicated that all students irrespective of their differences deserve teacher attention. One of these MCTs summarized this recognition by stating:

Every kid is different. They have different personalities . .I hope they

(STs) leave here with a respect for these kids, not only the athletes, but the kids that aren't so physically skilled. . .So I would hope that they would follow the example that I would set and work with all kids (3).

Three MCTs also emphasized the need for STs to understand that students are clearly influenced by the **non school environment** from which they come. One respondent pointed to the need to recognize that the school had to provide ". . .a secure environment for those children because so many of our children don't have that today" (7). Further, it was indicated that STs should realize that the emotional problems some students have meant ". . .that you have to deal with that person differently due to their mental make - up" (3). Thus, it was also felt that STs should know that if children don't always respond to their teaching, ". . .it 's not because what you're (teacher) doing is not necessarily important to them, it's just nothing's important to them, but what they're dealing with" (1).

Finally, in what could be related to the idea expressed concerning today's children's need for a sense of security at school, three MCTs identified STs being aware of the importance of **guidance and control** in students' school lives. "You (teacher) need to be consistent as you can when dealing with and disciplining kids" (3) stated one MCT.

<u>Summary of the Alternative Site MCT Findings.</u>

Review of the interview based findings of the seven Mars Area School - District health/physical education MCTs to the major research question, led to the emergence of five areas of student teaching focus; these areas are as follows: a) Participant Purposes; b) Observer Feedback; c) ST Responsibilities; d) ST Achievements; e) ST Child Understanding.

A). <u>Participant Purposes</u>

The majority of the MCTs identified their purpose during student teaching as that of being a 'guide' and an encourager of STs' pedagogical ideas. Some respondents also highlighted purposes involving the MCTs acting as a 'resource' and a feedback provider to

the ST.

In terms of the MCTs' skills/knowledge's needed to work with STs, eleven areas were identified by these respondents. None of these areas were highlighted by a majority of the MCTs. However, leading these findings was MCT knowledge concerning both already undertaken ST university teacher preparation experiences, and the desired outcomes for student teacher achievement.

As to whether the MT and CT purposes within the Teaching Centre design were different, all but one of the respondents felt that there was a difference. In particular, this difference was linked to the view that the CT had far less time (by centre design) to spend each day with their ST, than was afforded to the MT. Consequently, it was felt that the MT could have more influence on the ST.

With regard to the USs' purpose all the MCTs indicated that this should involve the provision of feedback to the ST. Further, a majority of MCTs felt the US should also act as the overall director of the student teaching experience, and that there was no difference in the US's relationship with either the MT or CT. However, such US - MCT relationships were seen by the majority of MCTs as requiring open and collaborative direction, although this was also felt not always to be the case in reality.

B). Observer Feedback

While only a minority of the MCTs identified feedback as a purpose for the MCT, all felt that feedback provision to STs was important. A majority of MCTs suggested that feedback should, in fact, have a corrective/improving influence on STs. In particular, all but one of the MCTs highlighted personal feedback on ST lesson plans as being meaningful. Further, a majority of the MCTs also perceived the areas of effective instruction and classroom management as relevant foci for their feedback.

All the MCTs indicated that they provided both verbal and written feedback to their STs and that this involved their using both questions and directions. However, the majority of MCTs also emphasized their

preference for using verbal comments and questioning.

The seven MCTs felt that feedback could have a positive influence on ST development. Further, it was felt by all the MCTs that the university could help them in their feedback provision by providing increased teacher guidance concerning student teacher supervision. A minority of the MCTs also indicated that more open dyad communication by STs would assist the feedback process. Further, the majority of MCTs, again, identified the CT's time problem in working with the STs at the Teaching Centre.

C). ST Responsibilities

The majority of the MCTs identified ST responsibilities toward their dyad counterpart as first involving the STs in being prepared to teach (ie., lesson plans into MCTs before teaching). This was followed by STs showing professional respect toward their MCTs and by their being open and honest in dyad communication. In terms of ST responsibilities toward the US the majority of MCTs felt that the STs should fulfill all the requirements set by the US.

D). ST Achievements

As to what STs should strive for through their student teaching experience, the majority of MCTs suggested the ability to demonstrate both professional self confidence and pedagogical skills as important achievements. In terms of pedagogical skills, effective teacher content presentation was highlighted by the majority of MCTs; particularly when they were asked about their observation focus as STs taught. However, lesson planning was identified by a majority of MCTs when it came to criteria by which to summatively evaluate the STs' performance.

E). ST Child Understanding

As to what MCTs hoped would develop in terms of ST attitudes and understanding toward children, the majority of MCTs pointed to a ST appreciation for the teacher - student relationship. Further, a minority of respondents also highlighted ST understanding concerning the influence of child differences, non school influences and children's need for guidance and control in the teaching - learning environment.

To conclude this chapter a table has been provided. Table 6 presents the leading MCT perceptions concerning self and others' purpose as identified in this chapter. Chapter 9 which follows focuses on the findings derived from the perceptions of the STs working in the Teaching Centre.

As indicated earlier with regard to the STs in the traditional site, investigation of STs' perceptions in relation to those of their dyad colleagues is very important. This is because as some of the reviewed research (Chapter 3) indicates, mismatch of dyad participant views can have a negative influence on the potential development of STs. Further, working with the same three MCTs concurrently over almost a full academic semester within the Teaching Centre, may, influence ST perceptions in different ways. Consequently, it is important to teacher education development to identify the influence of this alternative student teaching experience on ST perceptions.

PARTICIPANT
PURPOSE

The MCT:
1 Guide
2 Encourage ST pedagogical
 ideas

The US:
1 Provide feedback to STs
2 Overall director

OBSERVER FEEDBACK

The Focus:
1 ST correction/improvement
2 ST lesson plans
Method and Mode:
1 Written and verbal
2 Questions assist ST thinking

Table 6

Leading Alternative
Site Mentor -
Cooperating Teacher
*Perceptions
Concerning Self and
Others' Purpose

ST RESPONSIBILITY

To (M)CT:
1 Lesson plans in on time
2 Professional respect
3 Being prepared
4 Open communication

To US:
1 Meet US requirements

ST ACHIEVEMENTS

1 Professional self confidence
 /insight
2 Improved pedagogical skills

ST Evaluation Criteria:
1 Lesson planning

ST CHILD
UNDERSTANDING

1 Appreciation of teacher -
 student relationship

* All the above perceptions were identified by half or more participants in the group.

Chapter Nine

Alternative Site Student Teacher Findings

This chapter presents the alternative site student teacher (ST) findings derived from their interview responses related to this investigation's major research question:

A) What do STs in an alternative student teaching site perceive to be their own purpose and that of their school - based colleague during the student teaching experience?

In particular, these findings provide specific answers to the three research subquestions which helped to guide both the data collection and analysis conducted within this investigation. First, the findings indicate what these STs identify as their mentor - cooperating teachers' (MCT) purpose in working with both the ST and the (US). Second, they indicate what the STs perceive as their purpose in working with the MCTs and the US. Third the findings identify what STs believe to be their overall purpose for achievement as prospective teachers. Further, the findings identified under each of the three research subquestions are also subcategorized based on the particular focus within which the finding falls.

1). <u>ST Perceptions of MCT Purpose Related to Working with the ST and US</u>

Analysis of the eight Mars Area School - District health and physical education STs' interview data indicated four main perceptions concerning the purpose of the MCT in working with the ST.

<u>MCT Purpose</u>. Four STs used language that gave a sense of the **nurturing** purpose of the MCTs in the Teaching Centre. Descriptions were used to describe the MCT such as ". . .they look after you" (3); they're ". . .more of a big brother type" (4), ". . like the home - base for the ST to come back to" (6) and ". . .she's kind of like the mother" (7).

Four respondents also saw the MCT as a **problem - solving**

assistant for the ST. They were seen as providing the ST with ". . .someone to talk to about problems" (1); as someone who could help STs to ". . .answer any questions that we may have regarding any kind of teaching that we are doing" (2). Again, as in the concept of nurturing the MCT was seen here as someone the ST could fall back to for assistance. In fact, three STs referred specifically to the MCT as a ST **guide;** as a person to ". . .mainly guide you through the whole experience" (4) and ". . .to help you grow" (5).

MT and CT Purpose. Because the STs in the Teaching Centre design chose both mentor (MT) and cooperating teachers (CT) to assist them during student teaching, these respondents were asked if they perceived any difference in the purpose of these two dyad participants. Five STs felt that there was **no difference** in the purpose of the MCTs. However, seven of the respondents did feel that there was a difference in the amount of **dyad time** the MCTs had to spend with the ST.

The fact that the MT had the opportunity to spend more time with the ST (because of the number of lessons the ST taught for the MT as opposed to the CT) did influence some respondents. Four STs indicated that the MT had **more influence** on them than the CT. These respondents felt that the increased time with the MT translated into more dyad conferencing and feedback, and also more MT control of the ST. As one respondent indicated:

> The CT is concerned. . .with what you do for him or her as a teacher . . . the MT is concerned not only with what the ST does in teaching a class, but. . .he's making sure I fulfill other responsibilities. . .he checks up and makes sure I'm continuing with all I need to do, while my CT might not check up with those things (3).

Feedback Role. Interestingly, feedback, although not specifically asked about in the previous questions had been directly mentioned in certain respondent answers. Consequently, when asked about the value of feedback in the development of STs, all the respondents indicated it played an **important role.** Six STs felt that they needed

feedback both **praising** and **corrective** in nature. It was indicated by two of these respondents that STs needed a balance between these two types of feedback. Further, too much corrective feedback it was felt might lead STs to question their teaching ability.

However, it was indicated that STs do need to have their pedagogical mistakes identified and that corrective feedback was useful, especially if it could be put to immediate use (e.g., in teaching back to back classes to see the influence of any changes; a feedback advantage only the MT could provide in the Teaching Centre). Also, MCT feedback was felt helpful in linking ST instructional styles with those of their MCTs. Such a teaching connection it was suggested would help to avoid confusing children due to the possibility of too many ST classroom procedural changes.

Four respondents also pointed to their own lack of experience in **critiquing self** as a reason for needing experienced practitioner feedback. Failure to realize one's own mistakes might lead to no improvement, or to the need for a much longer period of practice. Further, feedback was seen as helping to keep STs' open - minded in their teaching approach (i.e., not only one way of doing things).

With regard to whether the provision of observer feedback to the ST changed over the duration of student teaching, two STs indicated that it **decreased** over their experience. One respondent suggested that this was to be expected ". . .because we make more mistakes in the beginning" (2). Later, STs become more confident and skillful in performance, consequently, less observer feedback was felt necessary. Generally, however, STs talked about the change in the **nature of feedback** over time rather than the amount. Five respondents suggested that over time the feedback became more specific and refined (i.e., ". . .nit picky" - 1 & 8) with regard to ST performance, and also more positive as STs demonstrated improved ability.

Feedback Focus. As to the areas of their performance on which STs preferred to receive feedback, a variety of perceptions emerged. Four

respondents indicated that they wanted to receive feedback on the effectiveness of their lesson **organization**; particularly, with regard to ". . .setting up the classroom" (2), ". . .keeping things organized" (3) and the ". . .flow of the entire lesson" (7). Three STs specifically referred to feedback focused on their ability to **control/discipline** children. However, for one of these respondents feedback came more from the ST watching the MCTs rather than vice versa:

> . . .I didn't get any discipline at Slippery Rock University. . .it's good to look at them (MCTs) and see how they handle the situations and then you copy that and put it into your own words (5).

Language usage was another feedback focus also identified by three STs. For example, development of voice usage along with age appropriate terminology were the main concerns expressed. As one respondent stated, ". . .my use of words was too high (advanced) for elementary kids. . .so that (feedback) helped me out" (5).

Feedback Method and Value. With regard to how their MCTs provided this feedback, the STs identified a number of methods. All the respondents said that they had received both **verbal** and **written** feedback during their student teaching. Two STs expressed a preference for verbal feedback from their observers stressing the **immediacy** of this mode of communication. In contrast, five respondents indicated either preferring written feedback or wanting this in combination with verbal information. Those STs identifying a written feedback preference indicated benefits both for the ST and the MCT. For example, one respondent suggested that written feedback allowed the ST to revisit points that might have been made in an earlier dyad discussion. Relatedly, three STs suggested that writing, in fact, allowed the MCTs to **remember** important observations they had made for later dyad conferences.

Feedback Mode. When asked whether they preferred to receive their observer's written and verbal feedback phrased as directions or questions, two STs indicated that they **preferred** to be given directions. While one of these respondents believed that questions were really

more, ". . .just a reminder. . .for them (observers)" (5) , the other ST emphasized that ". . .questions. . .are not telling me the answer. . .if they (observers) tell me what to do, then it will save me time and I won't make the mistake again" (2).

However, while no respondent indicated a preference for receiving only question oriented feedback, four respondents did indicate a preference for a **combination** of the two feedback modes. Regarding directions two of these respondents indicated that as experienced teachers their observers should be able to give them suggestions and ideas to try. Another ST pointed out that such directions were often phrased less threateningly as simply observer suggestions.

This idea of questions encouraging **ST thinking** was further emphasized by the three other respondents in this group of four who preferred a feedback mixture of questions and directions. It was pointed out that STs would not have their MCTs with them for very long, so they must learn to make professional decisions for themselves. Also, questioning allowed the ST to elaborate on his/her observed actions to help an observer's understanding of what may have occurred.

Dyad Interaction Time. However, only two of the eight STs indicated that they felt they had enough time with both their MT and their CTs. Five STs again pointed to the **lack of time** within the day to work adequately with their CTs. In particular, they lacked the time to hold dyad post teaching conferences.

US Purpose. As occurred with the traditional site respondent groups, so the STs working in the Teaching Centre were asked about their perceptions of the USs' purpose in student teaching. Previous research has indicated divergent dyad group views with regard to this question. Present data analysis produced four main ST perceptions regarding the USs' purpose. Three of these perceptions were each identified by four respondents.

One view that emerged was that the USs' purpose included acting as an **information provider** to the STs. However, only two of these

STs defined providing information in terms of giving feedback about the STs' specific teaching performance. The two other respondents saw this provider purpose as mainly keeping STs informed regarding information and requirements from the university perspective (i.e., academic - administrative).

Another emergent view identified the US purpose as involving **ST dyad support.** In particular, three of these four respondents mentioned the need for the US to interact with the MCTs on the behalf of the ST. For example, the US was seen as helping to both solve intra dyad problems and discuss ST progress with the MCTs. Further, the US was adjudged to be able explain to MCTs how prior college teacher preparation learning might have influenced ST actions (which MCTs might not have understood).

A further perception which relates to the above points concerned the US as both information provider and ST dyad support. This US purpose was defined as one of acting as a **school - university link.** This purpose was defined as that of keeping the channels of communication open between the university, the MCTs and the STs:

> . . .to keep the college maybe updated as far as. . .how the STs are doing in the different schools. . .also keeping the ST updated as far as new information that's going on in the department (i.e., university) on the different job searches and things like that (6).

The final ST perception regarding US purpose could be described as one of **evaluator.** "The purpose (US) is number one to evaluate us . . .and evaluate our teaching" (2). This theme was actually identified by three respondents. For one of these STs there had never been any formal identification of the US's purpose; ". . .it was never told to me what his purpose is. . .he 's going to evaluate you. .that's the only purpose I see him doing" (5).

MCT Relationship with the US. When asked what they perceived to be the purpose of the MCTs in interacting with the US, seven of the STs identified behaviours that could be classified under the idea of the MCT acting as a US **information source.** The seven respondents

indicated that the MCTs should ". . .talk to our supervisor and tell them how we are doing" (3). 'Doing' in terms of ST behaviour included MCTs informing the US about observed pedagogical strengths and weaknesses. This MCT purpose was seen as important ". . . because the supervisor doesn't see you (ST) very much" (5). Furthermore, some respondents felt this informing by their MCTs was even more paramount because ". . .they (MCT) see us everyday," but ". . .the (US) may catch us on a bad day, or a really good day" (7).

2). ST Perceptions of Self Purpose Related to Working with the MCT
    and US

In this section the STs were asked to focus on their own purpose. In particular, to identify personal responsibilities in relation to their work with the other participants in the student teaching process.

ST Responsibilities toward their MCTs. In terms of responsibilities these STs perceived they owed to their CTs, five areas emerged. Seven respondents highlighted the importance of ST **proaction.** Such ST initiative was defined in a variety of ways. One strong theme within this area saw six respondents point to the need for STs to approach their MCTs with personal ideas; ". . .when you offer feedback . . .they (MCTs) like it" (1); ". . .they were very open to any ideas that I had" (4). However, as indicated, by four respondents this dyad initiative - taking by STs took time to develop:

> . . .at the beginning. . .he or she (MCT) is more of a teacher, I am more of a student. . .I'm just going to do a lot of listening. . .Now I feel more professional and I would tell them. . .instead of just sitting back (3).

Clearly, STs needed time to develop their professional self confidence in order to be able to display such proactive behaviour within their dyad relationships. Further, this ST approach appeared more easily encouraged by open MCT attitudes; ". . .they have to be prepared to listen to what we have to say. . .there are things we expect out of student teaching and that we want to try" (7).

Further, four STs also pointed to the need to maintain some **dyad**

teaching approach consistency. "We (ST) have to follow them (MCT)" (7) and ". . .meet their objectives, their class rules; not to teach the way they teach but to be in the same frame" (4). To achieve this similarity in dyad approach meant according to one respondent, ". . .watching the teachers, seeing their system, how it works for them and what they do" (5).

The purpose behind this highlighted need for some pedagogical dyad similarity was so that ". . .the class isn't going crazy." (4). In other words, these STs felt the need to avoid the risk of confusing classes with too many changes to children's routines. Further, by maintaining some common framework the MCT could, again, step comfortably into the teaching role when the ST left the school.

Half the respondents had clearly identified a need to maintain some connection between the MCT and ST in teaching approach. However, four STs also felt that they had a responsibility to **demonstrate effective teaching.** For three of these respondents one important element of this process necessitated having lesson plans ready and in on time.

Being **respectful** toward their MCTs was a further responsibility three STs felt it was important to identify. One respondent suggested the importance of being able to ". . .get along with them (MCT). . . accept them. . .even if you don't believe what they believe" (1). Such respect required that the ST be able to identify the needs and the style of an MCT and adapt to these.

ST Responsibilities toward their US. In terms of their responsibilities to the US, two main themes emerged from ST responses. First, the importance of helping to maintain **open communication** with the US was identified by six respondents. Five of these STs specifically referred to the importance of talking to and listening to the US. "We have to have the patience to be able to listen to him (US) and try to work together. . .if there's a problem or that kind of thing" (7).

Further, within these ST responses concerning communication with the US was a sense of the need for ST proaction (as was also

indicated earlier with regard to ST to MCT responsibilities). As one respondent said, the ST is responsible to the US for ". . .keeping in touch with him, letting him know what I'm doing. . .problems that I have . . .he's a good person to bounce ideas off" (3).

Two STs also referred to their relationship with the US as being more formal and business - like than with their MCTs. Further, half the entire respondent group linked their US communication responsibility to the idea of the supervisor as evaluator. There was an underlying sense within these ST responses that USs were at least, in part, evaluators. This perception to a certain extent seemed to inhibit the ST - US communication process. As respondents indicated, STs ". . .have to get along with them (US)" (1). Further, a ST has to ". . .kind of hold your tongue" (6), ". . .because quote 'I don't want to get a bad report card'" (7).

3). ST Perceptions of the Overall Purposes for Personal Achievement

In this section STs were asked to outline what they believed they were trying to develop, demonstrate and achieve over the duration of the student teaching experience.

ST Professional Achievements. Three main perceptions emerged for ST overall achievement at the Mars Teaching Centre. First, six respondents identified the importance of simply obtaining **teaching process experience.** However, there was a sense derived from this group of responses that it was difficult for these STs to readily identify when certain elements of ST pedagogical learning occurred and, particularly, what such elements actually were. One ST talked about ". . .becoming comfortable with teaching" (3) through just experiencing the student teaching process. Another respondent described the goal for ST achievement as ". . .just the overall purpose is everything" (8).

Further, another ST talked about ". . .I think one thing we learned is just the reality of the whole thing" (7). The respondent gave examples of this 'reality' including the difference between teaching college peers and children, and the difference between high school students' attitudes today and those when the STs were at school. Other

respondents pointed to learning about, ". . .the format of what a teacher goes through in a day" (4), and of becoming more adaptable to ". . .think on your feet" (6) in different teacher situations.

The next two themes that emerged from the ST responses were more specific than the above category. Five respondents indicated that they wanted to develop and improve their personal **teaching skills.** Three of these respondents indicated their desire to improve their planning skills. For one ST, the ". . . better teacher" (2) who, in part, could be identified because their children learned during a lesson was, also, clearly proficient in planning.

In terms of planning skills, these included not only an ability to focus on the immediate lesson plan, but the ability ". . .to think more long range. . . down the line" (3). Further, a respondent also pointed to the value of lesson plans as a guide for STs who through working at a Teaching Centre would often change grade levels and schools within a single school day. Consequently, the ability to plan effectively was an important achievement for STs who wanted to indicate that they could organize themselves efficiently for a diverse school day.

The third theme identified by three STs as an overall goal for their achievement focused on the interplay between **teacher preparatory and student teaching experience.** For example, one ST felt that the opportunity to teach, particularly in the health classroom, made up in part for a lack of university preparation in terms of recognizing appropriate grade level content. Another respondent tried to summarize this interplay of experiences by referring to this situation in the following manner:

I'm trying to take what I've learned at Slippery Rock University and mold it into a teacher. I mean just because I've taken all these teacher classes. . .doesn't mean you can effectively teach it. You have to learn how to teach and by going to a Teaching Centre it's great because you get to learn. You're in many different atmospheres and you get to teach to many different types of people . . .a great experience which has helped me and molded me into a

teacher (5).

To try and delve more deeply into these STs' ideas concerning the development of their own teaching, they were asked what skills and abilities they tried to develop and demonstrate when teaching in the classroom, or gymnasium. Three main categories seemed to emerge from the perceptions provided.

ST Pedagogical Development. Four STs mentioned a variety of examples that focused on **effective instruction.** Three respondents highlighted the importance of clearly presenting content. This meant the teacher needed to use appropriate age related vocabulary and not assume that children would automatically understand. For one respondent, concern with clarity also meant asking the children questions to check their understanding. As this ST stated the need to make sure everyone understands, to check for understanding was important because ". . .everyone is always different, that's the hard part" (8).

Planning was identified by two respondents as a skill that they had also been working on. Clearly, it was felt that the outcomes of effective planning could be observed within the actual lesson. As one ST pointed out, if something that was to occur in the lesson was not written down, it was not usually presented; ". . .planning. . .for me I realized it's because if I don't write it down, I don't go about it" (3). Other elements of effective instruction that were also mentioned by individual respondents included: clarifying lesson ". . .expectations" (6) re. student learning; keeping children ". . .on task" and ". . . active" (8), and providing individualized teacher feedback.

Further, three STs also identified skills that could be associated with **effective organization/management;** an area considered by many as the basis on which effective instruction is built. As one respondent stated ". . .you have to have the best learning situation for your students and if you don't have discipline within your classroom you'll be hindering other students in their learning" (6).

The final area that three STs felt they had tried to develop and demonstrate in their teaching was the use of **effective communication skills.** In particular, these STs highlighted their use of grammar; ". . .with my MT especially, I've been really working on what I say and how I phrase it" (1); ". . .I've tried to develop things like my grammar, my speech. . .I think I have improved" (3).

ST Evaluation Criteria. Having investigated what it was that these prospective teachers were trying to achieve during student teaching, it was now of interest to find out what the STs perceived should be the criteria against which they felt they should be evaluated. This question produced a wide variety of perceptions which required the development of five categories to enable accurate presentation of the respondents differing views.

The most identified ST assessment criteria were classified under the description of **professional demeanour.** Six STs highlighted examples that fell into this area. While two respondents spoke of the need for STs to be seen to demonstrate " . . .enthusiasm" (1 , 2) for what they were doing, four STs felt they should also be held to an appropriate standard of dress befitting their subject area. However, no respondent attempted to define what they considered 'appropriate dress.' Individual respondents also mentioned being ". . .evaluated if you're (ST) there, and if you're on time every day" (5), and whether ". . you do a little extra; put forth a little more effort" (7).

Five STs felt that they should also be assessed in relation to the **rapport** they had developed during student teaching. Four STs identified the need to develop a rapport with their children which was defined as ". . .how you get along with kids" (8). However, only two respondents mentioned the need for this type of harmony with their MCTs. One respondent went further in defining rapport with children by stating that what is important is the teacher's:

> . . .attitude towards the students. . .because you cannot talk down to the students, you have to make them feel comfortable when talking . . .not being sarcastic with the students (2).

Four respondents also identified what represented the first category derived specifically from perceptions associated with the teaching process i.e., **organization/management.** When talking about the ability to manage a class one ST indicated that with regard to being an:

> . . .effective teacher. . .it's a person that can maintain control of the class. . .ultimately they (children) have to learn, if they don't learn then I don't think your effective (3).

Consequently, as was suggested in response to an earlier interview question, the ability of a teacher to organize and manage the teaching environment was again associated with student learning. In fact, four STs mentioned the concept of **children learning** in relation to lesson effectiveness. Therefore, this aspect of the educative process was suggested as a further potential criteria for ST assessment. Three respondents referred to child learning as the ST ". . .being able to meet their objectives" (6). One respondent specifically suggested that the evaluators ". . .look at their (ST) skill testing; their pre - test post - test, if it's increased or decreased. In other words did the results suggest that the ST had been effective in helping his/her students to improve their performance?

Planning was also identified by four respondents as another potential ST evaluation criteria. One respondent felt that ST assessment should revolve predominantly around the personal ability to plan, and the methods of presentation used:

> . . .if your lesson plan is prepared everyday in a way that can be taught to the class. . .I think mostly it (evaluation) should be on your lesson plan. . .how it's written and how your going to teach (5).

However, for another ST the ability to plan needed to be evaluated from the perspective of whether the written information was judged accessible to another teacher who might have to instruct from the lesson outline (e.g., substitute/supply teacher). For a third respondent the emphasis in planning was seen to centre around the ability to construct a logical progression of lesson events; ". . .getting your

sequencing down of how you're going to go about that lesson" (2).

ST Understandings Concerning Children. The final question that these Teaching - Centre based STs were asked, focused on the attitudes and understanding about children they perceived themselves to have developed through student teaching. The leading category revolved around ST adaptability to **children's needs/differences,** and was derived from views expressed by all eight respondents. While three STs indicated that some of the views they held about children had developed before entry to student teaching, one respondent did point out that such perceptions were now ". . .a little more fine tuned" (1) due to this teaching experience. Six respondents were clear in their responses concerning personal awareness that ". . .every student, every person you have to treat differently" (2).

In fact, variability in child response to teachers was seen as necessitating the use of different approaches by teachers. For one ST this realization had led to the career decision to focus at one particular school level:

> Younger ones are a lot of fun, but I don t want to teach them. I'd rather teach older ones. . .younger ones you have to be very energetic and up and bubbly all the time, and that's not my personality. To teach older ones you have to gain their respect (8).

Further, another ST felt that the recognition of this relationship between child differences and teacher behaviour had helped him a lot in terms of handling teaching stress:

> . . .it's good to see a student when he does a skill and he smiles at you. . .but then there's other times when kids. . .can just drive you up the wall. . .It's tough to step back and just take a deep breath and just relax. . .So how to handle those situations has helped me to handle my stress as a teacher (5).

One respondent within this theme of child needs/differences also focused on specific actions that they had tried to undertake during student teaching. These actions had in part been motivated by their attitudes and understandings about children. The first ST, a male, felt

that he had ". . .gotten a lot more caring. . .a lot more individualized. I was real guy oriented, it was guy this, guy that. . .I've worked on getting the girls involved" (4). This ST believed his original attitude toward the genders (i.e., focusing on the males) had been influenced by the teachers he had experienced. However, during student teaching he had ". . .worked on getting away from that so that I would be more open to both ends (genders)" (4).

<div align="center">Summary of the Alternative Site ST Findings</div>

Review of the interview based findings of the eight Mars Area School - District health/physical education STs to the major research question, led to the emergence of five areas of student teaching focus; these areas are as follows: a) Participant Purposes; b) Observer Feedback; c) ST Responsibilities; d) ST Achievements; e) ST Child Understanding.

A). Participant Purposes

With regard to the perceived purpose of the MCT, half the STs identified MCT purposes in terms of both the nurturing and problem-solving assistance they had received from their dyad colleagues. The sense of ST nurturing as a MCT purpose emerged from the family descriptors (e.g. "brother" and "mother") that STs used in their interview responses. Problem - solving assistance had been derived through indication by the STs of their going back to the MCTs to discuss problems and obtain answers.

As to whether the STs felt that there was any difference between the purposes of the MT and the CT, the majority felt that there was no difference. However, a majority of these STs did allude to the fact that the MT by nature of the design of the Teaching Center process did have more allocated time with the ST. Consequently, half the STs felt that this situation allowed the MT to exert greater influence than the CT over the ST.

With regard to the USs' purpose, there seemed to be a greater diversity of ST opinion than had been the case concerning their perceptions of the MCTs' purpose. Of the four US purposes that

emerged from the ST data, three were identified by at least half the STs. These purposes were summarized under the category headings of information provider, ST dyad support and school - university link.

The types of information highlighted as being provided by the US included feedback on both ST teaching performance and university student teaching requirements. ST dyad support was defined as the US interacting with the MCTs on the behalf of the ST. The school - university link was seen as involving a two way communicative affair. The US was expected to keep the university and its physical education department informed with regard to ST progress. In contrast, the US was also seen as keeping the STs informed of relevant university information.

With regard to the perceived purpose of MCTs in working with the US the majority of the STs' views fell into the category defined as US information source. The MCTs were seen as providing the US with detailed information about the development of the ST. This purpose was seen as important by some STs; in particular, because US visitations were felt to be limited and might not allow for a balanced picture of ST development.

B). Observer Feedback

All the STs felt that feedback played an important role in the development of the ST. The majority of STs felt that it was important to receive both corrective and praising feedback to help their pedagogical development. Half the STs indicated that feedback was needed because they lacked experience in self critique; lack of such feedback might lead to delayed or even no ST improvement. The majority of these STs suggested that it was more the nature rather than amount of feedback that changed over time. It was felt that the feedback to STs over time became more specific, refined and positive as the STs themselves became more pedagogically skillful. Further, In terms of ST preference for the focus of feedback, half indicated they wanted to receive observer information on their lesson organization. Few STs presented preferences that related to a concern for feedback on

specific instructional skills.

All the STs indicated that during the feedback process they had received both written and verbal information from their MCTs. While some STs showed a preference for verbal feedback due to its immediacy, the majority of these STs preferred written comments, or a combination of both feedback forms. Written feedback was felt by some STs to benefit both the MCT and the ST. Half the STs felt this feedback form was an asset in remembering important observational points.

While no ST indicated a preference for feedback framed predominantly in questioning format, half the STs did indicate a partiality for feedback that provided a combination of both questions and directions. Questions were seen as encouraging ST thinking; a particularly important attribute for development by STs who would not have their MCTs with them for very long. In contrast, observer directions were seen as providing STs with valuable suggestions, ideas and even praise based on MCTs' experience. However, the majority of STs (as indicated previously) pointed to a lack of available time within the day to interact and, particularly, conference with their CTs.

C). ST Responsibilities

ST proaction was identified by the majority of the STs as a responsibility that they owed to their MCTs. More specifically, three quarters of these STs indicated that such proaction was demonstrated when they approached their MCTs with ideas that they personally wanted to try. However, half the STs also pointed out that such initiative took time to develop because it required some pedagogical self confidence on the part of the ST.

Two further responsibilities that were each identified by half the STs involved maintaining some dyad teaching approach consistency and demonstrating effective teaching. Some similarity in dyad teaching approach was felt necessary so as not to confuse classes too much, and to make it easier for the MCTs to step back into the teachers' role after the STs had left student teaching. Effective teaching in this context seemed to revolve round STs having their lesson plans ready

and given to their MCTs on time.

With respect to ST responsibilities owed to the US, three quarters of the STs identified maintaining open communication as an example of such a duty. A majority of these STs mentioned the importance of their being prepared to talk with and listen to the US to maintain such openness. However, half the STs also suggested that their ability to maintain this open communication was inhibited because of their perception of the US as an official evaluator.

D). ST Achievements

Just gaining teaching process experience was identified by three quarters of the STs as one of their goals for overall student teaching achievement. However, the comments made within this theme suggested that these STs had difficulty in clearly defining the events, or even the specific pedagogical learning that they associated with this process experience. The feeling of simply having come to a recognition concerning the "reality" of the teaching process (as was mentioned by one ST) seemed to best summarize this more abstract thematic perception.

A majority of STs also identified a more specific goal for overall achievement; improving teaching skills. Planning ability, both short and long term was the most frequently mentioned skill within this particular area.

Effective teaching skills were highlighted by half the STs when asked to outline what skills and abilities they had tried to demonstrate as they taught. The skills outlined revolved around clear presentation of material including the use of relevant vocabulary and questioning. Further, efficient ST planning to avoid missing out important tasks within their lessons was also identified.

Interestingly, it was not a demonstrated teaching ability that was most identified when it came to STs indicating criteria against which they felt their student teaching performance should be judged. Three quarters of the STs provided perceptions that fell under the category of professional demeanour. Specifically, half these STs referred to the

importance of being held to an appropriate standard of dress befitting their subject.

Further, a majority of STs also felt that they should be assessed on their ability to create rapport; in particular, with their students. Other factors mentioned by half the STs with regard to perceived ST evaluation focused on their ability to plan, organize/manage and encourage children's learning.

E). <u>ST Child Understanding</u>

With regard to ST understanding and attitudes toward children the STs identified perceptions which came under the theme of the need for teachers to adapt to child differences/needs. Three quarters of the STs pointed to the need to treat each child differently. In fact, variability in children was seen as necessitating differing teacher approaches. Further, such recognition led to specific ST decisions regarding teaching focus, the handling of stress and attitude toward gender.

To conclude this chapter a table has been provided. Table 7 presents the leading ST perceptions concerning self and others' purpose as identified in this chapter. Chapter 10 that now follows (as occurred with the traditional dyad groups analysis) undertakes a componential analysis of both the alternative MCT and ST group findings; in particular, looking at the similarities and differences in emergent group perspectives. Again, it is important to undertake such comparative analysis because dyad group disagreements have been linked to ST concern and stress, and the suggestion of less effective dyad relationships and student teaching outcomes.

PARTICIPANT PURPOSE

The MCT:
1 Assist ST problem solving
2 Nurturer

The US:
1 Information provider
2 ST dyad support
3 School - Uni., link

OBSERVER FEEDBACK

The Focus:
1 Praise/correction
2 Self critique

Method and Mode:
1 Written or with verbal
2 Both questions & direction

Table 7

Leading Alternative Site Student Teacher *Perceptions Concerning Self and Others' Purpose

ST RESPONSIBILITY

To (M)CT:
1 Proaction
2 Dyad teaching consistency
3 Show effective teaching

To US:
1 Open communication

ST ACHIEVEMENTS

1 Learn from teaching process
2 Improved teaching skills

ST Evaluation Criteria:
1 Demeanour
2 Rapport
3 Child learning
4 Lesson Planning
5 Managerial skill

ST CHILD UNDERSTANDING

1 Children's needs and differences

* All the above perceptions were identified by half or more participants in the group.

Chapter Ten

Componential Analysis of the Alternative Site Dyad Findings

The purpose of this chapter is to analyze and discuss the major findings (presented in Table 8) derived from the interview responses of the alternative site - based dyad groups with regard to the major research question:

What do mentor - cooperating (MCT) and student teachers (ST) in an alternative student teaching site perceive to be their own purpose, and that of their school-based colleague during the student teaching experience?

Componential analysis is undertaken in relation to the five descriptive areas that emerged from the inductive analysis undertaken on the interview responses of the study groups. The five descriptive areas which helped to facilitate the componential analysis of the alternative site dyad group findings are as follows: 1) Participant Purposes; 2) Observer Feedback; 3) ST Responsibilities; 4) ST Achievements; 5) ST Child Understanding. Further, each descriptive area has been divided into subcategories which best define the themes that emerged from the componential analyses that were undertaken on the alternative dyad groups' data.

1. Participant Purposes

In 1966, Corrigan and Garner talked about the danger that discrepant views concerning student teaching participant roles could have on triad interaction. In particular, they highlighted the influence that such views may have in terms of lessening the positive impact of the experience for the ST.

MCT as Support and Facilitator. The majority of the present mentor - cooperating teachers (MCTs) identified their purpose as focusing on acting as a 'guide' to the student teachers (STs) and encouraging STs' ideas. In terms of the STs, half highlighted the MCTs' purpose as involving nurturing and acting as a problem - solving assistant to

Table 8

Comparative Model of the Leading Alternative Site Dyad Group *Perceptions
Concerning Self and Others' Purpose

Focus	MCT	AST
Purposes a. MCT.	1 Guide 2 Encourage ST pedagogic ideas	1 Assist ST problem solving 2 Nurturer
b. US	1 Provide feedback to STs 2 Overall director	1 Information provider 2 ST dyad support 3 School - University link
Feedback a. Focus	1 ST correction and improvement 2 ST lesson plans	1 Praise and correction 2 Self critique
b. Method and Mode	1 Written and verbal 2 Questions assist ST thinking	1 Written or with verbal 2 Both questions and direction
ST Responsibility a. To MCT	1 Lesson plans in on time 2 Professional respect 3 Being prepared 4 Open communication	1 Proaction 2 Dyad teaching consistency 3 Show effective teaching
b. To US	1 Meet US requirements	1 Open communication
ST Achievement	1 Professional self confidence /insight 2 Improved pedagogical skills	1 Learn from teaching process 2 Improved teaching skills
ST Evaluation Criteria	1 Lesson planning	1 Demeanour 2 Rapport 3 Child learning 4 Lesson Planning 5 Managerial skill
ST Child Understanding	1 Appreciation of teacher - student relationship	1 Child needs and differences

* All the above perceptions were identified by half or more participants in their group.

the ST.

Although the descriptors used in presenting the dyad participants major perceptions of MCT purpose may not be the same, it is possible to speculate that the ideas behind these perceptions are similar. Tannehill (1989) found CTs indicated encouraging ST experimentation as a personal purpose. Likewise, it could be argued that the MCTs in this study were of this mind in suggesting the encouragement of ST personal ideas. Further, the STs pointed to an MCT purpose as that of assisting them to problem solve during student teaching. Consequently, it could be argued that both dyad groups were focusing on the need to assist STs to try their own ideas.

The idea of the MCT as a 'guide' or a 'nurturer' is descriptively similar to the images used by the school - based teachers in Collison and Edwards (1994) study. Such terms suggest a sense of someone who encourages and supports a ST in their development. However, the idea of being a guide, which was also identified as a MCT purpose by a minority of the STs, implies that some specific direction is provided to the learner. This idea of direction was, in fact, suggested by some of the MCTs who had used the term 'guide' to describe their own purpose.

MCTs' Time and Influence. The **'time factor'** was highlighted by the majority of dyad participants as influencing the impact of the MCT. Half the STs indicated that as the MT was by the centre design process allocated more time with STs, this probably meant that they had **more influence** than the CTs on the STs.

US as a Guide and a Link. Concerning the purpose of the US, dyad groups highlighted a variety of perceptions. Interestingly, from the MCTs' perspective while only a minority of these participants had indicated their own purpose as specifically being a **feedback provider**, all suggested this as a US purpose. It might be speculated that one reason why all the MCTs perceived the US as a feedback provider, was because of the struggle they themselves may have had providing feedback; particularly operating as a CT.

As indicated earlier, both dyad groups perceived the difficulty CTs in

the centre had in finding time to provide in depth feedback to their STs. Consequently, it may have been felt that the US had more time during a specific visit to discuss observations with the ST.

However, half the STs suggested a broader US purpose than specifically that of feedback provider; US as more of a **general information provider**. This perception was, in part, related to another perceptual purpose identified by half the STs; US as a **school - university link**. The US was seen as bringing the information sent out by the university to the STs. Further, the US was also felt to keep the university updated with regard to the progress of the practicing STs.

The position of power that the US may hold within the student teaching experience also appears to have been recognized by both dyad groups. Half the MCTs described the US as the **overall director** of the student teaching experience. This view seemed to be related to the power it was perceived the US had in terms of grading the ST. In fact, a minority of the STs identified the US as an **evaluator**.

However, half the STs also identified another US purpose as that of a **ST dyad support**. The emphasis here in terms of dyad support was on the US helping the MCTs to understand the STs position, thus facilitating smooth dyad interaction. Interestingly, Rothwell, et al., (1994) also found that the role of the US became particularly important as a ST support when the dyad colleague was not considered up to standard by the ST. Consequently, the idea of the US as an evaluator and dyad support may well represent examples of ST perception concerning the power and authority of this particular triad participant.

MCT as US Source and Collaborator. The majority of dyad participants felt that both the MT and the CT in the Teaching Centre had **similar purposes** in terms of working with the US. However, half the STs again pointed to the **time factor** as potentially giving the MT more influence with the US when reporting on a ST's progress. In fact, the majority of the STs described the purpose of the MCTs in their interaction with the US as being that of an **information source**. Likewise, the majority of the MCTs perceived their own purpose to

involve the maintaining of an **open and collaborative interaction** with the US.

The ST concern was that the US did not see them very much and that US observations might 'catch them' on a good or bad teaching day. Consequently, STs perceived the more informed picture developed by the MCTs through their increased observation time as being valuable to the US. This perception may have been particularly strong for those STs who perceived the US as an evaluator; a purpose requiring a well informed picture of a ST.

Concern with keeping the US informed about the development of the ST was also held by some MCTs; particularly those who highlighted the need to keep open communication with the US. Further, this finding seems to be supported by the work of Aspinall, Garrett and Owen - Jackson (1994). Likewise, they found that STs generally believed school - based supervisors were in the best position to make informed judgments concerning ST progress. Thus, STs believed dyad colleagues had vital information which USs could use in their ST evaluations.

MCT Knowledge re. ST Preparation and Outcomes. The MCTs identified a number of diverse ideas when they outlined the skills and knowledge needed by the MCT in the ST supervisory process. Non of these perceptions, however, received majority identification. The most MCT identified views included **teacher preparation programme knowledge** and **expected ST outcomes**. These identified foci it might be speculated were important to the MCTs because of the number of STs they might be working with at any one time (i.e., up to 3). In an effort to bring some consistency to their interaction with different STs from the same teacher preparation programme, the MCTs may well have wanted to work from a basis of programmatic understanding. Such an understanding would focus on what STs had already been exposed to during their university - based preparation, coupled with knowledge of the generally expected outcomes for ST attainment.

In terms of how the university could help the MCTs to improve their

ST feedback ability, the need for more **university guidance** was highlighted. In particular, the MCTs wanted more indication of the university expectations for their STs. Further, the MCTs pointed out just as Burnstine (1979) had also found with CTs that the student teaching handbook was not particularly helpful; especially regarding ST outcome expectations. This present finding lends support to Constable's (1994) belief that written ST materials do not automatically produce a shared understanding between triad participants. However, as Foskett, Ratcliffe and Brunner (1994) suggest, participants should strive for shared perceptions concerning the nature of student teaching assessments if the experience is to be improved. Consequently, the present MCTs wanted clear knowledge regarding the expected ST outcomes; particularly, knowledge that would help them to achieve consistency of supervisory action and evaluation across STs in the Teaching Centre.

2. Observer Feedback

Acting as a ST feedback provider had only been identified by a minority of MCTs as a personal purpose. Further, the skills and knowledge identified by the MCTs to enable them to effectively supervise STs had not specifically focused on feedback provision. Interestingly, as speculated earlier, supervisory feedback may have been more closely associated with the purpose of the US than that of the MCTs. After all, feedback provision as a US purpose had already been identified by all the MCTs.

However, when asked directly, all dyad participants did indicate that feedback played an **important part** in the student teaching experience. Likewise, previous research had also indicated the importance of both school - based supervisors providing feedback (Glickman & Bey, 1990) and STs receiving such information (Johns & Cline, 1985).

Feedback as Directive and Compensatory. The majority of the MCTs identified the reason for feedback in the student teaching experience as related to the **correction and improvement** of STs. Likewise, the

majority of the STs perceived feedback to be important in the **correction and praise** of their performance. Further, half the STs also suggested that feedback was important to them because STs lacked experience in **self critique**. Similarly, a minority of MCTs also indicated some agreement with STs by pointing to feedback as a method of compensating for STs personal **lack of awareness** regarding their own development.

Feedback with a Pedagogical Focus. As to the areas dyad groups preferred to have feedback focus on, most MCTs identified four foci similar to those highlighted by CTs in previous research (O'Neal, 1983a; Tannehill, 1989); **STs' lesson plans, instruction, class management** and **organization**. The STs, however, were not as unified in their identification of areas for feedback focus. Only **lesson organization** was identified by at least half the STs.

It is possible to speculate that this lesser degree of ST identification regarding feedback foci is related to an earlier dyad finding. As indicated, both dyad groups had pointed to STs lack of experience in self critique and awareness concerning personal professional development (ie., knowing how, when and what to look for re., personal teacher analysis).

Feedback Form and Preference. Regarding feedback methods, all dyad participants indicated that they had utilized/received both **written** and **verbal** feedback. The majority of MCTs expressed a preference for using verbal feedback. In contrast, the majority of STs indicated a preference for receiving written feedback, or a combination of both methods.

Speculation might suggest that the MCT preference for using verbal feedback related to the pressures involved with some MCTs supervising up to three STs at a time. In particular, verbal feedback may have been emphasized in the restricted supervisory situations already identified (e.g., due to lack of CT - ST conference time). Further, some MCTs referred both to the difficulty at times of finding time to write feedback notes and the usefulness of '**to the point**' verbalizing.

Feedback for Reminding and Challenging. However, the majority of STs highlighted written feedback as allowing them to **revisit** their MCTs' points. In fact, a minority of STs may have been thinking about the lack of CT supervisory conference time when they suggested written feedback allowed MCTs themselves to **remember** points for later discussion.

All dyad participants indicated that they had utilized/received direct and indirect modes of feedback (i.e., directions and questions). Half the MCTs indicated they favoured the use of questions. In particular, because such a feedback mode forced STs to **think** through situations themselves to find potential answers. Half the STs also indicated that they preferred to receive both modes of feedback. Like the MCTs, the STs identified **thinking** as a perceived benefit of question focused feedback.

This focus on ST thinking via MCT questioning is not unexpected. The majority of dyad participants had already identified the MCTs' purpose as including both the encouragement of ST ideas, and acting as a ST problem-solving assistant. The use of observer questions in the feedback process would seem to be an important aid in achieving these perceived MCT purposes.

Further, such indirect supervision also places the emphasis back on the STs as participants sharing in the responsibility for their own improvement. Brooks, et al., (1994) have pointed to the lack of research regarding the potential STs themselves bring to the student teaching process. Clearly, for the present dyad groups questioning appears to be an important way in which to help STs bring into play their own ideas; thereby challenging self development. Further, Saffici (1996) also found that ST internal locus of control (ie., feeling in control of one's own situation) was significantly related to work motivation. Again, present dyad participants may be recognizing such motivational factors through their identified MCT purposes and preferred modes of supervision.

3. ST Responsibilities

Speculatively, it could be suggested that both MCTs and STs were of a like mind when providing certain perceptions. In particular, when identifying perspectives that related ST responsibilities toward MCTs.

ST Personal Initiative. A majority of the MCTs pointed to the STs **being prepared** and also having their **lesson plans in on time**. The majority of STs highlighted being **proactive** in their behaviour. It is plausible that for the STs a primary demonstration of proaction would have been being prepared for classes and having lesson plans ready without MCTs having to ask. Further, the idea of ST proaction was also apparent with regard to ST responsibilities owed to their US. While the majority of the MCTs felt ST responsibility revolved around meeting the US requirements, the majority of STs highlighted **open** and **honest communication** as a personal responsibility owed their US. In other words, this suggested communication that the STs might feel necessary to initiate themselves at times.

ST Professional Respect. In terms of showing **professional respect** to the MCT which a majority of the MCTs identified, only a minority of the STs highlighted this responsibility. However, this does not necessarily mean that most STs did not feel showing respect toward their MCTs was a personal responsibility. For example, half the STs did identify maintaining some **dyad teaching consistency** as a personal responsibility. This meant STs maintained some connection with the MCT's approach to teaching. STs indicated this was important to do; particularly, so that after the ST had left the school the MCT would not have to completely reintroduce each class to their own teaching approach. Speculatively, this perception may have been related to STs' feeling professionally respectful toward their MCTs.

Further, dyad teaching consistency may also be connected to a view about STs expressed by Tinning and Siedentop (1985). Their view focused on the fine balancing act undertaken by STs in terms of meeting the demands of their CT, US and children. Consequently, besides being a potential sign of respect for the present MCTs, dyad teaching consistency may also have represented a ST attempt to meet

the expectations of potentially their most prominent influence; children (Jones, 1992b). Staying closer to the teaching style used by the MCTs, may have helped STs to maintain a contextual stability for their own students. Further, it may be, in part, as a mark of respect for the MCT (who naturally would be concerned about the effective instruction of their classes) and as a concern for children, that half the STs also identified demonstrating **effective teaching** as another personal responsibility.

As indicated above, the STs had identified the personal responsibility of maintaining open and honest communication with their US. This is not surprising as the STs had already identified one US purpose as that of ST evaluator. Consequently, such a purpose emphasized the importance of the US receiving information describing ST development beyond that readily apparent to the US through brief personal observation. STs providing information themselves to their USs would speculatively be deemed very important by such dyad participants. In fact, even though it had already been indicated that the purpose of the MCT in interacting with the US was to act as an information source (including the progress of the ST), STs had provided a sense that this could not be left entirely to their MCT to undertake. Therefore, STs themselves had to also be proactive on this issue.

4. ST Achievements

Alternative dyad groups highlighted two major perceptions each with regard to the goals for overall ST achievement. These perceptions were identified by a majority of participants in each group.

ST Experiential Learning. For example, the MCTs indicated the need for STs to develop **professional self - confidence and insight.** The STs talked about the goal of **benefiting from teaching process experience.** In fact, both groups may have been focusing on a similar concept with regard to these two ST achievements.

MCTs defined the characteristics associated with professional confidence and insight in terms of ST recognition of their own abilities, coupled with feelings of confidence and optimism. However, it was

clear that the STs had difficulty in defining specifically how they benefited from what was perceived to be teaching process experience. The STs focused generally on feeling 'comfortable' in the school; in knowing the 'reality' of teaching and the teachers' daily experiences.

As suggested, it is possible that the STs were actually focusing on similar factors to their MCTs. For example, ST perceptions of 'comfort' may relate to what the MCTs had highlighted as ST ability to recognize personal strengths and weaknesses; an ability that might translate into increased ST feelings of self confidence. Further, demonstrating an understanding of what is required of a teacher in terms of the types of situation faced, and also knowing that one can meet varied challenges may, in fact, lead to the confidence and optimism suggested by MCTs as goals for ST achievement.

The present STs may have identified a feeling that participants in the research of Kyriaiou and Lin (1994) had also demonstrated. That investigation suggested that the nature of teaching was predominantly revealed to STs by their being actually able to teach day in and day out. Likewise, such experience in the present study seems to have had a cumulative effect in terms of revealing the world of teachers and teaching to the STs. However, these STs were still immersed in on - going experiences. Consequently, the STs appeared to need more time and possibly guidance to help them clarify exactly what these experiences meant both on a personal and professional level.

ST Technical Skill Improvement. Closer dyad perceptual accord was demonstrated in relation to the other category that was highlighted for ST achievement by the majority of both dyad groups; **improved pedagogical skills**. This ST achievement finding is in keeping with those of previous research on both CT supervisory (O'Neal, 1983a; Tannehill, 1989) and ST feedback foci (Helison, 1992). Within the area of pedagogical skills both present study groups identified the importance of improving ST planning and discipline procedures.

Clearly, these dyad groups were concerned with the technical aspects of teaching. May be this is to be expected, if, as Doyle (1990)

has suggested the concept of 'technical rationality' is the paradigmatic driving force behind most of teacher preparation. As indicated earlier, there has been an increased emphasis on teacher accountability. For example, in the state where the present study was conducted, school - districts have moved toward outcome - based curriculum via state directives (Jones, 1992a). Therefore, MCTs may naturally be concerned that their children should not 'suffer' educationally at the hands of STs.

Consequently, it could be speculated that centre teachers operating in the CT mode and who are pressed for time with STs, may concentrate very specifically on the STs effective teaching of lesson content. Further, the MCTs with the luxury of their STs teaching back to back lessons (often to the same grade level), may also recognize this situation as a supervisory opportunity unavailable in the CT context. Therefore, the MCTs also see an opportunity to focus closely on the observable teaching performance changes that their STs can make after feedback between lessons.

ST Lesson Planning Assessment. MCTs continued their concern with effective pedagogical behaviour when the majority identify ST **lesson planning** as one criteria against which ST performance should be assessed. Half the STs also felt that **planning** should be an area for evaluation. Again, concern with teacher accountability and being responsibly prepared for teaching classes could have driven the identification of planning by both groups as an assessable criteria for STs.

Further, with having to meet the demands of at least three MCTs and teach children in different grades and schools each day, the STs may have developed serious concerns about planning. Knowing exactly what they were going to do before entering these different daily teaching contexts would naturally have been very important to these centre STs. It is reasonable to suggest that proactive planning (i.e., proaction was the leading identified ST responsibility toward MCTs) helps to both reduce STs' stress and increase their professional self

confidence in the teaching environment. Similarly, MCT concerns may also have been reduced through their knowing that the STs were well prepared to present clear, organized information to their classes.

ST Deportment and Rapport Assessment. While the MCTs show some continuity in terms of their perceptions of both ST achievements and potential criteria for ST assessment (ie., the majority identified factors directly related to effective teaching - Rink, 1985). In contrast, the STs seem to demonstrate a shift in their perspectives between these two areas. Like their MCTs, the STs were also concerned with factors related to effective teaching in terms of personal goals for achievement. However, in relation to criteria against which they perceived their performance should be assessed, factors concerning effective teaching did not predominant. Only ST **planning** along with **organization/ management** were identified as assessment criteria related to effective teaching by half the STs.

Interestingly, the MCTs originally highlighted nine different criteria against which they felt ST performance might be assessed. However, only **lesson planning** (a factor in effective teaching) received more than a minority of participant support in terms of identification. This finding concerning the MCTs diverse perceptions of ST assessment criteria supports the belief of Foskett, et al., (1994). They suggest that a shared perspective regarding the nature of assessment between participants in the student teaching process takes time to build. Further, such participant acceptance cannot be assumed to occur just because goals for achievement/assessment are stated in a disseminated university student teaching handbook.

In contrast to their MCTs the STs were more in accord in terms of the assessment factors they identified. The five criteria highlighted each received support from at least half or more of the STs. The two leading ST majority assessment perceptions were **professional demeanour** (in particular, dress) and **rapport** with others. The emphasis in terms of rapport was predominantly on how STs got along with their children. Less emphasis was placed on dyad rapport. This is not a surprising

finding when research (Cruickshank, et al., 1974; Jones, 1992b) has identified the impact that children have on STs.

ST Learning Impact Assessment. Interestingly, half the STs also highlighted **children learning** as another potential ST assessment criteria. This apparent emphasis on developing both a comfortable rapport with children and being held responsible for influencing child learning appears to contrast with some earlier research. In particular, investigations (Boggess, et al.,1985; Schempp,1986) which suggested that physical education STs were most keenly concerned with the control and management of children, and felt less responsibility for children learning.

This identified difference between past and the present research findings may relate to what Furlong and Maynard (1995) referred to as the development of ST focus over the duration of the student teaching experience. More specifically, after initial concern for self and child management (i.e., the 'survival' stage) many STs become more concerned with their teaching impact on students, and their professional interaction with colleagues. Both these areas were highlighted by at least half the present STs as important potential ST evaluation criteria.

Further, as Furlong and Maynard (1995) indicate, STs vary as to how long it takes them to pass through this initial 'survival' stage. It is possible that in the 1980s American physical education research (e.g., Boggess, et al.,1985; Schempp,1986) ST participants had as little as ten weeks (i.e., five weeks in each of two traditional sites) for student teaching. The Teaching Centre STs had sixteen weeks all undertaken in the same teaching sites. Consequently, speculation might suggest that the increased time spent in the same school sites, may have enabled more of the present STs to move beyond primarily a concern for self and child management.

5. ST Child Understanding

Nature, Nurture and Child Response. The majority of the MCTs identified the need for STs to appreciate the different factors influencing

teacher - student interaction. These were seen as predominantly factors about which STs gained recognition through awareness of both children's behaviour and the potential influences that led to different responses (e.g., child's nature; non school environment, etc.). Interestingly, the STs had earlier highlighted the importance in terms of personal achievement of benefiting from what was termed 'teaching process experience.' Speculatively, such process experience may have included learning about the impact of different influences on children and on teacher - student interaction.

However, while only a minority of the MCTs specifically identified the need for STs to **recognize student differences**, all the STs highlighted this theme in conjunction with **adapting to childrens' needs** (e.g., children differ developmentally requiring varied teacher approaches; the need to focus positively for success and on both genders). This dyad group difference in terms of the number of participants identifying children's differences as a ST understanding may support previous research (McBride, 1984; Nichols, 1980). Such research suggests that triad members do not perceive ST concerns in the same manner or intensity.

In conclusion, Chapter 10 above has compared and contrasted the findings that emerged from the perceptual data provided by both the MCTs and STs working in the present research alternative site. Table 9 is provided to help summarize the areas that emerged from the componential analysis of dyad groups findings in this chapter. In particular, the table highlights dyad group perceptual areas that demonstrate most and least group perceptual similarity concerning self and others' purpose.

Chapter 11 which now follows presents the conclusions and hypotheses that are derived from the main issues arising out of the componential analysis conducted in this chapter. The grounded hypotheses (like those presented in the traditional analysis) have been developed to assist future researchers. In particular, by assisting in identifying potential directions worthy of further investigation which

emerged from the present componential analysis of dyad group findings set within the Teaching Centre.

Table 9

Comparative Model of the Leading Alternative Site Dyad Group Perceptions
Demonstrating Greatest and Least Similarity Concerning Self and Others'
Purpose

More Agreement	**Less Agreement**
1. MCT purpose includes assisting the ST to try their own ideas while acting as a supportive, encouraging figure who also provides the US with ST development information.	1. STs placed greater importance than did the MCTs on the influence of written rather then purely verbal MCT feedback on ST professional development.
2. CT purpose is impacted by the reduced amount of time that is available (compared to the MT) to interact with their ST(s).	2. STs focused on children's needs through developmental differences while the MCTs emphasized the influence of environmental impact on such needs.
3. Feedback with the aim of correcting ST performance is important in ST development; particularly, focused on lesson organization.	
4. Feedback questions play an important role in ST professional development; particularly, in terms of increased ST reflection.	
5. STs should be ready to teach their lessons and proactive in having researched and prepared what is necessary to successfully fulfill this responsibility toward their MCTs.	
6. STs should become self confident teachers who are comfortable in the knowledge of their own abilities; a professional self awareness derived from learning through teaching experience itself.	
7. STs should achieve improved pedagogical skill, particularly, in terms of lesson planning; a specific criteria against which STs should also be evaluated.	

Chapter 11

Alternative Dyad Group Findings: Conclusions and Hypotheses

The purpose of this chapter is to present both conclusions and hypotheses derived from the alternative dyad group componential analyses undertaken in the five summary areas: 1) Participant Purposes; 2) Observer Feedback; 3) ST Responsibilities; 4) ST Achievements; 5) ST Child Understanding. The grounded hypotheses presented emerged from the interplay of dyad group findings that occurred during componential analysis. While potential answers to these hypotheses are presented based on the present findings, each hypothesis does, however, remain as a guideline for future research by others investigating alternative student teaching settings.

1. Participant Purposes

Research (Ryan, 1989; Shippy, 1989) has indicated that differences in triad participants' perception of self and others' purpose can lead to dissatisfaction and conflict within the student teaching process. However, in terms of dyad perceptions in the present study related to MCTs' purpose there does seem to be some agreement. MCTs highlighted encouraging ST ideas while the STs identified the importance of MCTs helping them with problem - solving. These perceptions which suggest a potentially more indirect form of ST supervision seem to be in keeping with the research findings of Whitehead (1984). This study identified effective CT practices as highlighted by STs. Such practice included the use of indirect, freeing (i.e., questioning) rather than binding (i.e., directing) CT behaviours.

Similarly, in the present study dyad participants highlighted the encouragement of ST thinking via the use of observer questioning feedback mode. Such a two way form of ST supervision is not the kind of dyad interaction referred to by Brooks, et al., (1994). They suggest that traditionally student teaching interaction has been perceived more as a one way process. Such a process sees the supervising teacher

act as a resource providing a large amount of input for the ST. Present study dyad participants perceive a much more active role for the ST in facilitating their own learning in the Teaching Centre approach.

Consequently, the following hypothesis emerged from analysis of the findings concerning dyad group perceptions of the MCTs' purpose:

a) There is a relationship between mode of supervisory feedback, role of the ST and the purpose of the MCT.

The general descriptors that emerged from present dyad participants' perceptions of the MCT purpose as that of ST 'guide' and 'nurturer' suggest some sense of direction being involved in ST supervision. Yet, neither dyad group suggested the use of a dictatorial approach to ST supervision. As Researchers (Zeichner, 1979; Graber, 1988; Brooks, et al., 1994) have acknowledged the role of 'self' in teacher development may be a vital factor. Consequently, the MCT acting as a guide and nurturer would seem to be in keeping with the perspective of two way dyad interaction. In particular, a perspective that links to the MCTs' idea of providing an environment for ST input via the encouragement of STs' own ideas. This view supports that of Brooks, et al., (1994) who suggest that STs possess valuable insights to help in their own teacher development.

Interestingly, the influence of 'time' on both dyad and ST - US interaction and on supervisory impact also emerged from these findings focused on centre participant purposes. Time as a factor was perceived to influence the impact of the MCT on the ST. In particular, the majority of dyad participants felt that the impact of the CT on the ST might be decreased due to their having less daily time than the MT to work with the ST.

Consequently, the following hypothesis emerged from analysis of the findings concerning dyad perceptions of supervisory participants' contact time and their influence on others:

a) There is a relationship between the amount of time spent by centre MTs and CTs working with the ST, and their perceived influence on the ST.

The findings of this study concerning the perceived relationship between the time spent by MCTs and the US working both with one another and the ST in relation to potential supervisory influence, seems to support previous research (Brunelle, et al., 1981; McBride, 1984). Such investigations have identified STs' concern with the impact of CTs on STs related to the amount of time they spend with prospective teachers providing assistance (e.g., feedback). Further, triad perceptual differences have also been related to lack of student teaching participants' contact opportunities (Calvert, 1970).

In terms of present dyad groups underlying perceptions regarding US purpose, there appears to be a sense of the potential support this non school - based participant can provide to the ST. The most identified US purpose for both dyad groups revolved around the provision of information to the ST. The MCTs emphasized the provision of specific observation feedback on ST performance as a particular focus for the US. However, the STs' perceptions were more general in terms of the information they perceived the US could provide for them.

Emphasis by the MCTs on the US providing performance feedback to the ST, speculatively, may grow out of two identified MCT concerns. First, MCTs expressed concern at the difficulty of personally providing feedback to the STs; particularly when working as a CT. Second, the MCTs also called for more university (ie., by implication US) guidance with regard to developing their own ability to supervise STs effectively.

Consequently, the following hypothesis emerged from analysis of the findings concerning dyad perceptions of participant purposes, skills /knowledge and interaction:

a) There is a relationship between MCTs' perceptions of the skills/knowledge that the US brings to student teaching and their perception of the purpose of the US in triad interaction.

Present study findings indicate that the MCTs wanted more knowledge concerning both prior ST teacher preparation experiences and the expected student teaching outcomes. Such university provided information was felt to be important in helping MCTs to more effectively

supervise STs. Clearly, these would be areas that the MCTs would perceive the US to be more knowledgeable about. Consequently, they may well have felt that the US could more easily relate such understanding to what they observed the STs doing as they taught.

The importance of such MCT prior knowledge about ST programmatic experiences and student teaching expectations also seems to receive emphasis through a ST perception. The STs identified one US purpose as that of a ST dyad support. It was suggested that a US could help to explain to the MCTs some of the university experiences STs had gone through. In particular, experiences which led STs to behave in certain ways while student teaching. Such a perception suggests that some MCTs may have questioned how certain observed ST actions/beliefs related to prior university - based preparation. Interestingly, Aspinall, et al., (1994) indicated that STs liked to be able to call on the help of their US if they felt the need. This may well have included when school - based supervisors had difficulty comprehending the actions/attitudes of STs that may have stemmed from prior university preparatory experiences.

Consequently, the following hypothesis emerged from analysis of the findings concerning dyad perceptions of participant purposes, skills/ knowledge and interaction:

a) There is a relationship between MCTs and STs perceptions of the diverse demands and time constraints that impinge on their work in the Teaching Centre, and their perceptions of others as support.

Conjecture from the present findings suggests that by identifying the US as ST feedback provider the MCTs were inferring that the US had certain prerequisites needed for providing ST feedback. In particular, the US may have been perceived to have the time and background knowledge needed to provide effective feedback on STs' performance. However, the STs perceived a more general informational purpose for the US. This perception seems to relate to the ST idea of the US representing a practical school - university link; a two way information connection between the STs and their university programme.

Speculatively, the STs in the Teaching Centre because of the varying centre demands on them (e.g., working with three MCTs and with a wide variety of grade levels to teach daily) seemed to feel the need to identify sources to whom they could turn for support. They had already provided a sense of both the MCT as a nurturer; someone to whom they could turn, and the US as a ST dyad support. Therefore, the university may have been perceived by some STs as another base for deriving a sense of psychological support. Naturally, the US as the university representative would have been perceived as the symbol and the link with a supportive university. This sense of the US as having more a pastoral than pedagogical role was also the perception of STs in the research of Busher and King (1994).

In fact, ST perceptions concerning the purpose of the MCT and US, may, also support the research findings of Krause (1988). This sociological focused research lead to the suggestion that a stable coalition between a traditional CT and ST with clear US support, was the most encouraging triad configuration for ST development. Similarly, the present STs emphasized the supportive nature of the US's position in relation both to themselves and to the effective facilitation of dyad interaction. Likewise, the MCTs emphasized the help that the US could provide; in particular, by giving the STs performance - based feedback.

Both dyad groups also seem to imply an authority that is perceived to be the particular domain of the US within the triad. However, while the MCTs suggest a sense of the leadership inherent within the US position, some STs pointed to the USs' evaluatory authority (ie., the US writes the ST's final evaluation). This apparent difference in MCT and ST perspective related to the US, may, speculatively stem from the different concerns which confronted these dyad participants. For example, the MCTs had already identified potential supervisory problems related to: CT time availability; the need for MCT knowledge concerning prior ST preparation and student teaching outcomes. Consequently, these concerns, coupled with the demands incurred by the MCTs working with up to three STs at a time within the centre, may,

have led them to expect overall direction from the US.

However, from the STs' perspective the emphasis in terms of the US's authority was more on the perceived evaluatory purpose. Interestingly, although this US purpose was identified by only a minority of STs, it may have received further emphasis through other dyad group findings. For example, the STs had suggested that one purpose for the MCTs in their interaction with the US was to act as an information source concerning ST progress. In particular, STs perceived the importance of MCTs' informing the US to ensure that as their formal evaluator the US would clearly recognize any progress made by a ST.

Consequently, the following hypothesis emerged from analysis of the findings concerning dyad perceptions of participant purposes, skills/ knowledge and interaction:

a) There is a relationship between dyad perceptions of the USs' purpose and their perceptions of the MCTs' purpose in interacting with the US.

Present findings suggest that perceived lack of opportunity for USs to get a balanced, informed picture of ST progress from merely personal observation, seemed to stimulate ST perceptions of the MCTs' purpose in relation to the US. This finding, may, speculatively be supported by the research of Aspinall, et al., (1994). They found that STs generally felt that their school - based supervisors were in the best position to make judgments about ST progress and performance. The present MCTs also identified the importance of their maintaining an open/collaborative interaction with the US; a skill Loomis' (1980) had found the most important CT competency identified from the triad perspective.

2. Observer Feedback

All the present dyad participants were in agreement like those in previous research (Johns & Cline, 1985; Glickman & Bey, 1990; Rothwell, et al., 1994) concerning the importance of observer feedback during student teaching. The majority of the present MCTs and STs

were also unified regarding the purpose of this feedback. In particular, a majority of dyad participants linked feedback to the correction of ST errors. However, while MCTs emphasized the connection between feedback correction and ST improvement, the STs indicated concern that corrective feedback should be balanced with praise. Some STs indicated that too much corrective feedback by itself might lead them to question their own teaching ability.

These present findings give support to the research of Nichols (1980). This study indicated that triad participants may not perceive ST problems in the same manner or with the same intensity. Teaching Centre findings suggest that even while these dyad participants agree on the importance and purpose of feedback, the STs were also concerned to receive information regarding what they were doing well. Further, Arrighi and Young's (1987) research indicated that physical education STs defined successful teaching in terms of self feelings, rather than their effect on other groups. Likewise, the present STs clearly needed to know that they were doing some things correctly during student teaching to bolster their own feelings of success.

There is also agreement by some dyad participants concerning the initial professional inadequacies of STs. A minority of MCTs and half the STs pointed to what could be called the compensatory purpose of feedback. Like Furlong and Maynard (1995) suggest, STs need support in learning to teach; a very different demand from the concept of learning about teaching in a teacher preparation - based course. Therefore, observer feedback (both corrective and praising) may help STs to overcome their natural lack of initial professional awareness concerning personal professional growth and the ability to critique self.

Consequently, the following hypothesis emerged from analysis of the findings concerning dyad group perceptions regarding foci for ST feedback:

a) There is a relationship between dyad participants' teaching experience and their ability to identify specific ST feedback foci.

The findings of the present research suggest that STs' lack the ability

to critique their own professional development. Speculatively, this finding may also relate to participant clarity regarding feedback focus. The majority of MCTs were clear in their identification of ST lesson plans, instruction, class management and organization as foci for their feedback. However, only organization was highlighted by at least half the STs. Interestingly, this was not a situation where the majority of the STs chose other areas for feedback focus. Rather, it may have been an example of some STs simply not being clear, able or confident enough to easily identify those areas critical to skillful teacher performance; in other words, aspects on which they wished to receive observer feedback. This speculation may also receive support from the findings of Rothwell, et al., (1994). Their STs identified the need for observer feedback that would help them to develop criteria against which they could evaluate their own teaching performance.

Interestingly, in terms of the present research method the actual interview questions concerning feedback focus may have encouraged participants to highlight technical teaching criteria, rather than other factors for analysis. Constable and Norton (1994) have suggested that most ST professional encounters focus on classroom discipline, organization and lesson evaluation. Consequently, if observer feedback is traditionally identified with the actual teaching behaviour of STs then present dyad focus on technical teaching criteria is to be expected. Like Dewar and Lawson (1990) suggest, it does seem that the present dyad groups showed signs of embracing the idea of a 'shared technical culture' with regard to majority perceptions of feedback focus.

Further, all dyad participants indicated having used or received verbal and written feedback during student teaching. However, there was a contrast in dyad group preferences in this area.The majority of MCTs expressed a preference for the use of verbal feedback. The majority of STs indicated a preference for either receiving written feedback or a combination of the two methods. Again, as Nichols (1980) has indicated, dyad concerns on the same topic may vary in

intensity and manner. Consequently, from the perspective of the present study these dyad feedback mode differences may, again, relate to the influence on participants of the Teaching Center context itself.

Consequently, the following hypothesis emerged from analysis of the findings concerning dyad perceptions of feedback purpose and method:

a) There is a relationship between dyad participants' perceptions of the purpose of feedback and their preferred method(s) of presentation to STs.

MCTs had indicated concern with a perceived lack of time for writing feedback and also a preference for the more immediate, and 'to the point nature' of verbal feedback. Speculatively, particularly, from the CTs perspective it might have been perceived that time pressures allowed only quick verbal comments to the STs before they were on their way to another MCT's lesson. In contrast, MTs may have felt that with their back to back ST lessons, they had the opportunity to focus twice on a limited number of pedagogical factors. Thus they could provide comments before, in between and after lessons. Hence, the MTs may not have felt the need to provide written feedback; in fact, written MT comments in such a situation may have been felt to represent 'overkill.'

However, some MCTs along with the majority of the STs did emphasize the lasting nature of written feedback. As already identified, written corrective and praising comments on ST performance could be very helpful to these STs; particular, for STs who might be aware of their own lack of critical ability and professional self awareness. Further, the opportunity to read MCT comments might also alleviate stress for STs in terms of remembering what MCTs had said to them about their teaching (e.g., at the elementary level where the ST might only see the class once a week).

Research by Whitehead (1984) has also indicated that STs have identified effective CT behaviour that includes more indirect supervision

(i.e., use of questions). Likewise, the majority of the present MCTs and half the STs also showed a preference for either the use of questions, or a combination of direction and question in ST supervision. As indicated in chapter eight, dyad participants suggested that questioning encouraged ST thinking. This perception seems logically related to the dyad groups most identified MCT purposes; to encourage the ideas and assist the problem - solving of STs.

Further, self reliance may be another factor that influenced dyad perceptions concerning the value of questioning in ST supervision. After all, dyad participants had already highlighted the importance of STs thinking for themselves, in part, because MCTs would only be able to assist ST development for a relatively short period of time. Therefore, questioning could well be seen as an important element in developing thoughtful, creative and self reliant future teachers.

However, this idea of STs developing self reliance is interesting when compared with the earlier dyad group perception that STs lacked critical, professional self awareness. Speculatively, MCT feedback in the Teaching Centre needs to cater to two realizations. First, that STs need specific, concrete information (e.g., corrective and praising) from experienced practitioners to help guide their professional development. Second, feedback also needs to develop ST professional self reliance concerning decision - making. Therefore, the MCTs may have a difficult situation trying to maintain a balance between these two modes of feedback with different intents. Yet this balance is important as the STs indicated both modes of feedback were necessary to their development as knowledgeable, self reliant teachers.

Centre dyad perceptions concerning the influence of available time on ST development continually emerged in relation to observer feedback. The majority of dyad participants indicated there was a lack of time within the day for dyad interaction; particularly, a lack of time for conferencing between the CT and the ST.

Consequently, the following hypothesis emerged from analysis of the findings concerning dyad perceptions regarding available feedback

opportunity and MCT and ST satisfaction:

a) There is a relationship between the amount of time that dyad participants have to communicate feedback and their level of expressed satisfaction with the dyad relationship.

When it is considered that two out of three MCTs the ST works with in the Teaching Centre operate as CTs, dyad concern with conferencing time would seem to be very important to highlight. This seems to receive further emphasis when related to Mears research (1981) which suggests that ST morale itself significantly relates to personal perception of both dyad interaction and conference effectiveness. Further, Chandler (1971) found that the cognitive level at which the CT operated during conferencing was itself reciprocated by the ST.

The danger therefore implied in research such as Mears (1981) and Chandler (1971) is twofold. First, the present STs may not be challenged cognitively to the level possible by their CTs. In particular, because CTs with their more limited time may have difficulty in providing in depth, cognitively challenging feedback to STs constantly on the move to other sites. Brief, 'on the fly' analysis may not allow STs to develop more complex understanding of teaching - learning processes. Second, ST concern about dyad interaction and conferencing opportunity (particularly with the CT) may not allow them to achieve the level of personal satisfaction (morale) possible within student teaching.

3. ST Responsibilities

In terms of specific ST responsibilities the majority of the MCTs' identified STs being prepared for lessons; particularly, regarding the organizational aspects and having required equipment ready. MCTs also identified the need for STs to have a specific lesson plan available from which to teach. Such ST responsibilities would logically link to their achieving both learning outcomes and safe environments; two natural concerns for MCTs who felt responsible for the learning and safety of their own classes.

Further, research (Tinning & Siedentop, 1985) has shown the

concern that STs have with meeting the expectations of their dyad colleague. Therefore the responsibilities of being respectful to the MCT and maintaining some dyad teaching consistency identified by some STs, might be representations of ST concerns for their MCTs.

However, two leading ST identified responsibilities, being proactive teachers and demonstrating effective teaching, may go beyond just concern with meeting their MCTs' expectations. Research (Zeichner, 1979; Arrighi & Young;1987; Dodds,1989; Graber,1989) suggests STs are concerned for themselves both in terms of the response of others and in personally achieving a sense of professional development. Consequently, showing personal initiative may suggest a move by STs toward increased professional autonomy.

Further, as the MCTs indicated earlier, having STs become more professionally autonomous through self decision - making was one of their expectations (and MCT purposes) for ST development. Therefore, highlighting effective teaching by STs as a personal responsibility, might, speculatively be related to an increased ST sense of self as an autonomous professional. Also, although not specifically mentioned by the STs, enhanced professional performance might increase their standing in their MCTs' perceptions. This would not be an unimportant consideration for STs concerned with MCT progress reports to the US.

In terms of ST responsibilities toward the US, while there is some dyad agreement in relation to the two main identified foci, both groups did predominantly identify the opposite criteria. The majority of the MCTs pointed to the importance of STs meeting US requirements. Yet, a minority also identified STs maintaining open communication with the US. In contrast, the STs although perceiving the same two ST responsibilities as the MCTs, predominantly identified open communication rather than meeting US requirements.

As Nichols (1980) has suggested, triad participants do not necessarily perceive issues in the same way, or where they do, to the same level of intensity. This idea may help to explain the difference in present dyad perceptions concerning ST responsibilities to the US. The

STs had already identified one MCT purpose as providing information about ST progress to the US. Further, this MCT purpose, may, also relate to the earlier ST identified US purpose as an evaluator. In fact, some STs had commented on a lack of US visitation/observation as potentially impacting the US's ability to evaluate STs accurately and fairly.

Consequently, the following hypothesis emerged from analysis of the findings concerning dyad perceptions of ST responsibilities toward the MCT and the US:

a) There is a relationship between STs' concern for a positive evaluation by triad colleagues and their perceptions of personal responsibilities toward the MCT and US.

Based on the findings of the present study, it is not unrealistic to suggest that STs would feel more personally concerned than their MCTs, to keep the US informed about their own student teaching progress. After all, a positive evaluation by the US might be based, in part, on STs informing their supervisor about their personal progress. Therefore, it is clear that the concept of US evaluation was influential on ST perceptions of their personal triad responsibilities.

Tinning and Siedentop (1985) also indicate that STs may be very concerned to meet the expectations of their triad colleagues. After all, one expectation of the US would be that their STs develop positively during student teaching. Therefore, as suggested, STs may well be concerned to keep the US informed regarding their personal progress. However, STs might also naturally want to avoid imparting information that could negatively effect the US's positive expectations for them. Consequently, some STs identified the feeling that open communication with their US was sometimes inhibited. In particular, inhibited due to the tension that Hawkey (1994) suggests emerges because the supervisor is perceived by the ST as both helper and evaluator.

Furlong and Maynard (1995) have also referred to the visibility of ST learning. They suggest that such visibility may encourage ST need to

impress those with responsibility for their assessment. Therefore, understandably, the present STs may well be more concerned with professional image management for evaluation purposes, than in meeting the more academic expectations of the US to which the majority of the MCTs had referred.

As indicated, the majority of the MCTs identified criteria related to STs fulfilling observable requirements for both the MCTs and the US (e.g., equipment, plans, academic assignments ready). Speculatively, under the stress of the student teacher supervisory process (e.g., dyad time availability; numbers of STs to work with) MCTs may have found observable ST responsibilities the easiest criteria against which to evaluate STs. Hence, it may well be that both dyad group perceptions concerning ST responsibilities toward triad colleagues are influenced by their differing personal concerns within the Teaching Centre.

4. ST Achievements

Nias (1989) has suggested that teaching is a process that is both felt and experienced. Further, Fuller and Brown (1975) have described the process of learning to teach as a "...constant, unremitting self - confrontation" (p.48). Such perceptions may be helpful in explaining why the majority of the present STs while identifying achievement through benefiting from the teaching process experience itself, still had difficulty in defining the specific benefits gleaned from this on - going experience.

As Nias (1989) has indicated about the twofold nature of learning to teach, so the present ST comments appear to infer the 'feeling' that they had learned through 'experiencing' different teaching situations. The STs' comments suggested a sense of benefiting from the multiple experiences that only actual student teaching experience could provide. Again, there seemed to be emerging here for some STs a sense of the importance of the 'self' in learning to teach, referred to by previous researchers (Dodds,1989; Graber,1989; Brooks, et al., 1994).

As Fuller and Brown (1975) indicate, student teaching is for most STs the first opportunity they have had to teach all day, every day over an

extended period of time. Consequently, the 'constant self - confrontation' as Fuller and Brown refer to teaching appears to have a powerful impact on STs. Yet, while this impact was clearly felt by the present STs, as indicated, it was difficult for them to define such experience verbally. These difficulties may speculatively relate to an earlier perception concerning STs and feedback. Here, dyad participants pointed to ST difficulties in terms of analyzing personal performance. This, it was suggested related to an initial lack of ST professional awareness. Likewise, such inexperience may help explain why these STs had difficulty in clearly describing the learning they gained through constant student teaching experience.

The majority of participants in both dyad groups were also clearly influenced by the sense that STs needed to achieve improved competence in their use of various pedagogical skills. Some dyad group participants mentioned the need to focus on and help STs achieve effective lesson organization/management, and clear content presentation. In fact, for half the STs, management/organization was an area that they felt they should be evaluated on.

These findings concerning ST achievement and assessment criteria are not surprising. In particular, as the teaching behaviours outlined have been found through process - product research (Ysseldyke, 1987), to relate to environments conducive to learning. In fact, these STs had already been introduced to the ideas related to effective teaching behaviour in their pedagogical focused teacher preparation classes. Consequently, it is not unrealistic to expect STs to highlight some of these behaviours as areas for professional achievement.

Further, by identifying planning as another important ST assessment criteria, both dyad groups appear to acknowledge the need for beginning teachers to put what they will teach and how, on to paper. In fact, ST planning is a theme that seems to underlie dyad perceptions for ST achievement, MCT feedback and the criteria by which to assess ST performance.

Consequently, the following hypothesis emerged from analysis of the

findings concerning dyad perceptions of ST achievements and assessment criteria:

> a) There is a relationship between dyad perceptions of MCT concerns, ST lesson planning and ST assessment criteria.

According to Hellison and Templin (1991) the minimal research (Placek, 1983, 1984) undertaken into physical education teachers' planning indicates that, in fact, very little planning is carried out. However, based on the present study findings concerning the student teaching context, it appears that the majority of MCTs in the Teaching Centre felt that planning was a very important element for two reasons. First, it would allow the MCTs to become aware of what STs were going to undertake with their classes; vital from an MCT liability/curriculum accountability standpoint. Second, planning on paper would help the MCTs to assist ST in achieving effectiveness in terms of lesson organization, management and clear content presentation (i.e., specific dyad identified areas for ST achievement).

Interestingly, while lesson planning was by far the most MCT identified criteria for assessment of STs, it was only one of five criteria which emerged from the STs' responses. In fact, the most ST identified assessment criteria did not relate to the more practical, technical aspects of teaching which have been highlighted as so pervasive in teacher education (Doyle, 1990). The STs felt that traits such as dress, enthusiasm and being on time, were elements of professional demeanour that should be taken into account during ST assessment.

Reference to previous research may suggest why these present STs should have highlighted professional demeanour as a leading area for assessment of STs. Speculatively, they may have perceived this area as being directly related to their ability to influence others. Past research (Malloy, 1975; Melville & Maddalozzo, 1988) has indicated that teacher appearance has a positive influence on children's work perceptions and their attitudes toward teachers. Further, Cruickshank et al., (1974) and Jones (1992b) have identified the powerful influence of children on teachers. Consequently, the present STs may have

recognized the potential influence of personal demeanour on their own ability to influence children's social and learning responses.

Consequently, the following hypothesis emerged from analysis of the findings concerning dyad perceptions of ST achievements and assessment criteria:

a) There is a relationship between ST perceptions of personal assessment criteria and their perceptions about children's social and learning response.

According to the findings of the present study in terms of perceived overall assessment criteria, the STs were clearly concerned to be evaluated on their interaction with children. There appeared to be far less focus on assessment in relation to ST interaction with triad colleagues. Two of the five emergent assessment categories identified by STs were dominated by concern for their own students. Some of these STs were clearly concerned with how they 'got along' with their children (e.g., avoiding sarcasm and making the children feel comfortable). Speculatively, this view went beyond purely ST concern for child control and the response of children to the ST, as indicated by previous research (Schempp, 1986; Pettigrew, 1988).

Some present ST comments suggested a sense of developing more of a two way respect between the ST and the children. Encouragingly, half the STs also emphasized children learning as an area for STs to be assessed on. Even in earlier responses when STs had identified management and organization for observer feedback focus, these areas were seen by some STs as directly connected to helping children learn. The question raised, therefore, is why the STs in the present research group should have been more concerned with children learning than ST respondents in previous research (e.g., Placek, 1983; Schempp, 1986)?

Speculatively, this might relate to two possibilities. First, in depth semi structured interviews allow for a range of respondent perceptions to emerge and to be recognized. Instruments such as critical incidents or attitude surveys are not designed to collect such volume and diversity

of respondent perspectives. Consequently, STs' views about children learning may not have emerged so easily in previous investigation. However, secondly, ST respondents in earlier research had shorter student teaching experiences (i.e., 8 to 10 weeks total) than the present respondents. Therefore, this time period may not have allowed earlier research STs to move beyond what Furlong and Maynard (1995) have referred to as STs' concern for self, and children's social reaction toward them.

The present Teaching Centre STs had 16 weeks in the same student teaching sites interacting with the same children. Potentially, these STs had greater opportunity to move beyond a concern for self (Arrighi & Young, 1987), to focus more on their class needs and response in terms of child learning. Further, it is possible that with the Teaching Centre MCTs feeling greater responsibility for their children learning due to increased external accountability demands, these feelings may also have been transmitted to the STs. Such pressure may have heightened the ST focus in this area.

5. ST Child Understanding

Differences in dyad emphasis were displayed by both groups with regard to what it was hoped STs would learn/recognize about children through student teaching. However, both dyad groups highlighted one similar perspective; recognizing child differences (although they showed differing levels of identification on this theme). While a minority of MCTs identified the importance of ST recognition concerning children's developmental differences, all the STs identified the importance of their recognition in this area.

In contrast, the majority of MCTs identified the importance of STs recognizing factors perceived to influence the way in which children interacted with their teachers. MCTs' comments indicated they were looking beyond developmental factors to more social environmental influences on children. However, the STs were more concerned about recognizing as teachers, how children at various ages differed characteristically.

Consequently, the following hypothesis emerged from analysis of the findings concerning dyad perceptions of ST understandings about children:

a) There is a relationship between dyad perceptions of what influences children's response toward teachers and personal teaching experience.

Present study findings suggest the possibility that the MCTs through their increased amount of contextually situated teaching experience, were able to go beyond a focus on developmental influences effecting children's behaviour. In particular, MCTs acknowledged non developmental factors that their experience may have made them more aware of than the STs. After all, the STs had already indicated the need to benefit from on - going teaching experience and the recognition of everyday realities in a teacher's world. Likewise, some MCTs had pointed to ST need to recognize that outside class realities influence children to behave in certain ways. Overall, it was suggested that such recognition would help STs to avoid potential disillusionment with children and teaching.

To conclude this chapter a table has been provided. Table 10 highlights the main conclusions and hypotheses that emerged from this componential analysis of the alternative dyad participant groups' findings, as discussed in this chapter.

Chapter 12 which follows presents the ideas and conclusions that emerged when dyad group findings from both the traditional and alternative student teaching sites were compared. Clearly, this is an important analysis because it provides the opportunity to identify similar and differing potential site influences on dyad participants. Further, such analysis may also offer some guidance for future teacher education programme development, via comparative findings from two already operational student teaching designs.

Table 10

Summary of Main Conclusions and Hypotheses derived from the Alternative Dyad Group Findings

---

There is a relationship between the:

<u>Participant Purposes</u>

1   ...mode of supervisory feedback, role of the ST and the purpose of the MCT.

2   ...amount of time spent by MTs, CTs and USs working with the ST and their perceived influence on the ST.

3   ...MCTs' perceptions of the skills/knowledge that the US brings to student teaching and their perceptions of the purpose of the US in triad interaction.

4   ...MCT and ST perceptions of the diverse demands and time constraints that impinge on their work in the Teaching Centre, and their perceptions of others as support.

5   ...dyad perceptions of both the USs' purpose and the MCTs' purpose in interacting with the US.

<u>Observer Feedback</u>

6   ...dyad participants' teaching experience and their ability to identify specific ST feedback foci.

7   ...dyad participants' perceptions of both the purpose of feedback and their preferred methods of feedback presentation.

8   ...amount of time that dyad participants have to communicate and discuss feedback and their level of expressed satisfaction with the dyad relationship.

<u>ST Responsibilities</u>

9   ...STs' concern for a positive evaluation by triad colleagues and their perceptions of personal responsibilities toward the MCTs and US.

<u>ST Achievements</u>

10 ...dyad participants' perceptions of MCT concerns, ST lesson planning and ST assessment criteria.

11 ...ST perceptions of personal assessment criteria and their perceptions concerning children's learning response.

<u>ST Child Understanding</u>

12 ...dyad participants' perceptions of what influences children's response toward teachers and personal teaching experience.

Chapter 12

Traditional and Alternative Site Dyad Group Findings: Comparisons
and Conclusions

The purpose of this chapter was to conduct between site
comparisons of the leading findings that emerged from the traditional
and alternative dyad research groups (presented in Table 11). Between
site dyad group componential analysis was guided by the major
research question:

What do mentor - cooperating (MCT) and student teachers (ST) in a
traditional and alternative student teaching site perceive to be their
own purpose, and that of their school - based colleague during the
student teaching experience?

Conclusions are also drawn regarding the potential influence of site
design on particular highlighted dyad perceptions. Findings believed to
be either original or which contrast with those of previous research are
identified and discussed. The main overall generalizations emerging
from this analysis are presented in Table 12.

Further, this between site componential analysis is presented in
relation to the five summary areas that emerged from the present
researcher's analysis of the participants' interview responses. These
five areas are as follows:1) Participant Purposes; 2) Observer
Feedback; 3) ST Responsibilities; 4) ST Achievements; 5) ST Child
Understanding.

1. Participant Purposes

Concerning dyad perceived participant purposes, one major intra
site and inter site group theme emerged. This theme related to
participant perceptions of the mentor - cooperating teachers' (M)CTs)
purpose within the student teaching experience. In both traditional and
alternative sites, dyad participants focused predominantly on the idea
of the (M)CT as someone who fostered an environment in which STs
could make decisions themselves. In particular, an environment where

Table 11

Comparative Model of the Leading Traditional and Alternative Site Dyad Group
*Perceptions Concerning Self and Others' Purpose

Focus	TCT	TST	MCT	AST
Purposes				
a. (M)CT.	1 Encourage ST professional decision-making	1 Guide 2 Encourage ST experimentation 3 Information provider	1 Guide 2 Encourage ST pedagogic ideas	1 Assist ST problem solving 2 Nurturer
b. US	1 Guide/Resource 2 CT support	1 Facilitator 2 School-Uni., link 3 Evaluator	1 Provide feedback to STs 2 Overall director	1 Information provider 2 ST dyad support 3 School-Uni., link
Feedback				
a. Focus	1 ST instructional performance 2 ST lesson plans	1 ST pedagogic improvement	1 ST correction /improvement	1 Praise/correction 2 Self critique
b. Method and Mode	1 Written & verbal 2 Questions assist ST thinking	1 Written = remember/reflect 2 Question = reflect	1 Questions assist ST thinking	1 Written or with verbal 2Question&direction
ST Responsibility				
a. To (M)CT	1 Prepared for classes	1. Meet CT demands /expectations	1 Lesson plans in on time 2 Professional respect 3 Being prepared 4 Open communication	1 Proaction 2 Dyad teaching consistency 3 Show effective teaching
b. To US	1 Same as for CT	1 Meet US expectations 2 Communication 3 Show respect	1 Meet US requirements	1 Open communication
ST Achievement	1 Knowledgeable /confident teacher	1 Better teacher 2 Improved pedagogical skills	1 Professional self confidence/insight 2 Improved pedagogical skills	1 Learn from teaching process 2 Improved teaching skills
ST Evaluation Criteria	*No major criteria identified	1 Lesson planning 2 Professionalism 3 Child learning 4 ST interaction with others	1 Lesson planning	1 Demeanour 2 Rapport 3 Child learning 4 Lesson Planning 5 Managerial skill
ST Child Understanding	1 Recognize /respond to child differences 2 Meet child needs	1 Teacher-student motivators 2 Understand child development	1 Appreciation of teacher-student relationship	1 Child needs and differences

* All the above perceptions were identified by half or more participants in the relevant dyad group.

Table 12

Summary of the Main Generalizations Emerging from the Analysis of Dyad Group Findings in both the Traditional and Alternative Student Teaching Sites.

<u>Participant Purposes</u>

1. Dyad groups in both sites highlighted an important (M)CT purpose as that of fostering an environment in which STs could undertake some professional decision - making themselves.

2. STs in both sites (particularly, the Teaching Centre (TC) indicated an active rather than just passive personal role to assist in their own professional growth.

3. Traditional STs (TST) perceived the CT to be more an information - giver than did the STs in the TC.

4. While the traditional CTs (TCT) identified the US as more of a personal support in their work with the ST, the MCTs emphasized the US role in supporting the ST as a feedback provider re., pedagogical improvement.

5. STs perceived the US as an evaluator and a support figure, particularly, in the traditional site.

<u>Observer Feedback</u>

6. STs emphasized the importance of written feedback in terms of personal remembering, reflection and professional growth; lack of such observer information was felt to have a potentially negative effect on ST self development.

7. Dyad groups (particularly, the (M)CTs) emphasized the importance of feedback questioning in challenging ST reflection.

<u>ST Responsibilities</u>

8. (M)CTs highlighted STs being prepared for their classes; this perception was particularly related to lesson planning in the TC.

9. STs identified proaction as a personal responsibility owed to their (M)CTs, particularly, in the TC.

10. ST groups identified maintaining open communication with the US as a personal responsibility.

11. Dyad groups in the TC were both more diverse and unified in identifying ST responsibilities owed to the MCT, than were the traditional dyad groups. However, the TSTs identified more ST responsibilities owed to the US than did the other groups.

<u>ST Achievements</u>

12. (M)CTs wanted STs to become insightful, confident and knowledgeable teachers, including, but not limited to pedagogical ability. However, there was greater emphasis on ST improved pedagogical skillfulness by the MCTs at the TC than by the TCTs.

13. Lesson planning was identified as an important criteria against which to evaluate ST overall performance; particularly, by TC dyad groups.

14. ST groups were both more diverse and unified than were (M)CTS in terms of identified practical and personally oriented criteria against which to evaluate ST overall progress; such criteria included lesson planning and children's learning.

Table 12 (Con't)

<u>ST Child Understanding</u>

15. While all dyad groups identified the importance of STs recognizing the needs of children, ST ideas appeared more driven by a child development perspective; (M)CTs were more concerned with environmental influences on child response.

STs were encouraged to try their own ideas and to problem - solve.

Further, dyad participants in both sites also used the word 'guide' to summarize the (M)CT's purpose. Included within this descriptor was a sense of the (M)CTs providing both ST direction and facilitation. The STs in both sites also provided a sense of needing to feel personally involved in their own learning process, and having their (M)CTs recognize this need as well.

These findings provide evidence of what Brooks, et al., (1994) suggest is an area that needs much research; the role that STs play in their own teacher development. STs in both the present research sites did not give the impression that they perceived their role as passive. Nor, that their (M)CTs were expected to do all the giving while the STs contributed little themselves to the developmental process. Tabachnick, Popkewitz and Zeichner (1979) suggested that the STs role traditionally had been a passive one. However, the present STs were clearly very concerned to be allowed the opportunity to show initiative in their own professional growth.

Likewise, the (M)CTs in both sites indicated a desire to go beyond the idea of support and guidance suggested by Collison and Edwards (1994) as being typical of traditional CT behaviour. In fact, the perceptions of the dyads in the present research in terms of purpose, may suggest a desire by participants to move STs toward the transformational (Constable,1994). Present dyad groups seemed to want ST growth through some self analysis and pedagogical risk taking. This was in contrast to the idea of dyad participants being overly preoccupied with maintaining ST self esteem; in particular, maintaining such self esteem by allowing (even encouraging) STs to stay within their own comfort level.

Interestingly, this sense of STs being involved in their own development as an outcome of the (M)CT purpose, provided more a feeling of the hermeneutic supervisory approach (Walker, 1971), rather than the technical rational (Doyle, 1990). As indicated, there was a sense in both sites that the (M)CT purpose involved STs in becoming

more self directed; examining their own ideas and actions. There was less evidence that these four dyad groups perceived specific direction; particularly, that which focused on observable ST teaching performance to be a leading (M)CT supervisory purpose.

This sense of a facilitative relationship between the present (M)CTs and STs moves away from the more traditional, hierarchical apprenticeship model often associated with student teaching. The traditional model sees the school - based teacher occupying the role of the master pedagogue; one who provides an example that the ST attempts to imitate in terms of actions and attitudes (Arnstine, 1975).

The present dyad group perceptions of (M)CT purpose suggest a dyad model (especially when coupled with the STs' views on personal proaction, particularly in the Teaching Centre) that is more horizontal than vertical in its participant interaction. This more colleague interactive (rather than master to apprentice) model was originally intended within the Teaching Centre design (Jones, 1993). In particular, with STs personally selecting and working concurrently with three MCTs; the expectation was that STs would be encouraged via the process itself, to initiate actions and ideas to assist in their own development.

However, a noticeable concern for the (M)CTs focused on their ability to assess STs overall performance. In fact, (M)CTs identified few ST assessment criteria themselves. The Teaching Centre MCTs talked directly about lack of understanding concerning university goals for student teacher achievement. This is an important concern because Hardy (1997a) reported on the negative influence on physical education STs of observation/assessment disagreements and conflicting expectations.

Clearly, present findings indicate a need for Slippery Rock University teacher education faculty to develop in conjunction with the (M)CTs a more clearly defined set of ST achievement goals. In other words, ST competances to which the school - based teachers can subscribe and base their assessment on. Such university - school collaboration

concerning student teaching goals would help facilitate dyad interaction; particularly, by avoiding potentially conflicting teacher education goals within the same programme.

Interestingly (like the present research (M)CTs), mentor teachers in a study (Jones, et al., 1997) from England where a more highly structured competency - based student teaching experience exists (DFEE Circular 4/98), also saw encouragement of ST decision - making and experimenting as the responsibility of an effective mentor teacher. Yet, it also needs to be recognized that the present traditional - based STs (TST) perceived their CT purpose to include providing specific information to help them teach more effectively. In particular, the TSTs wanted to make use of the large store of experiences and ideas that their CTs possessed. In contrast, the alternative site STs (AST) did not identify their MCTs as information providers. In fact, the ASTs pointed to a lack of time within the Teaching Centre day for dyad interaction; particularly, with their CTs. These findings suggest that the ASTs' view of the MCTs' purpose with regard to information provision was less expectant than their TST counterparts.

Further, it is possible that the ASTs failure to respond in a similar manner to the TSTs concerning the (M)CT as perceived information - giver, also related to the more self directed nature of the Teaching Centre design. The ASTs may have felt that such specific information was more their responsibility to go and research, rather than waiting for their (M)CTs to provide to them. This speculation may also be supported by the ASTs identification of proactivity as a personal responsibility owed to their MCTs; a characteristic less identified by the TSTs.

In fact, this finding concerning (M)CT purpose and ST responsibility which was differently identified in the two present research sites by the ST groups, may represent some initial evidence. In particular, evidence of what Furlong et al., (1996) has described as those positive and critical attributes of successful school - based teacher preparation; ST self initiated and active involvement. The present research suggests

that this type of behaviour may actually be influenced by the design of the student teaching process, as evidenced by the response of the STs. Further, such findings would again move this type of present dyad model away from the traditional ST apprenticeship model, toward a situation which may potentially lead to new teachers who are more resourceful and less reliant on the actions of others.

General dyad group agreement also occurred concerning the purpose of the (M)CT in relation to working with the US. Participants in all the dyad groups indicated the need for effective communication between these two triad supervisory members. For the STs, (M)CT - US communication was vital in terms of keeping the US informed as to ST development. This would be a natural ST concern as STs in both sites (particularly, the traditional) had identified the US as an evaluator with limited observation time.

The supportive nature of the USs' purpose emerged from both (M)CT and ST comments. However, here the agreement appeared to have a different focus for the traditional CTs (TCT) and the Teaching Centre MCTs. Again, this difference may have arisen out of the two (M)CT groups potentially differing contextual needs. For example, one difference in site influence may relate to potential feelings of participant isolation. As speculated earlier (see Chapter 7), some of the traditional site dyad participant responses may have emerged due to a sense of isolation felt within the student teaching process. Yet, there is minimal research into the potential isolation experienced within the health and physical education student teaching dyad.

Historically, cooperating teachers have worked with only one ST at a time and rarely had the opportunity to interact with other dyad participants. Consequently, it would be natural for the present TCTs to look to the US as a guide, resource and a support for their own efforts with the ST. This would be particularly true for TCTs who felt accountability for the progress of their ST and to whom, therefore, the US would potentially be the only support for their efforts.

In contrast, the centre MCTs did not express the need for US

support in terms of self, but rather for the ST and for the Teaching Centre process in general. MCTs worked in situations where they had possible contact opportunity with at least two other MCTs daily; peers with whom they could discuss supervisory concerns and ideas. The MCTs might also be working with up to three STs concurrently. Thus, this situation would enable them to compare, contrast and discuss different ST attitudes and actions. Further, MCTs might also experience more US visits/contacts due, both to the number of STs they may be working with and the number of STs working in their school - building(s). Consequently, it is very possible that the MCTs felt far less isolated in their student teaching endeavours than their traditional site counter - parts and, therefore, potentially less reliant on the presence of the US.

In fact, the MCTs and the ASTs may have been experiencing what Veal and Rickard (1998) suggest is a needed sense of 'community' in the student teaching process. Such a sense of community rather than isolation within the Teaching Centre design may relate directly to centre dyad participants increased opportunities to interact (including with the US) and share information.

In contrast to the TCTs focus on the US as a personal support and resource, all the centre MCTs wanted the US to provide support first to the STs by way of feedback provision. This MCT perception was understandable as feedback was an area that especially those who had operated in the CT mode within the centre had expressed concern about providing. In particular, these concerns had centred on ST feedback provision in relation to available dyad interaction time in the centre.

Interestingly, this limitation seems to have led the MCTs to assign a very specific role to the US in relation to their work with the centre ASTs. Previous research as Chapter 3 indicates has identified the confusion amongst triad participants with regard to the purpose of others in student teaching. In particular, tensions have arisen between CTs and USs due to participant confusion over the US role (Rothman, 1981).

Consequently, the Teaching Centre approach appears to have

helped define a very important, specific and generally MCT perceived role for the US. Speculatively, this US role may have emerged, in part, through MCTs working in a context which engendered for them, less feelings of isolation and need for external support for self. In fact, this situation seems to have given greater credence to the USs' purpose in the triad process; a purpose that has in the past been marginalized or placed outside the operation of the dyad (Veal & Rickard, 1998). The centre MCTs appeared to suggest a complimentary role for the US. Further, such a US role would be in keeping with the collaborative model of supervision involving shared power and mutual dependency; a model identified as important by CTs in a study by Veal and Rickard (1998).

This greater specificity assigned to the role of the US within the triad at the Teaching Centre would also be particularly important in teacher education processes emphasizing increased school - based components. After all, continued triad marginalization of the US role in teacher education programmes with a reduced university - based component, would, potentially have serious effects; particularly, in terms of the universities ability to influence ST development.

Further, Brooks, et al., (1994) have referred to the act of inducting others into a professional role as creating a reflective environment where supervising teachers themselves may become more self aware and critical. The present research findings suggest that the more fluid and dynamic the supervisory process along with participant interactions (such as in the Teaching Centre), the more focused (M)CTs become in relation to recognizing their own supervisory strengths and limitations. In fact, such a situation may encourage (M)CTs in being not only more supportive of the USs' role, but may also create more meaningful opportunities for (M)CT inservice. In particular, inservice experiences that are driven by the perceived contextual needs of the school - based teachers themselves, rather than being externally directed.

In terms of ST perceptions, both site groups saw the US as a school - university link and a dyad support. However, there was greater

identification of these two US purposes by the TSTs than the ASTs. Speculatively, this difference may have been due to increased TST feelings of isolation. Like their MCTs, the ASTs may simply have felt less isolated through the centre design than was the case for their traditional - based counterparts. After all, the ASTs worked with three MCTs concurrently, had daily opportunities to meet and talk, at least, in passing with other ASTs and potentially saw their US about their buildings more often than occurred in the traditional setting.

This potentially less isolated Teaching Centre context for dyad participants as suggested by analysis of the findings is very important to recognize. In particular, as the research of Swarswick (1990) found that STs gave their highest ratings "...to sharing ideas, experience and expertise with other students" (p. 204). Clearly, there was more opportunity for AST interaction with their peers in the Teaching Centre, than for the TSTs. Again, such interaction was one of the original intentions for the centre design (Jones, 1993).

The possible influence of isolation in present dyad participants' perceptions, points to the importance of teacher education school - based components being carefully designed. In particular, being constructed with due recognition to the positive influence a closely located cohort of STs (verses haphazard ST placements - Tannehill & Goc - Karp,1992) may have on each others' development. Further, the present research suggests the potential benefit of on - going ST peer interaction in the Teaching Centre; possibly reducing ST reliance on the more traditional supervisory supports (ie., (M)CTs and USs).

Consequently, the more emphasis that teacher education comes to place on school - based teacher preparation the more the opportunity for on - going ST peer interaction would seem to gain in importance. In fact, such group support may act as a counter balance to ST feelings of isolation, undue influence by any single supervisor and ST over concern for self.

Despite the number of MCTs they worked with, the findings of the present study do not indicate that the ASTs felt any lack of concern on

the part of their MCTs for their development. This is in contrast to some of the STs in the research of Foskett, et al., (1994) who expressed this sentiment while working concurrently with four supervisors. Foskett, et al., called for a ST 'lynch pin' who would help to avoid such ST feelings regarding perceived lack of supervisory concern. This call may be exemplified in the role of the Teaching Centre mentor teacher (ie., the AST's self selected major school - based supervisor), to whom the AST could look for increased interaction opportunities and potential nurturing.

As indicated, both groups of STs did suggest the personal supportive nature of the US, particularly, through the USs' ability to help (M)CTs understand both ST opinions and instructional approaches (which may have been encouraged through university preparation). Such US supportive action on the behalf of the ST may well have been perceived to help to facilitate dyad interaction, thereby, decreasing potential ST feelings of isolation and stress. This speculation may be supported by other research (e.g., Aspinwall, et al., 1994; Rothwell, et al., 1994) which indicates that while STs felt their school - based dyad colleague was in the best position to judge their performance, the US was perceived as helpful in providing moderation and a second opinion in dyad interactions.

Further, the fact of having more STs closely located and interacting within the Teaching Centre, may, have helped encourage the ASTs to feel as a group that it was easier to make the US aware of their ideas /concerns. As the ASTs were working with many of the same MCTs the ASTs generally held views potentially, would have become more easily recognizable to the MCTs. Further, US to MCT and US to AST interaction may have been easier and more on - going in the Teaching Centre. Consequently, such interactions may have been more impacting in terms of enlightening the US with regard to ST views; moreso than was possible for dyad participants to achieve in the traditional site.

Such a potentially more impacting situation in the centre might also

relate to an already identified finding of Veal and Rickard (1998). The cooperating teachers in their study believed that the sharing of information by triad members (in an open and honest manner) led to the developing of a sense of 'community' within the student teaching process. As already suggested, such a sense of community may well have been encouraged in the Teaching Centre design based on present emergent findings.

(M)CTs in both sites were also concerned with having the US provide guidance and direction for the student teaching experience itself. Inter site analysis indicated that the centre MCTs in particular, were aware of their own lack of understanding concerning the goals for ST attainment. They were unclear from university student teaching written materials (as Foskett, et al., 1994 suggest is not uncommon amongst school - based supervisors) as to what the university expected them to look for in ST performance. Consequently, the US would be a naturally identified source for MCT direction on questions such as this. Such ST goal clarification would be vital to achieve, especially, as Rothman (1981) found that confusion in this specific area was one of the most intense areas of interpersonal tension between the US and the cooperating teacher.

Also, working with up to three ASTs concurrently, the centre MCTs may have become acutely aware of the need to bring greater consistency to their own multi ST supervisory approach. Awareness of the influence of other MCTs working simultaneously with their STs may also have heightened this concern. Interestingly, this concern for supervisory consistency does not seem so apparent in the traditional setting where each TCT worked with one ST at a time. This difference may be because the TCTs were neither required to compare their supervisory approach between STs, nor, to consider the influence of other CTs on their STs' development.

Consequently, the present findings suggest that the Teaching Centre approach may encourage increased MCT reflection concerning personal supervisory knowledge and aims; potentially beyond that

stimulated by the traditional ST setting. Further, the student teaching process provide by the Teaching Centre with its emphasis on increased multi dyad interaction, again, as suggested earlier, may offer more opportunity for impacting inservice programmes provided in collaboration between the university and the school - based teachers (e.g., ST feedback methods; goals for ST attainment). After all, inservice that emerges out of the needs of the participants themselves has been found to be more influential than that which is imposed externally (Arends, 1983).

2. Observer Feedback

It is interesting to note that none of the four research participant groups when asked to highlight the (M)CTs' purpose, provided majority identification of lesson feedback as a major focus. However, when asked directly about the value of feedback all participants said that it was important to STs. Therefore, this finding suggests that feedback represents only one of a number of perceived purposes of the (M)CT, and for these four participant groups, not an overall dominant one.

If, as has been suggested (Dewar & Lawson, 1990; Tinning, 1990) the technical perspective is predominant in teacher preparation, then it might have been anticipated that providing specific lesson feedback would have been identified by participants as a leading purpose of the (M)CT. However, actual (M)CT purposes in this present research appear more closely aligned with the idea of hermeneutic supervision. Here, the emphasis is more on personal reflection and the recognition of contextual influence on an individual's behaviour.

This observation concerning perceived (M)CT supervisory purpose may serve to demonstrate what Doyle (1990) has referred to as the eclectic nature of teacher preparation. Doyle suggests that elements from different conceptual orientations toward teacher preparation can be found in the same programme.

In fact, it was a sense of the personal orientation with STs being encouraged to think through their own problems and try their own ideas that seemed to emerge from present dyad participants concerning the

(M)CTs overall purpose. However, what might be described as a more practical orientation (Feiman - Nemser, 1990) was also evident in participant group findings. As indicated, all four dyad groups pointed to the use of feedback in correcting ST teaching performance. There was general participant agreement that lesson feedback should focus on STs' practical skills; instructional, organizational and managerial.

Published physical education university teacher educators (eg., Sparkes, et al., 1990; Tinning, 1990) talk of the dominance of the technical perspective in teacher education. Yet, again, such technical foci do not seem to be dominant concerns in the present research school - based sites. Therefore, this begs the question as to how well received more specific structures would be which require school - based teacher educators to focus predominantly on measurable, practical ST competences? The present study participants perceived specific, more observable competances as being only a part of both the supervisory process and the well rounded teachers make up.

Clearly, if as Linda Darling - Hammond et al., (1995) suggests collaboration between participants in school - based teacher education is the way to develop more effective field - based teacher education programmes; then no one group involved can expect to force its perspective on others. This would seem particularly true when considering that the top down historical approach does not seem to have created the ST outcomes desired within the traditional and much criticized (eg., Tabachnick & Zeichner, 1984; 1985; Zeichner, 1987; Tannehill & Goc - Karp, 1992) student teaching approach.

Further, governmental imposition of increased school - based teacher education such as in England, also, appears to have initiated problems; particularly, from the perspective of teacher educators who are expected to implement such schemes (Jones, et al., 1997; Wright & Bottery, 1997). Consequently, collaboration between groups directly involved in teacher education is vital; especially if frameworks for student teaching are to be effectively developed that are embraced by all groups concerned.

The concept of ST reflection also emerged from the present findings in relation to feedback. Feiman - Nemser (1990) has suggested that advocates from all the teacher preparation orientations would claim that STs in their programmes do reflect on questions. In the present study, having STs reflect was obviously linked to the perceived (M)CT purposes of encouraging ST personal professional decision - making, experimentation, ideas and problem - solving.

Opportunity for reflection on observer feedback was evidently important to the present STs. This may have been why ST groups placed greater identificatory emphasis than did the (M)CTs on the place and value of written feedback. In fact, the majority of the STs expressed a preference for written, or a combination of written and verbal feedback. Further, ST responses indicated that lack of written feedback could negatively influence dyad interaction and reflection. Dangers included dyad participants forgetting important points that were observed or suggested and, thus, not being able to reflect enough on or having a concrete base for later conferencing and discussion.

However, for the STs the idea of reflection as a part of the student teaching process appeared to go beyond initial discussion with their dyad colleague. There was a sense that STs needed to be able to go away with some concrete information that would enable them to continue to reflect on observer feedback. In turn, this would allow STs to come back at a later time if necessary, to discuss matters with their (M)CTs. Also, emphasis on ST reflection using more 'lasting' information would be in keeping with the centre ASTs' identified responsibility of being proactive (ie., personal problem - solving and lesson preparation). Further, such lasting information may have helped lessen AST concern about the time available for conferencing; particularly with their centre CTs.

Having both the opportunity and the means to reflect may also connect to a sense of the 'self' (Zeichner,1979; Dodds,1989; Brooks, et al., 1994) being directly involved in the development of STs. Speculatively, providing both opportunities and methods that

encourage ST reflection, particularly in private, may represent the beginning step in what Constable (1994) implies is missing in traditional dyad interaction. For Constable, traditional dyad interaction has not usually seen encouragement of STs to move toward transformational development. Rather, there has more often been a dyad preoccupation with the maintaining of ST self esteem than encouraging ST professional risk - taking and challenge.

Rossi (1996) suggested that "...reflection is a complex process that operates on several levels and requires the collection of good data for it to be in any way meaningful" (p. 187). The present research indicates that the first step in collecting 'good data' is that it should be available long enough for STs to be able to reflect carefully upon it. To achieve progressively deeper levels of reflection requires STs to be able to return to original questions and ideas. It should not be expected that STs can hold all feedback data provided cognitively, especially under the stress of daily teaching.

Further, STs may feel that their self esteem is less threatened through private reflection; particularly, because they are not confronted by the need for image management in front of their supervisors. Additionally, STs will also have the time to think through new ideas and strategies. According to Elbaz (1988) this reflective time may help STs to translate complex theoretical constructs into reality before they meet the scrutiny of colleagues and children.

However, from the present (M)CTs' perspective there was a concern about the amount of time needed for written observation. Some (M)CTs were also uncertain as to whether written comments had any greater effect than verbal on ST development. Clearly, the findings of the present research indicate that receiving 'lasting' feedback, particularly written, was important to the majority of the STs; at the very least psychologically in terms of their professional development.

Therefore, this differing dyad group emphasis on the value of written feedback represents another example of how personal perceptions may be influenced, both by the different contexts and needs that dyad

participants experience during student teaching. Consequently, these differences may have influenced present participants' perspectives concerning the perceived needs of others.

Related to this theme of ST reflection was the topic of ST challenge via the use of supervisory questioning. Despite less emphasis by (M)CTs than STs on the need for written feedback, all four groups were supportive of (M)CT provided written or verbal feedback utilizing questioning; particularly, where questioning was used as a means to challenge ST reflection. The two (M)CT groups more so than the STs identified the importance of questioning in encouraging ST thinking. This finding would logically link to the earlier (M)CT identified self purposes of encouraging ST decision - making and pedagogical ideas. Further, it also relates to the STs' perceptions of the (M)CT assisting ST experimentation and problem - solving.

Interestingly, in relation to 'mode' of feedback only the TST group indicated majority support for the usefulness of receiving specific 'to the point' TCT directions. This finding may well relate to the TST group's earlier identification of a TCT purpose as that of information provider. However, overall, the present findings suggest that ST reflection was important to all the participant groups in this study. In particular, reflection was perceived as vital in influencing ST development as it related to dyad participants' perceptions regarding (M)CT purpose, observer feedback and ST challenge via questioning.

Clearly, the implication of these present findings related to ST reflection are important to recognize in the development of teacher education school - based experiences. For example, it needs to be recognized that the (M)CTs in the present research did not appear to be aware of the degree to which STs believed in the value of receiving more 'lasting' forms of supervisory feedback. Therefore, such (M)CT lack of awareness regarding ST feedback concerns may have influenced both their views and actions toward STs in this area.

Again, such 'lasting' feedback may help STs reduce stress levels, self esteem damage and the need to become defensive in terms of image

management in front of others. Further, it may have provided opportunities for STs to develop new ideas and attitudes. In fact, much of the value of lasting feedback may relate to the psychological benefits perceived by the STs. However, changes in ST psychological perspectives may not be easily observed by supervisors. Thus, it is probable that supervisors fail to recognize the needs of STs in this area regarding feedback. In particular, by not recognizing the influence that lasting forms of feedback may have on ST development through effectively stimulated personal reflection.

Based on the above analysis concerning feedback mode and reflection, teacher education school - based programmes may, again, wish to consider the impact of the trend during the 1990s towards specifically defining the knowledges and skills a ST should possess upon completion of student teaching. Both time constraints for dyad interaction (Jones, 1993; Hardy, 1997b) and large numbers of specifically required outcomes (eg., England's DFEE Circular 4/98) may limit supervisory teachers' desire to allow STs the opportunity to develop their own ideas and attitudes. Particularly, in areas such as those suggested by the present (M)CTs and STs (ie., encourage ST decision - making, pedagogical ideas, experimentation and problem - solving).

The views of mentor teachers presented in a study from England (Jones, et al.,1997) suggests that meeting highly specified goals, along with some purposes (e.g., ST pedagogical risk taking) similar to those identified by the present research participants, may be difficult to achieve. The English mentors indicated that the competency - based student teaching framework in which they were required to operate, did not allow for regular dyad interaction time, immediate feedback or mentor availability; areas perceived as vital to effective mentor teacher - ST functioning.

3. ST Responsibilities

(M)CTs in both sites were in agreement that in terms of ST responsibility toward the (M)CT, the STs should be prepared for their

classes. While some TCTs commented on this preparation being related to planning, the majority of the Teaching Centre MCTs stated specifically the need for STs to have their lesson plans ready and in on time. Working with up to three ASTs concurrently and having only certain amounts of dyad interaction time available, the centre MCTs would understandably place clear emphasis on knowing that their STs were ready to teach individual lessons. Therefore, lesson plans would provide acceptable, concrete evidence of ST readiness to achieve defined objectives regarding children's learning and safety.

This (M)CT emphasis on ST planning is interesting in relation to previous research. The minimal research (Placek, 1983; 1984) conducted on physical education teacher planning suggests that little formal planning is actually undertaken by such teachers. However, it is possible that the increased emphasis on teaching accountability via competency - based education at the K-12 level in Pennsylvania (Jones, 1992a) during the early 1990s, has encouraged greater teacher focus on planning in general. Further, (M)CT legal responsibility for ST actions may also be a potentially potent driving force for (M)CTs perceptions concerning ST lesson planning.

Both present research site groups of STs identified proaction as a personal responsibility toward their (M)CTs. Yet, a larger number of the ASTs highlighted this factor than TSTs. It is possible that this finding relates to the already mentioned (M)CT perception concerning STs being prepared for class. As indicated, the Teaching Centre MCTs had specifically identified planning as an AST responsibility owed toward them. Therefore, proaction as a characteristic may be directly related (particularly in the centre) to the idea of STs having their lesson plans ready and into their (M)CTs on time.

This finding on ST focus on proaction is important. In particular, as research by Wade (1997) has indicated that encouraging ST proactivity leads to positive outcomes for both STs and their own students. Consequently, the design of the Teaching Centre process may be influential in relation to increased emphasis on ST proactivity.

Interestingly, the ASTs had not (unlike the TSTs) identified to the same degree the MCTs' purpose as that of an information source. This difference may have been because of the ASTs on - going interaction with three MCTs in two or three different schools. The more complex dyad interaction in the centre process, may, therefore, have encouraged STs to seek out their own information; in contrast to expecting it to be provided for them. Such proactive professional behaviour may have been particularly exemplified in terms of ASTs preparing their own up - coming lessons, while using their personal initiative and resources.

Further, the 1990s has seen within United States education, a shift towards evaluation of teachers through portfolio assessment, rather then the traditional administrative observation of 'one - off' lessons. Much of this more recent form of assessment now focuses on teacher ability to plan in 'concrete' form. Consequently, this present study emphasis on planning as both a ST responsibility and a focus for their evaluation would seem to represent a direct teacher evaluation connection; in particular, to the more 'concrete' forms of teacher accountability that have been introduced during the 1990s.

With regard to their responsibility toward the US, both groups of STs identified the importance of their maintaining open communication with the supervisor. This is not an unexpected finding when considered in relation to previous ST views concerning perceived (M)CT and US purpose. After all, STs in both sites (particularly the TSTs) had identified the US as a ST evaluator. Therefore, STs were probably influenced by the power that the US was perceived to have concerning successful student teaching assessment. ST desire to keep open communication channels with the triad colleague holding this type of perceived influence would be understandable.

However, participants from all the dyad groups had perceived difficulties for the US in recognizing and evaluating ST development; particularly, due to the few US observations conducted. Clearly, the STs would want to keep the US informed with regard to their personal

development. Further, ST potential awareness of any (M)CT - US communication problems may have led to increased ST concern for the personal maintenance of ST - US communication. Also, STs in both sites had earlier identified a US purpose as that of facilitating smooth dyad interaction. Thus, open communication with the supervisor would represent another vital interaction factor; this time in aiding the dyad facilitation process.

Interestingly, in terms of ST responsibilities owed to the (M)CT and US the traditional site - based dyad groups identified six in which at least half of the specific group concerned concurred. In contrast, the alternative site - based dyad groups provided nine such responsibilities. Further, the MCTs at the Teaching Centre seemed more specific and unified than the TCTs in terms of the responsibilities they perceived their STs owed towards them.

Such (M)CT group perceptual difference may relate to the concern identified earlier regarding lack of dyad conferencing time; particularly, for the centre ASTs and their CTs. Working with up to three ASTs concurrently, the MCTs may have been more keenly aware of the need for their ASTs to be proactive (ie., personally responsible) in several areas (e.g., lesson plans in on time; open dyad communication).

Likewise, the ASTs were both more diverse and uniform in their identification of personal responsibilities owed to their MCTs, than were the TSTs. The ASTs seemed to relate to the MCT implication that being responsible required ST self initiating as they specifically identified the personal ST responsibility of proaction. Speculatively, having to work with at least four supervisors in the Teaching Centre meant ASTs had to quickly become good 'readers'; in particular, regarding the needs of their dyad colleagues. After all, if time at the centre was at a premium, ASTs may well have felt the urgency to respond to perceived dyad colleague needs before being specifically asked.

This increased specificity from the Teaching Centre dyad groups concerning ST responsibilities toward the MCT raises an important question; does the dynamic, more fluid interaction of centre dyad

groups necessitate greater participant reflection concerning self and others' needs? Further, would such potential self reflection set within a process encouraging increased dyad interaction lead to greater recognition of what is required from oneself and one's colleagues; particularly, in terms of enabling participants to experience feelings of success? Again, the traditionally sited dyad groups did not appear to delineate ST to (M)CT responsibilities so clearly.

Consequently, based on the present findings it does appear that a process is developing in the Teaching Centre that encourages clearer dyad perspectives with regard to ST responsibilities. Further, such development in centre dyad perceptions may relate to the increased emphasis on ST proaction, and the apparent recognition by MCTs of both their own supervisory abilities and their contextual limitations.

However, the present findings also indicate that it was the TSTs who identified more ST responsibilities owed to the US and in greater unison than the ASTs. This finding may relate to an earlier suggestion concerning (M)CT and US purpose that the traditional dyad participants, may, in fact, have been more acutely aware of their own isolation in the student teaching process; thus more in need of 'outside' support for themselves. For the TSTs it is therefore possible the US represented a more important factor in their professional experience (in terms of concern for self) than was the case for the ASTs. In particular, the TSTs had focused more on a sense of deference to the US; someone whose expectations should be met and who deserved TST respect.

4. ST Achievements

As to what (M)CTs hoped STs would achieve over the duration of the student teaching experience the groups in both sites referred to STs becoming insightful, self confident and knowledgeable teachers. However, perceptions went beyond purely a concern for ST pedagogical skillfulness to a greater teacher awareness of the complexity of teaching in schools today.

The two groups of STs also displayed a potentially related perception

to that given by their (M)CTs. The TSTs referred to what was categorized as becoming a 'better teacher.' Within this they talked about the importance of learning from 'hands on' teaching experience. Likewise, the ASTs' comments also revolved around learning from their teaching process experience. STs' perceptions, like those of their (M)CTs went beyond the more pedagogical lesson - based skills and hinted at less easily definable teacher learning. The ASTs, in particular, seemed to have difficulty in clearly defining the characteristics of such learning.

Clearly, both groups of STs were very aware of the impact of actual teaching experience on their professional development. This present finding supports the research (Locke, 1979; Applegate, 1987) indicating student teaching to be the most influential of the teacher preparation experiences. However, the question arises as to why both ST groups (particularly, the ASTs) should have had some difficulty in clearly defining what it was that they specifically learned from their student teaching experience. This finding is supported by other research. For example, Duquette (1997) also found that prospective teachers in field - based experiences had difficulty in clearly defining their own development. She suggested that STs need to be assisted in learning how to learn from their ST experiences.

Interestingly, it may be that the present STs; particularly the ASTs needed time to step back from this entire experience, and reflect on the influence of this semester long process. Such post student teaching reflection may help STs to identify and understand the many factors that have impinged on their overall professional learning and development. Further, the idea of delayed ST recognition may be supported by Rothwell et al., (1994) who found that ex interns (i.e., STs) identified personal realizations about their student teaching experience that actual practicing interns did (or could) not.

This present research finding concerning ST recognition regarding personal learning raises an issue about the culminating preparatory experience within United States traditional teacher education.

According to Rothwell, et al., (1994) STs come to recognize more about the influence of student teaching on themselves after they have completed this component. Such data suggests, therefore, that there is a need for post student teaching follow up to take advantage of potential ST recognitions that may occur after the final experience is completed. However, if follow up work with STs after their student teaching is not possible, then at the least there needs to be carefully structured seminars focused on helping STs to clarify and understand (ie., learn) their on - going experiences, as suggested by Duquette (1997). Such suggestions as the above would seem even more imperative to consider in increasingly school - based teacher preparation programmes.

The time factor in the Teaching Centre site may also have influenced a difference that emerged between the two (M)CT group findings concerning ST achievement. As indicated, both groups identified STs becoming more confident teachers as a goal for achievement. Further, some TCTs also mentioned ST professional responsibility, career confirmation and job appreciation. However, the centre MCTs focused predominantly on pedagogical skills.

Speculatively, this (M)CT group difference in emphasis may have related to the TCTs having only one ST and the entire school day for dyad interaction. In other words, they simply may have had more time to focus on other more non pedagogical goals. In contrast, the MCTs with less daily time, potentially up to three STs with which to work and possible concern with teaching accountability, may, have been more keenly focused on the development of their STs' teaching skills.

Further, this present finding concerning the emphasis in the Teaching Centre on the development of ST teaching skills connects to a growing focus during the 1990s on teacher accountability in the learning environment. In the United States, critics (Lyons, 1979; Bushweller, 1995) have suggested a perceived lack of emphasis in teacher education on teachers' instructional ability. In fact, in England, external governmental direction has emphasized teacher education

focus more specifically on ST instruction (DFEE, Circular 4/98).

However, in the present study the Teaching Centre process itself (rather than non teacher education influences) seems to have engendered a greater dyad pedagogical concern related to ST achievement. In particular, there was a concern with the act of teaching itself and how ST development could be more effectively assisted in this area. Relatedly (as indicated earlier), the important role of the US in assisting ST pedagogical development/achievement also emerged from the present study findings in the Teaching Centre.

In terms of the perceived criteria against which ST performance should be assessed, lesson planning was a factor that clearly emerged from the comments of both ST groups and the centre MCTs. Dyad focus on planning was particular unified in the Teaching Centre. Again, such centre dyad unity may have related to participants' concerns regarding interaction time, the number of ASTs that MCTs worked with concurrently and curriculum and safety goals. Also, planning had been perceived earlier, particularly, by the MCTs as an important ST responsibility allowing quick assessment of ST readiness to teach specific lessons.

Further, Teaching Centre MCTs' may also have perceived planning to be the one 'concrete' method they could use to compare and contrast the developing pedagogical understanding of the STs with whom they worked. Such comparisons may have been felt more difficult to make via observed teaching; particularly, with ASTs instructing children both in different classes and at various grade levels. The MCTs may have believed that context influences variability in ST teaching performance. Thus, for the MCTs planning principles may have been perceived to be more generalizable and open to comparative assessment.

Potentially, the present findings concerning planning may suggest a process driven by the desire of centre MCTs and the ST groups to develop and utilize on - going written records; in particular, as evidence of ST 'concrete' pedagogical development and for assisting summative

ST assessment. Further, such emphasis on planning ties in with the 'push' during the 1990s for increased 'concrete' evidence of both teacher accountability and assessment' (ie., teacher assessment portfolios, including detailed units and daily plans).

In fact, planning, besides managerial skill (a continual concern for STs in the research literature - Furlong & Maynard, 1995) was the only dyad identified evaluation criteria that related to the concept of ST technical skill achievement. In contrast to their perceptions concerning goals for ST achievement, the more technical/practical factors did not weigh heavily in ST identification of criteria against it was felt personal performance should be assessed. This assessment finding supports earlier research by Isele (1989) which indicated that effective teaching skill criteria was not the dominant mode used in summative ST evaluation.

This is an interesting finding considering some theoretical literature (e.g., Dewar & Lawson, 1990; Tinning, 1990) which suggests the dominance of the technical paradigm in teacher preparation. However, as Doyle (1990) indicates the reality of teacher education may well be constructed more out of the eclectic orientations of involved faculty who are situated nationally in both the schools and universities. Clearly, this speculation holds implication for teacher education development. It raises the question about the reasons for the apparent minimal desire on the part of school - based teacher educators and STs (such as those in the present study) to focus ST assessment more on technical criteria. Further, another question is whether externally imposing such assessment focus via increased competency - based criteria will lead to improved school - based teacher education re., ST pedagogical development?

Imposing a particular perspective on school - based teacher education is unlikely to lead to the development of goals and participant roles that are perceived relevant by all those involved in the process (Welch, 1998). Evidence from the present research suggests that the careful design of the school - based student teaching process (when

supported by those involved) can encourage the development of certain desired participant perspectives. However, present perspectives also indicate more specific participant recognition regarding the concerns, needs and contextual limitations that influence both self and others.

As indicated, the majority of the present research findings concerning perceived ST evaluation criteria were not specifically technical or practical skill - based. STs identified professionalism, demeanour, rapport and interaction with others along with children learning, as factors against which ST performance should also be assessed. In fact, direct reference to Table 11 indicates that the ST groups, more so than the (M)CTs were both more diverse and unified in their identification of the overall criteria against which they perceived they should be evaluated.

Interestingly, the STs also seemed more inclined to share their views with regard to perceived overall evaluation criteria than did their (M)CTs. Speculatively, this dyad difference may relate to an earlier identified (M)CT concern (particularly, in the centre) regarding exactly what were the university teacher preparation goals for ST achievement. The (M)CTs may not have felt confident about identifying criteria on which to summatively assess ST performance. Such a concern would also gain support from research by Campbell and Horbury (1994). They found that school - based supervisors demonstrated feelings of insecurity when it came to being asked to assess the competence of their STs. Thus, this may be why the present (M)CTs themselves indicated during the research interviews that they perceived the US's report rather than their own, to represent the most formal assessment of ST performance.

This present finding suggests the need for teacher education to collaboratively develop criteria which would help guide and evaluate ST development. In fact, teacher educators in the United States need to take the lead in such school - based teacher preparation developments. They need to demonstrate leadership in a field that is open to

intervention and change by groups outside teacher education. Potentially, non teaching groups might seek to impose more specific ST guidelines which show minimal consideration for the orientations, ideas and research findings of those working within teacher education. In fact, there are those who suggest this is what has already happened in England with governmental driven teacher education reform (Gilroy, 1992).

In terms of the orientations demonstrated by the present research participants, the practical orientation was evident in the perceptions of all the dyad groups in terms of skills for ST achievement. Yet, as indicated this was not the case when it came to identifying criteria for assessing STs overall performance. From both ST groups there was a sense of the importance of the personal orientation; more a focus on one's overall influence on others. Feelings of professionalism and rapport outlined by the STs suggested a sense of responsibility beyond the routine performance of a job (e.g., influencing the positive development of others via role modeling). Further, while the TSTs emphasized establishing rapport with colleagues the ASTs focused more on their interactions with children. In fact, both ST groups highlighted children learning as another criteria by which to evaluate ST performance.

Speculatively, the TSTs' perspective which focused on their interaction with others outside of both dyad colleagues and children, may, again, relate to an already highlighted problem; TST potential sense of professional isolation. In contrast, the ASTs' sense of rapport focused more on interaction with their dyad colleagues and, particularly, with children. Again, increased opportunities for both peer and different dyad colleague interaction at the Teaching Centre, may, have 'freed' the ASTs to focus more on their children. However, as indicated both ST groups did focus on children's learning as a criterion against which to evaluate ST achievement.

In fact, this ST focus on children learning represents another present study finding that appears to to move away from previous research

findings in physical education (Placek, 1883; Schempp, 1986; Pettigrew, 1988). Past investigations have suggested a lack of concern on the part of physical education STs for their children learning. Speculatively, the present study focus on children's learning may be another example of a potential ST movement away from a predominant concern for self. Such self concern was very evident in the physical education research of the 1980s (Boggess, McBride & Griffey, 1985; Arrighi & Young, 1987). However, the present research suggests more ST regard for personal influence on children and their learning.

ST focus on children learning is important to recognize because this ST perceptual trend connects directly to the assessment of teachers in the 1990s. In particular, to a method of assessment which at the most basic level looks at teacher influence on children's standardized test scores, both within and between schools. Teachers are clearly being held more accountable for their influence on the learning of children. Consequently, the present STs may have been showing a recognition of this more recent trend in teacher accountability.

5. ST Child Understanding

The comments by present STs in response to what they perceived to be the criteria against which their student teaching performance should be assessed, indicated, that they were concerned with their influence on children. Dyad groups in both sites highlighted that it was important for STs to recognize the differences that exist in children. However, it is interesting to note the potential origin of this dyad group focus with regard to child differences. Both groups of STs focused predominantly on the developmental differences of children. In contrast, the two (M)CTs groups were more concerned that the STs understand the influence of everyday life on children.

Comments from STs suggested that they were operating from the perspective of university course preparation knowledge concerning child differences. However, (M)CTs appeared to be commenting from the perspective of their extensive daily experiences with children. This difference between MCT and ST group perspectives, again, may,

represent another example of how contextual experience impacts present participants' knowledge, concerns and views regarding the needs of self and others.

Further, this (M)CT perspective suggests that the (M)CT groups recognized what research (Cruickshank, et al., 1974; Jones, 1992b) has indicated; children's behavior strongly impacts the perceptions of STs. (M)CTs may have wanted STs to recognize the influence of the environment on children's social, academic and psychomotor responses. In particular, (M)CTs may have been concerned that STs would not become disillusioned due to some children's negative responses, potentially, stimulated by environmental influences beyond ST influence.

Also, the length of the present student teaching experience (which was longer than that experienced by STs involved in research during the 1980s) may have allowed the present STs to move beyond the 'survival' level (Furlong & Maynard, 1995). In fact, more student teaching practice time may have enabled present STs to develop a level of confidence which allowed them to focus more on their children's needs (eg., learning), rather than their own.

Clearly, this movement in ST focus toward the needs of their students is an important finding; particularly, as such emphasis on children's needs and learning should be explicitly encouraged at a time when teacher accountability focuses more on child outcomes. There now seems to be opportunity if the present study findings are an indication, to help STs understand not only the maturational but the equally important social, contextual influences that impact child response in the learning environment. Again, such a ST development would seem particularly helpful in an era of increasing school - based teacher education.

In conclusion, Table 13 presents a model of the perceived benefits and disadvantages that were experienced by dyad group participants working in the present traditional and alternative student teaching sites. Specifically, this model highlights participant experiences that emerged

from, and have been discussed within the comparative analysis of the dyad group findings presented in this chapter.

Further, Chapter 13 which follows provides a summary of the major findings and implications derived from this study. In particular, the major themes are highlighted along with the key contributions to knowledge that the present study provides. Implications for present and future health and physical education teacher education are also suggested.

Table 13

A Model of the Potential Professional Benefits (+) and Disadvantages (-)
Experienced by Dyad Participants working in the Traditional and the Alternative
Student Teaching Sites.

Traditional Site

+ STs demonstrated an increased sense of the value of CT professional experience as a source
    for ideas and direction.

+ STs demonstrated an increased sense of awareness of the USs' role and the influence on self;
    particularly, concerning US authority and ST professional evaluation.

- CTs and STs demonstrated a potentially increased sense of professional isolation in relation
    to the perceived purposes for self and others in the student teaching process.

Alternative Site

+ MCTs identified a specific purpose for the US related to the support of the STs' pedagogical
    development.

+ MCTs and STs demonstrated a potential sense of professional community within the Teaching
    Centre related to both personal purpose and perceptions of the role and influence of the US.

+ MCTS and STs demonstrated more emphasis on the importance and accountability of ST
    lesson planning.

+ STs demonstrated more concern for written feedback in relation to both professional self
    critique and empowerment.

+ STs demonstrated more concern for personal proaction in relation to their triad responsibilities.

+ MCTs and STs demonstrated more awareness of specific ST responsibilities toward the MCT.

- MCTs felt that centre design time constraints limited their dyad feedback effectiveness;
    particularly; in terms of the CTs' role.

- MCTs demonstrated concern regarding their knowledge of prior university teacher preparation
    programme experiences and the goals for ST achievement.

Traditional and Alternative Site Benefit Similarities

+ (M)CTs demonstrated a concern for encouraging ST decision - making and ideas.

+ STs demonstrated a concern for (M)CTs assisting ST experimentation and problem - solving.

+ STs demonstrated a concern for both lesson planning ability and children's learning as potential
    criteria for evaluating ST performance.

Chapter 13

Major Research Findings and Implications

This chapter summarizes the major findings and related implications
that emerged from analysis and comparison of the present research
data. The key contributions to the teacher education knowledge - base
derived from the present research are presented in Table 14.

Data was provided by four dyad groups whose participants (N = 30)
were working in either a traditional or an alternative designed student
teaching experience at Slippery Rock University (PA., U.S.A.). The
investigation findings sought to answer the major research question
that guided this study:

What do mentor - cooperating (MCT) and student teachers (ST) in a
traditional and alternative student teaching site perceive to be their
own purpose, and that of their school - based colleague during the
student teaching experience?

This summary chapter is presented in relation to the five descriptive
areas that originally emerged from the present researcher's analysis of
the study participants' interview responses. These five areas are as
follows:1) Participant Purposes; 2) Observer Feedback; 3) ST
Responsibilities; 4) ST Achievements; 5) ST Child Understandings.
1. Participant Purposes

The (M)CTs in both sites perceived their purpose to involve the
encouragement of ST professional decision - making and pedagogical
ideas. Likewise, the STs in both sites also linked the (M)CT purpose
with that of allowing them personal opportunity for self direction;
particularly, in terms of ST experimentation and problem - solving.

These findings indicate a dyad perceptual movement away from the
traditional hierarchical apprenticeship model of student teaching and
toward a more facilitative perception. Facilitative dyad interaction
involves the expectancy by both groups that STs are capable of and will
contribute toward their own development. Relatedly, it was the ASTs in

Table 14

Key Study Contributions to the Teacher Education Knowledge - Base

Participant Purposes
1. Both the (M)CT and ST groups identified the (M)CT purpose as involving the facilitation of ST professional development through creating an environment in which STs could try their own ideas and make their own decisions.
2. Traditionally sited STs felt that the (M)CTs represented an important source for drawing on pedagogical ideas while the Teaching Centre (TC) STs focused more on the nurturing influence of their MCTs.
3. In the traditional site dyad groups linked the purpose of the US to their own professional needs. However, in the TC the MCTs indicated the importance of the US in specifically assisting the pedagogical development of the ST.

Observer Feedback
4. Providing ST feedback was only one of a number of identified personal purposes by the (M)CT groups suggesting a supervisory perspective more toward a hermeneutic, rather than predominantly technical focus.
5. (M)CTs and STs differed with regard to the perceived importance of written feedback to STs. While (M)CTs gave such feedback less emphasis re., professional value, the STs felt it vital to their development, a lack of which could have negative influence on dyad and ST growth.

ST Responsibilities
6. (M)CTs and STs identified written planning as a ST responsibility owed to the (M)CT. This element of pedagogical performance was particularly highlighted by dyad groups in the TC for whom, planning, was also perceived as a specific criteria upon which to evaluate ST achievement.
7. While both ST groups identified proaction as a personal responsibility, the STs in the TC were particularly focused on this aspect of their professional behaviour which they related to effective teaching, interaction with their MCTs and professional growth.
8. TC dyad groups were more diverse and unified than traditional groups in their identification of ST responsibilities owed to the (M)CT.
9. Both ST groups indicated the importance of open communication with their US as a personal responsibility. However, the traditional STs were more diverse and unified in their identification of responsibilities owed to the US related to supervisor authority and evaluation.

ST Achievements
10. TC dyad groups more so than the traditional participants were most commonly focused on ST improved pedagogical skillfulness and lesson planning as areas for both ST achievement and evaluation.
11. ST groups identified professional assessment criteria that were more focused toward a sense of personal achievement through impacting others; in particular, via influencing children's learning and establishing rapport with others.

ST Child Understanding
12. While all dyad groups recognized the need to acknowledge the differences in children, (M)CTs and STs differed in terms of what they perceived were the major influences on such differences; STs focused more on child development while the (M)CTs perceptions came more from an environmental perspective.

the Teaching Centre who emphasized the need for proactive behavior as a personal responsibility owed to their (M)CTs. Further, the ASTs viewed their MCTs as nurturers rather than as information - providers; a view held more by the TSTs.

Consequently, the above findings suggest that the design of the student teaching experience does influence the perceptions of involved participants. All present dyad groups indicated they perceived dyad interaction as a process requiring some facilitation from both (M)CT and ST. However, the Teaching Centre process seems to have encouraged a less reliant ST perception of the (M)CTs' purpose than that demonstrated in the traditional site.

Further, in terms of describing the school - based teacher educators' purpose, Veal (1998) points out that the term 'mentor' teacher is used differently in various countries. For example, in England the mentor works with the ST in the school - based teacher preparation programme. In the United States the mentor is usually assigned to the newly employed first year teacher, while in Australia the term itself is not yet in common usage.

Yet, there are some suggested characteristics of the mentor relationship between experienced and beginning teachers which do seem to relate to dyad perceptions highlighted in the present student teaching study. For example, Mawer (1996) has identified 'support' and 'guidance' as characteristics of an effective mentor teacher. Relatedly, Hudson and Latham (1996) indicate that STs need to be 'active,' and 'analytical,' and to achieve some personal autonomy if they are to assist the successful mentor teacher.

The successful mentor and ST interaction characteristics as mentioned by Mawer (1996) and Hudson and Latham (1996) are also identified by the present dyad participants (eg., (M)CT as 'guide', and nurturer; ST as decision - maker and problem - solver). Again, however, it is the Teaching Centre that appears to have encouraged a more active, self reliant ST role perception. Thus, present findings suggest that the trend toward increased teacher preparation time spent in

school - based sites, necessitates careful design of the student teaching process. In particular, if such experiences are to encourage certain dyad participant views and actions, which, may influence ST development in desired directions.

Another interesting present potential finding and one that has received minimal research focus in the student teaching literature, relates to the influence of dyad isolation. Inter site comparison of present dyad group findings suggests a greater concern for self emerging within the traditional than alternative site; in particular, a concern for self related to dyad perceptions of the USs' purpose.

TCTs identified the US as being a specific support to their own work with the TST. However, the centre MCTs emphasized the US specifically supporting the AST rather than themselves; particularly, with pedagogical feedback. In fact, this US purpose identified by the centre MCTs creates a complimentary role for the US in the triad. This is in contrast to the often confusing and marginalized US roles cited in the research literature focused on triad participant purposes.

Further, the present MCTs' view of the US's purpose, may, also have been related to their perceptions that, particularly, as centre CTs they lacked time to be able to give STs the amount of feedback they desired. Again, the centre MCTs did not emphasize the personal need for support by the US which emerged more from the TCTs (ie., guide; CT support; resource). Even as the perceived director of student teaching at the centre the MCT focus here was on the US assisting centre process understanding, rather than specific MCTs' actions with ASTs.

MCT focus on US assistance both to ASTs and centre process understanding, may, have been influenced by a reduced sense of professional isolation. Dyad interaction opportunities were encouraged by the design of the Teaching Centre process. MCTs could more easily and regularly interact with other MCTs and ASTs than was possible for participants in the traditional site. Also, there may have been more MCT opportunity in the centre to contact the visiting US. After all, the number of ASTs that centre MCTs worked with daily in these alternative site

buildings meant an increased likelihood of MCT - US contact (even just in passing) throughout the entire student teaching semester. Working with only one TST for half a semester (often in buildings with no other active dyads) the traditional site process did not avail TCTs with such professional interaction opportunities. Consequently, it may have been a sense of professional 'community' (Veal & Rickard, 1998) developing in the present Teaching Centre, that reduced dyad participants concern for external non school - based support for self.

Further, STs in both sites identified a US purpose as that of a facilitator; particularly in terms of smooth dyad interaction and as a school - university link. However, there was greater identification of these purposes by the TSTs than the ASTs. Also, the TSTs clearly linked the US purpose with the traditional idea of an evaluator.

Again, the potential influence of professional isolation this time on the TSTs may have been emerging from the above finding. With only one TCT to turn to and with little or any peer support available the need for US support may have been more intense for TSTs, than for the ASTs. Further, this potentially more intense need for a one to one relationship with the US may have also increased TSTs' awareness of the US's evaluatory purpose. Consequently, the US may have been more influential in the professional life of the TST, than for the AST.

These findings concerning the potential impact of isolation and community on dyad group perceptions in the two present sites is vital to recognize and explore in future research. In particular, others need to investigate the ways in which a personal sense of isolation and community may impact on dyad participants' perceptions of both self and others purpose. Again, with the trend during the 1990s toward increased school - based teacher education we need to know the influence of different dyad and triad configurations (Veal & Rickard, 1998); particularly, related to both working conditions and participant perceptions. Such knowledge will allow teacher educators to design models of student teaching that help to encourage desired ST developments.

2. Observer Feedback

While feedback focus for the present dyad groups was of a practical nature, providing ST feedback did not emerge as a dominant purpose for the (M)CTs in the present study. This finding itself is interesting when considering that much published literature in physical education teacher education (Dewar & Lawson, 1990; Evans, 1990; Tinning, 1990; Sparkes, 1993) stresses the perceived dominance by technical rationality in the teacher education process. However, the student teaching process as Doyle (1990) suggests may, in fact, be dominated more by eclectic orientations rather than by a presumed technical focus.

Acknowledgement of the diversity of orientation in teacher education as supported by a more hermeneutic supervisory sense emerging from the present study, holds serious implications for future teacher education development. With more teacher preparation occurring within the domain of K - 12 schools, it is vital that both school and university - based teacher educators arrive at common understandings; in particular, regarding consensus concerning both goals for ST achievement and ways to assist ST development.

Yet, achieving such agreed upon ways to assist ST development and goal attainment will not be easy. For example, the present dyad group componential analysis highlighted the differing emphasis that participants placed on both feedback and its perceived influence on ST development. It was apparent that the (M)CT groups did not recognize the level of importance that the STs attached to this area; particularly, in terms of receiving 'lasting'/written feedback. (M)CTs questioned the influence of such lasting feedback on ST development and the amount of time necessary to provide it. In contrast, the ST groups indicated that lack of lasting feedback provision could have negative effects on dyad interaction; particularly, in terms of remembering important observation /ideas, assisting conference focus and allowing time for personal reflection.

Interestingly, teacher educators (Goodman 1988; Dodds, 1989)

have also highlighted the importance of actively engaging STs in their own development and transformation (Constable, 1994). The present dyad groups indicated the importance of challenging ST development through the use of questioning. In fact, this indirect supervisory approach utilizing questioning links to the present dyad participants perceived purposes of the (M)CT; encouraging ST decision - making, ideas and experimentation.

Further, it was clear from the present findings that the STs were concerned that to achieve the professional changes related to (M)CTs identified purposes, they needed the opportunity for personal reflection. For STs, such opportunity for reflection would be assisted by the provision of lasting feedback to which they could return for further, potentially deeper insights.

However, these differing dyad emphases on the value of lasting feedback in the STs' professional development, again, suggests the importance of carefully considering the design of new approaches to school - based teacher education. The Teaching Centre with its fluid, multi - dyad approach does appear to encourage an MCT group emphasis, at least, concerning the USs' purpose in specifically providing pedagogical feedback to the ASTs. This emphasis may also be coupled to a potential developing sense of professional community in the centre related to the increased opportunities for AST, MCT and US interaction (some of which may include feedback analysis).

Consequently, Teaching Centre participant perceptions of purpose (particularly, the US's) coupled with their potentially increased interactive experiences, may, prove impacting on centre AST development. However, such impact may be even more influential if interwoven with the provision of lasting forms of feedback. As suggested, written feedback may, in fact, encourage deeper ST reflection. Further, such reflection might also assist the stimulation of ideas that may manifest in AST proaction (an identified personal responsibility to the MCT). Thus, this cyclic process (ie., ST proaction - lasting feedback - increased reflection -) may empower STs toward

transformational influence on their own development. In other words, having reached goals for themselves, such learning has greater impact on STs and potentially their desire to continue with this type of self improvement.

3. ST Responsibilities

Three major emphases emerged from analysis of the present findings regarding dyad perceptions of ST responsibilities owed to their (M)CTs and US. These emphases focused on ST planning and proaction related to the student teaching context, and the differing ST group emphasis concerning perceived professional relationship with the US.

First, planning was identified by both (M)CT groups as a ST responsibility. However, the MCTs were particularly clear about this AST responsibility in the Teaching Centre. Working with up to three ASTs concurrently would require that MCTs have prior knowledge of their ASTs' readiness to teach in terms of child learning and safety outcomes. Consequently, lesson plan review would represent a logical way of quickly assessing such AST readiness. Thus, the centre process seemed to increase MCT recognition and focus in the area of planning; an area which has become more important in terms of teacher accountability and evaluation during the 1990s.

Further, three of the four present dyad groups (ie., both ST and the MCTs) also identified lesson planning as a major criteria against which to evaluate the achievement of STs. Consequently, this finding concerning ST planning indicates an opportunity for both the present school and university teacher educators to work in unison. In particular, by these educators emphasizing ST planning which represents both a college course and student teaching component, with, potentially, a major influence on ST development. As indicated, such planning relates to assisting observer analysis, ST teaching confidence, pedagogical performance, and overall ST achievement and evaluation.

Second, present findings also indicated that the ASTs were more unified than the TSTs in their identification of proaction as a personal

responsibility owed to the MCTs. This perception may have been related to the ASTs' view of their MCTs' purpose as a problem - solving assistant and nurturer. Speculatively, the ASTs may have perceived the essence of MCT nurturing and problem - solving assistance to lie within MCT reaction, stimulated by the self initiating actions of the ASTs.

In contrast, the TSTs had earlier identified a TCT purpose as that of information - provider. Thus, this potentially more reliant perception regarding TCT purpose may have reduced TST focus on proactive behaviour. However, the ASTs may have also felt pressure working with three MCTs concurrently. In particular, lack of dyad interaction time, most specifically between ASTs and their CTs would not allow a 'sit back and wait' attitude. After all, MCTs had identified the need for ASTs to have their lesson plans ready and in on time.

Teaching Centre design with its fluid, multi dyad interaction may have also encouraged the present finding that the centre groups were more diverse and unified than the traditional in terms of perceived ST responsibilities owed to the (M)CT. However, this finding may simply reflect a greater perceptual recognition by centre (rather than traditional) participants of necessary ST responsibilities. In particular, AST responsibilities that were perceived as vital in assisting successful MCT achievement of both supervisory self purpose and effective dyad interaction, set within the context of the Teaching Centre.

Further, this differential finding between dyad site groups suggests that the Teaching Centre approach may demonstrate what has often been reported as both existing and missing in traditional student teaching situations. In other words, a lack of clarity regarding the specific actions and attitudes that dyad participants commonly feel are owed to their colleagues. However, in the Teaching Centre, MCTs talked about AST responsibility in terms of their being prepared to teach and having lesson plans in on time. Similarly, the ASTs identified the need for proaction (and planning) within the domain of personal responsibility.

In terms of the third major present finding; ST responsibility owed to

the US, interestingly, the picture changes in relation to ST group emphasis. Here, the TSTs were more diverse and unified in their perceptions of responsibilities owed to the US than were the ASTs. There seems to emerge from this finding a greater sense of the USs' presence and potential power for the TSTs. Speculatively, this finding may, therefore, be related to a sense of potential isolation felt more so by the TST than the ASTs.

Present site ST groups also identified a further personal responsibility to the US as that of keeping communication open. This perception may well relate to the sense of the US as ST evaluator (a US purpose moreso identified by the TSTs). Thus, keeping the US specifically informed regarding one's personal progress and problems would be vital for STs; particularly, if there was a perception of limited US opportunity to visit STs.

However, while the idea of maintaining open communication between parties provided the sense of a two way professional relationship, other TST perceptions suggested a more hierarchically perceived US - TST interaction. In particular, the TSTs identified further personal responsibilities related to meeting US expectations and, also, showing respect for that position. Consequently, this potentially more hierarchical perception of the US - TST relationship may indicate a greater awareness of and need for a supportive figure in the professional life of the TST. In particular, a professional life that for the TST with only one TCT to work with each half of the student teaching semester, may have been more isolated than that of the AST.

Therefore, based on the present findings the US appears more influential in terms of presence and possible authority in the lives of the TSTs than for the ASTs. However, this greater TST awareness of the USs' presence may, in fact, be as much a reaction to potential traditional dyad isolation as any professional desire for another input source encouraging improved TST pedagogical performance.

Interestingly, the concept of a student teaching community, particularly, involving interacting peers has been identified as influential

by STs in terms of influence on their own development (Swarswick, 1990). Such a community influence may also be enhanced when the US assumes a specific role; a role that is accepted as important to the process by dyad participants and, therefore, is felt to contribute to the professional growth of the ST.

Again, the present study findings indicate the possibility of a developing sense of professional community within the Teaching Centre. Further, aligned with this possibility is the identification by the centre MCTs of a specific, complimentary purpose for the US; first as feedback provider to the ASTs, then as director of the centre process itself.

4. ST Achievements

It was dyad participants in the Teaching Centre rather than in the traditional site who brought most joint group focus to improved pedagogical skillfulness as a ST achievement. Likewise, centre dyad groups also focused more on ST lesson planning as an evaluation criterion. In fact, planning was perceived by the majority of dyad participant groups as the only practical aspect of ST performance against which to evaluate STs.

Again, a potential relationship may exist between design of the student teaching experience and the perceptions and focus of those who work within it. Present findings indicate that there was a greater dyad group focus in the Teaching Centre than in the traditional site on practical skills related to ST achievement and evaluation. This finding suggests that if increasingly school - based teacher education requires triad participants to focus more on practical/technical elements, then design rather than just amount of student teaching experience may be more influential.

Interestingly, both (M)CT groups did not uniformly identify specific criteria (outside of the MCTs focus on lesson planning) against which to evaluate STs. This finding may, in fact, relate to earlier centre MCT responses which identified the need for greater understanding of what the specific goals for ST achievement were within the Slippery Rock

University teacher education programme.

Collier (1995) indicates that having all parties in agreement on process goals is a vital factor in successful school - university collaboration. The present finding concerning lack of (M)CT identified ST evaluation criteria suggests a potential connection with participant goal clarity perception. In other words, (M)CTs may have been reticent to define ST evaluatory criteria due to concern about a lack of overall student teaching goal clarity; particularly, in the Teaching Centre process.

Similarly, the TSTs also had difficulty in clearly defining what they meant by being a 'better teacher'. Likewise, the centre ASTs were unclear as to what specifically they learned from the teaching process. Yet, there was a sense in the data that the identified ST achievements involved more than purely classroom interaction skills.

Research (Rothwell, et al., 1994) suggests that hindsight plays an important role in STs being able to perceive, specifically, what they have learned from the student teaching experience. Consequently, if hindsight allows deeper ST understanding into personal professional development, then this raises an important question. How should traditional and school - based teacher education approaches build on the slowly emerging understandings STs gain over time from student teaching experience?

Duquette (1997) suggests that STs need to be assisted in learning how to learn from their field - based experiences. Therefore, carefully structured on - going seminars for STs may allow (M)CTs and USs to help STs reflect on what it is that they are learning from their experience. However, knowledge from hindsight may also require consideration by teacher education of a post student teaching component. Unfortunately, in general, such components are not presently available in traditional teacher education within the United States; student teaching experience generally represents the culminating teacher education component.

Present ST groups were also clearly both more diverse and unified

than the (M)CTs in terms of identifying ST evaluation criteria. Further, the criteria highlighted went beyond purely technical/practical skills and provided a sense of STs' personal achievements with others. For example, both ST groups identified the ability to demonstrate interaction and rapport with colleagues and children as one evaluatory aspect for consideration. Interestingly, Friend and Cook (1992) have stated that:

> Teachers are being set up to fail because they enter their profession with content expertise and method, but without the skills to work effectively with their colleagues (p. 77).

STs in both present research sites apparently felt that they could develop effective interpersonal skills. Consequently, this finding may represent another potential area on which dyad participants together could focus. After all, (M)CTs had already indicated that they perceived the dyad professional relationship to be important. Therefore, the skills identified (particularly by centre participants in terms of ST responsibilities) for achieving successful professional relationships (eg., encouragement, open communication, proaction and professional respect, etc.), might also form the criteria for ST evaluation in the interpersonal area.

Interestingly, the present ST groups also highlighted children learning as another area against which they felt their performance should be evaluated. This finding contrasts with previous physical education student teaching research (Placek, 1983; Schempp, 1986) which indicates less ST concern regarding children's learning. This apparent difference in research findings is important to recognize. In particular, because like the already identified ST focus on colleague interaction and rapport, this present finding on ST evaluation related to children's learning, again, suggests ST concern for others.

Therefore, these ST identified evaluation criteria suggest a personal rather than predominantly practical orientation in ST perspectives. Further, these present findings on perceived ST evaluation criteria indicate a potential move away from a physical education ST concern

for predominantly self; contrasting with findings from past research (Boggess et al., 1985, Arrighi & Young, 1987).

This present ST movement toward a potentially more humanistic sense of personal involvement with others comes at an opportune time in teacher education. Chapter 12 indicates teacher education has been attacked for not adequately preparing teachers to meet the needs of children. Clearly, STs in both research sites were concerned that part of their evaluation be focused on their impact on children learning. Consequently, teacher educators need to capitalize on desires like those indicated by the present STs to have their influence (ie., on colleagues and children) evaluated. This is particularly important as such focus for evaluation is something that will be met when these STs become full - time teachers.

Further, teacher educators by focusing in this area may be able to contribute to the development of the teacher accountability movement; as opposed to watching or responding to designated changes. Teacher educator leadership may come through increased knowledge gained via analysis of specific aspects of teaching and learning. In particular, guidance could be provided based on knowledge developed concerning how ST influence in specified areas of learning might be fairly and accurately evaluated.

5. ST Child Understanding

All four present dyad groups acknowledged that STs should recognize the differences in children, particularly, as these relate to impact on children's response to teachers. However, the (M)CTs and STs differed in their focus as to what they perceived to influence these child responses. Chapter 12 has indicated these dyad group perceptual differences may be another example of how differing experiences influence both dyad participants' knowledge - base and concern for others.

ST group perceptions focused on child differences from a developmental perspective; a focus derived from college coursework. Understandably, due to lack of teaching experience this is the source

from which most ST information about children's development is initially obtained. However, the (M)CTs focus was more on how children's everyday life experiences influence their responses. In particular, the (M)CTs indicated a recognition of how non school - based contextual factors impacted children's learning responses to teachers and subject - matter.

This finding related to potential sources of dyad group perceptual difference is important to recognize. (M)CTs appeared to want STs to understand that while changes in development do influence children's response to subject - matter, so do other factors often outside the influence of the teachers domain. In particular, factors such as societal/ environmental influences (e.g., economic status, family grouping, education emphasis and access to learning opportunities, etc.) which, also, may impact children's social and learning response.

Further, the ST groups had already indicated feeling, at least, in part, accountable for children's learning. Consequently, the (M)CTs may well have wanted to help STs to maintain enthusiasm for teaching through having them recognize the part that both nature and nurture play in impacting children's social and learning responses. In fact, by recognizing and understanding the influence of both development and environment on children's behaviour, this may allow teachers to maintain their desire to help children learn. In particular, by creating a teaching context that over time helps encourage more positive social and psychomotor child responses in health and physical education.

The final chapter that now follows presents recommendations for future teacher education development based on the overall insights that emerged from the present investigation. Further, discussion of the research approach that was utilized in the present study is also presented to assist future investigations in this area.

Chapter 14

Research Recommendations and Evaluation

Evidence outlined in the first two chapters of the present study indicates that teacher education in the United States and even more so in other areas of the world, is becoming increasingly school - based. Professional teacher education groups and 'outside' organizations concerned with teacher preparation, in general, suggest such school - based development is relevant to producing effective teachers. However, it is the way in which such changes are informed and have been implemented that has led to disputes between the different parties involved. Such controversy has been particularly evident in teacher education within England during the 1990s.

Consequently, Table 15 which follows highlights the major research recommendations derived from the present study that may assist future teacher education investigation. These recommendations, which are discussed in this chapter, are based on the main findings and implications that emerged from the five focus areas generated within the present study. Further, the recommendations are designed to assist developments in the Slippery Rock University (SRU) student teaching programme in health and physical education. As indicated, they may also act as some potential guidelines for teacher education development in the United States, within health and physical education.

1. Participant Purposes

This area focused on the purposes of the (M)CT and the US in student teaching. Characteristics associated with effective mentor teachers in school - based teacher education in the research literature were also identified by present dyad participants in both study sites. (M)CT emphasis of purpose was on facilitating ST decision - making and pedagogical ideas. Likewise, both groups of STs supported their (M)CTs' perception of a personal facilitative purpose (ie., to assist ST experimentation and problem - solving).

Table 15

Major Research Recommendations.

---

1. If teacher education wishes to develop more self reliant STs then the design of the actual student teaching experience and the amount of time STs spend in the site(s), are both important considerations toward the attainment of such a goal.

2. If teacher education is to encourage less dyad participant concern for self and more focus on the needs of others, then the placement of cohorts of STs with interacting MCTs responsible for several concurrent STs over extended periods of student teaching in the same site, seems influential.

3. If teacher education is to encourage ST reflection in terms of increased self empowerment and proaction toward professional development, then written question and idea - giving holds potential; particularly, when the design of the student teaching process itself also encourages increased self reliance and proactivity.

4. If teacher education wishes to be more closely aligned with present day school - based teacher accountability measures, then there needs to be greater emphasis on ST lesson planning and children's learning in relation to ST assessment.

5. If teacher education is to mitigate against potential professional isolation and foster a sense of 'professional community' within the student teaching process, then creating cohorts of dyad participants within a carefully designed multi dyad experience is an important consideration.

6. If teacher education wishes to include the (M)CT more specifically in the ST supervisory and evaluation process, then commonly agreed upon goals for ST achievement must be clearly identified and pursued by triad participants within the student teaching process.

However, present results indicated that the Teaching Centre process, rather than the traditional, seemed to encourage (within STs) a greater emphasis on personal self reliance and less dependency on the MCT. This finding supports one of the original purposes for the centre design; to encourage ST choice, self reliance and action. Consequently, if encouragement of more self reliant STs is an aim for future teacher education, then designing student teaching experiences to encourage such characteristics is vital. The present findings suggest that process design as well as amount of time STs spend in a site seem to be important considerations in this area.

Further, the findings revolving around perceptions of the USs' purpose also indicate important inter site dyad differences. Again, such differences may link to the design of the two research sites. MCTs in the Teaching Centre assigned a specific purpose to the US; pedagogical feedback provider to the ASTs. While this complimented MCTs' work, the sense was that the US was there for ASTs, rather than the MCTs. However, TCTs gave a sense of the US as a support not only for the ST, but also for the actions of the TCTs with their ST.

This finding may be unique to the present study which appears to be the only research available comparing two differently designed student teaching sites in a traditional health and physical education four year teacher education programme. In fact, these different (M)CT group perceptions concerning the purpose of the US may emerge out of two minimally research areas; those of professional isolation and community within the student teaching process.

Clearly, the centre design involves a cohort of STs in varied dyadic and triadic interaction, both formal and informal (e.g., AST - AST; MCT - MCT; AST - MCT; AST - US; MCT - US; AST - MCT - US). Further, such interaction occurs over almost an entire academic semester as opposed to the half semester split site design of the traditional experience. Such longer term interactive opportunities may encourage development of a sense of professional community within the centre. Potentially, the MCTs may also feel more secure in their surroundings

supported by continual interaction with others involved in the student teaching process. Such professional interaction, may, in fact, reduce MCT concern for self support and allow them to redirect resources (ie., the US) to others (ie., the ASTs).

In contrast, potential professional dyad isolation and less semester time with their STs in the traditional site, may, encourage TCT need for personal US support for self as much as for the TST. Clearly, future researchers need to conduct specific investigation into these areas of professional isolation and community; particularly, to determine their influence on ST development. However, if teacher education development is to help encourage less dyad participant concern for self and more focus on the development of others, then placement of cohorts of STs with closely interacting (M)CTs over extended periods of time does seem influential, based on the present findings.

2. Observer Feedback

Present findings indicate that the (M)CTs did not recognize the need for or understand the potential impact of lasting forms of feedback such as written on STs. In fact, (M)CTs indicated they were not sure of the value or impact of such feedback on ST development. Clearly, the present findings highlight the need to make sure that school - based teacher educators are aware of the importance of more lasting feedback to STs. In particular, in terms of how such feedback may encourage the more spiral and deeper forms of reflection that empower STs to impact their own professional development.

In fact, self empowerment of STs to become proactive in their own professional growth seems to be integral to effective mentoring by the school - based teacher educator. Present (M)CTs highlighted self purposes that focused on facilitating ST personal action and decision - making. Likewise, the STs indicated that to help themselves to be active based on their perceptions of the (M)CTs' purpose (ie., encourage ST experimentation and problem solving), they needed to be able to reflect on the ideas and questions provided through lasting supervisory feedback.

Clearly, STs need time to reflect back on previous experiences. In fact, hindsight may play an important role in ST understanding. Therefore, the present findings suggest school - based teacher education has to try to provide time for ST reflection. By simply writing information over time that STs can take away with them, supervisors may provide an important base from which to encourage potential ST transformational behaviour; via self empowerment and proactivity. Further, such ST change may be encouraged when STs can reflect during their own time; particularly, in an environment where concern for image management and immediate answers are not required.

3. ST Responsibilities

Lesson planning and proaction are major responsibilities that STs owe toward their dyad colleagues according to the findings of the present study. Such areas are important to identify; particularly in a decade where teachers are now being held accountable for both what they do and the impact that they have on others.

Within the Teaching Centre present findings indicated that effective mentoring also meant knowing that the AST was ready to teach the lesson. Therefore, this appeared most effectively assessed via planning on paper. Further, the idea of planning as both a AST responsibility and a potential (M)CT necessity, may, relate directly to the identified dyad need for ASTs to demonstrate proactive behaviour. In fact, it appears that the dynamic nature of the Teaching Centre influenced, in part, by the operation of multi dyads, encouraged such AST behaviours.

Again, future school - based teacher education developments related to ST planning and proaction need to ensure two basic emphases. First, that commonly agreed upon areas for ST focus are identified by university and school - based teacher educators which are felt to be relevant to the needs of future teachers. Second, that the very design of the experience itself should encourage the demonstration by STs of these emphases.

Nor, should future teacher education research and development

ignore the potential influence of professional isolation on both the perceptions and needs of dyad participants. Again, present findings suggest that this relatively under researched area in the student teaching experience may influence the perceptions and needs of STs regarding their triad colleagues.

For example, TSTs seemed more aware of and concerned about the US presence, than the ASTs. The US appeared to be more a facilitator for the ASTs; a supervisor who needed ST communication in order to supervise effectively. The TSTs' perceptions suggested more an authority figure with a clear evaluatory role. However, a figure to whom the TSTs could look for support and whose authority deserved their respect.

Overall, the findings highlighted in this section on ST responsibilities suggest the potential emergence of a professional community; one composed of a cohort of closely working STs supported by a number of MCTs in the Teaching Centre. Further, the multi dyad dynamics of the centre suggests the removal of over dominance by any one triad member. Again, this is a potential finding that may relate to the possible increased feelings of professional community engendered by the centre process.

Further, the Teaching Centre design may encourage heightened ST feelings of personally contributing towards their own professional development. In fact, centre ASTs may act as learners who operate more on a horizontal plane with their triad colleagues; in other words, with MCTs and the US who are perceived as contributing to, rather than trying to control ST development.

4. ST Achievements

While the literature suggests that technical rationality dominates the teacher education process, findings from the present study did not support this supposition. The majority of the present dyad groups did identify ST achievement as involving the improvement of pedagogical skills. However, further dyad perceptions indicated a concern for ST achievement beyond purely the skills necessary for effective

pedagogical interaction. In fact, ST perceptions, in particular, that focused on evaluation criteria which emphasized a more personal rather than technical/practical orientation.

It was interesting to note that both groups of STs were more diversified and unified concerning potential ST evaluation criteria, than were the (M)CTs. School - based teacher educator reticence in terms of identifying ST evaluation criteria, may, have been due to a lack of confidence regarding the programmatic goals for ST achievement. Clearly, if increasingly school - based teacher education is to include (M)CTs more formally in the evaluation of STs, then commonly agreed up on goals for ST accomplishment must be identified.

Present findings also identified a ST concern for their influence on others. This is in contrast to the ST concern for self indicated in physical education student teaching investigation conducted during the 1980s. This important finding may relate to the increasing amount of time that STs now spend in student teaching practice. Further, such present ST perceptual change may be connected to (M)CT mentoring interaction that encourages STs to try their own ideas and make professional decisions.

However, ST concern for others requires more specific investigation by future researchers; particularly, to identify the potential stimulants to such perceptions. Teacher education also needs to act now to build on such professionally focused ST desires. Accusations that teacher education does not meet the needs of future teachers need to be countered. In fact, present ST concern for children learning (and the earlier focus on lesson planning, especially in the centre process) are on the cutting edge of modern teacher accountability and assessment.

Consequently, teacher educators now have the opportunity with increasing focus on school - based teacher preparation, to study and design experiences that serve as guide lines for both practicing and ST evaluation. In particular, this can be facilitated by constructing evaluations from criteria and assessments that emerge from input gathered from within the 'field' itself (ie., triad participants).

5. ST Child Understanding

Increasing school - based teacher preparation is important. As suggested earlier, professional teacher educators, in general, would agree that such experience is vital to teacher development. Some aspects of the teachers life can only be understood through knowledge gained or refined during the interaction between the teacher and their children. Present findings concerning ST understanding about children in the teaching - learning environment support this point.

For example, (M)CTs were clearly aware of the part that nurture as well as nature plays in children's social, cognitive and motor responses in the teaching - learning situation. The (M)CTs were particularly aware of environmental influences on children. Consequently, there was a sense that the they wanted the STs to recognize (ie., experiential ST learning) that children's responses may often have been stimulated as much by environmental influences, as by any teaching or maturational factor.

<div align="center">Research Evaluation</div>

Teacher education researchers can use the present study as a basis for guiding future investigation into certain areas. For example, there is clearly a need to investigate the influence of increasing amounts of student teaching time on STs' knowledge recognition, as well as their concern for self and others. Present findings suggest that STs in situations that allow increased teaching practice time, in fact, demonstrate contrasting perceptual emphases to STs who have had shorter student teaching opportunities (as demonstrated in comparison with past research findings). This finding itself holds important implications for teacher education programmes which are moving toward increased school - based preparation.

There are also specific issues which the present study did not explore, yet, which are important for teacher education consideration. For example, what motivated the recognition by one present study ST that he had been mainly male focused in his teacher - pupil interaction, and that he had tried to change this emphasis? The issue of gender in

teacher preparation; particularly, in student teaching triad interaction has received minimal research focus and yet, may, have profound impact on teacher - pupil relations.

Further, the STs in the Teaching Centre had also been able to request that their student teaching experience be undertaken within an alternative, rather than traditionally designed site. Consequently, research into what influences prospective STs to ask for a site such as the Teaching Centre rather than a traditional placement, may hold important implications; especially, in terms of the focus and impact of college - based teacher preparation on prospective teachers.

Acknowledgement also needs to be made that the present study focused only on dyad participants' perceptions. No attempt was made to try and connect participant perception to actual dyad behaviours. Such behavioural research was beyond the scope, time and finances of the present researcher. But, in a world moving quickly toward observable teacher accountability, research that analyzes and describes dyad participants' words/thoughts and actions is vital. Relatedly, teacher educators also need to know if identified ST perceptions/actions are, in fact, carried into full - time teaching. Consequently, the grounded hypotheses provided in Chapters 7 and 11 indicate several directions that future study in each present research site might take.

Further, the nature of the qualitative research process itself and the influence of the Ph.D format must be recognized. Interview data has a tendency to 'mushroom' on the researcher. Therefore, coupled with a dissertation word limitation, of necessity, data and findings have to be 'pruned' and prioritized in such a project. Unfortunately, some data cannot be utilized.

For example, originally the present dissertation had contained description concerning dyad perceptions in terms of the use and influence of videotape feedback and, also, whether the length of time assigned to the student teaching practice was long enough for effective dyad interaction. In terms of teacher educator orientations two Slippery

Rock University health and physical education USs had been interviewed by the present researcher. This task was undertaken to provide a descriptive example of the orientations of two teacher educators working within the same teacher education programme. However, due to the dissertation word limitations those perceptions (along with their researcher interpretations) related to the three examples outlined, were selected for omission from the final doctoral document.

Also, certain themes which only partially emerged during present study analysis, while being acknowledged (eg., professional isolation and community) did not receive the indepth analysis of other more pervasive ideas (eg., ST as proactor and planner). Yet, such fledgling meanings like their more developed peers do leave themselves as 'bait' to draw follow up research (ie., more focused and refined); again, a major purpose of exploratory investigation.

Clearly, having used dyad participants from only a single university teacher education programme set within one traditional and alternative student teaching site (with a focus specifically on health and physical education), has, limited any attempt to claim wider finding applicability to teacher education in general. However, as a qualitative investigation it is the reader who must judge the generalizability of any present study conclusions, implications or recommendations in terms of applicability to their own situations.

Finally, it again needs to be highlighted that the present research represents, potentially, the only exploratory investigation that has looked at the influence on dyad perceptions of two differently designed student teaching processes. In particular, two processes that are set within a traditional four year university teacher education programme in the United States. Consequently, the present key contributions made to the teacher education knowledge - base (see Chapter 13) and the major recommendations provided in this chapter, support the usefulness of such exploratory study within the student teaching component.

APPENDIX A

EXAMPLE LETTER TO THE RESEARCH SCHOOL - DISTRICT

SUPERINTENDENTS

SLIPPERY ROCK UNIVERSITY

19th November, 1992

Dr. William Pettigrew Jr, Superintendent
Mars Area School District
RD 2 Box 150
Mars, PA. 16046 - 9680

Mr. Rhys Jones
1203 Garth Drive
Kent, Ohio 44240
Tel: (216) 678 - 8160

Dear Dr. Pettigrew:

I am a former Assistant Professor in the Department of Physical Education at Slippery Rock University. I was employed as a full - time teacher by the university to replace a faculty member who was on sabbatical during the academic year 1991-92.

My responsibility at Slippery Rock University was in the area of health and physical education teacher education. In particular, my major responsibility was student teacher supervision. Consequently, during the Fall of 1991, and Spring 1992 it was my fortune to be able to work with our student teachers within the Mars Area School District Department of Health and Physical Education. During this period I worked with the following Mars faculty: Carol Devincio, Terry Dillner, and Connie Pastva at the high school; Marcia Semple, Denny Alsing, and Joe Joswiak at the middle school; Pam Best and Kim Bradley at the elementary level.

Slippery Rock University has recognized the benefits of placing health and physical education student teachers in the Mars Area School District. As you realize Mars is now an experimental site for the Teaching Center concept. This is as far as I am aware a unique joint approach between a university and school district with regard to health and physical education student teaching. I know the Mars faculty I have worked with see their interaction with the student teachers in the center as a professional responsibility to help in the development of our future teachers.

I apologize for this long preamble, but I hope it helps to provide a framework for the request I would like to make. Over the next eighteen months, as part of a doctoral course, I am going to initiate an indepth study of the student teaching experience from the perspectives of cooperating and student teachers involved in both the traditional and Teaching Center approaches. Such an investigation would seem timely recognizing the potential state of change that now surrounds teacher education in Pennsylvania and the U.S.A., and the dominant impact that student teaching has on future teachers. Consequently, I would like to initiate an investigation into participants' perceptions of the strengths, weaknesses and future developments of the traditional and center student teaching designs.

To this end I would ask if you would consider giving me your permission to invite the eight faculty (named earlier) with whom I worked during the 1991 - 92 academic year to join this study. This entire study would focus on cooperating and student teachers involved with Slippery Rock University, consequently, the results may assist the Department of Physical Education in the shaping of future teacher preparation field experiences. The chairperson, Dr. Helen Knierim has given this project Slippery Rock University Department of Physical Education support.

Clearly, the faculty at Mars Areas School District who are invited to take part in this study are under no obligation to accept, and any decision to decline would in no way be linked to future designation as a cooperating teacher for Slippery Rock students. Any faculty member accepting the invitation to join the study would be asked to give an audio - taped interview which would take approximately 45 minutes to conduct. The reason for audio taping is simply to ensure accuracy in transcribing the interview data provided.

My aim is to interview faculty either in the latter half of the Spring 1993 semester, or in the Fall, 1993. The interview would be carried out at a location, date and time convenient to the faculty member. Information provided by faculty members will be kept confidential by the researcher. There will be no identification used in the report submitted other than possibly respondent gender and school level.

I would like to thank you for considering this request. I hope that you will feel the reason and focus for this study allows you to give permission for me to approach the Mars faculty members outlined earlier. Please feel free to contact me if there is any further information that you need to assist you in your decision.

Sincerely,

Rhys Jones, Ed. S

APPENDIX B

EXAMPLE LETTERS TO POTENTIAL RESEARCH PARTICIPANTS

SLIPPERY ROCK UNIVERSITY

18th April, 1993

Health & Physical Educator
Bethel Park School District

Mr. Rhys Jones
1203 Garth Drive
Kent OH 44240

Tel: (216) 678 - 8160

Dear

Hopefully the passage of one year and the occurrence of no doubt many other pressing events has not completely obliterated any memory of our student teaching meetings during 1991-92. This was the brief period when I acted as the university supervisor for the Slippery Rock University (SRU) Department of Physical Education at Bethel Park. I hope that since our last meeting you have had a successful and enjoyable time at your school working with both your classes and further SRU student teachers.

As you may, or may not recall, I expressed the hope during the Spring 1992 semester that sometime in the future I would again be able to call on the cooperating teachers at Bethel Park, to ask for their assistance in a student teaching study I wanted to undertake. I was particularly interested in gathering cooperating and student teachers perceptions about the student teaching process within the school district. Consequently, it is with respect to this study that I am again contacting you.

I have sought and obtained the permission of the Bethel Park School District administration to approach health and/or physical education cooperating teachers in the district with regard to this study. The project has the support of the SRU physical education department, and the present university supervisors. This study is intended to provide feedback from the districts cooperating teachers and student teachers in this formal manner, to help in furthering both understanding, and future development of the student teaching experience.

Voluntary participation in this study will involve a single verbal interview conducted at your convenience, lasting approximately 50 minutes. The interview will be tape-recorded to ensure that answers to questions are gathered accurately. All information collected will be strictly confidential with no names used in any document produced. To ensure that the findings derived from the interviews with the Bethel Park cooperating teachers are accurate, a summary of the group results will be sent to you for your comments.

To give you an idea of the topics on which the interview will focus I have included the major research question that provides guidance for this study:

> What do health and/or physical education cooperating teachers in the Bethel Park School District perceive to be their own purpose, and that of the student teacher and university supervisor during the student teaching experience?

I hope that you will feel able to join this study of cooperating and student teacher perceptions in the Bethel Park School District. The information generated via the interviews will be very helpful to the SRU Physical Education department, as it continues to seek input from concerned parties regarding the future development of its teacher preparation program.

Further, the current debate on teacher education necessitates the need for those involved in teacher education in both the schools and universities, to share and voice their ideas on the preparatory process. The teaching profession cannot afford to be excluded by other influential groups from the decision - making process regarding the future direction of teacher education.

I would like to thank you for considering this invitation. I will be in contact either by telephone or in person with regard to your decision and to answer any questions you may have.

Sincerely,

Rhys Jones, Ed.S

SLIPPERY ROCK UNIVERSITY

18th April, 1993

Student Health & Physical Educator
Mars Area School District Teaching Center

Mr. Rhys Jones
1203 Garth Drive
Kent, OH 44240

Tel: (216) 678 - 8160

Dear

I am writing to ask if you would consider participating in a study that I am in the process of undertaking. A major purpose of this study is to gather and describe the perceptions of Slippery Rock University (SRU) Health and Physical Education student teachers and cooperating teachers, involved in the student teaching experience within the Mars Area School District.

As a former SRU Health and Physical Education university teacher and supervisor I have worked in the student teaching experience at the Mars Teaching Center. Consequently, I am familiar with the school district and the mentor-cooperating teachers in the different schools. This study has the support of the SRU Department of Physical Education who are very interested in further developing their teacher preparation program and its student teaching component. To enable them to do this effectively the department is interested in formally gathering the opinions and perceptions of student and mentor - cooperating teachers working in different student teaching sites.

I would ask you to please consider joining this study. All the Health and Physical Education student teachers at Mars this Spring 93 semester have been invited to participate, along with the mentor-cooperating teachers in the school district. Please feel free to discuss this request with the Mars mentor - cooperating teachers and your university supervisor who is aware of this project and has given it his support.

Your participation is voluntary and would involve you in a single verbal interview conducted at your convenience, lasting approximately 50 minutes. The interview will be tape-recorded to ensure that answers are gathered accurately. There are no right or wrong answers to any of the questions, only your perceptions based on personal experience. All the information you provide will be treated in confidence. No one will he able to identify you with any statements made. To ensure that the findings derived from the student teacher interviews are accurate, I will send you a copy of the group results summary for your comments.

To give you an idea of the topics on which the interview will focus I have included the major research question that provides guidance for this study:

> What do health and physical education student teachers in the Mars Area School District Teaching Center perceive to be their own purpose, and that of their mentor - cooperating teachers and university supervisor during the student teaching experience?

I hope that you will feel able to join this study of mentor - cooperating and student teacher perceptions in the Mars Area School District Teaching Center. The information generated will be very helpful to the SRU physical education department as it continues to seek input from concerned parties into the future development of its teacher preparation program.

Further, there is a need for student teachers as well as cooperating teachers and university teacher educators to share and voice their ideas about effective methods of preparing prospective teachers. This is vital it the education profession is not to be overlooked by other influential power groups with regard to the decision - making now being undertaken concerning the future direction of teacher education.

I would like to thank you for considering this invitation. I will be in contact by telephone or in person with regard to your decision and to answer any questions you may have.

Sincerely,

Rhys Jones, Ed.S

APPENDIX C

RESEARCH INTERVIEW SCHEDULES

Mentor - Cooperating Teacher Question schedule

Name: School - District:

# of years of teaching experience: Level:

#of student teachers supervised:

Any formal supervision training:

Questions:

What do you see as the purpose of the (mentor) - cooperating teacher in relation to their work with the student teacher?
                              AND
(Is the purpose of the mentor teacher any different to the purpose of the cooperating teacher in relation to student teacher development?)

What do you see as the (mentor) - cooperating teacher purpose in terms of providing feedback to the student teacher?

Are there any specific areas in which student teachers are developing where you feel feedback from you is important and should therefore be focused?

What sort of methods do you use to provide student teachers with feedback?

What sort of influence do you feel these methods have on student teachers' development?

Is there anything that student teachers or the university could do to help you in providing the type of student teacher feedback you feel is necessary?

What do you see as the purpose of the university supervisor in the student teaching experience?

What do you see as the purpose of the (mentor) - cooperating teacher in relation to working with the university supervisor during student teaching?
                              AND

(Is the purpose of the mentor teacher at the Teaching Centre any different to the purpose of the cooperating teacher in relation to their work with the university supervisor?)

What do you believe are the responsibilities a student teacher should demonstrate towards you as their (mentor) - cooperating teacher, to help create an effective working relationship between the two of you?

What do you believe are the responsibilities that student teachers should demonstrate towards the university supervisor to help create an effective working relationship between the two of them?

What do you see as the overall purposes for achievement by the student teacher at (the Mars Teaching Centre) Bethel Park?

What areas do you concentrate on and evaluate when you watch your student teacher actually instructing a health or physical education class over the duration of the student teaching experience?

What are the criteria that you personally think student teachers should be evaluated on?

What attitude towards and understanding about children do you hope your student teacher will develop through their student teaching experience?

What do you see as the benefits you personally receive from being involved in the student teaching experience at (the Mars Teaching Centre) Bethel Park?

Are there any further reasons why you continue to accept student teachers to work with?

What do you see as the benefits the student teachers' receive from being involved in the student teaching experience at Bethel Park (the Mars Teaching Centre)?

Do you feel that there are any benefits your school district receives through having student teachers working in the different schools within the district?

Do you feel there are any particular ways in which the university physical education department benefits through placing their student teachers in the (Mars Teaching Center) Bethel Park school - district?

What do you see as the disadvantages you personally experience from being involved in the student teaching experience at Bethel Park (the Mars Teaching Centre)?

What do you see as the disadvantages the student teacher experiences from being involved in student teaching as it is presently conducted within (the Mars Teaching Centre) Bethel Park?

What do you perceive to have been the main concerns of your student teachers during their student teaching experience?

Do you feel that there are any disadvantages your school - district experiences through having student teachers teaching in the different schools within the district?

Do you feel their are any disadvantages the university physical education department experiences from placing their student teachers in the (Mars) Bethel Park school - district?

What do you see as possible future developments in the student teaching experience at (the Teaching Centre) Bethel Park, that would enable you as the (mentor) - cooperating teacher to help even more in the development of student teachers?

What do you see as possible future developments in the student teaching experience that would enable the university supervisor to play a more influential role in the development of student teachers at (the Mars Teaching Centre) Bethel Park?

What do you see as possible future developments in the student teaching experience, that would enable student teachers' themselves, to play more of an influential role in their own development at (the Mars Teaching Centre) Bethel Park?

Are there any other points you would like to mention that you feel are important to help other people understanding more about the student teaching experience you have just gone through?

Student Teacher Interview Question Schedule

Name: School - District:

Age: Completed all NTE requirements before grad:

Questions:

What do you see as the purpose of the cooperating teacher in relation to their working with the student teacher?
                              OR
(What do you see as the purpose of the mentor teacher in the Teaching Centre in relation to their working with the student teacher?)
                              AND
(Do you see the purpose of your mentor teacher as being any different to the purpose of your cooperating teachers in the Teaching Centre?)

What part do you feel feedback from cooperating teachers and university supervisors plays in the development of a student teacher?

What areas of student teacher performance do you prefer to receive feedback on?

What method of feedback do you feel most helps you to develop as a prospective teacher?

Why do you prefer this type of feedback?

Can you describe the different methods your (mentor) - cooperating teachers and university supervisor have used to provide you with feedback?

What do you see as the purpose of the university supervisor in the student teaching experience?

In what ways do you feel the university supervisor has directly helped in your student teacher development?

What do you see as the purpose of your (mentor) - cooperating teacher in working with the university supervisor during student teaching?
                              AND
(Is the purpose of a mentor teacher different to the purpose of the cooperating teacher in terms their working with an individual student teacher's university supervisor in the Teaching Centre?

What do you see as your student teacher responsibilities towards your (mentor) - cooperating teacher that would help both of you to work effectively together?

What do you see as your student teacher responsibilities towards the university supervisor that would help both of you to work effectively together?

What do you see as the overall purpose for your achievement as a student teacher at (the Mars Teaching Centre) Bethel Park?

While teaching your health and physical education classes over the duration of the student teaching experience, what sort of skills and abilities have you tried to demonstrate and develop?

What do you personally think should be the criteria by which a student teacher's performance should be evaluated?

Are there any other student teacher evaluatory criteria that are important to you but may not be specifically observed as you actually teach in the gymnasium and classroom?

What sort of attitudes toward and understanding about children do you feel you have developed as a result of your student teaching experience?

What do you see as the benefits your (mentor) - cooperating teacher receives through being involved in the student teaching experience at (the Mars Teaching Centre) Bethel Park?

What do you see as the benefits that you as a student teacher have received by being involved in the student teaching experience at (the Mars Teaching Centre) Bethel Park?

Do you feel there are any benefits the (Mars) Bethel Park school - district receives through having student teachers working in the different schools?

In what ways do you feel the university physical education department benefits by placing their student teachers in the (Mars) Bethel Park school - district?

What do you see as the disadvantages the (mentor) - cooperating teachers' may experience from being involved in student teaching at (the Mars Teaching Centre) Bethel Park?

What do you see as the disadvantages you as a student teacher experienced from being involved in student teaching as it is presently conducted in (the Mars Teaching Centre) Bethel Park?

Did you experience any concerns during student teaching that made it more difficult for you to develop your potential as a prospective teacher?

Did any of these concerns affected your attitude toward teaching itself?

Do you feel that their are any disadvantages the (Mars) Bethel Park school - district experiences through having student teachers teaching in the different schools?

Do you feel their are any disadvantages the university physical education department experiences through placing student teachers in the (Mars) Bethel Park school - district?

What do you believe are possible future developments in the student teaching experience at (the Mars Teaching Centre) Bethel Park, that would enable your (mentor) - cooperating teacher to give more help to you in your development as a student teacher?

What do you believe are possible future developments in the student teaching experience at (the Mars Teaching Centre) Bethel Park, that would enable the university supervisor to play even more of an influential role in your development as a student teacher?

What do you believe are possible future developments in the student teaching experience at (the Mars Teaching Centre) Bethel Park, that would enable you the student teacher to play more of an influential role in your own development?

Are there any other points you would like to mention that you feel are important to help other people understand more about the student teaching experience you have just gone through?

Bibliography

America 2000. (1991). <u>An education strategy</u>, United States Department of Education. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Alexander, R. J., Rose J., & Woodhead, C. (1992). <u>Curriculum organization and classroom practice in primary schools: A discussion paper</u>, Department of Education and Science, London.

Apple, N. W. (1992). The text and cultural politics. <u>Educational Researcher,</u> <u>21</u>(7), 4 - 19.

Appleberry, M. (1976). What did you learn from student teaching? <u>Instructor,</u> <u>85</u>(6), 38 - 40.

Applegate, J. H. (1987). Early field experiences: Three viewpoints. In M. Haberman & J. Backus (Eds), <u>Advances in teacher education</u> (Vol. 3, pp 75 - 93).

Andrews, L. O. (1964). <u>Student teaching</u>, New York: Center for Applied Research in Teaching.

Arends, R. I. (1983). Beginning teachers as learners, <u>Journal of Educational Research</u>, <u>76</u>(4), 235 - 242.

Arnstine, D. (1975). Apprenticeship as the miseducation of teachers, <u>Philosophy of Education 1975: Proceedings of the 3lst Annual Meeting of the Philosophy of Education Society</u> (pp. 113 - 123), San Jose, CA: Society for Studies in Philosophy and Education.

Arrighi, M. A. & Young, J. C. (1987). Teacher perceptions about effective and successful teaching, <u>Journal of Teaching in Physical Education,</u> <u>6</u>(2), 122-135.

Aspinwall, K., Garrett, V., & Owen - Jackson, G. (1994). In at the beginning: A pilot partnership. In I. Reid, H. Constable & R. Griffiths (Eds), <u>Teacher Education Reform: Current Research</u> (pp. 19 - 39), London: Paul Chapman Pub.

Atkinson, P., Delamont S. & Hammersley, M. (1988). Qualitative research traditions, <u>Review of Educational Research</u>, <u>58</u>(2), 231 - 250.

Babbie, E. R. (1982). Social research for consumers, Wadsworth Publishing Company.

Babbie, E. R. (1989). The practice of social research, (5th ed.). Wadsworth Publishing Company.

Benjamin, A. (1981). The helping interview, Houghton Mifflin Co., Boston.

Bennett, N., & Carre, C. (1993). (Eds.) Learning to teach, London: Routledge.

Berliner, D. (1985). Laboratory settings and the study of teacher education. Journal of Teacher Education, 36(6), 2 - 8.

Beyer, L. (1984). Field experience, ideology, and the development of critical reflectivity. Journal of Teacher Education, 35(3), 36−41.

Beyer , L. (1988). Knowing and Acting: Inquiry and educational studies, Basingstoke, The Falmer Press.

Biddle, B. J., & Anderson, D. 5. (1986). Theory, methods, knowledge, and research on teaching. In N. C. Wittrock (Ed.), Handbook of research on teaching (3rd ed.) (pp. 230−252), New York: Macmillan.

Boggess, T. E., McBride, R. F., & Griffey, D. (1985). The concerns of physical education teachers. Journal of Teaching in Physical Education, 4(3), 202 - 212.

Book, C., Byers, J., & Freeman, D. (1983). Student expectations and teacher education traditions with which we can and cannot live. Journal of Teacher Education, 34(1), 9 - 13.

Bowe, R., & Whitty, G. (1983). A question of content and control: recent conflicts over the nature of school examinations at 16+. In M. Hammersley & A. Hargreaves (Eds.), Curriculum practice: some sociological case studies (pp. 229 - 250), London: Falmer.

Bowles, G., Duelli - Klein, R. (1983). Theories of Women's Studies, London: Routledge and Kegan Paul,

Bowers, L. J. (1971). The influence of the classroom verbal behavior of cooperating teachers upon the verbal behavior of selected intermediate grade student teachers. (Doctoral dissertation, Temple University). Dissertation Abstracts International, 32; 1952A - 1953A.

Brooks, V., Fitch, T., & Robinson, M. (1994). Positive mentoring and the novice - expert. In I. Reid, H. Constable & R. Griffiths (Eds.), Teacher Education Reform: Current Research (pp. 111 - 122), London: Paul Chapman Pub.

Brunelle, J., Tousignant, M., & Pieron, M. (1981). Student teachers perceptions of cooperating teachers' effectiveness, Journal of Teaching in Physical Education, Introductory Issue, 80 - 87.

Bullough, R. V., & Kauchak, D. (1997). Partnerships between higher education and secondary schools: Some problems, Journal of Education for Teaching, 23(3), 215 - 233.

Burnstine, D. (1979). Factors of supervisory help: Perceptions held by physical education college supervisors, student teachers, cooperating teachers, and college faculty members in Pennsylvania. Dissertation Abstracts International, 39; 6628.

Busher, H., & King, P. (1994). Managing further professional studies. In I. Reid, H. Constable & R. Griffiths (Eds), Teacher Education Reform: Current Research (pp. 45 - 52). London: Paul Chapman Pub.

Bushweller, K. (1995). Ed school stomp, The American School Journal, 182, 22 - 27.

Calderhead, J., & Robson, M. (1991). Images of teaching: Student teachers' early conceptions of classroom practice, Teaching and Teacher Education, 7, 1 - 8.

Calvert, C. E. (1970). The role of the cooperating teacher as perceived by student teachers, cooperating teachers, and college supervisors in selected teacher training institutions in Alabama. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Alabama). Dissertation Abstracts International, 71; 5243A - 5244A.

Campbell, B., & Horbury, A. (1994). Mentoring articled science teachers. In I. Reid, H. Constable & R. Griffiths (Eds), Teacher Education Reform: Current Research (pp. 89 - 96), London: Paul Chapman Pub.

Carr, W., & Kemmis, S. (1986). Becoming critical: Education, knowledge and action research, Lewes: Falmer/Deakin University Press.

Carney, M. (1996). Structural adjustment and the changing face of education, International Labour Review, 134(6), 652 - 675.

Castillo, J. B. (1971). The role expectations of cooperating teachers as viewed by student teachers, College supervisors, and cooperating teachers, (Doctoral dissertation, University of Rochester). Dissertation Abstracts International, 71 ; 1374A

Chadbourne, R. (1997). Teacher education in australia: What difference does a government make? Journal of Education for Teaching, 23(1), 7 - 26.

Chalk Circle Dialogue on Teacher Education. (1995). Education industry partnerships for quality teaching (Leichhardt, NSW, Australian Teaching Council and Australian Council of Deans of Education).

Chandler, B. (1971). Levels of thinking in supervisory conferences, Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New York, NY.

Cherryholmes, C. H. (1988). Power and criticism: Poststructural investigations in education, New York: Teachers College Press.

Clandinin, D. J. (1986). Classroom practice: Teacher images in action, Lewes: Falmer Press.

Collier, C. (1995). What we have learned through collaboration, Paper presented at the NASPE Teacher education Conference, Morgantown, WVA.

Collison, J., & Edwards, A. (1994). How teachers support student learning. In I. Reid, H. Constable & R. Griffiths (Eds), Teacher Education Reform: Current Research (pp. 131 - 136), London: Paul Chapman Pub.

Combs, A. (1978). Teacher education: The person in the process. Educational Leadership, 35, 558 - 561.

Conant, J. (1963). The education of American teachers, New York: McGraw Hill.

Constable, H. (1994). Implementing change in teacher education. In I. Reid, H. Constable & R. Griffiths (Eds), Teacher Education Reform: Current Research (pp. 229 - 236), London: Paul Chapman Pub.

Constable, H., & Norton, J. (1994). Student - teachers and their professional encounters. In I. Reid, H. Constable & R. Griffiths (Eds.), Teacher Education Reform: Current Research (pp. 123 - 130), London: Paul Chapman Pub.

Copeland, W. D. (1980). Affective dispositions of teachers in training toward examples of supervisory behavior, Journal of Educational Research, 74(1), 37 - 112.

Copeland, W. D. (1982). Student teachers' preference for supervisory approach, Journal of Teacher Education, 33(2), 32 - 36.

Corrigan, D., & Garland, C. (1966). Studying role relationships, Association for Student Teaching Research Bulletin, 6. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 027 249).

Coulon, S. C. (1989). Behavioral contracts: Uniting the student teaching triad. The Physical Educator, 46(2), 94 - 98.

Cruickshank, D. R. Kennedy, J. J., & Myers, B. (1974). Perceived problems of secondary school teachers. Journal of Educational Research, 58, 154 - 159.

Czejdo, J. (1989). Discrepancies in participants perceptions of the student teaching practicum, Dissertation Abstracts International, 50, 2864 - A.

Darling - Hammond, L., Bullmaster, M. L., & Cobb, V. L. (1995). Rethinking teacher leadership through professional development schools, Elementary School Journal, 96, 87 - 106.

Darst, P. (1974). The effects of a competency - based intervention on student teacher and pupil behavior, (Doctoral dissertation, The Ohio State University), Dissertation Abstracts International, 35; 5092A.

Denzin, N. K. (1970). The research act: A theoretical introduction to sociological methods, Chicago, IL.: Aldine.

Denzin, N. K. (1978). The research act: A theoretical introduction to sociological methods (2nd ed.), New York: McGraw - Hill.

Department for Education. (1992). Initial teacher training, (Secondary Phase), Circular 9/92 (London, DFE).

Department for Education. (1993). Circular 16/93, The initial training of primary school teachers: New criteria for course approval training, (London, DFE).

Department for Education and Employment. (1997). Circular 10/97, Requirements for courses of initial teacher training, (London, DFEE).

Department for Education and Employment. (1998). Circular 4/98, Teaching: high status, high standards. Requirements for courses of initial teacher training, (London, DFEE).

Department of Employment, Education and Training. (1992). Teacher education: A discussion paper, (Canberra, DEET).

Dewar, M. A., & Lawson, H. A. (1990). A critical examination of induction into physical education teaching, Paper presented at the Association Internationale des Ecoles Superieures d'Education Physique, World Convention, Loughborough, England.

Dillman, D. A. (1978). Mail and telephone surveys, Wiley & Sons Publishing.

Dodds, P. (1985). Delusions of "worth - it - ness": Field experiences in elementary physical education teacher education programs. In H. Hoffman & J. Rink (eds.), Physical education Professional preparation: Insights and foresights, 90 - 109. Reston, VA.: AAHPERD Publications.

Dodds, P. (1988). Who socializes trainees in early field experiences? Messages, media and mentors, Manuscript submitted for Publication

Dodds, P. (1989). Trainees, field experiences, and socialization into teaching. In T. J. Templin & P. C. Schempp (Eds), Socialization into physical education: Learning to teach (pp. 81 - 104), Indianapolis IN: Benchmark Press.

Doolittle, S. A., Dodds, P., & Placek, J. H. (1993). Persistence of beliefs about teaching during formal training of preservice teachers, (Monograph), Journal of Teaching in Physical Education, 12, 355 - 365.

Doyle, W. (1990). Themes in teacher education. In W. R. Houston (Ed) Handbook of research on teacher education (pp. 3 - 24), New York: Macmillan.

Dunne, M. (1996). Partnership in initial teacher training: After the shotgun wedding, Educational Review, 48(1), 41 - 53.

Duquette, C. A. (1997). Conflicting perceptions of participants in field - based teacher education programs, McGill Journal of Education, 32, 263 - 272.

Eisner, E. W. (1979). The educational imagination, New York: MacMillan Publishing Co.

Elbaz, F. (1988). Critical reflection on teaching: Insights from freire, Journal of Education for Teaching, 14, 171 - 181.

Elliot, J. (1986). Democratic evaluation as social criticism: or putting the judgment back into evaluation. In M. Hammersley (Ed), Controversies in classroom research (pp. 228 - 237), Milton Keynes, England: Open University Press (First edition).

Eltiste, W. K. (1989). A study to determine the effects of a supervision training program upon cooperating teachers and student teachers, Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Nebraska, Lincoln, NB.

Emans, R. (1983). Implementing the knowledge base: Redesigning the function of cooperating teachers and college supervisors, Journal of Teacher Education, 34(3), 14 - 18.

Erickson, A.(1986). Qualitative methods in research on teaching. In M. C. Wittrock (Ed), Handbook of research on teaching (3rd ed) (pp.119 - 161), New York: MacMillan.

Evans, J. (1990). <u>Researching pedagogy and reflective teaching</u>, Paper presented at the Association Internationale des Ecoles Superieures d'Education Physique, World Convention, Loughborough, England.

Feiman - Nemser, S. (1987). <u>Talking to prospective teachers: Lessons from educational psychology</u>, Paper presented at the meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Washington, DC.

Feiman - Nemser, S. (1990). Teacher preparation: Structural and conceptual alternatives. In W. R. Houston (Ed), <u>Handbook of research on education</u> (pp. 212 - 233), New York: Macmillan.

Feiman - Nemser, S., & Buchmann, N. (1983). <u>Pitfalls of experience in teacher education</u> (Occasional Paper #65), East Lansing, MI.: Michigan State University, Institute for Research on Teaching.

Feiman - Nemser, S., & Buchmann, N. (1987). When is student teaching teacher education? <u>Teaching and Teacher Education,</u> 3(4), 255 - 273.

Feiman - Nemser, S., & Featherstone, R. (1992). <u>Are mentor teachers teacher educators</u>?, East Lansing, MI.: National Center for Research on Teacher Learning,

Fernandez - Balboa, J. M. (1988). <u>Student teachers, views of their responses to pupil misbehavior in physical education classes</u>, Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Massachusetts, Amherst, MA.

Foskett, N., Ratcliffe, M., & Brunner, D. (1994). Communication and innovation. In I. Reid, H. Constable & R. Griffiths (Eds), <u>Teacher Education Reform: Current Research</u> (pp. 40 - 45), London: Paul Chapman Pub.

Fowler, F. (1988). <u>Survey research methods</u>, Sage Publications.

Friend, M., & Cook, L. (1992). <u>Interactions: Collaboration skills for school professionals</u>, New York: Longman.

Fuller, F. F., & Brown, O. H. (1975). Becoming a teacher. In K. Ryan (Ed) <u>Teacher education: The seventy - fourth yearbook of the national society for the study of education</u>, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Furlong, J. (1992). Reconstructing Professionalism: Ideological struggle in initial teacher education. In M. Arnot, & L. Barton (Eds) Voicing concerns: Sociological perspectives on contemporary education reforms (pp. 163 - 185), Triangle Books.

Furlong, J., & Maynard, T. (1995). The growth of professional knowledge: Mentoring student teachers, London: Routledge.

Furlong, J., Whitty, G., Whiting, C., Miles, S., Barton, L., & Barrett, E. (1996). Re - defining partnership: Revolution or reform in initial teacher education, Journal of Education for Teaching, 22(1)., 39 - 55.

Gage, N. L. (1978). The scientific basis of the art of teaching, New York: Teachers College Press.

Garner, A. F. (1973). Role expectations for cooperating teachers, Journal of Business Education, 48, 347 - 348.

Goetz, J. P., & LeCompte, M. D. (1984). Ethnography and qualitative design in educational research, Orlando, FL: Academic Press.

Gilroy, D. P. (1992). The political rape of initial teacher education in England and Wales: A jet rebuttal, Journal of Education for Teaching, 18(1), 5 - 22.

Glaser, B. G., & Strauss, A. L. (1967). The discovery of grounded theory, Chicago: Aldine

Glickman, C. D., & Bey, T. M. (1990). Supervision. In W. P. Houston (Ed), Handbook of research on teacher education (pp. 549 - 566), New York: Macmillan.

Godfrey, R. K. (1995). The influence of cooperating teachers on the educational philosophy of student teachers, Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of South Dakota, SD.

Goodlad, J. I. (1990). Disjunctures in the teacher education enterprise, American Association of Colleges for Teacher Educators Briefs, 2(2), 3 - 4.

Goodman, J. (1988). University culture and the problem of reforming field experiences in teacher education, Journal of Teacher Education, 45 - 53.

Graber, K. C. (1988). A naturalistic study of studentship in the context of preservice teacher training for physical educators, Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Massachusetts, Amherst, MA.

Graber, K. C. (1989). Teaching tomorrow's teachers: Professional preparation as an agent of socialization. In T. J. Templin & P. G. Schempp (Eds), Socialization into physical education: Learning to teach (pp. 59—80), Indianapolis, IN: Benchmark Press.

Gregory, S. A. (1971). Criteria for selecting supervising teachers, The Clearing House, 46(3), 178 - 182.

Griffin, P. S. (1984). Girls participation patterns in a middle school team sports unit, Journal of Teaching in Physical Education, 4, 30 - 38.

Guba, E. G. (1978). Toward a methodology of naturalistic inquiry in educational evaluation (CSE Monograph Series in Evaluation No. 8), Los Angeles: Center for the Study of Evaluation.

Guba, E. G., & Lincoln, Y. S. (1981). Effective evaluation: Improving the usefulness of evaluation results through responsive and naturalistic approaches, San Francisco: Jossey - Bass.

Guyton, E., & McIntyre, D. J. (1990). Student teaching and school experiences. In W. R. Houston (Ed), Handbook of research on teacher education (pp. 514 - 534), New York: Macmillan.

Haberman, M. (1983). Research on preservice laboratory and clinical experiences: Implications for teacher education. In F. Howey & W. Gardner (Eds), The education of teachers: A look ahead (pp. 98 - 117), New York: Longman.

Haberman, M., & Harris, P. (1982). State requirements for cooperating teachers. Journal of Teacher Education, 33(3), 45 - 47.

Hamilton, K. (1974). The effects of a competency - based intervention on student teacher and pupil behavior, (Doctoral dissertation, The Ohio State University), Dissertation Abstracts International, 35; 5191A.

Hardy, C. A. (1997a). Sources of conflict during the school experience of pre - service physical education teachers, European Physical Education Review, 3, 116 - 128.

Hardy, C. A. (1997b). Perceptions of mentoring in physical education classes: The subject mentor's view, The British Journal of Physical Education, 28(1), 12 - 16.

Haring, M., & Nelson, E. (1980). A five year follow - up comparison of recent and experienced graduates from campus and field - based teacher education programs, Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association. Boston.

Hartnett, A., & Naish, M. (1993). Democracy, teaching and the struggle for education: An essay in the political economy of teacher education, Curriculum Studies, 7(3), 335 - 345.

Hawkey, K. (1994). Peer support. In I. Reid, H. Constable & R. Griffiths (eds.), Teacher Education Reform: Current Research (pp. 40 - 45), London: Paul Chapman Pub.

Helison, J. G. (1992). A critical incident study of positively and negatively perceived cooperating teacher behaviors in the physical education student teaching experience, Paper presented at the American Alliance for Health, Physical Education, Recreation and Dance National Convention, Indianapolis.

Hellison, D. R., & Templin, T. J. (1991). A reflective approach to teaching physical education, Human Kinetics: Champaign IL.

Hirst, P. (1990). Internship: A view from outside. In P. Benton (Ed) The Oxford Internship Scheme, London: Calouste Gulbenkian Foundation.

Holland, P.E., Clift, R., Veal, M. L., Johnson, M., & McCarthy, J. (1992). Linking preservice and inservice supervision through professional inquiry. In C. D. Glickman (Ed), Supervision in Transition (pp. 169 - 182), Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development Yearbook. Alexandria, VA.: ASCD.

Holmes Group Report. (1990). Tomorrows schools: Principles for the design of professional development schools, East Lansing, MI.: The Holmes Group.

Holmes Group. (1995). Tomorrow's Schools of Education, East Lansing, MI.: The Holmes Group.

House, E. (1980). Evaluating with Validity, Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Hudson, J., & Latham, A. (1996). Working together: Roles and relationships in the mentoring process. In M. Mawer (Ed), Mentoring in Physical Education: Issues and Insights, Falmer Press: London.

Hynes - Dusel, J. M. (1997). Physical education student teacher concerns, Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Columbia University Teachers College, Columbia, NY.

Isele, F. C. (1989). The representation of teacher effectiveness research in elementary education summative student teacher evaluation forms of NCATE accredited institutions throughout the United States, Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Northern Illinois University, Dekalb, IL.

Jacobs, E. (1987). Qualitative research traditions: a review, Review of Educational Research, 57(1), 1 - 50.

James, T., & NcNiece, E. (1991). State approved alternative certification: Are these programs changing the face of teacher preparation? Paper presented at the summer workshop of the Association of Teacher Educators, Minot, MD.

Johns, K. W., & Cline, D. H. (1985). Supervisory practices and student teacher satisfaction in selected institutions of higher education, Paper presented at the annual meeting of the North Rocky mountain Educational Research Association, (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 267 037).

Jones, J. R. (1989). Teaching practice: Preservice physical educators' attitudes, perceptions and concerns, British Journal of Physical Education Research Supplement, 5, 1—4.

Jones, J. R. (1992a). Chapter 5: The potential dangers facing school - based physical education and teacher education preparation, Pennsylvania Journal of Health, Physical Education, Recreation and Dance, 62(3), 32 - 33.

Jones, J. R. (1992b). Student teachers: Incidents that lead them to confirm or question their career choice. The Physical Educator, 49(4), 205 - 212

Jones, J. R. (1993). The teaching center: An alternative approach to student teaching, <u>Journal of Physical Education, Recreation and Dance</u>, <u>64</u>(7), 53 - 58.

Jones, L., Reid, D., & Bevins, S. (1997). Teachers' perceptions of mentoring in a collaborative model of initial teacher training, <u>Journal of Education for Teaching</u>, <u>23</u>(3)., 253 - 261.

Joyce, B. (1975). Conceptions of man and their implications for teacher education. In K. Ryan (Ed), <u>Teacher Education</u> (74th yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Part II, pp. 111 - 145), Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Kagan, D. M. (1992). Professional growth among preservice and beginning teachers, <u>Review of Educational Research</u>, <u>62</u>, 129 - 169.

Kauffman, D. (1992). <u>Supervision of student teachers</u>, Eric Digest, (ERIC Reproduction Service No. ED 344 873).

Kennedy, M. M. (1991). Some surprising findings on how teachers learn to teach, <u>Educational Leadership</u>, <u>49</u>(3), 14—17.

Kirk, D. (1986). Beyond the limits of theoretical discourse in teacher education: Towards a critical pedagogy, <u>Teaching and Teacher Education</u>, 2, 155 - 167.

Knop, N., LeMaster, K., Norris, M., Raudensky, J., & Tannehill, D. (1997). What we have learned through collaboration: A summary report from a national teacher education conference, <u>The Physical Educator</u>, <u>54</u>(4), 170 - 180.

Koehler, V. (1984). <u>University supervision of student teaching</u> (National Institute of Education Report No. 9061), Austin, TX: University of Texas, R & D Center for Teacher Education, (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 270 349).

Krause, L. D. (1988). Master teacher, student teacher, supervisor: Socialization in a sponsored mentoring relationship, (Doctoral dissertation, Gonzaga University). <u>Dissertation Abstracts International</u>, <u>49</u>; 2927 - A.

Krugman, P. (1995). <u>Peddling Prosperity</u>, N.Y: W. W. Norton and Company, Inc.

Kyriacou, C., & Lin, M. (1994). Student - teachers thinking. In I. Reid, H. Constable & R. Griffiths (Eds), Teacher Education Reform: Current Research (pp. 164 - 169), London: Paul Chapman Pub.

Lanier, J. (1982). Teacher education: Needed research and practice for the preparation of teaching professionals. In D. Corrigan, D. Palmer, & P. Alexander (Eds), The future of teacher education (pp. 13 - 36), College Station: Texas A & M University.

Lawlor, S. (1990). Teachers mistaught, London: Centre for Policy Studies.

LeCompte, M. D., & Preissle, J. (1993). Ethnography and qualitative design in education research (2nd ed), San Diego: Academic Press.

Lindsay, B. (1990). Comparative teacher education: Illustrations from English speaking countries. In W. R. Houston (Ed), Handbook of research on teacher education (pp. 858 - 875), New York: Macmillan.

Locke, L. F. (1984). Research on teaching teachers: Where are we now? Journal of Teaching in Physical Education, Monograph 2, 3 - 85.

Locke, L. F. (1989). Qualitative research as a form of scientific inquiry in sport and physical education, Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport, 60(1), 1 - 20.

Loomis, L. J. (1980). Competencies of secondary school cooperating teachers, Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Arizona, Tempe, AZ.

Lyons, G. (September, 1979). Why teachers can't teach, Texas Monthly, 122 - 130.

MacDonald, B. (1974). Education and the control of education. In B. McDonald & R. Walker (Eds), Innovation, Evaluation, Research and the Problem of Control, Centre for Applied Research in Education: University of East Anglia.

Malloy, J. T. (1975). Dress for success, New York: Wyden

Marrs, L. K., & Templin, T. J. (1983). Student teacher as social strategist. In T. J. Templin & J. K. Olson (Eds), Teaching in Physical Education (pp. 118 - 128), Champaign, IL.: Human Kinetics.

Martinek, T. J., & Schempp, P. G. (1988). An introduction to models for collaboration (Monograph), Journal of Teaching in Physical Education, 7(3), 160 - 164).

Mawer, M. (1996). Learning to teach physical education in the primary school. In M. Mawer (Ed) Mentoring in Physical Education: Issues and Insights, (pp. 89 - 107), London: Falmer Press.

McBride, R. E. (1984). Perceived teaching and program concerns among preservice teachers, university supervisors, and cooperating teachers, Journal of Teaching in Physical Education, 3, 36 - 43.

McBride, R. E. (1989). Interview techniques in research. In Darst, P. W. Zakrajsek, D. B., & Mancini, V. H. (Eds) Analyzing physical education and sport instruction (2nd ed.), (pp. 423 - 430), Champaign. IL.: Human Kinetics.

McElvague, M., & Salters, M. (1992). Models of competence and teacher training, Belfast; Queens University, Belfast.

McIntyre, D. J. (1984). A response to the critics of field experience supervision, Journal of Teacher Education, 35(3), 42 - 45.

McIntyre, D. (1993). Theory, theorizing and reflection in initial teacher education. In J. Calderhead & P. Gates (Eds) Conceptualizing Reflection in Teacher Development, Lewes: Falmer Press.

Mears, R. A. (1981). Student teacher/cooperating teacher relationship, perceptions of conferences, and student morale, (Doctoral dissertation, The Pennsylvania State University). Dissertation Abstracts International, 42, 3115 - A.

Melville, D. S., & Maddalozzo, J. G. (1988). The effects of physical educators' appearance of body fatness on communicating exercise concepts to high school students, Journal of Teaching in Physical Education, 7(4), 343 - 353.

Merriam, S. B. (1988). Case study research in education, San Francisco: Jossey - Bass.

Mintz, M. B. (1972). The influences of cooperating teachers, responsive -descriptive verbal teaching behavior on the responsive - descriptive verbal teaching behavior of student teachers in their classrooms, (Doctoral dissertation, Columbia University), <u>Dissertation Abstracts International, 33</u>; 1064 - A.

Mitchell Waldrop, M. (1992). <u>Complexity</u>, Harmondsworth: Penguin Books.

Mott, D. L. (1976). The real world of the student teacher. <u>Business Education Forum, 30</u>(5), 5 - 6.

Mountford, B. (1993). Mentoring and initial teacher education. In P. Smith & J. West - Burnham (Eds), <u>Mentoring in the Effective School</u>, Harlow: Longman.

Nias, J. (1989). <u>Primary teachers talking: A study of teaching as work</u>, London: Routledge.

Nichols, J. E. (1980). An analysis of problems experienced by the elementary student teacher as perceived by the student teacher, cooperating teacher and university supervisor, <u>Dissertation Abstracts International</u>, <u>4</u>; 2069 - A.

Nickel, J. M. (1970). A study of the relationship between student teachers and cooperating teachers as determined by interaction analysis. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Kansas). <u>Dissertation Abstracts International, 31</u>; 5877A.

Niday, D. M. (1996). Beginning again: Mentoring the novice teacher, (Doctoral dissertation, University of Iowa), <u>Dissertation Abstracts International</u>, 57 - 08.

Norris, N. (1991). <u>Understanding educational evaluation</u>, London: Kogan Page.

Nugent, N. (1994). <u>The government and politics of the european union</u>. London: MacMillan Press.

O'Hear, A. (1988). <u>Who teaches the teachers? A contribution to the public debate on the DES green paper</u>, London: Social Affairs Unit.

Ohio. (1989). <u>Senate Bill 140</u>.

O'Neal, S. (1983). An analysis of student teaching cooperating teacher conferences as related to the self - concept, flexibility, and teaching concerns of each participant, Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Montreal, (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 234 030).

Pajares, M. F. (1992). Teachers' beliefs and educational research: Cleaning up a messy construct, Review of Educational Research, 62, 307 - 332.

Patton, M. Q. (1980). Qualitative evaluative methods, Beverley Hills: Sage.

Patton, M. Q. (1982). Practical evaluation, Beverly Hills: Sage.

Patton, M. Q. (1987). How to use qualitative methods in evaluation, Newbury Park: Sage.

Pettigrew, F. (1988). The effect of student teaching on instructional styles of preservice physical education majors, Paper presented at the Midwest District AAHPERD Conference, Dearborn, MI.

Pfister, J., & Newcomb, L. H. (1984). Evaluation of the student teaching program in agricultural education at the Ohio State University: Summary of research, Ohio State University, Department of Agricultural Education, (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 239 097.

Placek, J. H. (1983). Conceptions of success in teaching: Busy, happy and good. In T. Templin & J. Olsen (Eds). Teaching in Physical Education, (pp. 46 - 56), Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.

Placek, J. H.(1984). A multi - case study of teacher planning in physical education, Journal of Teaching in Physical Education, 4(1), 39 - 49.

Placek, J. H., & Dodds, P. (1988). A critical incident study of preservice teachers' beliefs about teaching success and nonsuccess, Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport, 59, 351 - 358.

Popkewitz, T. (1987). Critical studies in teacher education: Its folklore, theory and practice, Lewes: Falmer Press.

Powney, J. & Watts, M. (1987). Interviewing in educational research, London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Price, A. M. (1998). The beliefs and attitudes of preservice teachers during the initial teacher preparation course in secondary education, Unpublished Masters Thesis, Texas A & M University

Rickard, G. L., & Knight, S. M. (1997). Obstacles to professional development: Interns' desire to fit in, get along, and be real teachers, Journal of Teaching in Physical Education, 16(4), 440 - 453.

Rink, J. (1985). Teaching physical education for learning, St. Louis, MO: Mosby.

Rothman, L. S. (1981). Effective and ineffective supervisory behavior of college supervisors as perceived by secondary cooperating teachers, (Doctoral dissertation, The University of Florida), Dissertation Abstracts International, 45(5), 2086A.

Rothwell, S., Nardi, E., & McIntyre, D. (1994). The perceived values of the role activities of mentors and curricular, professional and general tutors. In I. Reid, H. Constable & R. Griffiths (Eds), Teacher Education Reform: Current Research (pp. 19 - 39), London: Paul Chapman Pub.

Rossi, T. (1996). Pedagogical content knowledge and critical reflection in physical education. In M. Mawer (Ed), Mentoring in Physical Education: Issues and Insights (pp. 179 - 190), London: Falmer Press.

Ryan, M. W. (1989). An investigation of the role expectations held among and within the groups representing each of the three members of the student teaching triad, Dissertation Abstracts International, 50; 924A.

Saffici, C. L. (1996). The relationship of hardiness, efficiency and locus of control to the work motivation of student teachers, (Doctoral dissertation, University of Houston), Dissertation Abstracts International, 57; 08.

Scarth, J. (1987). Teacher strategies; A review and a critique, British Journal of Sociology of Education, 8(3), 245 - 262.

Schempp, P. (1985). Becoming a better teacher: An analysis of the student teaching experience, Journal of Teaching in Physical Education, 4, 198 - 203.

Schempp, P. (1986). Physical education student teachers' beliefs in their control over student learning, Journal of Teaching in Physical Education, 5(3), 198 - 203.

Schofield, J. W. (1989). Increasing the generalizability of qualitative research. In E. W. Eisner & A. Peshkin (Eds), Qualitative Inquiry in Education: The Continuing Debate (pp. 201 - 232), New York: Teachers College Press.

Schon, D. (1983). The reflective practitioner: How professionals think in action, New York: Basic Books.

Schon, D. (1987). Educating the reflective practioner: Toward a new design for teaching and learning, San Francisco: Jossey - Bass.

Schubert, W. H. (1989). Reconceptualizing and the matter of paradigms, Journal of Teacher Education, 11(4), 27 - 32.

Shippy, V. S. (1989). An investigation of role expectations in the student teaching triad as viewed by student teachers, cooperating teachers and College supervisors, (Doctoral dissertation, State University of New York at Albany), Dissertation Abstracts International, 50; 926 - A.

Shulman, L. S. (1986). Those who understand: Knowledge growth in teaching, Educational Researcher, 15(2), 4 - 14.

Simons, H. (1987). Getting to know school in a democracy, London: Falmer Press.

Smith, Y. R. S. (1981). Analysis of selected processes associated with physical education student teachers experiences, Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor.: MI

Smith, B. O. (1971). Introduction. In B. O. Smith (Ed), Research in teacher education: A symposium (pp. 1 - 9), Englewood Cliffs, NJ.: Prentice - hall.

Smith, J. M. (1991). The alternate route: Flaws in the New Jersey plan, Educational Leadership, 49(3), 32 - 36.

Smyth, J. (1985). Developing a critical appreciation of clinical supervision, Journal of Curriculum Studies, 17(4), 1 - 15.

Solmon, M. A., & Ashy, M. H. (1995). Value orientations of preservice teachers, Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport, 66(3), 219 - 230.

Spradley, J. P. (1979). The ethnographic interview, New York: Hell Rinehart and Winston.

Sparkes, A. C. (1993). Challenging technical rationality in physical education: The potential of a life history, Physical Education Review, 16(2), 107 - 121.

Sparkes, A. C., Templin, T., & Schempp, P. G. (1990). The problematic nature of a career in a marginal subject: some implications for teacher education programmes, Journal of Education for Teaching, 16(1), 3 - 28.

Sparkes, B., Steffen, J., & Carlisle, C. (1990). An analysis of the clinical experience in teacher education in physical education within institutions of varying sizes, orientation and missions, The Physical Educator, 47(4), 27 - 36.

Tabachnick, B. R. (1988). Research on teacher education in the future: Naturalistic research that is culturally responsive, Paper presented at the First Asia - Pacific Conference on Teacher Education, Bangkok, Thailand.

Tabachnick, B. R., Popkewitz, T., & Zeichner, K. (1979). Teacher education and the professional perspectives of student teachers, Interchange, 10(4), 12 - 29.

Tabachnick, B. R., & Zeichner, K. (1984). The impact of the student teaching experience on the development of teaching perspective,. Journal of Teacher Education, 35(6), 28 - 37.

Tabachnick, B. P., & Zeichner, K. (1985). The development of teacher perspectives: Final report, Madison, WI.: University of Wisconsin, Center for Education Research.

Tannehill, D. (1989). Student teaching: A view from the other side, Journal of Teaching in Physical Education, 8, 243 - 253.

Tannehill, D., & Goc - Karp, G. (1992). The student teaching practicum: Placement trends and issues, The Physical Educator, 49(1), 39 - 48.

Tannehill, D., & Zakrajsek, D. (1990). Effects of a self - directed training program on cooperating teacher behavior, Journal of Teaching in Physical Education, 9, 140 - 151.

Tanner, D. E. (1986). Do university supervisors, cooperating leachers and student teachers agree about the student teachers performance? Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Association of Teacher Educators, Atlanta. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 272 507).

Teaching and America's Future (1996). What matters most: Teaching for america's future, New York: National Commission on Teaching and America's Future.

Templin, T. (1979). Occupational socialization and the physical education student teacher, Research Quarterly, 50(3), 482 - 493.

Templin, T. (1981). Student as socializing agent, Journal of Teaching in Physical Education, Introductory Issue: 30 - 38.

Templin, T., Sharpe, T., & Savage, M. (1997). Moving beyond Reification: Collaboration and educational reform in sport pedagogy, International Journal of Physical Education: a Review Publication, 1(1), 4 - 9.

Tinning, R. I. (1988). Student teaching and the pedagogy of necessity, Journal of Teaching in Physical Education, 7(2), 82 - 89.

Tinning, R. I. (1990). Teacher education pedagogy: Dominant discourses arid the process of problem - setting, Paper presented at the Association Internationale des Ecoles Supericures d'Education Physique, World Convention, Loughborough, England.

Tinning, R. I., & Siedentop, D. (1985). The characteristics of tasks and accountability in student teaching, Journal of Teaching in Physical Education, 4, 286 - 299.

True, J. A. (1983). Finding out: Conducting and evaluating social research, Belmont, CA.: Wadsworth Publishing Company.

Tullis, H. J. (1988). Expectation shift of student teachers and their cooperating teachers, (Doctoral dissertation, Texas Tech University), Dissertation Abstracts International, 49; 3337 - A.

Veal, M. (1998). Media reviews, Journal of Teaching Physical Education, 17, 505 - 509.

Veal, M. L., & Rikard, L. (1998). Cooperating teachers' perspectives on the student teaching triad, Journal of Teacher Education, 49(2), 108 - 119.

Wade, R. C. (1997). Empowerment in student teaching through community service learning, Theory into Practice, 36, 184 - 191.

Walker, D. (1971). The process of curriculum development: A naturalist model, School Review, I, 51 - 69.

Webb, M. S. (1979). Conflict in the supervisory triad of college supervisor, cooperating teacher and student teacher, (Doctoral dissertation, University of Oregon), Dissertation Abstracts International, 40; 5012 - A.

Webster, G. E., & Graham, C. M. (1989). Expectations for student teachers: Rigid and flexible triads, Paper presented at the American Alliance for Health, Physical Education, Recreation and Dance National Convention, Boston.

Welch, M. (1998). Collaboration: Staying on the bandwagon, Journal of Teacher Education, 49(1), 26 - 37.

Weinstein, C. S. (1989). Teacher education students' perceptions of teaching, Journal of Teacher Education, 40(2), 53 - 60.

Whitehead, R. (1984). Practicum students' perceptions of teacher associates supervisory behaviors, Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Canadian society for the Study of Educat ion, Guelph, Canada. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 269 856).

Whitty, G. L. (1997). Giving the 'hidden hand' a helping hand? The rhetoric and reality of liberal education reform in england and new zealand, Comparative Education, 33(3), 453 - 467.

Wiley, R. C. (1972). Determining tendencies of college faculty, student teachers, and cooperating teachers toward traditionalism or progressivism in their attitudes regarding education, Research in Education, 7(11), 131.

Wise, A. E. (1991). Response: We need more than a redesign, Educational Leadership, 49(3), 7.

Wright, N., & Bottery, M. (1997). Perceptions of professionalism by the mentors of student teachers, Journal of Education for Teaching, 23(3), 240 - 252.

Yee, A. (1969). Do cooperating teachers influence the attitudes of student teachers? Journal of Educational Psychology, 60(4), 327 - 332.

Ysseldyke, J. E. (1987). Instructional factors that influence student achievement: An integrative review (Monograph No.7), Minneapolis, MN. : University of Minnesota Instructional Alternatives Project, (ERIC Document Reproduction Services No. ED 303 977).

Zeichner, K. N. (1979). The dialectics of teacher socialization, Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Association of Teacher Educators, Orlando, FL.

Zeichner, K. M. (1983). Alternative paradigms of teacher education, Journal of Teacher Education, 34(3), 3 - 9.

Zeichner, K. M. (1987). The ecology of field experience: Toward an understanding of the role of field experiences in teacher development. In M. Haberman & J. Backus (Eds), Advances in Teacher Education (pp. 94 - 117), Norwood, NJ.: Ablex.

Zeichner, K. M., & Gore, J. M. (1990). Teacher socialization. In W. R. Houston (Ed), Handbook of research on teacher education (pp. 329 - 348), New York: Macmillan.

Zeichner, K. M., & Liston, D. (1987). Teaching student teachers to reflect, Harvard Educational Review, 57(1), 23 - 48.

Zeichner, K. M., Liston, D., Mahlios, M., & Gomes, M. (1987). The structure and goals of a student teaching program and the characteristics and qualities of supervisory discourse, Paper presented at the meeting of the American Educational Research Association. Washington, DC.

Zimpher, N., Devoss, G., & Nott, D. (1980). A closer look at university student teacher supervision, Journal of Teacher Education, 31(4), 11 - 15.

Zimpher, N., & Howey, K. (1987). Adapting supervisory practice to different orientations of teaching competence, Journal of Curriculum and Supervision, 2(2), 101 - 127.