THE TRIAD IN THE SUPERVISION PROCESS OF THE PRACTICUM: A CASE FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF PARTNERSHIP WITH SCHOOLS AND THE USE OF MENTORS INSTEAD OF COOPERATING TEACHERS.

ALAN KEITH LINNELL,

BA, M Ed, MA, FRGS

Faculty of Education *School of Teaching & Curriculum Studies*

A Dissertation submitted in partial fulfilment of requirements for the award of Doctor of Education, University of Sydney, 1998.

ABSTRACT.

The most consistent aspect of teacher education programs is a period of in-school experience during which student teachers refine their newly acquired teaching skills in an actual classroom setting. Although known by various names this experience is commonly referred to as the practicum.

Most groups engaged in this practicum see it as a central component of the teacher education curriculum, but there are a number of inherent problems in its application. They are problems of philosophy and organization which have attracted considerable research. Some innovations have filtered through to the practicum programs, but there is still room for considerable improvement.

In particular, considerable doubt has grown in recent years about the effectiveness of traditional types of teaching practice supervision, yet most education institutions continue to arrange teaching practice on a broadly "triadic" basis of partnership (student teacher - cooperating teacher and university supervisor). This study will look closely at the perceptions of the roles and relationships engendered by this triad as provided by a selection of triadic partners for a group of student teachers from the University of Sydney, Australia. An alternative model that incorporates closer liaison with practising schools through the development of partnerships and the introduction of mentors to replace cooperating teachers, is considered.

The research methodology used consists of a number of interviews conducted during a particular period of practicum, where a group of student teachers, cooperating teachers and university supervisors were asked specific questions regarding their roles and relationships during the in-school experience and their attitude towards certain changes in the format of the practicum.
The resultant information was collated and used as a basis to investigate four salient questions, namely:

1.Do the data from the participants in this study indicate that the development of partnerships between tertiary institutions and practising schools will lead to a better understanding by both schools and universities of the needs of the student teacher on practicum?

2.Do the data from the participants in this study indicate that the innovation of mentor teacher to replace the traditional cooperating teacher on the practicum would result in the development of student teachers more able to cope with the needs of the classroom and the profession?

3. Do the data from the participants in this study indicate that the role of the university supervisor can be clearly delineated to support the notion of partnership and mentoring?

4. Do the data from the participants in this study indicate that the roles and relationships of the triad would be improved by the introduction of a system of partnership between schools and universities and the development of training of teachers to act as mentors?

The findings support the development of a model of partnership between university and practising schools and the development of mentors instead of the traditional cooperating teachers through a structured in-service program conducted by the tertiary institution.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.

I would like to thank Dr. David Smith for his patience, help and advice in supervising this research. At all times he has been available to me to help with the many challenges that I faced. I am indebted to him.

My thanks also to the professional colleagues, student teachers, cooperating teachers and university lecturers alike, who supported me in my endeavours. I am also indebted to the many colleagues that I met in Britain during my visits to universities to collect material and data specifically related to school-based teacher education.

Finally, my gratitude to my wife, Margaret, for the hours spent alone, in being an interested listener, and putting up with my idiosyncrasies, and to Sheila Drysdale for helping me to overcome the traumas of initial computer work. Any errors that may appear in the text are mine alone and not to be attributed to any other person.

ALAN LINNELL.

DEFINITION OF TERMS USED IN THIS THESIS.

1. PRACTICUM. Refers to a period of teaching and related activities in a school conducted by a student teacher, where the student teacher assumes a major responsibility for the full range of teaching studies in a real situation, under the guidance of qualified personnel from the teacher education institution and from the cooperating school. It includes all facets of the life of a school with which the student teacher should be involved.

2. TEACHING PRACTICE. This concept is used synonymously with the term 'practicum' because this is how it is used throughout the literature studied.

3. PRACTICE TEACHING. In this study this term will refer to the actual face to face teaching carried out by the student teacher whilst on practicum. It is thus, a far narrower concept than practicum or teaching practice.

4. INTERNSHIP. This is an extended period of placement in a school, which is a structured program that places final year student teachers with an experienced teacher. There is continuous contact with the university supervisor and the student teacher is recognized as a beginning teacher being inducted into the teaching profession.

5. INDUCTION. This is a planned program intended to provide some systematic and sustained assistance to beginning teachers for atleast one school year. Although some Australian universities use the term loosely when considering internship programs, the American experience sees the induction year as the first teaching year for beginning teachers.

6. COLLEAGUE TEACHER. The teacher with whom the student teacher would work in the internship situation on a daily basis in the classroom. The student teacher could have more than one colleague teacher, and one of the colleague teachers would be the mentor.

7. COOPERATING TEACHER. Experienced members of a school staff are asked to fill this position by principals of schools in cooperation with university teacher education programs. They are expected to guide student teachers through the practice teaching period with the offer of advice, explanation of teaching methods used, general classroom management and, in many cases, to assist the university in the assessment of the student teacher.

8. SUPPORT TEACHER. This is a specific reference to the American notion of a cooperating teacher. The term refers to the supportive role the teacher performs in helping the student teacher.

9. MENTOR. Experienced members of a school's teaching staff are invited to attend in-service workshops which prepare them to carry out the duties of a mentor. That is, they are acquainted with the needs of the student teacher whilst on the practicum. They oversee the immersion of the student teacher into the full life of the school and the accompanying teaching responsibilities. This is done through regular conferencing, reflection and role modelling. An important part of these responsibilities is that the mentor acts as liaison between the school and the university by holding regular meetings with the university supervisor to discuss the student teacher's progress. The mentor, in many cases, is also responsible for the assessment of the student teacher.

10. MENTORING. This concept refers to the carrying out of the mentor responsibilities during the practicum.

11. UNIVERSITY SUPERVISOR. The person allocated with the reponsibility of ensuring that the practising school fully understands the needs of the university teacher education program is the supervisor. He or she is expected to support the student teacher by regular visits to the school and regular attendance in the classroom to observe taught lessons. Liaison with the mentor and cooperating teachers on the progress of the student teacher is a vital part of his or her duties.

12. PARTNERSHIP. Refers to a far closer relationship between a practising school and a university than that which was previously recognized. Although there are varying degrees of partnership, the basic thrust is to improve the communication between the parties so that the university has better trained student teachers and the school gains through the expertise offered by the university and through the collaboration with other partnership schools. In the partnership, the school is expected to allow a number of its teaching staff to be prepared (through in-service courses) to act as mentors to support student teachers. The university supervisor is expected to visit schools on a number of occasions to support curriculum innovations, which should help the ongoing development of the school.

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION.

The Practicum, which includes all school experiences has emerged as an entrenched and widely accepted component of teacher preparation. Conant (1963), Andrews (1978), Price (1989), Zeichner (1990) and Jeans (1993) all describe school experiences as the most important element in professional education and student teaching as the most universally approved education course. These statements are consistently supported by teachers' high ratings of practicum as the single most beneficial segment of their teacher education program (Turney,et al. 1982, McCulloch & Lock, 1992). It was found that students generally value practice teaching highly and regard it as the most important component of their preparation (Turney,et.al 1982; Bullough & Gitlin 1994). Recent educational reform movements have often resulted in an increase in the amount of school experience required of teacher education students (Holmes Group,1986; Department of Education & Science.1989, Ebbeck Report, 1990, Holmes Group,1990). It is this highly valued experience that is the focus of this dissertation.

1.1 AIMS OF THE DISSERTATION.

The major aim of this dissertation is to examine the roles and relationships existing in the practicum and to suggest possible improvements. To this end the study will address the following sub-aims:

i)to implement research that investigates the roles and relationships of the supervisory triad, namely the student teacher, the cooperating teacher and the university supervisor existing in the current practicum arrangements;

ii) to develop from this review an ideal of partnership between practising schools and tertiary institutions based on the concept of mentor teacher; and iii) to develop strategies of mentoring to be used instead of the traditional role of the cooperating teacher in the practicum and to evaluate critically the recommended strategies.

The investigation of four salient questions through the responses of the study participants will be used to satisfy the aims and sub aims:

1. *Do the data from the participants in this study indicate that the development of partnerships, as defined, between tertiary institutions and schools will lead to a better understanding by both parties of the needs of the student teacher on practicum?* The study will attempt to show that the development of closer links between universities and practising schools will improve the quality of the practicum for the student teacher.

2. *Do the data from the participants in this study indicate that the innovation of mentor, as defined, to replace the traditional cooperating teacher on the practicum would result in the development of student teachers more able to cope with the needs of the classroom and the profession?* This question is at the crux of this study. The study will attempt to show that a more capable student teacher will emerge if the traditional role of the cooperating teacher is replaced by a 'trained' mentor.

3.*Do the data from the participants in this study indicate that the role of university supervisor can be clearly delineated to support the notion of partnership and mentoring.* The university supervisor is the main link between the practising schools and the university. The study will attempt to emphasize this link and its importance in the development of the innovations of partnership and mentor.

4.*Do the data from the participants in this study indicate that the roles and relationships of the triad (the student teacher, the cooperating teacher and the university supervisor) would be improved by the introduction of a system of partnership between schools and institutes of higher education and the development and training of teachers to act as mentors?* The study will attempt to show that the development of closer relationships with practising schools by institutes of higher education and the replacement of the traditional cooperating teacher by a trained mentor will lead to better relationships within the triad.

1.2 DEFINITION OF PRACTICUM.

At the outset of this study there is need for a clear definition as to what is meant by the practicum, (see definition of terms). The use of the word "practicum" as a generic term encompasses many similar components such as teaching practice, clinical experience, student teaching, field experience, teaching rounds and micro teaching. As suggested by Turney, et. al. (1985) **"Ideally conceived, the practicum is a purposeful series of supervised professional experiences in which student teachers apply, refine and reconstruct theoretical learnings and through which they develop their teaching competences".** This research will limit itself to a period of in-school experience undertaken by student teachers under the guidance and supervision of cooperating teachers and university supervisors. It will also limit itself to high school experiences undertaken by University of Sydney students in the Faculty of Education. For the purpose of clarity the term practicum, as used in the dissertation, will be synonymous with the terms teaching practice and in-school experience, which broadly apply the ideas suggested by Turney (1985).

1.3 FOCUS OF RESEARCH.

To focus research on the practicum is to isolate unnaturally one element in an integrated course of professional education. The student teachers' experience of teaching in school is necessarily linked to their theoretical studies in the university; the interplay of the two is a fundamental assumption on which the present organization of training is based. Thus practicum in all its forms cannot be understood as a self contained phenomena, but must, it can be argued, be considered in relation to the university course as a whole, it must be seen moreover, against the background of a university society designed to encourage professional attitudes (Stones,1986,pp176-178). To isolate it, even for research purposes, is to suggest an arbitrary distinction between elements in the course which is less than fair to the attempts at coherence and integration which faculties of education strenuously promote (Zeichner, 1990).

Nevertheless, for this study a focal point was necessary. The Practicum provides such a focal point. It is part of the University course in which all student teachers must engage. Its boundaries are defined in terms of time, since in the case of practicum, it occupies specific and clear cut periods and space since it necessitates the student teachers' presence in schools. It is also that aspect of the teacher education course which most directly involves the participation of university supervisors, teachers in schools, and which imposes direct demands on the school system.

1.4 SOURCE MATERIAL.

The first aim of this exercise was to gain as much information as possible about the findings of Australian, American and British research into various aspects of practicum. In order to assess the strengths, limitations and future directions of the research it was necessary to pay some attention to ways in which the research projects were conducted. For the following Literature Review

empirical investigations, that is, surveys, action research, case studies, evaluations, reflections on anecdotal data, as well as pre or post test designs (with or without interventions) were deemed to belong to research on the topic. Philosophical treatises, description of course arrangements, procedures and principles, and position papers on the practicum were also included.

Information upon which this research and this thesis were based were obtained from a variety of sources. These included overseas visits in 1994 to the United Kingdom and interviews held with teaching staff in the universities of Leeds, Sheffield, Manchester, Birmingham and Oxford. Communication across Australia with schools of education, namely: the Australian National University, La Trobe University, Griffith University, the University of NSW and the University of Sydney Interviews were also held with a number of student teachers, university supervisors and cooperating teachers involved in the B.Ed. program at the university of Sydney. Various text were consulted as shown in the bibliography. Electronic data sources were searched to obtain numerous journal articles on the research topic taken from the U.S., the U.K. and Australia. About half the investigatory projects consulted were cross sectional surveys using questionnaires or interview techniques to collect data; about 12% can be described as case studies and a comparable proportion as action research projects. Only 10% involved pre and post testing, where data was collected at the beginning and end of a short period of time, for example, a three week practice teaching period. Generally, the projects were of short duration. In the majority of cases the investigatory subjects were persons enrolled in courses taught by the principal investigators.

1.5 OUTLINE OF THE DISSERTATION.

Chapters 2 and 3 are concerned with the review of the literature. Chapter 2 will look specifically at issues related to the roles and relationships

experienced in the practicum triad and a consideration of the various examples of research previously conducted. In Chapter 3 the main thrust in the review of the literature is school-based teacher education, which is namely a study of the concepts of internship, induction and partnership between schools and universities, internships and mentor teaching. Chapter 4 outlines the theoretical base of the study and chapter 5 describes the study undertaken. Chapter 6 reports the results of the study and considers in detail the interview data gained from members of the triad - the student teacher, the cooperating teacher and the university supervisor. The findings are then discussed in Chapter 7 in relation to the literature reviewed in Chapters 2 and 3. This chapter also considers the conclusions of the dissertation and implications for further research and development.

CHAPTER 2.

THE ROLES AND RELATIONSHIPS IN THE PRACTICUM TRIAD: A CRITICAL REVIEW.

The research context of this dissertation lies in recent theorising and research into the practicum component of Teacher Education Programs. This review of literature discusses particular aspects of the previous research which are relevant to the study. It begins by looking at recent comment on the directions of teacher education in Australia, United States and Great Britain. It then considers literature written on an important aspect of the practicum, supervision and supervisors, and finally reports on the literature that has been generated with regard to the roles and relationships that are evident in the practicum by cooperating teachers and mentors.

2.1. DIRECTIONS IN TEACHER EDUCATION. It is not possible to undertake a complete review of the literature on teacher education in the Western World. However it is necessary to provide a framework and this includes an overview of recent developments in teacher education in Australia, United States and Great Britain, which impinge directly on the thrust of this study. A key aspect of these developments is the effect they have had upon the nature of the practicum and the personnel involved in it.

2.2. SUPERVISION AND SUPERVISORS is an examination of the research already conducted into the supervision of the practicum from a macro stance and considers the basic shortcomings in the present methods of this supervision. A natural progression from this section was to look at the roles and relationships exhibited by members of the triad in the practicum, that is the student teacher, the university supervisor and the cooperating teacher.

2.3 COOPERATING TEACHERS AND MENTORS focuses on an outline of previous research into one of the focal areas of the study. A large proportion of the problems stated by student teachers in the research available is concerned with their relationships with their cooperating teachers.

2.1. DIRECTIONS IN TEACHER EDUCATION.

There are at present very significant forces for change in teacher education in Australia. These forces have the potential to alter the fundamental aspects of existing policy and practice, including course length, nature, and balance of content. They are represented in print by a number of reports, including the Discipline Review of Teacher Education in Mathematics and Science (Department of Employment, Education & Training, 1989) the Schools Council paper on Teacher Quality (National Board for Employment, Education & Training, 1989), the Discussion Paper on Course Length and Nomenclature (N.B.E.E.T.,1989), the Federal Government's Strategy on Rural Education and Training (D.E.E.T., 1989) and perhaps most significantly, the Report of the Australian Education Council's (1990) Working Party on Teacher Education. These publications followed a series of others which appeared earlier, including the Commonwealth Government's White Paper on Higher Education (Dawkins,1988; Beazley, 1993), and the Report of the Commonwealth Schools Commission's In-Service Teacher Education Project(1988). One characteristic of this current pressure for change is that it originates overwhelmingly from governments, and from governments holding far more interventionist intentions than has been the case in the past. This is a direct result of a preoccupation with the quality of teachers and the nature of teacher education programs, especially preservice teacher education and a national government that set about reforming higher education with the amalgamations of institutes of higher education (Dawkins,1988). Another

characteristic is that these sorts of changes implied are not confined to Australia. Similar pressure exists and similar actions are being taken by governments in other countries, particularly the United States, (Holmes Group,1986, Carnegie Task Force on Teaching as a Profession,1986, Holmes Group, 1990) and Great Britain, (Department of Education & Science, 1983, 1989, Educational Reform Act,1988, Education Act 1994, Department For Education, 1992a,1992b).

A preoccupation with the quality of teachers and the nature of teacher education programs, especially pre-service, existed throughout the 1980's and especially in the second half of that decade. One particular area in which there has been significant debate is the definition of a knowledge base for teacher preparation. (Cruickshank & Cruz 1989). This debate has included discussion as to what constitutes the knowledge base, its length and breadth, and its capacity to form a basis for teacher preparation programs. It has been argued (Beaudry,1990, Guyton & McIntyre 1990) , that the definition of a knowledge base is fundamental to establish professional standards for teaching. Unlike some other professions, for example, Engineering and Medicine, teaching has not had clearly defined standards for preparation, and this has influenced the public perception of teaching as a sub-professional career and the view that teachers lack expertise. (Beaudry,1990).

Two other current issues of concern to this thesis identifiable from the literature should be mentioned. The first is continuing questioning over the effectiveness of the practicum, including the lack of coherence with university-based studies, and the training of supervisors (Beeson,1991, Carnegie Task Force,1986, Holmes Group,1990). The second is concern over government support of alternate routes into teaching (Holmes Group, 1986, Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education, (C.A.T.E.), 1985, D.E.S., 1989, D.F.E.,1992a). The fear in the United States and Britain is that the alternative

routes, sometimes consisting only of short, intensive skills sessions for certain academically qualified applicants, will become the main model. This is not, of course, an unusual situation. In NSW in the 1980's, when there was an apparent shortage of teachers in areas such as Science teaching, the Department of Education ran short, intensive courses of 12 weeks duration with the blessing and support of some teacher education institutions. For example, St. George Institute of Education took part in the program (Thursby,1980). Support for alternative routes into teaching comes in terms of arguments against the school to university to school models of teacher preparation, and the costs of extended teacher education programs (Eltis,1992).

These rather pessimistic views of trends in teacher education are supported by Zeichner (1990) and Guyton &McIntyre (1990). They conclude, rather strongly that "research in teacher education and particularly, in field experiences, is too theoretical, simplistic, disparate, contradictory, inconsequential and non critical, and has prompted teacher educators not to action, but to indifference and despair" (Guyton & McIntyre, 1990). However, Zeichner does state that he detects a noticeable shift in the practicum literature in the past few years: "more and more studies are beginning to emerge which do attend to the multi-dimensional and dynamic quality of the practicum" (Zeichner, 1990). He states: "that these studies are in a minority,but they have begun to provide important insights into the educational potential of the practicum".

The practicum, itself, has seen considerable shift of emphasis towards longer periods of in school experience. Similarities with the British model, where pre service student teachers spend over 60% of the final year of their course in schools are noted in Australia and the United States (City Art Institute, B ED(Art) Program, 1981, Carnegie Report,1986). Overall, there are certain

common trends in the development of teacher education in recent years. These are:

1. concern about teacher quality;

2. increased activities by governments to influence the nature, structure and direction of teacher education;

3. greater recognition of the importance of viewing teacher education as a continuum, with continuing professional development throughout the teacher's career, following preservice preparation;

4.more emphasis on in-service education that is focused on the school;

5.greater emphasis on the preparation of beginning teachers for the practice of teaching, including emphasis on the development of skills and the provision of greater periods of time and more realistic experiences in schools, possibly through the use of some form of internship;

6. a continuing interest in the lengths of preservice programs; and

7. concern about the ability to attract good quality applicants to the profession.

These trends form the basis of much that follows in this study. Perhaps the most pertinent to this section is the second, which refers to increased government intervention. Continuing concerns over the effectiveness of present practicum arrangements in Australia, including the lack of coherence with instution-based studies and the training of supervisors are highlighted by Beeson (1991). Again, there are signs that the politicisation of teacher education in the United States has increased in intensity (Zeichner, 1990).

Faced with the task of remedying the lack of coherence in the preparation of teachers, the British Government introduced national standards in training and as a result became highly interventionist with the teacher training institutions. The formation of C.A.T.E. allowed the British Government to impose its presence universally (Wilkin,1992). The notion of a move to a model of "school-based teacher education, with schools in the lead in all phases of the development and running of courses was enthusiastically supported by government" (Judge, et al., 1994). Although the practicum, per se, represents the main thrust of this study it cannot be considered in isolation. The trends referred to impinge on all parts of teacher education.

This overview of directions in teacher education was necessary to set the scene for what follows. Suggested changes to the practicum and its organization are a direct result of the trends mentioned earlier. One of the most important parts of the practicum are matters pertaining to supervision. The following section on supervision and supervisors looks at the literature pertinent to this study.

2.2. SUPERVISION AND SUPERVISORS.

The scope and quality of school supervision during the practicum has a major impact on the development of teaching skills and attitudes (Turney et al. 1985), yet until recently supervision has received scant attention and has largely been taken for granted (Cameron & Wilson,1993). A paper by Boydell (1986) presented an extensive analysis of supervision in practice teaching and highlighted such critical issues as:

1. The large amount of time(and cost) associated with supervision by teachers and tertiary staff;

2. The dearth of information available about supervision;

3. The ineffectiveness of traditional styles of supervision promoted by tertiary staff.; and

4. The dominance of an apprenticeship approach to practice teaching coupled with the traditional form of assessment, forcing conformity to existing practices.

He argued, however, that locating full responsibility for supervision in the hands of teachers was not the answer to these problems, for such a change would enhance the importance of the apprenticeship model, a model which was grossly inadequate (Stones,1984; Zeichner,1986; Wilkin,1992).

A more realistic approach was to reconceptualize the role of the university supervisor (Boydell,1986) so that the process of supervision encouraged student teachers to reflect on the process of their socialization, "to make informed sociological and psychological analysis of school and classroom life, and consequently move to beyond mere observation and imitation of classroom practice but to appraise, question, evaluate and to experiment in teaching" (Stones,1984). This approach very much reflected the clinical form of supervision which sought to develop a supervisory relationship between student and supervisor whereby both were jointly involved in all aspects of the student's teaching, from initial planning to post lesson analysis and evaluation (Smyth,1982, Turney et al.1982; Zeichner,1992). Clinical supervision, therefore, involved a collegial partnership, allowing the supervisor to work with the student so that he or she developed skills and attitudes necessary for long term professional development. A different approach to changing supervision reflected views expressed by Emans (1983) and reported in Boydell (1986). This approach recognized that the fundamental problem was that schools themselves must change, and university supervisors, therefore, should

give top priority to teachers rather than students, and therefore act in an in-service mode to influence curriculum development and teaching in schools, and focus on the interpretation of theory and research that constituted the knowledge base of education (Boydell,1986). This suggested a somewhat radical change in role, but with the retention and expression of vital links between training institutions and schools as was illustrated in the following quotation from Emans (1983): "College supervisors would still be the liaison between the university and the schools, and would still be available if something goes wrong in the student teaching situation, however, their main influence would be on the cooperating teacher and, indirectly, on the school environment"(Emans,1983,p.16).

This view, of course, pre supposed the development of a much closer link between training institutions and school systems and recognition that pre-service and in-service education have much in common. A view already mooted in major state reviews of teacher education in Australia (Board of Teacher Education,Queensland, 1984) and illustrated in practice in the IT-Inset approach (Ashton, Henderson, Merritt & Mortimer (1983) in which tutors worked cooperatively with small groups of student teachers and teachers in a given curricular area over a period of time. Cooperation extended across preservice and inservice areas so that training-institution-school relationships were seen as cooperative and mutually beneficial (Ashton,et al.1983, Price,1989, Jeans,1993, Fullerton,et al., 1993).

The above ongoing view of supervision was also stressed in a comment on supervision in Australian Teacher Education (Price,1987). Price said "however, supervision must go well beyond accommodating current needs, and must look to broader issues of the on-going teacher ", (Price, p.35). To achieve this, the focus on supervision required was one which encouraged self-sufficiency in student teachers so that as teachers they would have the capacity

for autonomous functioning, (Eltis,1984). This issue has been given considerable attention by educators recognizing the need for teachers to have skills to support their own continuing education (Eltis et al. 1983; McIntyre,1983; Griffith & Tann,1992). Tinning (1984) argued for a reconceptualization of supervision roles in the practicum so that supervisors were less concerned with a diagnostic - evaluative focus and more with assisting student teachers to develop skills on critical reflection so that "they recognize the implications of their own practices" (Tinning,1984 p.35).

A study by Zimpher, et al. (1980) using interviews and observations into how university supervisors performed their roles found, together with two of her students at Ohio State university, that if the university supervisor was not directly involved in the student teacher experience, there would have been no direction set for requirements, evaluation, or assessment of the student teacher's experience. Second, informational communication among participants appeared to be enhanced because of the presence of the university supervisor. Third, even though the university supervisor appeared frustrated by a lack of direct influence on the teaching style of the student teachers, the supervisor seemed to be the only one making any critical contributions to the student teacher's progress. An obvious proviso to the first point should be stated, and that is, perhaps the cooperating teacher expected the university supervisor to provide all these things as part of his\her duty. If properly prepared, the cooperating teacher would answer the criticism made by Zimpher, et al.

These findings led the researchers to conclude that the university supervisors appear to do more in their role than the topics of research reports would indicate, and that the role of the supervisor cannot be limited to observation; rather, the role constituted the totality of the supervisor's presence in the student teaching experience.

Zimpher (1980),in another aspect of her research previously reviewed, with regard to the role played by the university supervisor in the practicum, found that there were several important roles played by the supervisor in the triad studied. These related to the setting of goals and expectations, phasing the student teacher into classroom responsibility and providing constructive criticism. Her study consisted of interviewing three student teachers, three cooperating teachers and only one university supervisor, so its findings should be taken with caution, because of the obvious small sample. Yet the findings shed some light on the attitudes of the triad towards each other. For example, she found that without the motivating presence of the supervisor, student teaching would have rather a flat profile. It would be simply an experience in which the student teacher attempted, as quickly as possible, to replicate all that the cooperating teacher did without analysis or reflection about the teacher's role. An important role for university supervisors concerned evaluation and constructive criticism. Cooperating teachers, in her study, did not provide critical feed back to student teachers. Rather, Zimpher(1980) found that they tended to assume a buffer role defending the student teacher against the university supervisor. The statement was true, up to a point, but considerable constructive feedback is given to student teachers by a number of cooperating teachers (Linnell,1987). Two further points made by Zimpher(1980) were worthy of note. First, the limited number of observations that the university supervisor was able to make during the practicum gave the student teachers and cooperating teachers grounds for doubting the validity of the supervisor's criticism. The second, a more covert activity of the university supervisor was to act as a personal confidante to the cooperating teacher and the student teacher. This tendency helped the supervisor time the introduction of critical comments to the student teachers. That is, when something went awry in the student teacher's personal life, the cooperating teacher would ask the supervisor to be additionally supportive. The conclusion was that direct personal communication (as opposed to informational professional

communication) between cooperating teacher and student teacher was not usually possible. This might be one of the major reasons why the triadic relationship was necessary.

Research by Gitlin, et al. (1985) in the U.S. complemented the work of Zimpher(1980). Two groups of university supervisors were studied and comparisons were made between each group's beliefs about educational aims and subsequent supervisory practice. The groups were selected to determine if different socialization patterns influenced supervisory practice. The main instrument for the research was a questionnaire which had been field tested for clarity and ease of completion. It was supported by personal interview. A major finding was that supervisors hold a wide range of beliefs about education. Within the aims identified, supervisors were more apt to give priority to cognitive and affective concerns. One dominant pre understanding that supervisors held was that the functional needs of society are best met by developing managerial or technical skills. This technocratic - mindness (Bullough,Gollstein & Holt,1984; McIntyre,1993) might account, according to the authors, for the vast majority of contingency management issues identified by supervisors. Assumptions about teaching, such as the commonly voiced notion that control and order must prevail before other aspects of teaching can be discussed, might also explain gaps between beliefs and practice.

It would seem from this study, that if student teachers were to develop beyond being good technicians, merely facilitating the status quo, supervisors must become aware of their own narrow focus in practice, and confront the belief that a school's role was solely to fit students into the existing matrix of society. To begin this process the relationship of supervisor beliefs, socialization and practice should become a major area of investigation. From such investigations supervisors may confront the narrow translation of beliefs into

practice and provide student teachers with a more comprehensive understanding of educational issues.

The differential role played by cooperating teachers and univerity supervisors was studied by Williams (1993). She interviewed student teachers from four different institutions at the end of their secondary *Post Graduate Certificate of Education* year to obtain their views of various aspects of their training including their perceptions of the support given to them during practice teaching. Their responses were analyzed in the context of changing requirements for courses of initial teacher training. The student teachers stated that they received support of variable quality from both the higher education tutors and the school cooperating teachers. At best, both teachers and supervisors were valued for the complementary roles which they were able to play. While there appeared to be scope for some interchangeability of roles, other aspects would not be easily assumed by the other partner. Student teachers valued school-based work, but they provided little evidence of support for wholly school-based courses .

Williams'(1993) findings revealed that it would be difficult for either partner (cooperating teacher or supervisor) to assume fully the role currently played by the other. Thus, she believed that ways needed to be found which enabled both to continue to play a full part in teacher training, while allowing other forms of provision to develop to meet the needs of different student teachers. This would mean identifying not only those conditions in school which were best able to ensure effective support for student teachers, but also higher education structures which provided support which was of value. The study seemed to confirm that greater involvement of schools made the management and control of quality in teacher training more difficult. This was partly a question of resources which could not be solved wholly by allocating money to schools (which was a British Government demand) for the training of teachers, but also

a question of priorities. Higher Education could probably offer quality guarantees not simply through being given this responsibility, but by discharging it through a continued involvement in the training process rather than simply through its management. In my visits to higher education establishments in England in 1993 I found that a number of faculties of education, who had been responsible for teacher training, had been decimated by the problems highlighted by Williams. Many had become simply managers in the teacher education process; this was Williams' worst fear.

An important related area of supervision is that of training. Joyce and Showers (1983; McIntyre, 1990), through extensive research, demonstrated that the learning of professional skills in the complex world of teaching was a very difficult undertaking requiring a number of stages that include exploring theory; demonstrating the skill through modelling; practising the skill under closely simulated conditions and practice in the work place under guidance (Joyce & Showers,1983).

This Joyce & Showers' approach was a far cry from the simplistic apprenticeship style of supervision criticized in the literature (Henry,1983; McIntyre & Killian,1987; Stones,1984; Zeichner,1986, Barber, 1993). It incorporated much of the essential features of clinical supervision advocated by Smyth (1982), Turney,et al. (1982), Calderhead (1989), particularly the concept of professional partnership during the practice coaching stage, when technical not judgmental feedback was given so that the learner (student teacher) was also learning "executive control". Executive control (Joyce & Showers,1983) was a form of professional growth which was comparable to the notion of reflective teaching (Hatton & Smith,1995) and similar to the action research approach to supervision advocated by Henry and Charles et al.(1984). Some earlier research in Australia which has focused deliberately on supervision included a study by Price & Sellers (1985) which indicated that

excellent supervisors used basic principles of clinical supervision in that they were collegial, non directive and supportive rather than coercive in style, and sought to foster professional autonomy in students under their care. However, one does not know the extent to which supervision was practised by teachers generally; the literature is sparse in this area. In an Australian study, Gore & Bartlett (1988) used qualitative methodology to explore the development of reflective teaching with students in a teacher education program before school experiences occurred. The findings have much to offer both the field of supervision and teacher education. The study clearly illustrated the potential of the reflective approaches to teaching for encouraging student teachers, with supervisory support, to adopt a critically reflective approach to teaching rather than simply to imitate the practice observed during practice teaching. One central aspect of such an approach was the roles of both the student teacher and the supervisor.

2.2.1 PEOPLE INVOLVED IN THE SUPERVISION OF THE PRACTICUM: THE TRIAD.

A typical student teaching experience brings together three people who are expected to work together for common purposes: a student teacher, a cooperating teacher and a university supervisor. The working relationship is a well established and accepted one, and the work context and conditions are similar for the many triads in existence at any given time.(Guyton & McIntyre,1990). Roles and responsibilities for each member of the triad are outlined in university and faculty handbooks and national guidelines, for example: "The roles and responsibilities of education students, college-based supervisors and field-based supervisors are delineated in negotiated written agreements"(National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education, (CATE)1985 p. 6). Yet no formal comparative studies have been conducted, so it is difficult to discuss differences and similarities in stated expectations. This

situation fosters an environment in which statements are freely interpreted by the triad members who bring with them role expectations of themselves, of the other triad members, and of the student teaching experience. Thus agreement among triad members regarding roles and responsibilities is not prevalent and this has led to one of the greatest problems of the practicum. Among cooperating teachers and university supervisors there is a shared frame of reference regarding the purpose of the practicum, but divergence in role interpretations (Beswick et al, 1990). Garland, (1965) and Kaplan, (1967) also reported conflicting expectations of the cooperating teacher. Kapel and Sadler (1978) found that cooperating teachers and university supervisors had different views on the cooperating teacher's role in decision making and policy formation. Goodfellow (1995) stated that it did not imply that cooperating teachers actually worked in cooperation with the universities. Disagreement was also found regarding the student teacher's role in the schools (Gettone,1980; Wilson&Cameron,1996) and interview data indicated that student teachers' self perceived role shifted throughout the student teaching experience (Calderhead,1987, Williams,et al.1992).

Studies also indicated conflict among triad members regarding expectations for field experiences. Watts (1987) found that student teachers and cooperating teachers thought that developing self confidence was most important, whereas university supervisors considered the application of theory most important. Student teachers thought that experimentation was important, but the other groups did not. Perspectives on the benefits of practice teaching were also divergent. Applegate and Lasley (1985) obtained descriptions of what students expected to learn in field experiences. Quite often student teacher expectations were fulfilled but cooperating teachers' and university supervisors' expectations varied and were global and general(Griffin,1983; Zeichner,1992).

Problems expressed by triad members were indications of unfulfilled expectations and desires. Communication was a recurring problem. Yates (1981) reported that cooperating teachers in England and Wales were unsure of what was expected of them, and expressed a need for better communication. American studies confirm the fact that lack of communication was a problem for cooperating teachers, as well as for university supervisors and student teachers (Schon,1987). Australian studies (Tisher,1987a; Cameron & Wilson,1993) supported this notion of the importance of good communication within the triad during practice teaching episodes. Watts (1987) found divergence and tendencies for triad members to blame each other when problem areas were examined. The university supervisor and the student teacher saw the cooperating teacher's lack of modelling as a serious problem, and the cooperating teachers viewed insufficient help from the university supervisor as one. School personnel saw preparation of the student teacher and lack of information from the university's faculty of education as serious problems; and university supervisors viewed lack of control over the practical experience as one for the university. Goodfellow (1995) made the important point that cooperating teachers have no choice when student teachers are placed in a school. They have to deal with a wide range of student teacher of differing abilities (p.165). The one point of agreement for the groups was that finding and retaining good cooperating teachers was a problem for the university. From the beginning to the end of the practical teaching period, triad members became more negative toward each other, especially university supervisors and student teachers, and triad relationships became more competitive than cooperative (Shulman,1987). Barrows (1979) characterized the triad as a very unbalanced relationship, with the cooperating teacher exercising inordinate power and authority in determining student teacher success. This argument was supported in the work of Cameron & Wilson,(1993), who spoke of student teacher 'powerlessness' expressed in terms of their passivity: student teachers failing to respond to teacher action or

keeping their opinions to themselves. The corollary of this was made by Goodfellow (1995) who referred to the 'powerfulness' of the cooperating teacher in the practicum situation. Student teacher dissatisfaction with the role of the university supervisor was prevalent (Griffin,1983; Funk et al., 1992; Cameron & Wilson,1993). Student teachers sought legitimization of their roles as professionals and indicators of success more from pupils than from cooperating teachers, and almost never from university supervisors (Friebus,1977). The members of the triad experience intra and interpersonal role confusion during practice teaching, uncertainty about their own and others' roles and divergent role expectations of themselves and others. These phenomena contributed to the disappointing outcomes of the practice teaching experience and the lack of achievement of objectives, particularly objectives desired by the university's faculty of education (Guyton & McIntyre,1990).

Once again, the key to this problem was communication. The solution required more detailed guidelines, role definitions and instructions. But these would probably only help minimally. Those that existed were based on tradition and practice rather than on a theoretical or an empirical base, and were very individualistic (Guyton&McIntyre,1990). The research in this area informed what roles and role expectations were currently associated with the practicum, but not about what they ought to be. Several studies that focus on university supervisors illustrated the need for exploring cognitions that influence behaviour and attitudes. Zimpher, De Voss and Nott (1980) found that university supervisors did not carry out their formal roles, and that they believed they had little impact on student teacher methods. This second finding was supported by Koehler (1988) who also found that if university supervisors held clinical supervision as one of their primary responsibilities, they felt little satisfaction with or accomplishment in their roles. If they considered their primary responsibility one of support for the student teacher, they felt a strong sense of role satisfaction.

Copeland (1982) considered a distinction between directive and non - directive approaches to the supervisory process. The supervisor who uses a directive approach influenced the student teacher by offering opinions or suggestions that the supervisor perceived were needed by the student teacher. The intent of a directive supervisory approach was to offer the student teacher immediate and useful advice for overcoming instructional difficulties. By contrast, the non - directive approach used interrogative statements to solicit opinions and to encourage the student teacher to make suggestions. This approach depended more on reflecting the student teacher's ideas and offering information as the student teacher requested it. The intention of the non - directive approach was to encourage the teacher to take responsibility for making and evaluating instructional decision.

According to Copeland, most authors who have considered this issue supported the non - directive approach because of its concern with individual freedom, autonomy and self - realization. However, his research found that individual student teacher's preference for the two approaches differed and, therefore, supervisors of practicum could not opt for the non - directive style and be assured that they were matching the preferences of their clients. (Copeland,1982).

Another example of research on practicum supervision is a study by Zahorik (1988) who examined the observing and conferencing practices of a group of university supervisors. On the surface, the supervisors all followed the same procedures and could all be grouped as practising clinical supervision. Zahorik's study, based on interviews with the supervisors and observations of the substance of their work, resulted in the identification of three major types and 9 specific sub-types which described the work of these 10 supervisors.

Zahorik's work gave a good account of the practices of supervisors that help provide access for beginning supervisors to some of the subtleties of supervision.

The next section looks more specifically at the roles and relationships engendered in the practicum by members of the triad. According to Zeichner (1990), research on practicum supervision needed to get to the heart of the matter and examine the actual substance of supervision as it was enacted, and the roles and relationships involved. This argument was supported by Stones (1986) who stated: "work of this kind (supervision) with practising student teachers over the years has convinced me that one of the key factors in the development of research and teaching lies in the reassessment of the role of the supervision of student teachers" (Stones,1986,p176).

2.3 COOPERATING TEACHERS AND MENTORS.

A large proportion of the problems stated by student teachers in the research available, dealt with their relationships with their cooperating teachers. These problems related, in general, to the lack of understanding and flexibility by both parties. One means to improve the practicum suggested that the best public school teachers should serve as cooperating teachers, because they contributed so much to the professional development of new teachers (Seiferth & Samuelson,1984; Cruickshank & Armaline,1986; Furlong,et al.(1996). Supervising teachers should be masterful teachers themselves, skilled in fostering the professional growth of others. The problem, of course, is what does one mean by 'best'. The accomplished classroom teacher does not necessarily make a good teacher supervisor. He or she may have excellent teaching skills and good rapport with the pupils in their charge, but lack the ability to share this expertise with others, and be wanting in the area of personal relationships (Zeichner,1990).

A study during a three week practicum in which 28 student teachers were asked to keep an unstructured journal, describing their experiences and reactions to the practicum Cameron & Wilson,(1993) utilized ethnographic techniques to collect and interpret data. Journals were used because the authors believed they had the potential to provide a broad spectrum of student insights into the practicum experience. The data were analyzed by a team of three researchers using the constant comparative method of analysis to refine an understanding of the data (Strauss,1987). This method basically involved the analysis and coding of the journals as a basis for identifying possible categories. The study found four distinct styles of supervision: Neglectful; Directive; Consultative and Collegial. It was possible to view these as a continuum in which the neglectful and directive styles were characterized by low student teacher satisfaction and low communication between student and supervisor. The consultative and collegial styles were marked by high student satisfaction and high levels of communication between student and supervising teacher. Thus neglectful supervision was seen to belong at one end of the continuum with collegial supervision at the other.

If one recognized that students ought to develop a critical awareness of their own practice (Cruickshank & Applegate,1981; Zeichner & Liston,1987; Griffiths & Tann,1992), and that the practicum provided important opportunities for such reflection, then the role of the supervising teacher in this process was to utilize basic principles of clinical supervision, and to provide non-directive support. Unfortunately,Cameron and Wilson (1993) found that supervising teachers followed the findings of Boydell (1986) which emphasized the students as apprentice. According to Cairns and Eltis (1982) teachers tended to supervise more effectively when trained in supervisory techniques. The authors conceded that training modules needed to be

developed for teachers to allow them to understand the goals of the practicum and how to work with student teachers to enhance student reflection.

Applegate and Lasley (1982) using questionnaires and a collection of problem incidents from cooperating teachers, found that teacher educators need to establish procedures for carefully training cooperating teachers; as stated frequently before, "field experiences must be more than apprenticeships" (Zeichner,1990). This study also suggested that student teachers need to be carefully instructed about what was expected of them when they enter classrooms.

The fact that universities allowed supervising teachers to grade student teachers was found to be a factor in the 'powerlessness' felt by students, and the way they completed the journal, was the crux of the study. Obviously, further study is required to establish teacher perception of supervision and why students felt powerlessness during the practicum. As the authors conclude: "If we are to develop reflective student teachers, the students must feel that they are emerging professionals who have legitimacy in the school setting" (Cameron & Wilson,1993).

One of the challenges of supervision in the practicum, was, obviously, the ability and suitability of cooperating teachers to fulfil the role. Thies-Sprinthall (1980) studied attempts to distinguish elements differentiating educative from mis-educative supervision, and this was based on the premise of earlier research (Gerwinner,1968) that student teachers in general became more authoritarian, less flexible, less responsive to pupils, and more rigid in their classroom behaviour during their student teaching experience. The research examined the possible relationship between student teachers and their classroom supervisors within a specific theoretical framework. The goal was to examine aspects of supervision which might relate to effective versus

ineffective role performance. The theoretical framework was based on the work of Hunt (1976) and Kohlberg (1975). Hunt demonstrated consistently the importance of the interaction between the conceptual level of the classroom teacher and the impact on pupil performance, while Kohlberg demonstrated the significance of moral judgment stage and general role taking capacity. The evidence suggested that cooperating teachers at higher stages of conceptual and moral development could 'radiate' more abundant educational environments, could more accurately 'read' individual differences in student teachers, be more democratic and employ a greater repertoire of instructional techniques. The ability to role take and to process experience at more complex levels was equated with effective teaching. To obtain these levels of expertise and abilities a case can be made for the development of the concept of mentor as previously defined on page 6.

2.3.1. THE CONCEPT OF MENTOR.

From an examination of the literature it is possible to identify three rather distinct models of mentoring: the apprenticeship model; the competency model; and the reflective practitioner model. Although each is only partial, and therefore, inadequate, in combination they may contribute to a concept of mentoring that may satisfy the needs of the student teacher.

THE APPRENTICESHIP MODEL.

The first model apparent in the literature is termed the apprenticeship model. It was an approach to learning to teach strongly advocated by O'Hear (1988) and the Hillgate Group (1989). This latter group argued that "some skills.... are best learned by the emulation of experienced practitioners and by supervised practice under guidance" (Hillgate Group,p.9). In the case of such skills, apprenticeship, they suggest,should take precedence over instruction.

The Hillgate Group argued that their apprenticeship model was all that was necessary in learning to teach - all one needed to do was to work alongside an experienced practitioner. Indeed according to McIntyre (1993) the work of the mentor does contain elements of an apprentice model. Trainee teachers need first-hand experience of real students, teaching situations, classroom strategies and subject matter and they need to be able to model themselves on someone. Burn (1992) in describing her work as a mentor in the Oxford Internship scheme used the term 'collaborative teaching' for apprenticeship, where the student teacher saw the mentor as a model and an interpreter. The student teacher took responsibility for a small part of the whole teaching process. This would seem to be precisely the sort of training that student teachers need in the early stages of school experience.

THE COMPETENCY MODEL.

While the Hillgate Group were advocating the apprenticeship way of learning to teach others support a competency-based approach. This group state that learning to teach involved practical training on a list of pre-defined competences, (Turney,et al., 1973, Smyth, 1991, Finn, 1992, DFE, 1992). The mentor takes on the role of a systematic trainer, observing the student teacher with a pre-defined observation schedule and providing feedback. They are in effect coaching the student teacher on a list of agreed behaviours that are specified by others. What is right about the competency approach is that after a initial period of collaborative teaching, student teachers will benefit from an explicit program of training following a routine of observation and feedback. Current British regulations are prioritizing the competency model (McIntyre, 1993).

THE REFLECTIVE MODEL.

The final approach to mentoring currently widely advocated is the reflective practitioner model. According to Calderhead (1989) there were great difficulties in defining what reflective teaching actually was and even more difficulty in suggesting what activities by mentors would promote its development. Indeed a number of teacher education programs have tried to promote the reflective practitioner by means other than by mentors - by the way the program is structured with concurrent periods of school and university activity so that lecturers can encourage the student teacher to reflect (St.George School of Teacher Education,1981, Newcastle University,1993). Once student teachers have, with systematic support from their mentor, achieved basic classroom competence, ways have to be found to introduce a critical element into the mentoring process itself. Therefore reflection in teaching must be part of the process of learning to teach. Supporting student teachers in this more reflective process demands a shift in the role of the mentor. To facilitate this process mentors need to be able to move from being a model and instructor to being a co-enquirer (McIntyre,1994). The other aspects of their role should continue, but in promoting critical reflection a more equal and open relationship is essential.

These three models reveal how effective mentoring is a difficult and demanding task and teachers who are asked to perform the role need the time and inservice support appropriate to the increased responsibilities being placed upon them. Mentoring in school-based teacher education has been the focus of considerable research in the past 10 years. Booth (1993) of the University of Cambridge conducted research using two questionnaires to find the student teachers' views. The research was based on a cohort of 45 English, Geography, and History students, who were training in the One Year P.G.C.E. Course. One questionnaire was completed after the first practicum in the

Spring of 1990, the second in the December of the same year, after the final practicum.

Students in their comments on the questionnaires emphasized three areas. By far the most important of these was the general support they received from the mentor. Such support was described in terms of accessibility of the mentor and the sympathetic and positive support that was given. Of particular note was the mention of the 'time' given to the student. The second area that the students highlighted was the extent to which the mentor aided their professional development. It was reported that a number of comments indicated that students valued mentors, who treated them as professionals and who adopted a style ofcounselling which was not too directive and where they had the opportunity to set, at least, part of the agenda for discussion. The third, and final, area for successful mentoring to which students pointed, concerned the subject and general issues which were discussed with their mentors. Here, the emphasis was on the practicality of the discussion and advice offered (Booth,1993).

The author admitted, however, it was difficult to decide how much of this discussion and advice of subject-specific and general teaching issues was couched in reflective, theoretical terms as against a more practical emphasis on survival and the nuts and bolts of classroom practice. Students tended to be utilitarian in their requirements in the early stages of learning to teach, focusing on issues they considered to be of immediate concern: the day to day business of classroom management, for example. It might be that the concern for the reflective practitioner which is current at the moment (Kemmis,1987; Gore & Bartlett,1988; McNamara,1990; Hatton & Smith,1995) is inappropriate for the beginning student, trying to be successful with classroom practice. Calderhead (1989) lent some support for this view and Richerts' research (1990) indicated "reluctance of novice teachers to look back on their work with

a critical eye". Wubbels and Korthagen's study also supported this view by indicating the limitations of a program designed primarily to promote reflective teaching among beginning teachers (Wubbels & Korthagen,1990). Hatton & Smith (1995) reported a contrary finding in that very few of their sample did not show some evidence of reflection, albiet of a more descriptive and simple form.

Interestingly, in a study by Booth (1993) Australian student teachers referred to the work of the senior teacher in the schools with overall responsibility for trainee students. Student teachers claimed that although these senior coordinators organized fairly regular meetings for the student teachers, they were not considered to be particularly helpful. It would seem that most schools used in this study have yet to develop an overall school policy as far as student teachers are concerned and that successful mentoring at the moment is largely dependent on the efforts of individual subject teachers creating a mentoring culture or climate within their own departments. Certainly, some research in the past has suggested that student teachers should be appointed to a school in the fullest sense of the term rather than to a subject department; that the school be responsible for the overall training rather than a small segment of the school population (Stones,1987, pp72-75).

The research by Booth provided some evidence for the crucial importance of the mentor in the development of the trainee student's professional skills and confidence. It gave weight to the view that simply placing student teachers in schools without adequate mentoring support would give student teachers little chance to develop their classroom and subject teaching skills and understanding. It also indicated that in the early stages of their work in schools, student teachers were principally looking for support which was positive, unthreatening and readily available. Furlong (1990) indicated that though student teachers in the first instance want a training that was "strongly

practical in its orientation", they also wanted time to consider the broader issues. It might well be, therefore, that such matters are better tackled once the student teacher has acquired a degree of classroom and subject confidence. Once this has been achieved, the training institution would have the key role in ensuring that the broader issues were addressed. This point, of course, brings up an entirely new issue; where, in the teacher education program, is the optimum time? At the end of two years or at the end of four years?

Booth stated that the debate about the training of mentors should centre on where such training should be given and how it should relate to the work student teachers do with mentors. He also said that mentors should be involved in the planning, structure and delivery of the whole training course, and that training institution lecturers and mentors should determine the procedures for the mentoring of students. These views follow very closely the thoughts of Proctor (1984) and referred to in detail in the next chapter, pages 43-45. Finally, he stated that schools should formulate whole school approaches to the training of beginning teachers. School-based teacher education as envisaged by the British Department of Education and Science, would certainly support such views, for the success, or failure of the British Model depends upon the involvement of the schools at all levels in the trainee teacher's development.(D.E.S.,1991; Edwards,1992, pp. 285-287; Judge, et al. 1994 pp.204-211).

Another stance on mentoring was taken by Wilkin(1992a), who maintained that the mentoring scene in the U.K. was confused. There was little agreement on what was meant by the term 'mentor' and there was wide variation across school-based training programs with regard to their philosophies and hence their expectations for mentoring practices. In the U.S. there has been considerable work on the use of mentors in the induction process and the literature is well documented. The Journal for Teacher Education in 1992

devoted an issue to Induction and Mentoring. Three studies that refer to much wider reading are Anderson and Shannon (1988) who reviewed the general philosophical scene and argued that effective mentoring depended on a clear conception of what a mentor was. They synthesized the essential attributes of mentoring as: the process of nurturing; the act of serving as a role model; teaching, sponsoring, encouraging, counselling and befriending; the focus on professional and personal development and the ongoing caring relationship.

The analysis of a large number of mentor designations with an overall aim of clarifying mentoring functions in practicums was carried out by Zimpher & Reiger (1988). These repeatedly emphasised the caring support roles detailed by Anderson and Shannon (1988). They made several suggestions: improving conditions of service for mentors; developing selection criteria for mentors; and pairing mentors and proteges. They concluded that mentors deserved recognition, support and mentoring themselves.

Thies-Sprinthall (1986) analyzed the efficiency of practicums and isolated two major generic problems:

i) the problem of assistance offered by mentors - inadequate training and random selection of mentors leads to miseducative experiences, and

ii)the problem of evaluation using any form of rating scale encourages mentors to teach to the test. 'Standard practice can become malpractice.' (Thies-Sprintall,1980 p 17).

These generic problems were a result of the fact that mentors operated in a diversity of areas and different functions within areas. There were two main directions that mentor relationships appeared to take, namely those of a professional and those of a pastoral direction. According to Monaghan (1992

p. 257), the professional approach incorporated two main aspects, training and assessment; the pastoral approach had many facets, which were not easily separated. Moreover, a mentor might combine elements of the pastoral function along with professional elements.

It would seem, therefore, that any attempt to state what it was that constituted a mentor was fallacious and confused what a mentor was with what a mentor should be. What existed was a mentor defined within a specific scheme whose existence is prescribed by the roles given to the mentor in that scheme.

Mentoring among American teachers has been spurred by public and professional debate over the quality of the workforce (Little,1990). The proliferation of mentor programs resulted not from a groundswell of teacher interest, but largely a product of policy interests and institutional concerns. In America, increased public attention to certification, tenure decisions, and teacher evaluation has driven the development of formal mentor roles. Much of the research, in turn, has taken the form of policy studies or program evaluations conducted in sites and settings shaped by formal intervention (see Directions in Teacher Education). The research has also been slow to pursue some of the larger questions implicit in the choice of mentoring as a favoured policy option for supplying career retention incentives to experienced teachers and for expanding professional support in schools. There were, according to Little, few comprehensive studies, well informed by theory and designed to examine in depth the context, content and consequences of mentoring. But the themes that ran through the smaller studies proved remarkably consistent. From a range of investigations, one could piece together a picture of the emergence of formal mentor roles through the implementation of local and state sponsored programs.

The role of the support teacher or mentor teacher has been carefully studied by the staff of the Center of Excellence in Teacher Education at Memphis State University (1987). They outlined a number of personal factors that appeared to support the development of a positive mentor-protege relationship, which included:

i) prior experience in assisting student teachers in understanding and mastering the responsibilities of teaching;

ii) years of experience as a classroom teacher;

iii) willingness to commit time to the protege early in the relationship so that both have opportunities to come to know and respect each other;

iv) ability to conceive of the relationship in developmental terms, with sensitivity to the need to modify the mentor role as the protege progressed; and

v) high status within the school and within the profession.

When one attempted to list what mentors did, the list of responsibilities and activities was considerable. Huling-Austin and Murphy (1987) found that first year teachers in their study reported receiving help from their support teachers in 14 different areas. Areas most frequently mentioned included "someone to talk to and listen to", followed by "locating materials" and help with "lesson planning". Because the role of the support teacher was so extensive, Huling-Austin and Murphy recommended that support teachers should receive extensive training in how to provide assistance in a variety of areas and in how to work with another adult in a supportive manner. They stated that they should also be compensated for their participation in induction programs. It was interesting to note here that this latter point had become international. New South Wales has paid its cooperating teachers on practicum for services

rendered since 1967. The English model of Partnership sees funding for practice teaching services going directly to schools, and mentor teachers being compensated with time off from face to face teaching to attend inservice courses.(Wilkin,1992).

In the scheme of a partnership between a university and a practising school the mentor plays a highly significant role. The responsibities go far beyond previous demands for the practicum and mentors are asked to assume a much more active role in their association with the student teacher.

First, the mentor oversees the immersion of the student teacher into the school culture or life through regular conferencing; reflecting with the student teacher on significant incidents; making the student teacher aware of school policies; and, role modelling their implementation. Non classroom activities such as playground supervision, administrative duties, pastoral care and staff development exercises are shared by the student teacher and mentor. Again, the social integration of the student teacher into the school staff and full participation in staff professional and social activities is a reponsibility of the mentor (Everton & White,1992, p150).

Second, the mentor acts as a liaison between the school and university by holding regular meetings with the university tutor/supervisor to discuss the progress of the student teacher. The mentor is also responsible for the continuous assessment of the student as per university guidelines and should regularly report to the school principal on the progress of the student and the practicum generally, and convey any advice or suggestions to the university (Everton & White, 1992).

Third, the mentor should encourage the student teacher's engagement with the professional culture by attendance at meetings of professional associations and

the reading of professional journals as well as the joining of appropriate professional associations.

Finally, the mentor should act as the focus person in a practising school to support a student teacher through ongoing liaison with colleague teachers and even beyond into links with other practising schools and dialogue with other mentors on problems and challenges of the partnership scheme (Wilkin,1992, pp.86-88).

To this end it would be necessary for the mentor to attend inservice courses at the University, and within the practising schools, so that this dialogue could lead to a worthwhile understanding and implementation of the Teacher Education Program of the University. As stated previously, to be successful, the mentor should see and understand the benefits of mentorship not only to the student teacher but also to the university and the wider school community. An interesting argument to support the notion of mentor was the "Mutual Benefits Model" (Zey,1984). This model stated that investing some teachers with special titles, resources and obligations readily assured them of various individual and institutional benefits. The mentors themselves, would receive public acknowledgement of their accumulated knowledge, skill and judgment. Student teachers would receive support that mediated the difficulties of early teaching experience. Career opportunities in the profession would be enriched, and schools would expand their capacity to serve students and to adapt to societal demands. This seems all very fine, but pragmatic experience reveals that this was not always so.

According to Little (1993) the mentor role satisfied three related problems: Mentoring first responded to the problems of occupational induction of teachers. Experienced teachers, acknowledged for their own record of classroom achievement, were invited to pass on this knowledge to the novice.

Second, 'the mantle of mentorship' (Lemberger,1990) supposedly created an incentive for teacher retention and commitment by confirming public recognition and reward on the most accomplished teachers. Lastly, the concentration of discretionary resources on mentors signalled a shifting strategy; the logic being that a concentration of resources on a relatively small proportion of teachers would yield benefits for the larger teacher population and for the schools and universities that employ them.

A teacher is selected as a mentor principally on the basis of accomplishments with children; the teacher is subsequently accepted as a mentor on the basis of accomplishments with fellow teachers and administrators. The demands on mentor's expertise are frequently far greater than a prospective mentor might anticipate on the basis of selection criteria alone. Thus the need for specialized training for mentors will become a prominent component of role development (Thies-Sprintall,1986). Some would dispute the need for organized training and support. Opponents could make a case that the very selection of teachers as mentors was intended to signify a high level of professional capacity. In my experience some traditional cooperating teachers have carried out the duties of mentors to a remarkable degree, but others have been wanting because of the lack of expertise on their part, and a misunderstanding of the needs of the student teacher and the University Teacher Development Program. These latter problems, it is hoped, could be improved by some form of training provided by the tertiary institution.

2.3.2. CHALLENGES OF MENTORSHIP.

One of the difficulties, of course, relating to the need for the training of mentors or otherwise, is that there were virtually no studies that trace the contribution made by post-selection training to the subsequent performance of the mentors, or to their success in relationship with teachers or administrators.

No studies compared mentors who received training with those who were left to their own resources. Nor have there been any attempts to assess the relative advantage to be gained by investing institutional resources in post-selection training versus various forms of preselection preparation of individuals, groups or organizations. Yet in the U.K. and in the U.S. considerable funding has been made available at the school level in the development of mentoring. A dominant rationale for the proliferation of mentoring is the 'reality shock' that commonly follows when young teachers abruptly and without assistance assume full scale and full time responsibilities for teaching. Considerable research (Lacey & Lamont,1977; Lortie,1975; Veenman,1984; Gore,1988; Zeichner,1993) has looked at the problem of early teaching, which drove capable people out of teaching. For those that remained, these same conditions placed a premium on survival skills but retarded their development of more principled understanding of teaching and their capacity for critical analysis. (Kennedy & Zeichner,1989). At worse such conditions might produce and perpetuate marginal performance in the classroom and tenuous commitment to teaching (Bridges,1986).

Under the reforms initiated in the development of mentoring, it is hoped that the direct assistance and personal involvement with new teachers will enable mentors to relieve some of the stress associated with the intellectual, social and emotional demands of the early period of teaching.

Mentoring is a vital component of any partnership model. A university embarking on a partnership program, without careful development of an accompanying mentor program, wouldl only succeed in providing its students with perhaps a lengthened practicum, but with little change in the role of the traditional cooperating teacher. In regard to what should be included in mentor training, a number of authors and programs have provided direction in this area. Odell (1987) suggested that content for mentor training programs

should be derived from the literature pertaining to teacher development, new teacher needs and concerns, effective teaching, supervision, induction, and adult professional development. Kilgore and Kozisek (1988) concluded from their study, in which mentors were provided with neither training nor compensation, that the envisioned role of the mentor teacher was not fulfilled, primarily because mentors were not provided with support for assuming the duties of a mentor (eg. extra pay, recognition, training). They stated that "the school as an organization had to come to grips with how they saw mentors or career teachers helping those working their way into the system" (Kilgore & Kozisek, 1988,pp56-62). The challenges of mentorship are not easily answered for as Wilkin (1992) stated that there was so many different interpretations of what a mentor is and what a mentor does. Nevertheless, it would seem from the literature that there is a case for the development of the role of the mentor to satisfy the needs of student teachers in a particular teaching situation. Obviously, any development needs to keep in mind the need for flexibility to cover all eventualities.

2.4. SUMMARY.

This review of literature which has constituted Chapter Two can now be summarized. The section headed 'Directions in Teacher Education' revealed that pressures for change in teacher education were not confined to Australia. Similar pressures existed and similar actions were being taken in other countries. A preoccupation with the quality and the nature of teacher education programs existed throughout the 1980s and well into the 1990s. Continuing concerns over the effectiveness of the practicum and the lack of coherence with university-based studies was recorded in studies from Australia, United States and Great Britain. In my visits to a number of English universities, I was told of the problems that faced the faculties of education attempting to develop a more worthwhile practicum experience. Staff

cutbacks, funding deficiences and a forced move towards more school-based teacher education were highlighted. There has been a considerable shift of emphasis towards longer periods of school experience, and similarities with the British model of school-based teacher education were noted in Australia and the United States.

The next section in the chapter considered a literature review of research into 'Supervision and Supervisors", where the main points identified were the recognition of the fundamental problem that schools themselves needed to change with regard to their attitude to the practicum, and there was a need, according to previous research for closer links between training institutions and schools. The importance of training for those involved in the supervision of student teachers was considered important in some of the research to avoid the simplistic apprenticeship style of supervision which was the danger of school-based teacher training.

The research recorded that excellent supervisors used clinical supervision principles, were collegial, non directive and supportive of the needs of the student teachers on the practicum. However, one of the greatest problems with supervision of the practicum was identified as being that among cooperating teachers and university supervisors where there is a shared reference regarding the purpose of the practicum, but divergence in role interpretations. The differing views of cooperating teachers on their role in decision making and policy formation remains even today one of the challenges to worthwhile supervision and is, therefore, one of the major concerns of this study.

There was also, according to the research, conflict among the triad members regarding the expectations of the practicum. Student teachers and cooperating teachers thought that developing self confidence was most important, whereas

Perhaps the identification of communication problems is partly responsible for this conflict. The solution requires more detailed guidelines, role definition and instructions regarding the practicum. There is also confusion over the role of the university supervisor in the practicum. Some student teachers are dissatisfied with this role whilst other research conclude that the university supervisor did more in their role than some of the research reports stated.

The final section of the chapter looked at the research into the concept of mentor and the various models that have been devised. Evidence was found to support the crucial importance of the mentor in the development of the student teacher's professional skills. However, this development was not without its problems which were highlighted. Some student teachers were concerned about their 'powerlessness' felt when cooperating teachers or mentors were allowed to grade them on the final practicum. Based upon this fact was their concern for the suitability and ability of mentors to fulfil this role adequately. The need for the training of mentors was stated and becomes an important part of this study.

Through my work as a supervisor on practicum I have been inevitably aware of successive challenges to the effectiveness of the supervisor's role. In my own research I do not set out specifically to defend existing practice, but rather to put the student teacher at the centre of a small scale study which would raise questions on behalf of the student teacher about the existing provision and support for them during the teaching practice. The following chapter continues the concept of mentoring and is a review of the literature on the internship, induction, partnership and develops the notion of closer links between tertiary institutions and practising schools. These closer links could be of considerable benefit to the student teacher and, perhaps, solve some of the problems stated in this summary.

CHAPTER 3.

INTERNSHIP, INDUCTION AND PARTNERSHIP: A CRITICAL REVIEW.

One of the key aspects of the present study and its purposes is the potential importance of more school-based teacher education. As indicated in the previous chapter internship is one of the important forms of school-based teacher education. Thus this chapter will review innovative programs that use various forms of internship in the practicum and that focus on the notion of 'partnerships' between schools and universities, which form an integral part of this study.

Teachers have stated, atleast in some research, that their principal teacher has been experience. They learned to teach through trial and error in the classroom (Lortie,1975, McIntyre,1993). A similar conclusion was reached by Fuller and Brown (1975) who, following an extensive review of the literature on teacher education, argued that: "what laymen, legislators, and education students have been claiming for many decades might be true: teacher education is orthogonal to the teacher." This negative opinion of the efficacy of teacher education was commonly attributed to two factors. The first was disjunction between the theoretical content provided by the university environment within which most teacher education took place and the actual demands upon teachers in the classroom. Another was the inadequacy of the practical component of teacher education (Arnstine,1975; Burgess,1975; Lortie,1975; Friedman,et al.,1980; Furlong,et al.1996). Teacher respondents to the research by Lortie (1975) said 'they had too little preparation in classroom management, routines and discipline'. It was suggested by many researchers (Zeichner,1990, Hargreaves,1993) that these factors could be corrected by

better forms of school-based teacher education, especially those focused on the internship and induction programs.

3.1. THE INTERNSHIP AND INDUCTION.

One form of school-based teacher education that is developing rapidly, both overseas and in Australia, as indicated in Chapter 2, is that of the internship or (in the United States) an induction year. Teacher induction (internship) has been defined as the transition from student teaching to teacher (Griffin, et al, 1983; Zeichner,1990). In the past, this transition has often been quite abrupt; in the teaching profession, beginners are expected to do essentially the same job on their first day of employment as 20 year veterans. In addition, because teachers spend the majority of their work day isolated from their peers, the natural induction process that occurs in most professions is prevented from occurring. The unique nature of teaching, has meant that beginning teachers has frequently resort to learning by trial and error (Lortie, 1975) and to developing 'coping' strategies that help them survive in the classroom. Unfortunately, these strategies could actually prevent effective instruction from occurring. "If beginning teachers were not provided with support and assistance during their early years, early coping strategies could crystallize into teaching styles that would be utilized throughout entire careers" (MacDonald, 1980).

Concern both within the profession and from external sources about beginning teachers and their induction into the profession has, in recent years, prompted the development of teacher induction programs in the form of internships. Broadly defined an induction program is a planned program intended to provide some systematic and sustained assistance to beginning teachers for atleast one year (Zeichner, 1982). In Australia, the internship is defined as a structured program (Fullerton,1993) that places final year student teachers in

a school setting for an extended period of time with an experienced teacher, as though the student teacher was being inducted into the profession as a beginning teacher. According to a model currently in use at one Australian University (Fullerton et al.,1993) an internship should have two major purposes. The first was to address the issue of inducting beginning teachers in a more effective way. The second was to provide opportunities for school and staff development. One of the key personnel in this model was the colleague teacher or mentor, who supported the student teacher. The preparation of the colleague teacher was the responsibility of the university's faculty of education. The model provided training programs focused on the concerns of beginning teachers, and procedures and strategies for working with beginning teachers. At Newcastle, the colleague teacher was to serve as guide, consultant and advocate for the beginning teacher but not as evaluator. Evaluation was to be carried out by trained personnel from the school (for example, a school administrator) and the university.

Another typical internship program in Australia (St George School of Education, University of New South Wales, 1981) had three phases:

Phase 1. The student teacher was attached to a colleague teacher in a school for four days each week for 2 weeks. The purpose of this phase was to provide the student teacher with orientation to the school and class(es), observation of the class(es) and school activities, opportunities for team teaching with the colleague teacher and the teaching of lessons drawn from the class(es) programs. The fifth day of each week was spent at the university discussing with faculty staff any problems that might have arisen and deciding upon possible solutions.

Phase 2. This phase was for four weeks, again 4 days per week, and the purpose of this phase was to facilitate the induction of the student teacher into the

school and class(es). The colleague teacher provided professional development and support for the student teacher with team and solo teaching with a view to satisfying the minimal standards of teaching confidence. The student teacher must satisfy these minmal standards within 4 weeks in order to progress to the third, and final, phase. Once these standards are satisfied, the student teacher progressed automatically to phase three of the program. Assessment for progression was the responsibilty of a trained school executive member and a university teacher educator. The colleague teacher may act as an advocate for the student teacher.

Phase 3. Once approval had been given to continue in the placement, the student teacher assumed, with the agreement of the colleague teacher and school executive, increasing reponsibility for programming, planning, teaching and evaluating classes. This period occupied the final 7 weeks of the internship.

During phase 2 and especially phase 3, the colleague teacher was freed from face to face teaching to perform work which reflected the priorities of the school's management plan, to participate in personal staff development programs and / or to contribute to pre-service teacher education at the university.

The final assessment and grading of the student teacher was a collaborative responsibility between the university teacher educator and the school executive member, after consultation with the appropriate colleague teacher. (St George School of Teacher Education, University of N.S.W. Internship Documentation, 1993.)

This model was very similar to the British Model as practised by the Oxford Internship Scheme, which became a pilot scheme for school-based teacher

education in England (McIntyre, 1990). The model was based on three main ideas:

1. there were teacher education goals to be attained;
2. there were endemic problems in teacher education which needed to be solved;
3. there were principles of procedure of the scheme directed towards the attainment of the stated goals and the formulation of solutions to the identified problems.

Each of these ideas is discussed in more detail below:

3.1.1. GOALS TO BE ATTAINED.

According to the model there were agreed goals towards which the program was directed and these goals were linked to the individual student teacher. The main goals were:

i) to be able to cope effectively in the classroom, that is, to have attained sufficient fluency in classroom management and control, and in the skills necessary for effective use of a variety of classroom teaching strategies, and,

ii) to possess a critical understanding of the curriculum and pedagogy of their subject area, and to have attained an understanding of the different ways of organising the curriculum within their subject area and in relation to the whole- school curriculum.

Other goals are based on the wider context of teaching and the education system as a whole, and importantly have been formulated with great care and as a result of extensive critical debate and negotiation (McIntyre,1990).

3.1.2. ENDEMIC PROBLEMS OF TEACHER EDUCATION.

The Oxford model identified a number of problems, which were also recognizable in Australian teacher education programs. The internship offered potential solutions. First,the student teachers were marginal people in schools, without the status, authority or situational knowledge to be like 'real teachers'. In most teacher education programs, student teachers spend at most a term in any one school. By the time they have learned about their students, their classes and the school in which they are teaching, it was time to leave.

Second, there was often little opportunity to try out in schools even the practical advice given in university. Not surprisingly there were often quite substantial differences between the modes and strategies of teaching promoted by teacher educators and those practised in schools. Such opportunities would in most circumstances depend on a good match between the thinking of university tutors and the practice of supervising teachers. This could only arise with more lengthy communication between university and school and the development of the concept of mentors.

Third, school visits by university staff were often seen primarily as occasions for the testing of student teacher classroom competence. The objective reality, that visiting lecturers/tutors do have the task of judging the adequacy of student teachers' teaching and the relative infrequency of their visits, added to their lack of contextual knowledge, promoted the view that the prime purpose of these visits was one of assessment, not of guidance and support. Understandably, it was not surprising that student teachers often viewed their lecturers' visits more as occasions to be survived than as opportunities for learning.

3.1.3. PRINCIPLES OF INTERNSHIP.

Most of the problems outlined above could be grouped into two main categories. The first of these was concerned with the problem of continuity between university and school contexts, while the second set of problems related to the condition of learning which student teachers experience in schools. The internship was seen as a solution to the problem of continuity, but needed to be linked with the notion of partnership between university and school. This was an ongoing partnership not simply operating during the period that the student teacher spent in the school, but based upon an effective organizational continuity.

In past practicums there has often been a heavy reliance on 'learning from experience' in an unguided and non-analytic way. Student teachers have tended to learn in contexts that are demanding or anxiety-provoking and what was learned tended to be strategies for surviving. The Oxford model provided for a strong contribution from both university and schools. This led to a common understanding of the conditions needed for effective learning , and the continuity provided by the internship, alleviated many of these difficulties.

In the United States universities have moved towards school-based teacher education with the development of the concept of the induction year. Huling-Austin (1990) has carried out considerable research into induction programs. Broadly defined, an induction program is a planned program intended to provide some systematic and sustained assistance, specifically to beginning teachers for at least one school year (Zeichner,1992). Huling-Austin's research, based on data systematically collected and analyzed, found that the induction year improved teaching performance and increased retention of promising beginning teachers (there had been a large drop out rate of beginning teachers in Indiana prior to the introduction of an induction year).

But probably the most consistent finding of her studies was the importance of the support teacher (sometime called the mentor teacher). She contended that 'the assignment of an appropriate support teacher was likely to be the most powerful and cost effective intervention in an induction program (Huling-Austin,1990). Most of the beginning teachers in this study reported that having a support teacher was the single most helpful aspect of the program because it gave them someone to turn to on a daily basis as problems arose.

Currently, there is extensive interest across the U.S. in teacher induction programs. Furthermore, a large amount of writing and activity has been produced on the topic in the past ten years, so much so that it was becoming increasingly difficult at any point in time to determine what the knowledge base and research base were saying to the field, but there were already clearly defined areas of both consensus and controversy.

There was support for induction programs to assist beginning teachers in areas such as classroom management and student evaluation (Veenman,1984). There was also considerable support for the role of the mentor teacher, and a need for the various agencies (institutes of higher education, State Education Agencies and professional organizations) to collaborate in providing support and assistance to beginning teachers. The need for beginning teachers to be placed in school situations that would allow them to succeed, as opposed to extremely difficult placements that would promote their failure, was also considered to be of prime importance.

There were still areas of controversy in the field of teacher induction. These include a realistic definition of a successful beginning teacher. It would seem unrealistic to expect the beginning teacher to perform as well as the 20 year veteran at the end of one year of teaching, regardless of how effective the teacher induction program was. Nevertheless, in many programs the same

evaluation criteria were being used for beginning teachers that were being used for experienced professionals (Huling-Austin,1990). Another problem concerned the assistance and assessment functions of induction programs. There was considerable data to support the fact that beginning teachers were hesitant to seek assistance from persons responsible for conducting their formal assessments; most educators agreed on the need to separate the assistance and assessment roles of program facilitators. Yet, in practice, many programs have the same persons fulfilling both assessment and assistance roles. Other areas of controversy include the exact role of the support teacher; how should this role be structured? And importantly, how should induction programs be evaluated? Induction programs thus faced a number of challenges; in the future there seemed to be a need to sharpen the focus of efforts in the areas of policy, practice, and research. Without doubt there was considerable similarity in the challenges offered by induction programs, those that presented themselves in the British Partnership Model, and those that were are apparent in the Australian experience of internship. This was summed up succintly by Bullough & Gitlin (1994) who stated "...survival and the desire to obtain positive evaluation or to fit into a department consumed student teachers during induction years or internship" (p.75).

3.2.PARTNERSHIP AND SCHOOLS.

Partnership with schools is not a new concept but recent research has begun to look more closely at school-based teacher education. Accordingly, considerable research has appeared about this strategy (Proctor, 1984; Zeichner, 1990,1992; Everton & White, 1992; McWilliam & O'Brien, 1993). Most of it coming from Britain, where central government pressures upon teacher training institutions has resulted in major changes to the programs offered by faculties of education. One of the most important of these changes taking place in British teacher education was the move towards developing a

partnership with schools. Her Majesty's Inspectorate had proposed that teachers should be involved in planning courses and in selecting, teaching, supervising, and assessing students. Tutors responsible for professional courses should also spend more time teaching in schools (Proctor,1984).

Proctor (1984) considered these ideas in great detail in his article which is commented upon here because of its relevance to the issue of supervision of the practicum. The partnership envisaged, created a completely new philosophy about supervision and who was responsible for what. He saw the teacher involved in five areas of pre-service teacher education. They were:

i) *involving teachers in the planning and operation of teacher education courses.*

The setting up of a local committee made up of the training institution, the local education authority, local practising teachers and individuals from outside the education service was a commendable notion, but presented, according to Proctor, a number of concerns. The wide range in the provision of educational needs could not possibly be dealt with by one committee. Any decision made by the committee would also have serious implications for inservice training support (an area in which they would have no responsibility). There were also difficulties in separating academic components from professional aspects (the only interest of the professional committee) of courses which were designed from the outset as totally professional. In many progressive institutions the dichotomy between professional and academic studies no longer existed and thus there might be problems identifying the exact role of the professional committee.

ii) *involving teachers in the interview process.*

Involving teachers in interviewing prospective candidates for teaching or mentoring could be advantageous to all concerned. The teachers become aware of the very different qualities possessed by interviewees who would shortly be teaching in their schools; in terms of teachers' personal development, their further experience of being "on the other side of the table" was a long term benefit to them and their schools. Student teachers would be considerably more relaxed with classroom teachers and indirectly become instantly aware of the vocational emphasis of the interview and of the pragmatic, professional focus of the course. However, there was considerable evidence (Cook,1979) that interviewing provides no help in selection and the sheer cost in teachers' time cannot be justified in the light of this evidence.

iii) *involving teachers in university-based teaching.*

"The professional element in the student teacher's preparation should be taught by people who were successful and experienced members of the teaching profession" (D.E.S.,1983). This emphasis on observation and experience at the expense of theory was a matter of real concern, for as Stones (1983) argued: "successful teaching cannot be derived solely from subject knowledge or exposure to classrooms; it must be based on a deep understanding of the way children think and learn and on the development of a rigorous theory-based, practically oriented pedagogy"(Stones,1984,p75). Considerable thought, therefore, needed to be given to the purpose of 'casual' teaching involvement in university-based teaching, though in principle, no one would question the value of certain inputs.

iv) *involvement of teachers in teaching practice supervision and assessment.*

Considerable research (Boydell,1986; Turney,1988) supported the role of the cooperating teacher in the supervision of the student teacher on practicum. Cooperating teachers have been involved in assessment at various levels for a number of years. Yet few training institutions pass the responsibility of the final assessment of the student teacher on practicum to the school staff. In a small scale research, unpublished, Linnell,(1994) found that cooperating teachers argued "whose is the responsibility" for the final assessment, for many believed that they have done it for years under the guise of advice to the university supervisor; that this advice should be recognised as an overt contribution to the assessment process. Certainly in the British Model of Partnership the mentor teachers' contribution to the final assessment of student teachers on practicum was recognised. The internship program at the N.S.W. University, College of the Arts, in the B.Ed (Art) program has allowed cooperating teachers to assess student teachers on their final practicum in the Bachelor of Education in Art. course for a considerable period of time, very successfully (Thursby,1980).

v)*involving tutors/supervisors in classroom teaching.*

"Staff of training institutions who were concerned with pedagogy should have school teaching experience and they should have enjoyed recent success as teachers, and should maintain regular and frequent experience of classroom teaching" (D.E.S.,1989). There would be little disagreement with this principle, but any compulsion could lead to hostility and confrontation. Perhaps, the ideal was as Galton (1984) suggests a situation where student teachers, the cooperating teacher and the university supervisor are partners in a research enterprise, where the classroom was regarded as a curriculum laboratory and each member of the team explored the practice of the others.

This would be of much greater value than merely expecting tutors and supervisors to update their teaching experience.

Since Proctor's ideas were formulated there has followed a decade of British Government demands to develop more "practically oriented" teacher education courses. Most British higher education institutes have devised means to integrate the higher education and school-based aspects of their courses. Up to 1992 a number of higher education institutes had put considerable effort into reforming the higher education rather than the school-based parts of their programs (Furlong, et.al., 1996). As a result, it was possible to identify three models of partnership that have developed in the British scene:

i) *Collaborative partnership* was perhaps the best one known through the literature (Benton,1990; McIntyre, 1991; McIntyre, 1993), and was best represented by the Oxford Model. At the heart of the model was a commitment to develop a training program where student teachers were exposed to different forms of educational knowledge, some of which came from school, some of which came from the higher education institute or elsewhere. Cooperating teachers were seen as having an equally legitimate but perhaps different body of professional knowledge from those in higher education. Student teachers were expected and encouraged to use what they learned in school to critique what they learned within the higher education institute and vice versa. For the model to succeed, cooperating teachers and lecturers needed opportunities to work and plan together on a regular basis (McIntyre, 1993).

ii) *Higher Education led Partnership* was fundamentally different from the collaborative model in that it was indeed led by those in the higher education institute. The aim, as far as course leadership was concerned, was to utilize schools as a resource in setting up learning opportunities for student teachers. Course leaders have a set of aims which they want to achieve and this

demanded that schools act in similar ways and make available comparable opportunities for all student teachers. Within this model, quality control - making sure that all student teachers received comparable training opportunities - was a high priority (Furlong, et al,1996 pp. 39-55).

iii) *'Separatist' Partnership* was the final model of partnership where the school and higher education are seen as having separate and complementary responsibilities but where there was no systematic attempt to bring these two dimensions into dialogue. In other words there was partnership but not necessarily integration in the course; integration was something the student teachers, themselves, had to achieve. Interestingly, this was the model put forward by government (D.F.E., Circular, 9/92; Circular, 16/93).
In the research (McIntyre,1993 & Furlong, et al., 1996), only a minority of British teacher education courses represented these three models in pure form. Mixed models were common up to 1996, where, for example, a number of courses had adopted a 'split' model of partnership in effect running two courses. Collaborative partnerships had been developed with one group of schools while the remainder were involved in an higher education led model or even a non partnership approach.

According to Zeichner (1990) one of the most valuable aspects of the Sydney University's conception of the practicum has been the way it has underlined the narrowness of the practicum as it was typically conducted. He recognised the need to broaden the scope of the practicum with the setting up of professional development schools in the U.S. From the description of this innovation it was similar to the partnership model espoused by Proctor, (1984), but for this model to be successful it needed to be seen to offer benefits to all parties involved. Student teachers should be given opportunities to acquire basic teaching skills through taking a full part in the normal life of a school, and the school and its teachers should also benefit from the scheme. According to

Everton & White (1992) "the collaborative aspects of such a scheme were designed around models which allowed teachers to develop their own professional and personal skills alongside the student teachers who were working and learning with them" (p.148).

The development of partnership between university and schools was not without its problems. There were constraints that limit pedagogical practices in contemporary schools. There were the logistical difficulties inherent in the daily life of the school, such as timetable restraints, the demands of extra-curricular activities, and as McWilliam & O'Brien (1993) stated: " Such problems involved the lack of formal preparation for supervisors.....the fact that schools were not set up to foster teacher education.....the discrepancy between the role of the teacher as professional decision-maker embedded in the goals of many teacher education programs and the role of the teacher as technician which were dominant in practice; and.....the technocratic rationality which gave legitimacy to narrowly defined roles for teachers and which located the source and solutions to our problems within individuals and not within the systems in which they worked" (McWilliam & O'Brien p. 46).

There was also the difficulty of an ongoing scenario in which teacher culture and academic culture were oppositional in the teacher preparation process. Tripp (1990 p.51) cogently made the point that far from being assisted by the academic culture in education - especially through its practice of educational research - teachers as a group, in the main tended to be marginalised, excluded and even attacked by it. He pointed out:

"....Teachers were not well served by the products of educational research. It has an ideology which tended to denigrate teachers in a number of different ways, deprofessionalized them and legitimated control of them by others." (Tripp, 1990, p.51).

Clearly, this trend militated against the development of partnerships between universities and schools. Unfortunately, academic culture had less to gain than teacher culture from the innovation of partnership. Teachers might gain from 'an extra pair of hands' in carrying out teaching tasks, but academics were not rewarded in any tangible way by active involvement in the day to day teaching in schools (McWilliam & O'Brien, 1993). In fact there was little wonder then that when called upon for experimentation in 'role sharing' with the classroom teacher there was little enthusiasm on the part of academics (Woods, 1985).

3.3. PARTNERSHIP BETWEEN UNIVERSITY AND SCHOOL.

There are three sections to this part of the review. One will look at the needs of the participants in the partnership. The second will discuss the notion of a whole school policy, and the final section will look at the university supervisor within the partnership.

3.3.1. ADDRESSING THE NEEDS OF ALL PARTICIPANTS.

There were moves afoot throughout Australia to make initial teacher training more school-based (Edwards,1992). In some quarters these proposals have been portrayed as a return to the pupil-teacher apprenticeship system of the last century and alarm has been expressed by busy schools, who see proposals of more school-based training as yet another initiative to which they would have to respond, and by university teacher educators who feared a bleak future for their own role in initial teacher training (Wilkin,1992, pp.80-82). Yet, I believe the development of partnership between universities and practising schools is the most important development in teacher education for a number of years.

There was a world of difference between a cut price "sitting next to Nellie" approach (Everton & White,1992) and a carefully planned and properly coordinated partnership scheme built on existing good practice and rooted in sound educational theory. The most effective partnership arrangements would be those that addressed equally the needs of all participants (student teachers, teachers and university supervisors) (see Ashton,et al.,1983). Such a model would provide school-based initial training for student teachers with opportunities for collaboration with experienced teachers, it would also provide school-focused in-service training for teachers, which related to their immediate concerns and offered regular experience of classroom teaching for university tutor\lecturers. Yet, for such a model to be successful it needed to be seen to offer benefits to all parties involved.

When considering the development of partnership, it was interesting to note that the obligation to achieve a strengthened relationship with schools was all on the side of the training establishments, while no obligation was placed on the school to respond to such requests and no resources had been made to either side, as yet, in New South Wales. But in the United States and particularly in Britain, moves were instigated by Government for funds to be made available to specifically develop the notion of partnership.

The really distinctive feature of a successful partnership model, it can be argued, was an emphasis on benefits for schools and teachers as well as those for student teachers. There should be a firm commitment to the belief that teachers could learn as much from students new to the profession, as the latter could learn from the staff with more experience.

The collaborative aspects of partnership should be designed around models which allowed teachers to develop their own professional and personal skills alongside the students, who were working and learning with them. Partnership

student teachers should be seen as members of staff from the first day of their attachment to the school, and they should be encouraged to involve themselves in and take responsibility for as many aspects of school life as possible. There was need, however, for clear policy statements about the student teacher in the classroom and further, about the student teacher's role in the wider life of the school. Student teachers should be encouraged to enter fully into the life of the school and not to remain in the confines of a subject department (the model that has been traditional in N.S.W. for many years). There will be many different interpretations of partnership, but the most fruitful possibilities would come from a model of professional development which extended beyond the school and the university to include the wider community of parents, government authorities, teaching unions and, of course, the student teachers themselves.

3.3.2. A WHOLE SCHOOL POLICY.

Increased awareness of the need for a whole school policy for the practicum was obviously necessary, together with joint analysis of the implications of such a policy of partnership, in terms of the training needs of schools and of the university (Everton & White,1992). This whole school policy should have the following four major points:

i) commitment to professional education and the incorporation of training into the management strategy of the school on the basis of explicit agreements with the university, systematic arrangements for liaison and identification of responsibilities.

ii) clear statement based on agreed criteria about the role of the cooperating teacher (mentor) working directly with the student teacher, including considerations such as involvement with planning and documentation,

observations and commentary on student teaching, frequency of oral and written feedback, systematic discussions of the student teachers' professional development, and the opportunities which might be taken by the cooperating teacher in the presence of a competent student teacher.

iii) commitment to training and development of host teachers\mentors alongside university supervisors\tutors to construct an agreed and systematic structure for student teacher support which recognizes differential perpectives between school and subject department.

iv) agreements about the mode of assessment to be employed; the extent of student involvement in school life outside the classroom, the opportunity to see competent practitioners at work, the documentation in support of student teachers and the role of student evaluation on the school itself.

Clearly, such a policy would need to be reviewed regularly to be effective, should be devised by all members of the school community within a framework agreed by the school and university (Barber,1993).

To develop the concept of a whole school policy was not easy. It would require a complete rethink by a school's executive and its wider community on the importance of a school's role in practice teaching. Only then could the points made by Barber be put into practice and bear fruition. The focus on a whole school rather than individual classrooms as sites for practicum experiences would avoid the narrowness of the practicum experience for student teachers as they became so immersed in individual classrooms that they failed to get involved in the kinds of school level activities such as those described in Turney et al's (1985) presentation of the school domain of the practicum curriculum. In particular, this lack of preparation to become involved in school-wide policy-making and curriculum development reinforced the role of teacher as technician that the formal curriculum of most teacher education programs overtly rejected (Zeichner, 1990 p.118).

The focus on the individual classroom as opposed to the school as the site of a practicum reinforced many of the negative effects of the apprenticeship model that most teacher educators rejected. Placing student teachers in schools instead of in classrooms gave the opportunity for a variety experiences with different teachers so that the impact of one teacher was not so influential. The establishment of 'special' schools which could implement a whole school policy and thus assume the professional education of student teachers as a primary function would be the goal of a developed partnership between university and a school system.

3.3.3. THE UNIVERSITY SUPERVISOR AND THE CONCEPT OF PARTNERSHIP.

The partnership scheme, it was argued, would provide an ideal vehicle for university lecturers in teaching programs to maintain and develop their own teaching experience(McIntyre, 1990), and to do this in a way which was closely related to their normal work with student teachers. Under this scheme the university supervisor\tutor would spend a day a week in one of their partnership schools, they could be involved in the following activities:

i) chairing a professional course seminar attended by the partnership student teachers from that school. These seminars would follow up university professional course inputs and monitor any investigations to be carried out by the student teachers. There were obvious advantages in holding these seminars in the practising schools. Firstly, the school's professional mentors, and other school staff who have an interest in a particular cross-curriculum area could take part. Secondly, the students were able to consider issues in the context of their partnership school and to relate their professional studies to the work they were doing in the school.

ii) working in the classroom with the student teacher and the mentor and sharing in the planning, teaching and discussion of the triad's work.

iii) liaising with the mentors in their partnership schools in relation to the ongoing planning and evaluation of the Partnership Scheme. This aspect of the work allowed university supervisor\tutors to identify more closely with the working life of their schools and to become much more aware of the concerns and needs of the teachers working in them. This also enabled the university supervisor\ tutor to consider other aspects of the teacher development course in the light of current school and classroom experience.

This sustained contact with a small group of schools provided university lecturers with regular opportunities to refresh their classroom experience through full participation in a triad teaching, observation and discussion situation. They would be required to address real questions about actual pupils' learning for which they shared responsibility. University supervisors\tutors would also be given opportunity to take part in changing the practice in schools and this would encourage them to adopt a similarly evaluative stance towards curriculum offered at the university. A recent practicum at the University of Sydney (June,1995) brought this point out clearly when practising school staff had the problem of student teachers taught an objectives approach to lesson planning at the university, as distinct from the outcomes approach, which was a requirement of the N.S.W. School System. Perhaps there was a case for universities to require their lecturers in teacher education programs to benefit from classroom teaching experience themselves every five years. This would certainly avoid the present problem of the accusation by student teachers and cooperating teachers alike, that some university supervisors have not practised in the classroom for twenty years! It was a condition of the lecturer's contract at the University of Birmingham, U.K.

that he or she showed evidence of a period spent teaching in schools every five years,(Williams,1993).

Ideally, the idea of a partnership between school and training institution would evolve naturally and irreversibly in institutions committed to teacher education. It would take little effort for the present levels of informal cooperation and collaboration to be transformed into a lasting partnership beneficial to schools and universities alike.

3.4. SUMMARY

In review, this treatise on partnerships is an integral part of the place of supervision in teacher education courses. If school-based teacher education became the norm, as it would seem from the evidence in the literature review, then the whole philosophy governing the supervision of student teachers would have to change to meet these new pressures, which put the school and its staff at the forefront of teacher training, at the expense of higher education institutes. These institutes would have to change their methods of supervision to accommodate the new thinking. Supervision would no longer be the sole responsibility of the university, but would become a 'partnership' in the true sense of the word. If not, then faculties of education might no longer include teacher training as their main raison d'etre.

This chapter highlighted the concern both within the profession and from external sources about beginning teachers and their induction into the profession. These concerns have prompted the development of teacher induction programs, which were seen as providing systematic and sustained assistance to the young teacher for atleast the first year of teaching. In Australia, the internship is seen as a form of induction for student teachers. It offers possible solutions to the endemic problems of teacher education namely that the student teachers were recognized as marginal people in schools.

Further, because of this marginalisation they lacked the opportunity to try out what had been learned at the university and the apparent failure of school visits by university staff to be little more than occasions for testing student teacher classroom competence (Booth, 1993).

These problems were recognized as ones of continuity between university and school contexts. Perhaps the internship could be seen as a solution to these through the concept of partnership between the university and the practising school. Various forms of partnership were recognized from a collaborative model best represented by the Oxford Scheme, to a partnership led by the higher education establishment where the school was seen as a resource for setting up learning opportunities for student teachers. Finally a separatist model where the school and the university were seen as having separate and complementary responsiblities but where there was no attempt to bring these two dimensions into dialogue was discussed. In other words, there was a partnership, but not necessarily integration in the course.

The development of partnership between university and schools was not without its problems. Those referred to were logistical difficulties inherent in the daily life of a school. The difficulty of the ongoing scenario in which teacher culture and academic culture were oppositional was in the teacher preparation process was also recognized. According to McWilliam & O'Brien (1993). this conflict clearly militates against the development of partnerships between universities and schools. In fact the research showed that the obligation to achieve a strengthened relationship was all on the side of the training establishment.

The distinctive feature of a successful partnership model revealed in the review was an emphasis on benefits for schools and teachers as well as those for student teachers. From this results a firm commitment to the belief that

teachers could learn as much from students new to the profession, as the latter could learn from the teaching staff with more experience.

The chapter also considered the need for a "whole school" policy for the practicum. Clearly, a student teacher is appointed to a school when completing a practicum, but this has usually meant spending the period in one subject department. The notion of a whole school policy goes well beyond this normal situation. Everton & White (1992) called for a school management strategy which was based on explicit agreements with the university, the need for agreed criteria about the role of the cooperating teacher or mentor within the school, the training of mentors alongside university supervisors, agreements about the mode of assessment to be employed and the involvement of the student teacher in the life of the school. However, such a policy would need to be reviewed regularly to be effective and more importantly devised by all members of the school community within a framework agreed to by the university and the school.

The partnership scheme, it has been argued, would provide an ideal vehicle for university supervisors to improve their standing in the practicum situation. It would enable them to work closer with the teachers that support them in the practicum. Visits to practising schools would be held on a more systematic and regular basis which would allow the supervisor to identify more closely with the working life of the schools. Worthwhile partnership requires the development of mentors to support the student teacher and the university program requirements. The university supervisor would play a key role in the development of mentoring through the organization of inservice courses to provide for the needs of teaching staff prepared to support the university program. The partnership scheme would also allow for the correction of a basic problem with the practicum and that is the recognition of the importance of the university supervisor by the other two members of the triad, the student

teacher and the mentor as more time would be spent in the school by the supervisor.

Chapter 4 looks at role theory in the context of the practicum and sets the scene for the study that follows.

CHAPTER 4

ROLE THEORY IN THE CONTEXT OF THE PRACTICUM.

One of the bases of this research is the interplay of the roles and relationships experienced by the members of the triad involved in the practicum. It was necessary, therefore, to devote a chapter of this study to role theory and to look more closely at the roles of the student teacher, the university supervisor and the cooperating teacher.

4.1. A FIELD OF STUDY.

Role Theory as a field of study has developed since the 1930's. Although it has not been widely recognized, arguably, it shares with more mature fields of behavioural science the fact that it possesses an identifiable domain of study, perspective, and language, and has a body of knowledge, some rudiments of theory and characteristic methods of enquiry.

.

The major role players in the current research are the student teacher, the cooperating teacher,and the university supervisor. Role theory will be considered in this light and its implications for the overall research.

The concept of role has proved, since the 1930s, an increasingly useful tool in the social sciences. Linton(1947), Merton(1949), Newcomb(1950), Biddle(1966) and others have developed and refined role theory, and though the terminology has been employed with confusing variations. Biddle (1979) gives a meticulous and exhaustive survey of the ambiguities) there is now some stabilization of the terms employed.

More important, a growing number of research studies testify to the usefulness of the idea of role as an intellectual tool. Particularly valuable, since it contains a review of the then existing state of role theory, is the study of role consensus conducted by Gross,Mason,Ross and McEarshern (1958). A perceptive English enquiry directly relevant to the current research is Booth's (1993), where he investigated the effectiveness and role of the mentor in schools. Such studies demonstrate that role theory, in spite of initial confusion of nomenclature and inadequacies in existing conceptualizations, can bring organization and insight into particular areas of research enquiry into the practicum.

4.2. ROLE ANALYSIS.

Consensus in the field is summed up by Banton (1970), who asserts "It is agreed that behaviour can be related to a position in a social structure; that actual behaviour can be related to the individual's own ideas of what is appropriate (role cognition), or to other people's ideas about what he or she should do (norms). In this light a role may be understood as a set of norms and expectations applied to the incumbent of a particular position." (Banton, pp28-29). In an earlier context Banton defines a role as a cluster "of rights and obligations," and suggests that "the concept of role provides one of the best available means for studying the elements of cooperation." (Banton, p2). Biddle &Thomas,(1966) stated that the most common definition of role is that it is a set of prescriptions defining what the behaviour of a position member should be (p.29).

4.3. ROLE CONFLICT AND AMBIGUITY.

To understand fully the degree of conflict or ambiguity in a role, the total pattern of expectations and pressures must be considered. A thorough

investigation into all role expectations held at a given moment by all the members of a role set should yield an indication of the potential in the situation for conflict. In certain situations an individual may find him or herself exposed to conflicting expectations: some people expect him or her to behave in one way, others in another, and these expectations are incompatible.

An examination of the literature concerned with "role conflict" (Gross,McEachern &Ward (1966) reveals that this term has been given different meanings by different social scientists. Some have used it to denote incompatible expectation situations to which a person has been exposed, whether he or she is aware of the conflict or not. Other social scientists use "role conflict" to mean situations in which a person perceives incompatible expectations. The student teacher and the cooperating teacher may hold quite opposite expectations for his or her behaviour but he or she may or may not be aware of this discrepancy.

Some formulations of role conflict specify that a person must be exposed to conflicting expectations that derive from the fact that he or she occupies two or more positions simultaneously. A student teacher may occupy simultaneously the positions of student and colleague towards the cooperating teacher and a completely different position towards the university supervisor. In view of these differences in this study it was necessary to specify the way the problem was defined and limited. My interest was in role conflicts that were perceived by individuals subject to them, and who were concerned with incompatible expectations resulting from an occupancy of a single position as well as multiple positions. Certainly, members of the triad when interviewed made me aware of these role conflicts.

The concept of role, therefore, has obvious relevance to any enquiry into teaching practice, since cooperation between student teachers, university staff

and cooperating teachers is an essential requirement of the enterprise. The work of Turney, et al. (1982) in the " Role Handbook, Supervisor Development Programmes" recorded that supervisors play six major roles in their relationships with student teachers. These were stated as:

1. MANAGEMENT ROLE, where the supervisor is concerned with the purposeful and smooth operation of the practicum. Here Turney, et al. talked about supervisory behaviours that contribute both to successful planning and organizing of the practicum.

2. COUNSELLOR ROLE, which is based upon a sensitivity and concern for the student teacher as a person and as a developing teacher.

3.INSTRUCTOR ROLE; this role is concerned with assisting the student teacher to explore and improve their teaching plans and performances.

4. OBSERVER ROLE is concerned with the systematic and purposeful viewing and accurate recording data on the teaching of the student teacher.

5. FEEDBACK ROLE, where the supervisor conveys to the student teacher information arising from the observation of the teaching episode.

6.EVALUATOR ROLE: the evaluator role is concerned with making sound judgements about the level of the student teacher's development as a teacher

(Turney, et al. 1982).

The role of the teacher has, of course, been explored in a number of sociological analyses, which inquired into teachers' and parents' conceptions of the teacher's role. An article by Westwood (1987) surveys previous studies of the teacher's role, and advocates the need for investigation of the period of teacher training as one in which the student teacher acquires his/her conceptions of what a teacher should be and should do. Such an approach

involves "reviewing the whole of the training period as one in which the student teacher is learning to play his/her role." (Westwood, p131).

One study by Finlayson and Deer (1979) investigated the conceptions of the teacher's role with 268 college of education students, and compared these with the conceptions of 183 head teachers. Significant differences emerge from the responses of these two groups, the head teachers being, among other things, "much more strongly in favour of teachers interpreting right and wrong for the child, using punishment, being stricter in their discipline, and in insisting on immediate conformity from children as compared with student teacher responses. On the other hand, they are more inclined to reject activities in which children formulate their own rules of behaviour, opportunities for children to learn from their own experiences and for them to discuss their personal difficulties with teachers."

This study, however, although it involves a comparison of student teachers' role expectations and those of cooperating teachers, does not ask for their expectation of role behaviour towards each other in the practice teaching context. Yet in my studies of the practice situation through discussion and observation, I have found certain aspects of role theory a most useful means of analysing some of the areas of difficulty.

Goodfellow (1995) stated that there were many factors that contribute to the images the cooperating teachers held of their role. These included their own life experiences as adult learners, experiences in working with other student teachers, images they held of themselves as early childhood teachers, perceptions of their relationships with student teacher and university resources (Goodfellow, p.161). The following section looks at the specific role of the student teacher.

4.4. ROLE OF THE STUDENT TEACHER.

Some research suggests that student teachers during practice are concerned entirely with the practice and relinquish all obligations as members of subject groups back at the university. (McCulloch & Lock,1992 Jeans,1993). In other words, their role on the practicum is a single, though complex one, and their position is akin to the teacher's rather than to the university student. Nevertheless this single role is an uneasy and demanding one since it involves the establishing of a professional teaching relationship with the pupils, and the establishing of a student learning relationship with cooperating teachers and with supervisors. Student teachers, and to some extent school and university staff, often attempt to resolve its complexity by concentrating on one aspect - the professional teaching relationship with pupils. Student teachers in many a discussion express the wish to be treated on practice as 'proper' teachers. I have never heard one of them request to be treated as a 'proper' student. In the past, principals have told me reassuringly that student teachers in their schools are considered as ordinary members of staff. Yet the essential nature of the practice situation renders, it is asserted, these wishes and reassurances misplaced. Certainly, the student's primary desire on practice is to assume an effective teaching relationship with pupils. In his or her role of student teacher he or she has, however, certain learning obligations. It is possible, because the elements in student teacher role performance have not been rigorously defined, that there are practice conditions which interfere unduly with the activating of the teaching element, while failing to provide adequately for the full development of the student teacher learning aspect. More stringent analysis might lead to practice organization and supervisory arrangements which would allow all aspects of the role to be activated with the minimum of duress and strain. For instance, for an adequate performance of the 'teacher' role, the student teacher might require a practice of some duration (similar to an internship) with the minimum of intervention by direct incursion into the

class room by university supervisors, but with considerable exploratory talk between student teacher and supervisor on the nature of the experience.

To exploit the learning obligations and privileges of the student's role, short and intensive experiences might be devised, in which student teachers, lecturers and cooperating teachers, singly or in groups, carried out specified teaching tasks in conditions which were experimental and did not pretend to reproduce customary classroom circumstances. These experiences could be studied by a variety of analytical procedures, by comments from teachers, lecturers or other student teachers, using similar methods as micro teaching laboratories. Differentiation of this kind might reduce some of the complexities of the student teacher's role performance and might intensify the learning to be derived from the practicum experience. Whatever differentiation may be introduced, however, the condition of being a learner practitioner does not permit the student teacher to assume the full role of teacher; thus an element of tension is inherent in the condition and cannot be resolved. It is possible that students' complaints of 'artificiality' and 'unreality' are in part a confused reaction to this inevitable tension. What these emotive words may be registering is the fact that being a student teacher on practice is different from being a teacher. The student teacher role on practice does not lack 'reality' so much as definition. Even under present conditions of role confusion, practice teaching is a very 'real' experience - the vividness of recall of the experience by experienced teachers testifies to this.

The reality of the role of the student teacher on the practicum may be lost because of the student teacher's natural desire to acquire confidence by assuming the role of a fully fledged teacher. He or she indulges in fantasies that if once their true role is disclosed to the children an appropriate professional relationship will be difficult or impossible. Discussion with students has shown that they set great store by the way they are introduced to

their classes, and attribute subsequent disciplinary problems to their being introduced as the 'new student' rather than the 'new teacher'.

In summary, the role of the student teacher is a single, though complex one, and their position is akin to the teacher's rather than to the university student. This single role is an uneasy and demanding one; it does not lack 'reality' so much as definition.

Even the conditions of role confusion still make practice teaching a very 'real' experience. The section that follows considers the role of the university supervisor, one of the people who is perhaps responsible for this role confusion.

4.5. ROLE OF THE UNIVERSITY SUPERVISOR.

Although the role of the university supervisor was looked at in Chapter 2 it is necessary to look again at other aspects of this role at this stage in the study. Firstly, the role of the supervisor is always a short term one, and is invariably combined with another professional role, that of university lecturer. I distinguish these two roles, rather than treat them as different aspects of the one role of 'university staff', since the requirements of each seem sufficiently distinctive to justify this, and, more important, since this intellectual device clarifies some of the problems faced by lecturers in the practicum situation. Staff in faculties of education are appointed to the role of education or subject lecturer; it is assumed that the new incumbents will be sufficiently versatile to activate the short term role of supervisor at appropriate stages in the university year. This assumption is sometimes made on too optimistic a basis. Experience of advanced academic study in a discipline and of teaching this at a high level is obviously appropriate to the role of the university lecturer; this is not always, nor necessarily combined, for example, with that interest in the education of children or understanding of work with less academically gifted pupils in the

secondary school, which would seem relevant to activating the supervisor's role in a faculty of education. Difficulties arise when an individual equipped to activate the one is forced by present organization of teaching practice to activate the other, even when his or her experience is irrelevant to the task. Yet, in rating the effectiveness of university supervisors, both student teachers and cooperating teachers perceived little difference between those with classroom experience and those without classroom experience (Lamb & Montague, 1982).

Even where university staff acquire the relevant balance and expertise to activate both roles, there is a strain imposed by this duality. In most universities, operating a four year B.Ed course or a one year Diploma course, the two roles are being implemented in the same span of time, the staff member having obligations to fulfil as university lecturer and as teaching practice supervisor.

Research by Glickman & Bey (1990) found that where supervisors had large groups of student teachers to supervise they were simply viewed as 'troubleshooters' (p.561) and sporadic visits were not of high benefit to student teachers (Morris, 1974). Koehler (1984) contended that the clinical functions of university supervisors, such as observation, data collection, and feedback were devalued, because there was so little time to observe and communicate with student teachers. Certainly the brevity of the opportunity provided by present practicum arrangements strongly suggests that it might be expedient to tap existing role relationships.

It is, of course, possible to argue for the alternative viewpoint, namely, that the pre-existing pattern of role norms and expectations may confuse the establishing of new ones, and that the supervisor should ideally be in that role, and that only, to a particular student. This argument, however, seems to lack

cogency when weighed against the necessity for mutual confidence and understanding between supervisor and student teacher. This cannot be easily forged on occasional visits over three or four weeks of teaching practice.

Whatever one's views of the opposing arguments, in the actual school situation duality of role contact with the same students is not uncommon with university staff. The problem then is to prevent preconceptions acquired in the previous relationship from blocking or unduly colouring perceptions in the new relationship.

In summary, the role of the supervisor is always a short term one, and is invariably combined with another professional role, that of university lecturer. Even where university staff acquire the relevant balance and expertise to activate both roles, there is a strain imposed by this duality, some student teachers complaining that supervisors show interest only in their own subject area. The final role considered is that of the cooperating teacher, a concept that is developed specifically for practice teaching.

4.6. ROLE OF THE COOPERATING TEACHER.

As regards the cooperating teacher, the role of supervising inschool experiences comes into existence only in relationship with that of the student teacher. The role of teacher, however, exists primarily in relationship with that of pupil, and only intermittently, under the present system, with that of student teacher. Wilson (1979) has described the teacher's role obligations as "diffuse"; one can only say from the evidence of observation and discussion that the role in relation to student teachers is diffuse to the point of vagueness. The cooperating teacher is also uncertain as to the supervisory and assessing aspects of the role, which in turn leads to uncertainty as to the appropriate relationship with university supervisors. The one sure obligation is to allow the

student teacher some experience of teaching the children. This immediately involves the cooperating teacher in maintaining a balance between responsibilities imposed by the still existing teacher-pupil relationship and those imposed by the new teacher-student teacher relationship. Cooperating teachers complain that sometimes they must sacrifice some of the obligations (for example, to ensure satisfactory progress in pupil learning inherent in the former relationship) in order to fulfil their obligations in the latter.

Role conflict here (loyalty to pupils and loyalty to a student teacher)is not imposed by the demands of maintaining two different roles - unless one splits off the teacher's relationship with the student into a separate category, calling it, for instance, the "school supervisor's" role. In the present situation this is an unnecessary complication. It is simpler to assert that the teacher's role embraces an intermittent relationship with the student teacher as well as a more permanent relationship with the pupil. Student teachers are part of a teacher's role set as are pupils. The problem then for the cooperating teacher is in reconciling the rights and obligations of different members of his role set.

4.6.1. ROLE OF THE MENTOR.

The role of the cooperating teacher is being expanded as universities move closer to the notion of school- based teacher education. They are being assigned greater responsibility as institutions seek to establish a firmer partnership with their colleagues in schools. Riverina university, N.S.W., for example, states that "the university believes that the cooperating teacher rather than the lecturing staff should have the major professional role of making decisions for the best development and welfare of the student in his or her charge"(Turney,1988). The difficulty here, of course, is that schools receive student teachers from different institutions with different regulations, whilst institutions like Riverina are happy for cooperating teachers to assess

student teachers, places like the university of Sydney, still wish to hold on to this task. Cooperating teachers, in these circumstances may find their role difficult to carry out.

The role of the mentor was discussed at length in Chapter 2 what follows is an expansion of a working model depicting the role of the mentor. According to McIntyre, et al. (1993), the mentor has two roles - the first as the point of reference in the practising school and for the day- to- day introduction into the context of the school (the guide, philosopher and friend role); the second as a colleague teacher responsible for the student teacher in a particular subject area (p.64).

In the Oxford Model (McIntyre,1990), the mentor played a highly significant role in the program. The responsibilities went beyond previous demands for the practicum and mentors were asked to assume a much more active role in their association with the student teacher. These extra demands were detailed in their study statements, listed below.

The mentor oversees the immersion of the student teacher into the school culture by:

regular conferencing with the student teacher;

reflecting with the student teacher on significant incidents;

making the student teacher aware of school policies and role modelling their implementation;

sharing non-classroom activities and duties such as playground supervision, administrative duties, participating in pastoral care groups and staff development exercises;

ensuring the social intergration of the student teacher into the school staff and full participation in staff activities.

The mentor also takes on a liaison role between the school and the university by:

regular meetings between the mentor and university supervisor appointed to that school to discuss the progress of the student teacher;

writingthe final report at the conclusion of the practicum;

regularly reporting to the school principal on the progress of the student teacher and the practicum and conveying any suggestions or advice to the university supervisor.

The mentor encourages engagement with the professional culture by:

attendance at meetings of professional associations;

reading of professional journals;

joining the appropriate professional association.

The mentor acts as the focus person responsible for a particular student teacher in the practising school by:

participating in the selection of colleague teachers;

ongoing liaison with colleague teachers;

negotiating with peer teachers for additional colleague teachers where appropriate.

N.B. The mentor acts as a colleague teacher in one of the student teachers subject areas, other areas of the student teacher' work would be covered by other teaching staff acting as colleague teachers.

In the Oxford Model these expectations are implemented by the individual mentor and the university supervisor. (McIntyre,et al. 1993, pp.64-66).

In summary, the role of teacher exists primarily in relationship with that of pupil, and only intermittently with that of student teacher. Thus the cooperating teacher is uncertain as to the supervisory and assessing aspects of

the role, which in turn leads to uncertainty as to the appropriate relationship with university supervisors; but the role of the cooperating teacher is being expanded as universities move closer to the notion of school-based teacher education. The research clearly indicates that any resultant role conflict must be resolved for worthwhile development of any new teacher education programs, and requires greater input from schools and school teachers (Yee,1967; Zahorik,1988; Zimpher,1988; Guyton&McIntyre,1990).

The present study, it is hoped, will bridge this gap by developing a case for closer links between universities and practising schools through partnership and internship; and in the development of the concept of mentor to replace the traditional cooperating teacher. Only then can the role confusion referred to by Wilkin (1992) between members of the triad be successfully resolved. Chapter 5, which follows, looks at how the study was conducted, the nature of qualitative research methods, the research design, and the arrangements for data collection and analysis.

CHAPTER 5.

THE STUDY.

A large proportion of the problems stated by student teachers in the research already reviewed deal with the relationships with their cooperating teachers and university supervisors(Zeichner,1982; Strauss,1987;Zimpher,1988; Wilkin,1992;Williams,1993). The present study sets out to examine how the various participants in the practicum interpret their roles and those of other participants, and how they perceive the relationships arising from those roles. This chapter outlines the nature of qualitative research, the rationale for using it in this study, how the study was conducted, arrangements for data collection, and the way responses were obtained and analyzed.

5.1. THE NATURE OF QUALITATIVE RESEARCH.

Qualitative research is a term used for a broad range of research strategies (Burgess,et al. 1987; Ary,Jacobs & Razavieh, 1990; Bogden & Biklen,1992; Hittleman & Simon,1992; Dey,1993; Mitchell & Jolley,1996). Qualitative Research emphasises the importance of understanding, interpreting and explaining phenomena and events through sensitive observation and an integral involvement in the underlying processes (Dey,1993 p.30). There are distinctive characteristics of qualitative research that are worthy of particular note and applicable to this study. They are:

i) researchers collect data within the natural setting of the information, and the key data collection instruments are the researchers themselves;

ii) data are generally verbal and not numerical. Checklists may be used to count occurrences of behaviours or activities, but this is done to note trends and not to present pictures of averages;

iii) qualitative researchers are concerned with the process of an activity rather than only the outcomes from that activity; and,

iv) qualitative researchers analyze the data verbally rather than statistically. Thus the outcomes of much qualitative research are the generation of research questions and conjectures, not the verification of predicted relationships or outcomes (Hittleman & Simon,1992, p.31).

This study used interviews as one method of data gathering in the qualitative approach because it represents a direct attempt by the researcher to obtain reliable and valid measures in the form of verbal responses (Burgess, 1987, p. 10). It is realized, however, that in doing this, no research, regardless of the field of operation or methodolgy is independent of value judgments of the researcher. Decisions always have to be made as to what in the light of current opinion and knowledge are worthy of further study and how best to do this (Bogden & Biklen, 1992, p.23).

5.2 THE RATIONALE FOR THE USE OF THIS METHOD.

The present study deals with the meanings and perceptions, which have to be negotiated with the members of the practicum triad. The interview seems to offer the most appropriate method of data collection. Thus the study uses descriptive research methods, which involve collecting data in order to test hypotheses or to answer questions concerning the current status of the subject of the study (Dey, 1993, p.98). The interview process has a number of advantages and disadvantages. When well conducted it can produce in-depth

data not possible with a questionnaire. On the other hand, it is expensive and time consuming, and generally involves smaller samples. The interview is most appropriate for asking questions which cannot effectively be structured into a multiple-choice format, such as questions of a personal nature. In contrast to the questionnaire, the interview is flexible, the interviewer can adapt the situation to each subject while maintaining validity and reliability (Powney&Watts, 1987). By establishing rapport and a trust relationship, the interviewer can often obtain data that participants would not provide in a questionnaire. The interview may also result in more accurate and honest responses since the interviewer can explain and clarify both the purpose of the research and individual questions (Gay,1981 pp167-169). Another advantage of the interview is that the interviewer can follow up on incomplete or unclear responses by asking additional probing questions, while reasons for particular responses can also be determined. This method was found particularly useful in the current study, because all the interviews took place during a period of practicum when time was valuable and interviewees were responding to questions posed within the school situation. This background was very useful as student teachers were interviewed between teaching episodes or soon after dialogue with their cooperating teachers. Cooperating teachers were also interviewed in the school situation and university supervisors reflected on their roles and relationships with the other members of the triad whilst they were conducting school visits.

Direct interviewer-interviewee contact has some disadvantages. The responses given by a subject may be biased and affected by his or her reaction to the interviewer, either positive or negative. Research has shown (Mouly,1963, Powney & Watts,1987) that interviewers tend to obtain data that agree with their own personal convictions and this is an obvious problem to any later findings. Again, a person may become hostile or uncooperative if the interviewer, unknowingly, has upset him or her. Another disadvantage is that

the number of participants that can be accommodated is generally considerably less than the number which can be sent a questionnaire. Interviewing 500 people would be a monumental task compared with mailing 500 questionnaires. Also, the interview requires a level of skill usually beyond that of a beginning researcher. It requires not only research skills such as knowledge of sampling and question development, but also a variety of communication and interpersonal relations skills. Obviously, any findings must bear these statements in mind.

Steps in conducting an interview study are similar to those for a questionnaire study, but with some unique differences. The process of selecting and defining a problem and formulating questions to be answered is essentially the same. Samples of persons who possess the desired information are selected in similar manner except that they may be a much smaller sample, as is the case with the present study, because of earlier mentioned problems of time constraints and cost. An effort must be made to get a commitment of cooperation from selected persons. People who do not attend interviews present the same problems as people who do not return questionnaires. The problem is more serious for interviews, however, since the sample size may be smaller to begin with. The major differences between an interview study and a questionnaire study are the nature of the instrument involved, an interview guide versus a questionnaire. In addition, because of the face to face nature of interviews, the need for human relation and communication skills and methods for recording responses are paramount(Mitchell & Jolley,1996).

Interviews and interview data can only provide individual perceptions of the student teachers, supervisors and cooperating teachers concerning the experience of teaching practice "at a particular time and in a particular school setting"(Gay,1981). Mitchell & Jolley (1996) support this statement in another way: "The primary goal of any survey is the investigation of the present status of

the phenomena." Nevertheless, by comparing and contrasting the views expressed it should be possible to see whether the raw evidence of each interview tends to be confirmed or contradicted by other interviewees. Judicious inferences may then be drawn about:

i)how far the stated views and needs of each person or group interviewed are understood by, and communicated to others involved;

or

ii)how far those views are in harmony, and how far they are in contradiction. with others. (Bogden & Biklen, 1992, p. 96).

While the interview schedules include different questions for each different group of interviewees, they are devised with a common framework of enquiry about attitudes to each other. Thus students were asked about themselves, their supervisor and their cooperating teacher; supervisors were asked about themselves, student teachers, cooperating teachers, and so on. A more structured approach was taken in the interview format to give more precise focus in the later stages of the study.

Effective communication during the interview is critical. Before the first formal question is asked it is essential to give some time to establishing rapport and putting the interviewee at ease. The purpose of the study was then explained and strict confidentiality of responses assured. As the interview proceeded, the flexibility of the interview situation was also fully exploited. For example, the purpose of a particular question was explained more clearly.

Responses made during the interviews were recorded by tape recorder rather than manually. The manual recording of responses tends to slow down the process and it makes some subjects nervous if someone is writing down every word they say. Accordingly, in such situations, tape recordings were used to

record responses. Even tape recordings, however, present problems. The presence of a microphone is more likely to make the interviewer nervous than the respondent! (Powney&Watts,1987). Nevertheless, on balance, it was the judgement of the researcher that audio taping was the most effective way to record data.

5.3 THE RESEARCH DESIGN.

The design had to be fitted in to an on-going situation in which there could be no disturbance of conventional procedures by experimental control. Interviewing the participants whilst they were taking part in a practicum had the obvious advantage of the major topic 'roles and relationships in the practicum' being on their minds. Participant observation was ruled out because of the limited time available and because of the need of the researcher to appear to be impartial in what was known to be a delicate relationship between cooperating teachers, student teachers and university staff. My position as a non-participant observer demanded frankness about the purpose of the study and the avoidance of any procedure which might appear threatening to the participants.

Since I had behind me 18 years' experience in teacher education I was anxious not to create research instruments and procedures based solely on my preconceptions. Moreover, since the practicum involves student teachers, university supervisors and cooperating teachers in a situation of some complexity, it could be assumed that the more subtle human relationship problems would only emerge as a result of face to face interviews between the researcher and individuals. Discussion was therefore an essential element in the research procedures. The discussions enabled the participants to express opinions and attitudes and to reveal their role expectations of themselves and others.

The interview design was based on three major areas of discussion. The student teacher was asked questions with regard to the supervisor, the cooperating teacher and the organization of the practicum. Similarly the university supervisor was asked to discuss his/her attitudes towards the student teacher, the cooperating teacher and the organization of the practicum. Finally, the cooperating teacher was asked questions regarding his/her attitudes towards the student teacher, the university supervisor and the organization of the practicum.

These interviews took place in school settings (as previously listed) for both the student teachers and the cooperating teachers. The supervisors were interviewed at the University of Sydney.

5.4. FORMULATION OF QUESTIONS.

The questions were compiled as a result of the research of the literature which revealed that the major areas of concern for this study were embodied in the attitudes of the members of the triad towards each other and their views on alternate forms of the practicum. The literature search encompassed attitudes, roles and relationships revealed in Australian, American and British teacher education programs.

THE STUDENT TEACHER. Questions asked were based on the student teachers' attitudes towards the roles and relationships exhibited towards them by the university supervisor and the cooperating teacher. The literature research had shown this to be a major area of concern in that there was considerable conflict in the student teachers' views of these relationships. It was hoped that their responses would help in answering the salient questions referred to in the Abstract and Chapter 1.

Specific questions were asked about the organization of the practicum to elicit the student teachers' views on the development of an internship model, how they viewed the notion of closer links with practising schools via the concept of partnership and finally, but linked to this previous notion, the idea of replacing the existing cooperating teacher with that of a mentor. It was realized that the participants had not experienced an internship, a partnership model or the notion of mentoring, but it was felt that as final year students in a Bachelor of Education Program they had had enough practicum experience to give their views.

THE UNIVERSITY SUPERVISOR. Questions were based upon the university supervisors' attitudes towards the role and relationships exhibited towards them by student teachers and cooperating teachers. Again, the literature search had shown conflicting views in what the university supervisor felt they achieved on practicum with contrary views of student teachers and cooperating teachers.

Specific questions were asked about the organization of the practicum to obtain the supervisors' views on the development of internships, closer liaison with practising schools, namely partnerships, and the adjunct coming from this, the development of mentors. Again, it was realized that the supervisors did not have any experience of partnership, but two of the participants had experienced an internship model at City Art Institute (1981-88) and the accompanying training of cooperating teachers to support the B.ED (Art) Program. All the supervisors interviewed had considerable experience in practicum supervision and were therefore, in my opinion, able to give informed views on the development of internship, partnership and mentoring.

THE COOPERATING TEACHER. Again, the questions took the same format as those asked to the other members of the triad, that is, questions were framed to elicit information on the perceived roles and relationships of the cooperating teacher towards the student teacher and the university supervisor.

Specific questions were asked about the organization of the practicum to obtain their views on an internship model, partnership and the concept of mentoring. Although none of the cooperating teachers had experienced the partnership model or were 'trained' as mentors, they had experienced a wide variety of practicum models through their schools' involvement with student teachers from a number of tertiary institutes. I felt, therefore, that I could value their input into my research. I followed closely the work of Cope (1973), Zimpher, et al (1980), Williams (1993) and Booth (1993) in the compilation of the questions asked.

COPE (1973). My salient questions to be answered by this study were based on hypotheses used by Cope (p.29). I considered the questionnaire approach used by Cope in her study, but moved towards the interview as a data collection technique because of the unwieldiness of the questionaire as structured by her in her research (Research Methodology Course, ED.D., Semester 2, 1993). However, I found her study "school experience in teacher education" of considerable value.

ZIMPHER (1980). This research looked at the triad in the practicum situation and was based on the precept that there was considerable descriptive data about the nature of student teaching, but an obvious lack of intimate knowledge about what happens to student teachers, university supervisors and cooperating teachers on the practicum (p.12). My study attempted to correct this anomaly by following Zimpher in interviewing members of the triad.

WILLIAMS (1993). Her research entitled "the roles and responsibilities in initial teacher education - students' views" provided the background for my

study segment into the organization of the practicum. I also travelled to the U.K. and interviewed Dr. Williams at the University of Birmingham in 1995. BOOTH (1993). This research data looked at the student teacher's attitudes towards cooperating teachers and mentoring. Booth stated on p. 186 that such research was lacking. I followed his model in looking at final year student teachers in secondary school settings.

5.5. ARRANGEMENTS FOR DATA COLLECTION.

The Ethics Committee of the University of Sydney was given details of the research proposal in 1993 and permission was granted for the research to go ahead with the conditions of consent and confidentiality of those involved in the study. The principals of the schools listed in Appendix 1. gave the researcher permission to enter their schools and to interview the teaching staff who were engaged in practicum supervision by the University of Sydney.

Investigations took place in six school settings. They were Sydney Metropolitan High Schools characterized by socially diverse catchment areas and containing pupils in the 12 - 18 age range of widely differing academic abilities and attainments. The schools were simply the ones to which student teachers had been allocated. All the schools used have considerable experience as hosts to student teachers on teaching practice. The cooperating teachers are experienced as advisors to student teachers. In some cases, they have followed closely what has been outlined in chapter 3 as the duties of the ideal mentor, but generally they have carried out satisfactorily the work of a cooperating teacher within the present practicum arrangements.

After a request during a core Education lecture the student teachers, themselves, volunteered to take part in the study. The students were identified as neither outstandingly strong nor particularly weak in the profile they had presented thus far in their course. Six volunteers were chosen, who

represented a range of discipline areas (see Appendix 1 d) for details). The student teachers involved in the study are enrolled in the Bachelor of Education Degree at the University of Sydney, leading to qualified teacher status after a four year course. This B.Ed. Course has three teaching practice periods, namely:

YEAR 2	10 DAYS	MAY - JUNE
YEAR 3	15 DAYS	MAY - JUNE
YEAR 4	30 DAYS	MAY - JUNE.

Interviews were conducted during the third of these periods, because this meant student teachers had already experienced two previous practice teaching periods. In the six secondary school settings three interviews were conducted, one each with a student teacher, their cooperating teacher and their university supervisor.

As the interviews were conducted during a latter period of practicum, all student teachers would have experienced working in a different school prior to this practicum. The current supervisors, in nearly all cases were university lecturers in the School of Teaching and Curriculum Studies in the Faculty of Education with responsibility for one, or both of the curriculum studies components of the course

Nearly all schools involved in initial teacher training have a nominated "coordinator" in charge of student teachers and practice teaching arrangements. This is often the Deputy Principal or other senior member of staff with administrative responsibility, but the extent to which this person may be actively involved in supervision is varied, and is determined almost entirely by the individual way of working of the school or the occupant of the post. Many coordinators retain little more than a liaison role with the training

institution, and act as a point of reference when problems arise. Responsibility for the day to day supervision of the student teacher is generally handed over to the Subject Department, which usually designates a particular member of the department to oversee the student teacher's development. For the purposes of this study, therefore, the cooperating teachers were those subject teachers nominated by the student teachers.

5.6. CONTENT ANALYSIS OF THE INTERVIEW DATA.

The analysis of the interview data was based upon Holsti's Content Analysis (Holsti,1969), which is a multipurpose research method developed specifically for investigating any problem in which the content of communication serves as a basis for inference. Content analysis is also defined as a research technique for making replicable and valid inferences from data to their context (Krippendorff,1986, p.21). According to Holsti, Content Analysis requires three important concepts: objectivity, system and generality:

OBJECTIVITY stipulates that each step in the research process is carried out on the basis of explicitly formulated rules and procedures. If these rules and procedures are followed by another analyst, and he or she reaches similar conclusions, then the requirement of objectivity has been fulfilled. In this study a genuine attempt was made to be objective. All interviews followed the same format, with questions being asked in the same order over the same period of time.

SYSTEMATIC means that the inclusion or exclusion of content is done according to consistently applied rules and this eliminates any skew towards hypotheses that only support the investigators interests. It also implies that

categories are defined in a manner which permits them to be used according to consistently applied rules(Holsti, p.4 1969). Again, in this study I attempted to be unbiased, but was aware, that at times, when an interviewee answered questions with responses which I supported, I found myself nodding in agreement.

GENERALITY is that findings must have theoretical relevance. Purely descriptive information about content, unrelated to other attributes, is of little value. Results must take on a meaning when compared with documents produced by other sources. Obviously, a link needs to be seen to previous research revealed by the literature review. The practicum has been a concept that has led to considerable research, and studying the roles and relationships that are apparent in the practicum triad has provided a theoretical relevance to this study.

The requirements of objectivity, system, and generality are not unique to content analysis, being necessary conditions for all scientific enquiry. Thus content analysis is the application of scientific methods to documentary evidence. Krippendorff (1989) offered a framework to understand content analysis. This framework served three purposes:

i)prescriptive in the sense that it should guide the conceptualization and the design of practical content analyses for any given circumstance;

ii)analytical in the sense that it should facilitate the critical examination of content analysis results obtained by others; and

iii) methodological in the sense that it should direct the growth and systematic improvement of methods for content analysis (Krippendorff,1989,p.26).

My study endeavoured to follow this framework in recognising the importance of prescription, analysis and methodology.

PRESCRIPTION. Specific questions were asked to the three groups interviewed concerning their roles and relationships in a specific practicum period, namely the final practicum for B.Ed student teachers at the university of Sydney in June of 1995. The same questions (in a slightly different format) were asked to all those interviewed. Questions to elicit views on the organization of this practicum period were also asked. The responses were collated and appear in the next chapter.

ANALYSIS. The review of the literature highlighted content analyses that were relevant to the present study. The questions were framed to elicit information regarding the roles and relationships revealed by members of the supervisory triad towards each other. The questions were specific and much of the information obtained from the participants was similar there was need, therefore, to sift this information and the resulting data appear in the following chapter.

METHODOLOGY. As stated previously, the interviews were carried out in a very narrow time period, that is a four week final practicum time slot. Nevertheless, all the interviews occurred in similar settings, were carried out in the same manner and responses were recorded and collated in the same way.

The next chapter considers the study findings, looking specifically at the responses of the student teachers, the university supervisors and the cooperating teachers in that order.

CHAPTER 6.

RESULTS OF THE STUDY.

6.1. INTRODUCTION.

The current research sets out to examine responses to the questions asked at the interviews set out in appendix 4. These questions were framed as indicated in Chapter 5 from the review of literature undertaken in Chapters 2 - 4 to obtain responses to four major areas, namely: attitudes towards student teachers, attitudes towards cooperating teachers, attitudes towards university supervisors and general attitudes towards the organization of practicum. The interviews were sufficiently open- ended to allow discussion to consider the four salient questions referred to earlier in the Abstract, which relate to the roles and relationships exhibited by members of the practicum triad towards each other, the concept of partnership between institutions that train teachers and schools, and finally the need for mentors to replace the traditional cooperating teacher. This chapter reports the results of the study. First it considers the student teacher perspective, then the supervisors' responses and finally those of the cooperating teachers. Interviews are identified using the following code:

Student teachers.....ST1 to ST6.

Cooperating teachers.....CT1 to CT6.

University Supervisors.....S1 to S6.

6. 2. THE STUDENT TEACHER PERSPECTIVE.

"We need advice, criticism, and above all, encouragement."(ST1,ST3,ST5)

This section was concerned with the student teachers' perceptions and expectations of themselves, their university supervisor, their cooperating

teacher and the organization of the practicum. The data selected was that which was relevant to the questions asked. These questions can be found in appendix 4 a).

6. 2.1. STUDENT TEACHER AND SUPERVISOR.

Student teachers' expectations of their supervisor before the final teaching practice showed some contrast with how they had perceived the role of the supervisor after the practicum. They expected "criticism," "more detailed pedantic criticism", "help", "detailed notes" (ST2,3,5) and not as one said, "He fell asleep at the back of the room - I was so embarrassed."(ST6)

In all cases the student teachers had experienced different supervisors of their teaching practices at various stages in the four years of their teacher education program. Student teachers were asked about the ways they had been supervised. They specified issues such as formal versus informal styles, involvement versus detachment on the part of the supervisor. One found her supervisor very helpful and added: "Its good to have pointed out to you what you're doing wrong but in an encouraging way"(ST5). However, another said, "I had no relationship with a hired stranger, who could have been an ice cream salesman off the street"(ST1). In one case the supervisor wrote down everything the student teacher said, also noting any communication between student teacher and the pupils.(ST3). They then talked through the lesson in great detail.

There were similarities in the ways in which student teachers perceived the role of the supervisor. ST1,2,3,4 said, "They represented a mark, regardless of their attitude". Three student teachers then said that they behaved according to what they thought the supervisor wanted. The role was also seen in terms of help, support, advice, encouragement, suggestions for methodological

improvement and hints for better classroom management (ST4,5,6). One student teacher (ST1) alluded to role confusion by a complaint that supervisors show interest only in their own subject area. Certainly, at the University of Sydney, where a supervisor had been expected in the past to advise and supervise all student teachers in a high school, across all disciplines, there was need for expertise in a number of discrete disciplines. As the student teacher interviewed said, "My supervisor was a Mathematics specialist, who saw lots of things wrong, which a supervisor in another subject would not have noticed. Then you get a different assessment"(ST1). Here the lecturer, instead of assuming the role of a general supervisor, was felt to be retaining the specialist concerns appropriate to the university lecturer. This would naturally be the area where he\she felt the possession of the most expertise. Certainly the assumption of a "different assessment" is an untested one, interesting only that it revealed student teachers' anxiety about evaluation, and their awareness of the chance elements which may influence grades. Nevertheless, the comment from the student teacher is revealing as showing that he rightly expected a different role performance from the supervisor when on practice teaching, even though one person was put in the position of activating both.

One student teacher said, "I think that it is good if you have a supervisor that you can actually sort of say things to without knowing that it's going to go down on record - you know, I needed a lot of advice on how to work this out and work that out"(ST3).

However, another said, "He was far removed from the classroom and had forgotten how to teach"(ST1).

Student teachers were asked, "What happens when your supervisor visits you?" Student teachers found that the practice varied greatly between supervisors. In

four cases supervisors arranged time to talk before the lesson began (ST2,3,5,6).

Two others, however, commented on the late arrival of the supervisor. "There is nothing worse than having the supervisor arrive in the middle of the lesson and disrupt things"(ST1,5). All student teachers stated that their supervisors took notes during lessons observed, but in one case these were extremely detailed and the student was expected to use the account to analyse the lesson (ST3). Debriefing took place after the lesson in four cases(ST2,3,5,6). Student teachers appreciated detailed, constructive criticism but as one student teacher said: "I felt this to be too short and at worse exasperating"(ST5). One reason for this exasperation was the fact that the supervisor did not stay long enough. Thus,

"There is nothing more frustrating than having a piece of paper thrown at you with "I've got to go....."(ST1).

Most student teachers found their supervisors helpful. This perceived helpfulness was demonstrated in a number of ways. Either by being supportive, critcising '"in a positive and encouraging way, no matter how disastrous the lesson is"(ST4); by writing everything down; and noting what the children were saying, especially in group work. Only one found her supervisor "no help at all"(ST3). All student teachers highlighted the infrequency of visits as an inhibiting factor. The time lag between visits meant that strategies discussed and implemented by the student teacher were not considered again by the supervisor until much later. Yet another saw the supervisor as a none too welcome restraint because he was at variance with what the cooperating teacher had said (ST6).

All student teachers appeared confident to deal with any differences which emerged between their views of the process of teaching and learning and those of their supervisor, but three said that they just accepted what was said by the

supervisor (bearing their mark in mind)(ST1,2,4). One student teacher spoke of a "power relationship" with the supervisor,(ST1), making disagreement or the expression of it problematic. The student teachers' perception of the quality of the relationship they enjoyed with their supervisor seemed central to the way in which they coped with differences of opinion. One said "there's just no way we can communicate"(ST4). These views were echoed by other student teachers(ST1,6). One student teacher clearly saw disagreement as criticism and would try to "shake it off" (ST6). Another was too conscious of the supervisor's authority to disagree (ST4). The student teachers' comments were summed up in the words of ST 3: "I keep quiet sometimes. It depends on who the supervisor is.... It's easier to discuss with the cooperating teacher".

Even when relationships were good between the student teachers and their supervisors, there appeared to be a mismatch between what the supervisor was offering ("giving a lot of encouragement", "the need to discuss is more important than to advise", "a non interventionalist role") and what the student teacher was looking for. In all cases the student teachers would have appreciated more help, more criticism, more ideas, more advice and more teaching strategies. One thing came through very clearly that student teachers did not appreciate the use of part-time supervisors by the university. These were described as, "People I did not know and people who did not know us"(ST1,2,3,4,5,6).

From the research, supervisors were generally found to be helpful and supportive,but within limits. Yet the differences in the approaches of the supervisors to their task in the practicum was obvious. The differing approaches and the comments of the student teachers seem to suggest a need for some form of inservice for supervisors to develop a more even and structured approach in the way lessons were reported upon and the way in which student teachers were assessed. The next section deals with the findings

related to the perceived attitudes of cooperating teachers by the student teachers in their care.

6. 2.2. STUDENT TEACHERS AND COOPERATING TEACHERS.

At the University of Sydney, whilst on teaching practice, student teachers may be involved with one or several teachers. These may include a coordinating teacher, who looks after students in general; a head teacher of a subject and class teachers. The students were asked to nominate the person who had given them most help during the practice. In four cases they did not nominate the cooperating teacher (ST1,2,4,5). In three of these cases it proved to be the head teacher in their teaching subject area (ST1,4,5).

The cooperating teacher's involvement in lesson planning, debriefing and presence in the classroom during a student teacher's lessons (from interview reports) varied considerably from school to school. This was perceived by the student teachers as probably stemming from an absence of consensus or lack of guidance from the training institution (CT1,2,5.). Yet again, in some schools it is policy not to leave student teachers on their own regardless of their ability. Student teacher comments about the role of the cooperating teacher included "left me pretty much to myself" (ST6), "leaves me on my own", "I've been left to my own devices"; or being given "a few guidelines", or "simple hints, and you follow those or you can do whatever you want" (ST2). At the other extreme, the teacher gave encouragement, and "was there whenever I needed to seek advice, was helpful whilst providing freedom" (ST4), and "is for ever popping in and out of lessons" (ST3). Student teachers also set great store on the way they were initially introduced to their classes. Some attribute subsequent discipline problems to their being introduced as the "new student" rather than the "new teacher". One student teacher stated, "my teacher wrote on the board "This is Miss G- she is our student". For two days I had difficulty because the children

knew that I was not a real teacher", (ST 3). The findings from the student teachers suggest that the cooperating teacher often seemed to assess the competence of the student teacher at the early part of the practicum and then decided how much help was required.

The way the cooperating teacher behaved when the supervisor visited was perceived to vary greatly, depending on the relationship between the supervisor and the cooperating teacher. Four student teachers felt that the cooperating teacher was supportive and talked to the supervisor after the lesson (ST2,4,5,6). One felt that there should have been far more communication between cooperating teacher and supervisor (ST1). He felt that the cooperating teacher saw more lessons and it was, therefore, more important for them to communicate their reactions to the supervisor. Three of the six student teachers interviewed said that cooperating teachers interpreted the supervisor's visits as "judgmental assessment" and ask the student teacher afterwards "how did it go with your supervisor?" (ST2,4,5). In one case where the cooperating teacher had no respect for the supervisor because he had known the supervisor at university, the student teacher said, "The teacher thinks it's a big joke, and was amused watching me getting myself worked up before the visit"(ST1).

Responses varied when student teachers were asked if they had been made to feel as if they were "one of the staff". One felt very unwelcome, found staff very unfriendly, felt that they were being ignored, and found it difficult to feel involved (ST4). Others found staff very friendly and helpful (ST2,4,5,6). One felt that he was treated as a permanent member of staff (ST2). Some were invited to staff and departmental meetings (ST2,5,6). With one exception, resources were readily available, although one student teacher "had to ask" (ST1). It seems, however, from the student teachers' and cooperating teachers' data that one of the critical reasons for non acceptance was the high number of

student teachers placed in one school, where the staff felt under pressure from the university to accept and help out (ST5,6,CT2,3). One student teacher alluded to the fact that the cooperating teacher was initially uncooperative because he had learned at the last moment that he was to have a student teacher (ST5). According to data from cooperating teachers,Newtown High School were told 3 days into the practicum period to expect student teachers from the university (CT5,6). It would seem that there are atleast perceived examples of breakdowns in communication within the school or at the school-university level.

Student teachers' perceived ideal role of the cooperating teacher corresponded closely. " They should give advice, help,support, but allow the student teacher freedom to develop their own ideas" (ST1,3,5,6.). "They should help the student teacher become independent, help them develop confidence, give encouragement, be there for discussion, give constructive criticism and always debrief" (ST 1,2,3,4,5,6). Nevertheless, student teachers, on the whole,would have liked more help and advice. There was only one case in which there was a close correlation between what the student teacher hoped for in a cooperating teacher and what the teacher offered (ST4,CT5). These included an informal approach, the importance of working as a team, offering\receiving advice and help, helping the student teacher feel welcome in lessons and in the staffroom (ST4). In all other cases, although the teachers said that they were "very supportive" (CT1,2), "gave advice" (CT3,5,6), "felt they were being friendly and informal"(CT1,5,6,), the students felt insecure(ST3), "needed someone to talk to"(ST6), and atleast one felt "that there was little or no feedback"(ST1). These differences in perception between student teachers and cooperating teachers regarding their roles raise some interesting questions that will be taken up in the discussion chapter.

6. 2.3. STUDENT TEACHERS' VIEWS OF THE ORGANIZATION OF THE PRACTICUM.

All the student teachers appreciated the importance of teaching practice, but some felt that it should be longer (ST2,3,4,6). Three did not feel particularly well prepared for their first teaching practice (ST1,3,5). Four wanted more help with planning lessons and criticised the fact that the university was behind in teaching techniques and curriculum development (ST1,2,5,6). One stated, "My cooperating teacher was always talking in terms of pupil profiles and lesson outcomes, I still wanted to write up aims and objectives!"(ST1). Two would have liked more help in the preparation of actual topic areas(ST2,5). They felt that, at the University, there had been too much reliance upon theory and not enough upon 'techniques'. By techniques I assumed that the student teachers were referring to strategies of teaching and classroom organization. On the other hand, comments included, "We had a good grounding" (ST3). "Every time you stand in front of a new class of thirty kids you are not prepared"(ST6).

They all felt better on the later practicums but partly because they had some teaching experience. Thus some commented, "I learnt a lot on the first teaching practice"(ST1,3,5,6).

There was considerable criticism of the university decision to place a whole year group in 8 Sydney Metropolitan schools(ST1,2,3,5,6). It was unanimously believed by these six student teachers that they should be given more choice of school in their final practice period. The main reason for this complaint was that placings on previous practicums had not been taken into consideration. The result was that some student teachers had a very narrow band of in-school experience. For example, some had never experienced teaching in a single sex school or in a private school. With job opportunities as they are, the student

teachers felt the wider the experience the more marketable a student teacher became.

There was considerable support for the notion of an internship or extended practice teaching period (ST1,3,5,6). This would help to avoid the artificiality of the practice teaching period as the student teacher became recognised as a member of staff by the pupils and the teachers (ST2,3,5,6). However, many student teachers added the rider that it would be very difficult to spend a long time in a school with a cooperating teacher with whom you could not get along (ST1,2,4,6). They stated that, then, the University should have mechanisms in place, to move them to other schools(ST1,2,5).

There was considerable debate on the question of assessment. Three student teachers preferred to retain some form of final grading, but were at odds as to who should be finally responsible for the compilation of such grades(ST1,3,4). They stated that the cooperating teacher and the university supervisor should have consensus on any award(ST1,3,4,5). They were unanimous and adamant that it should not be left to the university supervisor alone. The idea of a very full report on their teaching abilities written by both the cooperating teacher and the supervisor, but not supported by any grading system (simply SATISFACTORY or UNSATISFACTORY) received only minor support (ST2).

This expression of opinion related to grading seemed to be a direct result of the present economic climate, where grading is a fact of life, plus the fact that the student teachers would be interviewed by the N.S.W. Department of School Education staff within four weeks of the completion of their final practice. Correct or otherwise, they stated that a grade was all important (ST1,3,4,6). In relation to grading, a grade of OUTSTANDING or HIGHLY SATISFACTORY was what all student teachers aimed for; to be deemed

SATISFACTORY was of little value in the eyes of atleast three student teachers (ST1,5,6).

The responses of student teachers thus indicated that they saw room for improvement in this vital part of their teacher education program. The next section looks at the comments resulting from the interviews carried out with six university lecturers who acted as supervisors on the practicum.

6. 3. THE SUPERVISOR PERSPECTIVES.

The visiting supervisor from the training institution is usually a lecturer who teaches in the Faculty of Education and knows the student teacher at the professional level. For sometime the University of Sydney has had to use a number of part-time supervisors to support the teacher education program in relation to the practicum. Supervisors, generally, are able to offer a different perspective from that of the cooperating teacher as a consequence of their knowledge of many schools and student teachers. They are therefore important for ensuring a degree of 'quality control'. Student teachers and supervisors identified four principal roles for the visiting supervisor:

i) helper\encourager\counsellor\friend;
ii) constructive critic\adviser\consultant;
iii) detached researcher\neutral recorder; and
iv) assessor\judge\evaluator. (ST1,2,5,6, S1,3,4)

In addition to these roles, there was also felt, especially on the part of supervisors, that there was a responsibility for maintaining an overview of the professional development of the student teacher (S1,2,5,6). The next sections of this chapter explore the perceptions of the university supervisor as to whether these roles were maintained or not.

6. 3.1. SUPERVISORS AND STUDENT TEACHERS.

Interviews with supervisors showed that there was considerable variance on the number of visits made by supervisors to their students.(S3,S4). The frequency of visits, it was stated by one supervisor, was also affected by the other teaching and administrative duties performed by him(S3). As one supervisor remarked: "It is difficult when you drive out to see a student teach and can't stay and discuss what you have seen. You have to rush back to the university to be in time for a lecture to another group of students" (S3).

There was some evidence, too, that as well as maintaining two roles, one in the practicum situation and one in the university environment, academic staff may find themselves activating both roles simultaneuosly in the school situation (S3). A relationship may have already been established on the basis of university lecturer- student roles; should the lecturer be placed in the role of supervisor to the same student teacher, the earlier set of expectations and norms will still be operating. Some lecturers believed this to be helpful and felt that university staff should always supervise student teachers they already 'know', that is, have already encountered in the role of 'lecturer' or 'tutor'(S1,4). As one lecturer stated to me, "I would like to supervise my own personal tutorial group or the students in my subject group. If you see a student teacher for the first time on teaching practice you are limited to the help you can give" (S1). Certainly the brevity of the opportunity provided by present practicum arrangements strongly suggested that it might be expedient to tap existing role relationships. It is, of course, possible to argue for the alternative viewpoint, namely, that the pre-existing pattern of role norms and expectations may confuse the establishing of new ones, and that the supervisor should ideally be in that role, and that only, to a particular student teacher. This argument, however, seems to lack cogency when weighed against the

necessity for mutual confidence and understanding between supervisor and student teacher. This cannot be easily forged on occasional visits over three or four weeks of teaching practice. Whatever one's views of the opposing arguments, in the actual school situation duality of role contact with the same student teachers is not uncommon with university staff. The problem then is to prevent preconceptions acquired in the previous relationship from blocking or unduly colouring perceptions in the new relationship. One lecturer said, "Personalities emerge differently in the practicum. The good discusser in the lecture room can be a lump in front of the children and others can blossom. I have known a student stutter badly in normal conversation and never stutter with a class. You often change your views of a student" (S3).

There was also considerable variation in the perceived amount of time supervisors spend with their students on the visits (S1,2,3,6). The six supervisors regarded it as very important that they should be present atleast 10 minutes before the lesson starts and all stated that they telephoned in advance to say that they were going to observe a particular lesson. As a result, the majority of classes, it was perceived, were not disturbed by the late arrival of the supervisor and the student teacher may be helped to avoid unnecessary tension before the lesson begins. The use made of this pre teaching period varied considerably with lecturers reporting that they often get a feel for what the lesson is about (S1,2,5,6). One supervisor pointed out the difficulty of too much knowledge about what was planned, since there was a temptation of offering advice or being critical of the plan in advance of the lesson(S4).

Four supervisors reported that their supervision visits lasted a minimum of one hour with some supervisors spending half a day with a student teacher (S1,3,5,6). The discussion at the end of the lesson was regarded as being of great importance and often lasted over twenty minutes. This was usually a discussion between student teacher and supervisor, but one lecturer stated that

"he always made sure that the cooperating teacher was involved in the debrief session"(S1).

Whilst visits were reportedly often determined by the logistics of student teacher and supervisor timetables it was reported by one supervisor (S6) that it is usually possible for prior consultation to occur so that a balance of the ages, abilities and subjects of the classes observed can be achieved. Four supervisors negotiated the focus of observation of particular visits with the student teacher and its subsequent debriefing (S1,2,3,5). Thus one supervisor saw his role as a university supervisor as giving the student, " a chance to talk about what she (the student) felt....what she wanted attention drawn to"(S3).

Four supervisors stated that they preferred to adopt a "fly on the wall" presence in the classroom and be as unobtrusive as possible (S1,3,4,5). This attitude, it was reported, arises from their concern not to affect unduly the class/student teacher relationship and make the lesson seem as normal as possible. On the other hand some student teachers are much happier to make use of the supervisor's presence as an added resource and this was reported as often welcomed by the supervisor (S1,3,6). However, three supervisors said that they had great difficulty in restraining themselves from involvement particularly when the student teacher had lost the plot or had taught something which was factually wrong (S2,4,5).

All the supervisors saw themselves in the business of assisting young prospective teachers to become proficient in the task of teaching. As such they see their role, in general terms, as a deep commitment to helping student teachers to cope with difficult situations, encouraging them when problems arise and counselling them when particular anxieties surfaced (S1,2,3,4,5,6). There was also the hope, in some instances, that they would be seen as a friend in the classroom (S5,6). Two supervisors wanted the student teachers to treat

them as equals, with the student teachers thinking of them as colleagues who had been in the job a little longer (S3,5).

Typically, it was reported by atleast three supervisors that the supervisor was present as an observer, acted as a consultant, took notes on the lessons, encouraged, advised and evaluated the lessons (S2,3,5). Overall, the supervisors unanimously perceived their role as particularly related to the development of the student teacher as a teacher. Therefore helpfulness and encouragement were emphasized as means of building up the confidence and competence of the starting teacher (S1,2,3). It was usual for supervisors at Sydney University to be introduced to the class by the student teacher, who would usually state openly, "This is my supervisor from the University" (S3,5). Some, however, expressed the view that their personal preference was to " be ignored" (S1,2,4,6).

The data suggested that supervisors usually approached the discussion of the lessons in an informal manner and often first invited the student teacher to volunteer their reactions to the lesson and its progress(S1,3,5). By asking, first of all, the student teachers to give their impressions of how the lesson had gone, all supervisors are hoping that the student teachers would be able to analyze their own actions and the responses of the pupils and hence learn more about themselves as teachers (S1,2,5,6). Ideally, all the important issues should arise naturally. Two supervisors, however, reported that they did have their own "hidden agendas" which they hoped the student teacher would cover, but would be prepared to raise directly themselves should the need arise (S1,4).

Virtually all supervisors expressed the belief that they should not be prescriptive or overly critical of student achievements (S1,2,3,4). There is clearly an overwhelming desire that the relationship should be one in which the

student teacher was helped to come to an assessment of his or her own capabilities, competence and make a sound judgement of the overall success of the lesson (S1,3,6). One supervisor stated that he wrote detailed notes on the progress of the lessons and the student-pupil interactions that took place so that after the lesson it should be possible for the students to "advise themselves" on the basis of the record (S2). He said:

"I try as far as possible to get the students to describe what's happened, interpret what's happened, and then judge what's happened, and pick out their own strengths and weaknesses. Where there is a weakness, I then try to get them to give themselves advice, but that doesn't always work, because they don't know what to do at that stage" (S2).

The use of a detailed written record, it was suggested, can provide an excellent resource for the discussion of the progress of the lesson and enabled self evaluation to be undertaken more effectively (S1,5,6). Following initial discussion three supervisors reported that they might then offer suggestions of other approaches to try (S2,3,5). The record itself, however, could produce tension and one student teacher - whilst being able to see its value - was also able to describe it as "like a character assassination of myself"(ST4).

While student teachers generally appreciated the good intentions of supervisors in trying to offer advice and criticism in a constructive manner, they were sometimes left feeling that:

"He could try and tone down any criticism he had and try to say them to me in a way that wouldn't upset me."(ST2).

In trying to support a student teacher, boost his confidence and give him encouragement, the supervisor, it was reported, may fail to be sufficiently critical in their feedback to be really helpful to the student teacher. Other supervisors confessed that they sometimes found it difficult to avoid saying "I would have done this" or "You should have done that"(S1,S2).

Overall, supervisors expressed that the correct approach to supervision is to pose questions rather than answers, to get the student teacher to look at their approach and other possible approaches so as to evaluate their effectiveness.

This preference of supervisors to "ask the student teacher" about how their lesson had progressed could clash with the student teacher's own desire to be told how well they had performed. One student teacher, for example, reported: "I wanted everything pointed out to me because I can't do anything about it unless someone tells me about it"(ST1).

A more difficult situation affecting the supervisor's role arises when there are disciplinary and control problems within the lesson. Without exception the supervisors were of the opinion that intervention during a lesson was not an acceptable strategy unless the situation was of such gravity that there were real dangers to the safety of the pupils. Thus one supervisor observed:

"I suppose the only occasion I might intervene would be if I thought that safety was important, if something was happening that I could foresee would result in one of them being injured"(S4).

Direct intervention when the student teacher was "up front" was considered to be inappropriate and a contradiction of the "helper" role.(S1,S3). Other supervisors referred to their actions during supervision which may have had some impact on the class:

One supervisor noted that, " Looking and staring at the kids can be an intervention...sometimes I see kids misbehaving and I make it very evident to them that I've noticed"(S2).

Another supervisor reported that, "on seeing a small group of pupils being a bit disruptive or not paying attention', he had occasionally got up, walked over and stood just beside them and glanced over their shoulder to see what they were doing and quite often that was a calming influence on the people concerned" (S4).

Ideally, many supervisors sought equality in the relationship between themselves and their student teachers.(S1,S4). They would like to be seen as colleagues working in partnership, but with one having considerably more experience. Unfortunately, this view is sometimes not shared by the student teacher who failed to appreciate the relevance of the experience and advice of the supervisor (ST1).

This misperception was illustrated by one student teacher (ST1) which can result in a situation where the student teacher, in their own self interest, decided to keep on the "right side of the law!" They made a conscious decision to follow the supervisor's ideas for the moment but have the firm intention of doing "their own thing" later (ST1). As stated previously in the comments made by student teachers: "for some the supervisor represented a mark" (ST1,3,4,6).

This attitude was somewhat at odds with the declared intention of the supervisor, who regarded a good relationship as essential so that a student teacher could ask for help and be prepared to take the initiative if necessary. Yet student teachers saw themselves as dependent upon their supervisor's experience for help, new ideas, different approaches and encouragement. The extent of this dependence could easily be underestimated and could lead to students being uncertain of their position.(S1,3,ST1,4).

All parties clearly understood and accepted that, at some point, there was a clear obligation upon the supervisor to make a decision relating to his or her

view of the competence of the student teacher as a teacher. Whilst the supervisors, themselves, were very conscious of this aspect of their responsibilities it was, for them, very much relegated to the background and very secondary to helping and encouraging those student teachers for whom they were responsible (S1,3,5,6). Some supervisors make deliberate attempts to take a non judgmental approach to lessons by merely recording events during lessons and allowing the student teacher to interpret these events in the light of their intentions for the lesson.(S2,S4). Student teachers appreciated this approach, but these activities still gave rise to some student teacher anxiety, because whilst the student teacher could accept the discussion of a single lesson in these terms, they found it difficult to divorce it from the overall judgment that they both knew the supervisor must eventually make.

Not all supervisors were well known to the student teachers prior to the commencement of the practice teaching period (S1,2,4). Clearly the need to establish sound working relationships against a background of having to make judgments about competence, after perhaps only three or four meetings, became problematic for both student teacher and supervisor. Where the student teacher and supervisor have had the opportunity of working together for several months, in a variety of settings, they were in a much better position to know each other as people and the probability of being able to stress the support role, at the expense of the judgmental role, is improved(S4).

6. 3.2. SUPERVISORS AND COOPERATING TEACHERS.

Although there is considerable variation in the frequency with which schools are asked to host student teachers it was evident that most included in the present study were tried and tested practising schools. Schools included in the present study had been used previously to host students in the subjects concerned.(CT1,4). Nevertheless, from time to time, the regular use of a

school department can be unavoidably interrupted because of staff changes, the presence of inexperienced teachers or a change in school policy(CT4,5,6).

It was reported that liaison between the supervisor and the cooperating teacher before the practice begins varied considerably. In most cases the liaison was at the administrative level through documentation and telephone communication, but one lecturer did state "that he always went to a practising school prior to the commencement of the practice period to meet the staff" (S1). Again, it must be recognized that some cooperating teachers had already been 'selected' by the tertiary institute, and many were therefore known to the supervisors (S1,5,6). This 'selection' was part of a hidden agenda, which supervisors stated worked well (S1,5,6). For some time certain schools had been recognized by the university staff as being sound or valuable schools for practicum experience. This fact was in no small way due to the cooperation received by lecturers from school staff, who were known through professional associations and previous practicum experiences.

The roles of both the supervisors and the cooperating teachers were perceived as being similar (ST1,S4,CT5). The cooperating teacher had a far greater day-to-day oversight of the student teacher and hence knew them better and had a more intensive relationship with them. This could occasionally lead to the supervisor acting as a mediator or intermediary between the student teacher and the school.

Such intervention became particularly important in two situations:

a) where the student teacher and cooperating teacher were finding that their personalities clashed, or the teacher was unsuitable; and

b) where there was need to explain the demands made upon the student teacher by the university. This may well arise when the student teacher was being encouraged by the university to explore different approaches within the classroom which may not be familiar to the teacher (ST3,CT4,S1,3).

In the first situation, the student teacher may be moved to another school; and in second scenario the supervisor would take the responsibility of negotiating with the cooperating teacher(S1,2,3).

There were considerable variations in the reactions of cooperating teachers to 'experimentation' on the part of the student teacher. Whilst some see the exploration of different strategies as part of the university role, others were less sure of its validity, especially if the student teacher was weak. (CT2,4,5,6). However, supervisors also saw themselves as having an overview of the situation arising from their involvement with many student teachers and other schools. This gave them a broader perspective than the teacher who was heavily involved with one student teacher at a time (S1,3).

The influence of the teaching practice school upon the teaching methods used by the student was difficult to measure. Student teachers may well work with other teachers besides the cooperating teacher each of whom would have their own preferences, idiosyncracies and possibly different competencies. Overall, a close relationship between student teacher and cooperating teacher could result in greater control, which may be of particular benefit to the weaker student teacher. For a good student teacher the degree of control could be relaxed where this was seen as desirable (CT2,6).

In general, supervisors were of the opinion that it was preferable for cooperating teachers and supervisors to have similar views and approaches so that students were not confused (S1,2,3,6).

Three supervisors hoped that the cooperating teachers would see their visits as stimulating and of benefit to the student teachers, although they thought that there was some uncertainty among cooperating teachers about their role in the practicum (S2,3,4). This was compounded at the University of Sydney because, although supervisors felt welcomed at the schools, the lack of previous contact could make the cooperating teacher rather wary (S1,5).

Supervisors reported that they would like to be seen as an additional resource to support student teacher development. Preferably this would be as part of a team engaging in a two way process for the benefit of the student teacher. This was expressed by one supervisor , who said:

"I'd like to feel that what we're doing is working together on a cooperative basis to improve a student's teaching. So I like my relationship with them (cooperating teachers) to be friendly, encouraging above all. I think encouragement is very important...."(S1).

This supervisor was reported to be very supportive by a student teacher (ST4), and this resulted, the student teacher felt, in better lessons because she did not feel that she was being "judged". The same supervisor pointed to the importance in debriefing of giving encouragement to student teachers. He was struck by the often very prescriptive relationship that existed between cooperating teachers in the school and student teachers, not because of anyone's fault but simply because of the wide range of other demands placed upon them (for example, pastoral work, other lessons, administration). As a consequence they did not seem to have a lot of time and:

"Student teachers don't really get a chance to discuss their own problems or their own feelings about their teaching practice....they saw my role as a

supervisor from the University as giving them a bit of space to think about and discuss what they felt"(S1).

Indeed, in many cases, the supervisor saw these interactions as being stimulating and beneficial to themselves as well as for the student teacher(S1,3).

Generally, it appears from the data from supervisors, that there is an appreciation that the supervisor and the cooperating teacher have different but complementary contributions to make to the development of the student teacher. In order for this to be maximized (for the benefit of the student teache) the relationship between the cooperating teacher and supervisor should be one of frankness. Each must show respect for the other's position, experience and detailed knowledge of the situation. They must be able to work together as a team and accept that they had different perspectives and breadth of experience but must share the common concern of supporting the development of the student teacher. Supervisors were then questioned regarding the system under which practice teaching was organized.

6. 3.3. SUPERVISORS AND THE ORGANIZATION OF THE PRACTICUM.

Most supervisors enjoyed the organization under which they worked and saw great value in practice teaching not just for the student teacher but also for themselves. As one stated, "It keeps me in touch with what's happening in the schools...."(S2).

They were divided on the value of a longer practice period although they agreed that much of the artificiality connected with short practice teaching periods would be removed(S1,4,5). The idea of partnership between university

and school was unanimously supported by all supervisors. The idea of a close relationship with a school during a long practice period was seen as stimulating for the cooperating teacher, the classes as well as the student teacher(S5,6). Though one supervisor felt that if teachers are required to hand over their classes for a shorter length of time, this would result in fewer discipline problems and less subsequent remedial attention to inadequately taught subject matter(S1).

The disadvantages of the practicum were often related to organizational matters such as travel, the time available for supervision duties, report writing, and the lack of coincidence of school terms and university semesters (S3). The choice of schools was also reported to leave much to be desired. Some were simply used for geographical reasons rather than for the ablities of the teaching staff, and some were used simply because they have been 'allocated' to the university so that other tertiary institutions do not overload particular schools (S1,2,4,6).

As far as improvements to the organization of the practicum are concerned all supervisors would prefer to spend more time supervising in schools. The problem of the quality of cooperating teachers, in the eyes of two supervisors, could be corrected to some extent by the institution of in-service courses and a more stringent choice of school and teaching staff invited to join a teacher development program (S1,4). The 'training' of university supervisors was unanimously recognized as being of paramount importance as they also realized the importance of the changes taking place in the schools and in classrooms. Finally, four supervisors felt that the Faculty of Education, at the University of Sydney, must change its attitude to the practice teaching segment of its programs. That practice teaching should become an integral part of the program and not just simply 'tacked' on where it is administratively convenient(S1,2,4,5,6).

The next section deals with the interviewing of the cooperating teachers and their responses to the practice teaching situation.

6. 4.THE COOPERATING TEACHERS' PERSPECTIVES .

"Whose is the responsibility?" (CT1,2,5).

Any discussion of the 'cooperating teacher's point of view' must necessarily run up against the question posed above: Whose is the responsibility for training future teachers? This is the theme running through many of the interview findings.

To appreciate fully the remarks teachers had made it was important to realize that as cooperating teachers they experienced various forms of practice teaching, this research was only concerned with their roles and views of the University of Sydney experience. They were paid by the University for their duties as cooperating teachers. Most of them volunteered to host student teachers in the first place, and the ability of these teachers to fulfill the duties of a cooperating teacher varied enormously. The University may choose the schools it wishes to use from an initial allocation, but at this point of time had little or no control over the selection of the majority of cooperating teachers. The student teacher may be working with and for as many as three or four teachers in a specified subject or subjects; these factors naturally generate different attitudes and approaches. Nevertheless, on many points there was a great deal of agreement.

6. 4.1. TEACHERS' VIEWS OF THEIR OWN ROLE.

Asked specifically about their 'role' cooperating teachers were largely in agreement:

....."I see my job as to be very supportive; to give advice which will hopefully last them throughout their career; to pick up weaknesses and shortcomings; to offer advice and strategies to overcome these. And as well to build up confidence and tell students their strengths.....I also see it as a 'confessor' figure... they need someone to talk to" (CT1).

This was one teacher's view of the situation. It was echoed by the majority of those interviewed. They used words like "support", "advice", "help in developing the student teacher's strengths", "a friendly but demanding colleague", and "an experienced helper" as their view of their role and all the accompanying stress, but, again, the teacher could receive stimulus and benefit from the student teacher too (CT1,5). Two cooperating teachers also included in their role the need to choose classes with care and to liaise with the student teacher about what they were teaching, discussing the syllabus with them and establishing the limits within which they would work as well as leaving a good deal to their own interpretation(CT1,3).

All agreed that student teachers should be allowed a fair amount of freedom in their preparation of lessons. To quote one cooperating teacher:
"I think that student teachers have got to be given the chance to experiment. Very often they'll learn from their mistakes and in any case who am I to say that material that I may force upon a student teacher to present to kids is better than what a student teacher would do." (CT5).

Four cooperating teachers proposed a more gradual granting of freedom to the student(CT1,3,5,6). One cooperating teacher said, "After a couple of weeks I

make it very clear to the student teacher that the responsibility for the lesson rests on his\her shoulder's now"(CT3).

The degree of freedom would depend upon the student teacher. Good student teachers were able to make more use of freedom and towards the end of a practice could be left almost entirely to their own devices; weaker student teachers would need more help and support, but all have to work within the pattern of the syllabus (CT5,6).

In the way in which they carried out their supervisory role, cooperating teachers described a similar set of activities. They all agreed that the student teacher should know when a cooperating teacher would be observing their teaching. They all also agreed that any problems may be discussed well ahead of the actual lesson and encouragement should be given. During the lesson, itself, the teacher's role was reported to be that of a passive observer - atleast as long as the student teacher was talking to the whole class - some took notes of good and bad aspects of the teaching for discussion and comment afterwards (CT2,3,5,6). One cooperating teacher stressed the observation of how pupils reacted to the student teacher(CT1), and all agreed that intervention in the lesson should be avoided, unless the safety of the pupils was in question. Three cooperating teachers felt that while they were present the pupils would react to him or her rather than to the student teacher; they made a practice of "hiding in the storeroom" or "blending into the background" (CT1,3,6). All agreed that the after-lesson discussion was vital and that it should be carried out in a relaxed and informal way. Two cooperating teachers said that they first invited comment from the student teacher and see how far this was in agreement with their own perceptions, adopting "I wonder if..." approach when they want to make suggestions (CT2,5); one cooperating teacher stressed that encouragement must be part of the commenting on what had happened(CT4).

There was some conflict, however, as to whether the teacher should assist with classroom relationships and matters of discipline. Some felt that if matters were "getting out of hand" they must take action, either by removing disruptive pupils or by arranging to be in a certain place so that difficult pupils may be sent to them (CT1,4). Others emphasized that, in the end, the student teacher must be able to handle disciplinary problems and should discuss with the teacher afterwards how this could be achieved (CT5,6). As stated previously, however, some schools' policies do not allow student teachers to be left on their own during the teaching situation, the class teacher was ever present.

All agreed that there was much to be learnt from student teachers and the contact with the tertiary institute was appreciated. This last point was taken up by some cooperating teachers when discussing the rewards of supervising student teachers. They felt that it kept them "alert and on the ball" and that there was a great advantage in having someone else to discuss things with, they also emphasised that seeing student teachers develop, talking to them, and watching them help the pupils were all rewarding aspects of their role. All identified as problems, shortage of time and stress, the "clash of personalities" situation and the difficulties that arose when a student teracher "just won't make it as a teacher" (CT1,2,3,4,5,6). They also mentioned disruption of classes, turning them off the subject, having to draw the ends together after the student teacher had gone (CT1,2,3,5,6).

As for their reactions when a student teacher takes over a class, four described their feelings as "mixed", because so much depended upon the individual student teacher (CT1,4,5,6). One Cooperating teacher stated that his attitude was one "of fairly neutral curiosity"(CT5). Another said at the outset of the practice she was "quite nervous"(CT1). One Cooperating teacher admitted that if the student teacher turned out to be unsuccessful he felt that he had abandoned the class (CT4). All of them felt that they needed to weigh up the

advantages of new approaches, a new personality; one stated he needed to devise ways of working against the feeling that, in the end, the class might resent coming back to him(CT4).

Reflecting on the relationships (ideal and real) between cooperating teacher and student teacher, it was reported that these must be friendly, open, and relaxed. Cooperating teachers should offer advice and help, should bolster up a student teacher's confidence, should be open to questioning from student teachers and should talk "on the same level", albeit with the proviso that cooperating teachers had experience and this the student should acknowledge. (CT1,3,4,5,6).

6. 4.2. COOPERATING TEACHERS AND STUDENT TEACHERS.

All the cooperating teachers reported that expectations of student teachers differ, depending upon whether it was the first, subsequent, or final practice experience. Great emphasis was placed, particularly in the first practicum, on student teachers listening, absorbing the atmosphere, observing what was going on in the classroom, and only planning at the beginning for short periods of time.(CT1,5,6). All agreed that student teachers must work hard, prepare themselves thoroughly before a lesson and "exert themselves to the utmost". As future practices developed there was an expectation that student teachers should be able to plan to teach for longer periods of time and to be prepared to plunge in fairly quickly to the teaching practice situation (CT1,3). At this stage more specific demands were made of the student teachers; they asked for punctuality, enthusiasm for the subject and commitment; willingness to learn and to "develop a disposition to be flexible". (CT1,3,5,6).

When asked how they handled the situation if differences emerged between their view of the process of teaching and learning and those of the student

teacher all the cooperating teachers felt that this was a situation that did not often occur. A minority of cooperating teachers (CT5,6) were on the whole more positive in their welcome of differences and felt that students should be allowed to try out their own suggestions and to be encouraged not just to "mimic" the style they had observed, always with the proviso that the pupils were not disadvantaged (CT1,3). Three cooperating teachers felt that they should accept that different individuals approach teaching in different ways, and should ask the student teachers to justify their approaches, accepting them as valid if learning had taken place (CT1,5,6). However, the need to maintain a balance between responsibilities imposed by the teacher-pupil relationship and those imposed by the new cooperating teacher-student teacher relationship presented difficulties. One cooperating teacher complained that sometimes he must sacrifice some of the obligations (for example, to ensure satisfactory progress in pupil learning inherent in the former relationship) in order to fulfil his obligations in the latter. CT4 said, "I have a Year 10 class and it's an important year before they commence senior work for the HSC. I have a lot to cover and if I get a poor student teacher it takes time to get the class back into proper ways. Of course, it takes a lot of patience, too. You can see things going wrong but you've got to hold yourself back or else you'll undermine the poor girl" (CT4).

6. 4.3. COOPERATING TEACHERS AND SUPERVISORS.

Turning to the cooperating teacher's view of the university supervisor, it became obvious that some were critical of both the supervisor's role in preparing student teacher for teaching practice and their actual practice of supervision during the time in schools (CT1,3,5). One went so far as to complain that the weeks before the teaching practice should be used for more dialogue with the cooperating teachers and that the university supervisor's job

was made more difficult by the fact that he or she had little knowledge of the classes being taught (CT5).

Lack of contact between student teachers and supervisors was again a point of criticism. One cooperating teacher said that a supervisor should have the same student teachers "under his or her wing" for the whole year, and that supervisors should have had recent contact with the classroom situation (CT5). They also suggested that supervisors should be able to offer "time" and talk of leisurely discussions with student teachers (CT1,5). In differentiating between the cooperating teacher's role and the supervisor's role three cooperating teachers stress that the supervisor's role is to present different approaches, to help the student teacher develop themselves as people and future teachers and to encourage them to build up a philosophy of teaching (CT1,3,6).

Two of the interviewees felt that their role was similar to the supervisor's role, though there were limits to the latter's usefulness "because they don't see the student teachers as often or in as many different classes"(CT2,3). In general there was a plea for trust and understanding and a greater degree of contact between supervisors and cooperating teachers(CT2,5,6).

As far as actual roles were concerned, cooperating teachers stressed that their primary responsibility was to the pupils and the supervisor's to the student teachers (CT5,CT6). They also made the point that the supervisors should be more concerned with teaching methods and cooperating teachers with subject content and the 'survival' of the student teacher in the school situation (CT1,2). The cooperating teacher had a better chance of seeing improvement since he or she was with the student teacher most of the time whereas to see real improvement the supervisor must visit the same class on a number of occasions. (CT1).

Four cooperating teachers stressed the joint responsibility of both 'partners' in the training situation: while the supervisor has the final responsibility and has perhaps a broader view, being able to draw on experience from many schools and of many student teachers, the cooperating teacher was more in contact with the practical situation (CT1,2,5,6).

All would like to see closer relationships of trust between supervisor and student teacher. One cooperating teacher stressed that there should be no emotional friction between them, that frankness and support were vital, and that relationships should be those "of mature adults to each other"(CT4). The atmosphere should be informal and easy so that problems could be easily discussed and advice should be given on management and deployment. He also emphasized that student teachers should not be afraid when supervisors visited them; that there should be more equality and less apprehension, and that supervisors must be supportive at all times. Finally, there should be meetings before the practicum begins so that everyone knew what was expected of them. Discussion should be on a "team basis" with all members of the triad involved so that all were fully aware of the university's expectations and those of the school. One teacher's concluding remarks were: " Teacher and supervisor are 'two colleagues doing a job together' for the good of the student and the pupils"(CT4).

.

It is obvious that those interviewed would prefer a much tighter organization between school and university as to the purpose of the practicum. They stated that there is a need to spell out exactly what is expected of the cooperating teacher and what is expected of the university supervisor through the handbooks and taken up in discussion. They also see a definite differentiation in roles. The next section records their views on the system under which practice teaching operates.

6. 4.4. COOPERATING TEACHERS AND THE ORGANIZATION OF PRACTICUM.

One teacher, in particular, was anxious that his comments on the organization should be conveyed to the highest office at the University (CT2). Firstly, he was not alone in regretting the lack of contact before the arrival of student teachers, and where there had been contact with the training institution it could have been more explicit (CT2,3). For example, "they were sent extra student teachers of which they had no knowledge until they arrived at the school for the pre practice visit. Earlier contact with the university supervisor, it was believed, could have alleviated some of this initial difficulty" (CT2). The question of an internship or an extended teaching practice period received qualified approval (CT1,2,3). All cooperating teachers stated that there had to be a way in which personality clashes could be quickly resolved if teaching practices were extended, even to the extent of removing student teachers to other schools before any lasting damage was done.

With regard to the use of mentors instead of traditional cooperating teacher, most believed that some form of formal training was a very good idea, but the idea of their attending workshops at the training institution met with a mixed response (CT1,4,6). They were unanimous in stating that the major point was "where could the time be found in a normal school day to free teachers from their normal duties to attend such courses? The idea of financial remuneration to the school to provide relief staff was by far the most satisfactory solution" (CT1,2,6). Two teachers supported the notion that the in-service training of mentors should be conducted within practising schools and that their colleagues in other schools be invited to join them (CT2,3). The idea that the university should provide some form of post-graduate qualification for those teachers who became successful mentors was not well received. All the

cooperating teachers interviewed did not support this concept, because they did not accept the need for involvement with the university at 'student level'. Interestingly, at the University of Birmingham, U.K. such a post-graduate qualification was offered as part of the mentor program.

The cooperating teachers wanted the university to retain the assessment responsibilities for the student teacher (CT1,2,4,5,6). They were prepared to be involved in the assessment procedure, but wanted to retain a very close liaison with the supervisor on such an important issue. To support this, they were unanimous in asking that the University should spell out its requirements of the practicum so that every one who was involved is fully aware of what was expected of them. Similarly, the University should ensure that it was fully cognisant with the needs of the school, and its curriculum challenges. All cooperating teachers stated that this can only be done through much closer liaison between school and university throughout the school year.

6.5. SUMMARY.

There were many satisfactory aspects to the present organization of the practicum. Student teachers interviewed referred to it as the most valuable part of their teacher education course. Cooperating teachers welcomed the opportunity to invite new ideas into their classrooms via a young student teacher, and at the same time, grasp the opportunity to consider more closely their own views on teaching as they attempted to inculcate their knowledge and experience. The university supervisor gained considerably from interaction with schools where much of what he or she have talked about in the lecture or seminar was played out. The opportunity to witness their student teachers in the classroom was again of great value as a link between what they have said at the university and what was observed in the school setting.

The present format of the practicum had been in place for many years and with little change had been responsible in part for the training and development of many many successful teachers, yet regardless of the successes it was still possible from the findings of this study to improve the structure, the delivery and very ethos of the practicum.

In this study, student teachers were as one calling for changes to the roles and relationships of the members of the triad. These changes and the need for them are outlined here:

Student teachers' expectations of their university supervisor varied but there was a general consensus of those interviewed that they needed more help and constructive criticism; they were aware of a mismatch between what the supervisor was offering and what the student teacher was looking for. There was also a request for more time from the supervisor to be spent at the school, to discuss more fully the observed lessons and to give more ideas, more advice and more teaching strategies. To most student teachers, the supervisor represented a teaching mark. The importance of the assessment role of the supervisor according to the study cannot be overstated. Regardless of how supportive the supervisor felt, he or she was, they were regarded with suspicion by some student teachers because of the assessment role they undertook.

Student teachers interviewed felt that cooperating teachers, like schools, could be a "lucky dip". Some cooperating teachers were most supportive according to student teachers, making them feel very welcome in their classrooms, giving of their time freely and helping with lesson planning and preparation. Student teachers added a rider here, that they appreciated that schools varied considerably in not only their attitude to student teachers and the practicum but also in attitude to their own permanent teaching staff. Even in a school with some difficulties, student teachers were full of praise with the positive

attitude of their cooperating teachers to these problems and the support they received in coming to terms with their own teaching. Obviously, student teachers who were interviewed talked of 'good and less helpful' cooperating teachers. According to the student teachers interviewed the 'good' ones spent considerable time with them, were caring and critical when it was necessary. The less helpful cooperating teachers completely ignored the student teacher and gave no help whatsoever, some even having their own problems of survival in the classroom and thus should never have been allowed to have a student teacher under their wing in the first place.

Overall, student teachers perceived the ideal role of the cooperating teacher to be one where advice, help, support was offered, but where the student teacher was given freedom to develop their own ideas. This ideal role also helped the student teacher gain independence and confidence in the teaching situation, it also gave constructive criticism and was always available when help was required.

From the point of view of the organization of the practicum, it would seem that members of the triad are all agreed that there is need for change. Student teachers welcomed the notion of longer practicums, but wanted some built in safety measures to allow for a student teacher to be moved to another school if a personality clash or other difficulties became intolerable for either party, or, atleast, mechanism to allow for a conference to discuss any problems should they eventuate. The possible removal of the artificiality of short practicums was applauded by all student teachers interviewed.

Assessment procedures raised considerable debate among the student teachers interviewed. Surprisingly, all supported the retention of a final assessment or grading, but were at odds to decide who should be finally responsible for the

compilation of such grades. They were unanimous that it should not be left to the university supervisor under the present arrangements.

Supervisors saw their role as one of assisting young teachers to become more proficient in the task of teaching. To this end they saw their role as a deep commitment to help student teachers to cope with difficult situations, encouraging them and above all to be seen as a friend; even to be considered as a colleague who has been on the job a little longer. Supervisors saw themselves as not being overly critical of student teachers and there was an overwhelming desire that the relationship should be one of trust and help wherever possible to promote more confidence by the student teacher in the teaching situation. For all these virtues to be attained it was agreed by those interviewed that a considerable period of time had to be spent in schools face to face with student teachers and their cooperating teachers.

The majority of supervisors interviewed applauded the idea of an internship or atleast, an extended practicum period and a closer relationship with practising schools. The notion of partnership between university and school was welcomed by those interviewed. Though they did say that the university would have to rethink its attitude towards teacher education if more time had to be spent in schools by university staff. That is, some allowance of professional time, outside normal lecture and research time for such visits to establish closer links with the schools. All supervisors, interviewed in the study, supported the notion of inservice training for all cooperating teachers in the development of the concept of mentors.

Supervisors were prepared to share the assessment responsibilities with trained school personnel, but still felt that the final assessment responsibility should remain with the training institution, namely the university.

Cooperating teachers, who were interviewed, had reservations about whether they should be trained as mentors to student teachers on extended practicums. Although they supported the idea of being more aware of the requirements of the university programs of teacher development and the needs of student teachers, they were concerned about where the time could be found to allow them to attend inservice courses organized by the university. All those interviewed supported the need to spell out their role in the development of student teachers, and, in particular,support was registered for the notion of partnership between the schools and the university as an ongoing procedure throughout the school year.

In the literature review considerable emphasis was placed on the need for student teachers to be attached to a school rather than a department within a school on the practicum (Proctor,1984; Zeichner,1992). Although the University of Sydney does indeed appoint student teachers to schools, the reality is that the student teacher becomes part of a particular teaching department and, in the majority of cases in the current study, student teachers saw little of the overall school life and teaching in other parts of the school. Little progress was reached in this study in this direction. Perhaps such an innovation could only happen over time after a partnership has been well and truly established between university and the particular practising school.

In conclusion to this chapter, the members of the triad still have a major problem with their relationships For example, what the triad members think they are offering to other members of the triad is not the same as what the others state that they are receiving. Until this basic problem is resolved there is little opportunity for the development of more successful practicums.

Nevertheless, the chapter has revealed considerable support for positive answers to the four salient questions posed in the Abstract section of the study.

There is obvious agreement from those interviewed that universities and schools should move towards closer relationship in the form of partnership, which is the thrust of question 1. Similarly, there is qualified support for the notion of mentor to replace the present cooperating teacher role. Both teachers and supervisors saw the need for inservice activities to improve their part in the practicum. Salient question 2 asks for this change. Question 3 asks that the role of the university supervisor be delineated to support the notion of partnership and mentoring. Information gathered in the interviews would suggest that all supervisors would support this notion. Finally, salient question 4 asks whether the roles and relationships of the triad will be improved with the introduction of partnership and mentoring. If these two innovations lead to greater communication between all parties, then perhaps this would lead to better understanding and improved roles and relationships.

The next chapter considers the implications from the study by considering the emerging issues, and looks particularly at the importance of the triad relationship, the notion of partnerships with schools and the development of mentors.

CHAPTER 7.

IMPLICATIONS FROM THE STUDY: EMERGING ISSUES AND CONCLUSIONS.

This study was based on a total of eighteen interviews conducted by myself with student teachers, their university supervisors and their cooperating teachers in six high schools within the Sydney metropolitan area. Issues emerging and discussed in this chapter come from the comparative views of the different interviewees. While I am aware, of course, that inferences drawn from this study may only apply to its particular contexts some clear common views may be discerned across the interviews. Nevertheless, my sustained collaboration and debate with professional colleagues during the years spent involved in practice teaching at all levels and within all disciplines may be claimed to constitute a further body of anecdotal evidence that may be used in the interpretation of the interview data. Some atleast of this experience may deserve attention beyond the contexts of the study and have been recognised in the literature reviewed in chapters 2 and 3.

7.1 THE IMPORTANCE OF THE TRIAD RELATIONSHIP.

There is no doubt that findings from the present study further confirm previous research regarding the importance of the relationships between members of the triad. For all the student teachers interviewed, teaching practice was viewed as a remarkably demanding, often stressful experience. This is supported by previous research. Barrows(1979) spoke of the inordinate power and authority of the cooperating teacher in determining student teacher success. Cruickshank and Armaline (1986) stated that a large proportion of the problems identified by student teachers dealt with their relationships with their cooperating teachers,while Funk et al(1982) researched student dissatisfaction with the role of the university supervisor. These problems

related to the lack of understanding and flexibility by both parties. The 'powerlessness' felt by student teachers whilst on practice teaching had been recognised in more recent research as being due to the fact that their university allowed supervising teachers to grade student teachers (Cameron and Wilson,1993). While other parts of their training may have involved 'simulations' of various kinds, teaching practice takes place in real schools and with real pupils, whose learning is - for the time being, and for better or worse - in the hands of the student teacher. Given this considerable responsibility, all student teachers in the study acknowledged the need for support, personal and professional, from every possible source. As one student teacher declared, "students need to be given advice, criticized constructively and, above all, encouraged." (ST2). While an individual teacher or individual supervisor might be criticized by a student for inadequate provision, no student disputed the principle of the triadic relationship.

To this end, the model outlined below is worth consideration as it outlines the major roles that should be taken by the student teacher on practicum. The material is based upon data from three sources:

i) B.Ed. (ART) Program Practicum Documentation used at City Art Institute (now the College of Fine Arts, University of N.S.W.) 1981 - 1995, the production for which I was responsible during the period 1981-1988.

ii) Documents obtained from the Departments of Education, Universities of Leeds and Sheffield, U.K. during my visits in 1995.

iii) Documentation of Teaching Outcomes used by the University of Sydney on its practicums and sourced from the N.S.W. Department of School Education 1997.

The data recognized a number of roles to be taken by the triad, but it was thought that four roles were adequate and these were considered in depth. It was produced in a manner that would be suitable to be discussed at workshop level, but also used by student teachers as a form of checklist:

7.1.1. THE STUDENT TEACHER'S ROLE.

RATIONALE. At the university the student teacher would begin to understand professionalism in teaching and practise it with peers, lecturers, mentors and teachers. In the school situation he or she should practice and further develop his or her professionalism.
To this end the following four roles should be identified:

MANAGEMENT ROLE IN SCHOOL

Developing and maintaining links with relevant personnel - knowing lines of referral.
Maintaining school procedures for monitoring and recording pupil progress.
Negotiating an appropriate timetable on Practicum.
Managing the learning experiences of pupils.

PROFESSIONAL ROLE IN SCHOOL

#Becoming familiar with school policies and procedures.
Conforming to appropriate standards of dress, demeanour and attendance.
Being prepared for all teaching episodes.
Marking all assignments.
Being aware of the roles of the mentor, university tutor\supervisor and subject teachers.
Engaging in feedback sessions with mentors, tutors and peers in a

constructive way.

PASTORAL ROLE IN SCHOOL

As a class teacher, becoming familiar with pastoral systems and policies of the school.

ASSESSMENT ROLE IN SCHOOL

Assessing pupils according to school policy.
Being assessed as a student teacher by current procedures as per the University handbook.

It is hoped that these roles and responsibilities will formalize more accurately what is required of the student teacher in the practice teaching situation. This model identifies four specific role areas that the student teacher should observe. The "management roles" although fairly obvious do, indeed, need to be spelt out to the beginning teacher particularly the first, which refers to links with relevant personnel. The research indicated that student teachers felt that they needed far more guidance in this area. The "professional role" lists duties that should be observed, but is linked to the innovation of partnership and mentoring for worthwhile application. The "pastoral role", again, could only be fully implemented with the development of a partnership relationship between universities and practising schools. Finally, the "assessment role" for the student teacher is still one that causes controversy, but depending upon the policies of the individual university, still needs to be spelt out to the student teacher.

Among the cooperating teachers interviewed there was clear acknowledgement of the importance of their task, in advising and supporting student teachers. The recurring self-view of the role of cooperating teachers was of 'a friendly but demanding colleague', or of a mentor (CT1,2,3). In the commercial world such a relationship might sometimes be maintained over a number of years, but, given that teacher training is not at present related to a particular teaching post, the possibilities of the mentor relationship remains restricted in its time frame. The point made here is that regardless of the expertise revealed by the mentor, it would be impossible for him or her to help the student teacher to be prepared for all eventualities in the teaching situation, for no two teaching posts are alike.. It is arguable, too, that a restriction to one 'mentor' in training would limit the opportunities that student teachers need for a variety of experience in teaching styles and curriculum policies. As with the student teachers, the cooperating teachers interviewed supported the principle of a triadic framework. Where there were complaints about an individual weakness or relationship in the framework, the plea was for a stonger framework, for closer collaboration between the school and the tertiary institute.

The model that follows outlines the roles that could be taken by the cooperating teacher when he or she accepted the duties of a mentor. Again, the model follows closely the format used for the student teacher, in that there are four umbrella role groups that could be considered at inservice discussion with prospective mentors.

7.1.2. THE MENTOR'S ROLE.

RATIONALE. In the context of the need for schools to be more centrally involved in the development of teachers, the University sees the mentor as the key link between the School and the University. As such, the mentor is responsible for ensuring that the structures relating to observation, supervision

and assessment of student teachers are understood, applied and managed in accordance with course requirements. The mentor has overall responsibility for the student's work in the school, and his or her key functions are management liaison, facilitation and coordination. To this end the following roles should be identified:

MANAGEMENT ROLE.

Involving student teacher in observation, team teaching and teaching as as appropriate.
Ensuring that timetable time is available for mentor to discuss professional development with the student teacher.
Involving the student teacher as appropriate, in departmental meetings, projects and other developments.
Liaising with other class teachers of the subject with whom the student teacher works.
Liaising where necessary with the university tutor\supervisor on the student teacher's progress.
Ensuring that the student teacher has the opportunity to use different teaching styles.

PROFESSIONAL ROLE.

Observing lessons, as agreed, to include joint observation with other mentors for standardisation purposes.
Discussing the focus of the observation beforehand with the student teacher.
Giving constructive oral and written feedback to student teacher after the observations with particular reference to the agreed assessment criteria.
Helping student teacher set targets and plan strategies to achieve agreed goals with respect to classroom performance.

Conducting weekly review sessions with the student teacher.

Checking the student teacher's teaching documentation regularly.

Serving as a role model by demonstrating successful teaching strategies and methods of establishing good working relationships in the classroom.

Communicating student teacher's progress to the University tutor\supervisor both formally and informally.

Undertaking preparation and evaluation sessions with other subject mentors and the university.

Assisting in the preparation of other members for the role of mentor through in-service within the school and at the university.

PASTORAL ROLE.

Counselling student teacher regarding teaching and help identify strengths and weaknesses.

Communicating the formal and informal realities of working effectively within the Department and the School.

Helping student teacher to establish good working relationship with other teachers within the school.

ASSESSMENT ROLE

Providing the university with regular formal feedback regarding the student teacher's progress in the classroom.

Being responsible for writing a final report on the student teacher in consultation with class teachers and the university tutor\supervisor. This will form an important part in assessing whether or not the student teacher obtains QUALIFIED TEACHER status.

These changes in the roles and responsibilities of the traditional cooperating teacher will ensure, it is hoped, a far better structure for the development of new members of the teaching profession. The closer liaison with the university should also ensure a fuller understanding by mentors of the requirements of the university's teacher education programs.

These innovations formalize what was stated during the interviews held with cooperating teachers. There were qualifications, for example, all teachers referred to the problem of time allocation for mentor development, but this problem could be overcome with the allocation of relief staff through improved funding. The listing of role duties in this manner would undoubtedly improve the awareness of mentors to the importance of their role in the practicum.

Not surprisingly, supervisors also emphasised the importance of a strong relationship with both their student teachers and the cooperating teachers involved in the school. Yet in the Literature Review, Williams (1993) found that student teachers stated that they received support of variable quality from both the higher education tutors and school cooperating teachers. At best, both teachers and supervisors were valued for the complementary roles which they were able to play (Williams,1993). Inevitably, the supervisors play something of an 'outsider' role; they work outside their own institutions, and they remain - no matter how committed in their approach, nor how warmly received by the teachers - outsiders to the schools that they visit (Zeichner,1990). Their 'outsider' status may account for some uncertainties of self-views that emerged among the supervisors interviewed. With varying degrees of emphasis the supervisors saw themselves, in relation to the student teacher, in the four roles of advisor\critic, supporter\counsellor; detached observer\researcher and of assessor\judge. Yet the potential contradictions, even conflicts of these roles tended to remain unexamined by supervisors. The hopes they expressed for good triadic links were not always confirmed by the

student teacher and cooperating teacher interviews. This discernible gap between the expressed beliefs of supervisors, and the actual experience of student teachers and cooperating teachers should be given further examination. Nevertheless, the model that follows attempts to improve the supervisor's role in the practicum.

This model follows the same format as that for the other members of the triad in that four areas of role responsibility are recognized:

7.1.3. UNIVERSITY TUTOR\SUPERVISORS ROLE.

RATIONALE. The roles identified show the importance of the Tutor\Supervisor as the link between University and School. Such a role supplements that of the mentor; many aspects of the role contain both professional and times, appear to overlap. The important difference with the traditional role of the university supervisor is that the new role is ongoing throughout the academic and school year, maintaining close contact with the practising school.
To this end the following roles should be identified:

MANAGEMENT ROLE

Negotiating interview schedules with school mentors.
Attending Course Committee Meetings (and others) to ensure the development and coherence of the Partnership Program.
Negotiating placements with schools.
Developing and maintain professional links between all parties.
Coordinating a program of joint observation.
Managing assessment arrangements.

PROFESSIONAL ROLE.

Selecting and inducting students.

Engaging in professional links with schools and student teachers during school experience - engaging in professional dialogue with staff and student teachers.

Devising,delivering and evaluating the academic requirements of the taught elements of the teacher education course.

Offering students a broad view of teaching and learning across a variety of contexts.

Providing a model of a variety of teaching and learning styles.

Maintaining an overview of current developments within the subject area.

Helping student teachers prepare for school experience.

Enabling students to develop and maintain their subject content

Monitoring student progress across all elements of the Course.

Monitoring, discussing, and helping students to set targets within the teacher education program.

Observing, offering feedback and support within the school classroom.

Helping students to develop the qualities of reflection, to apply them to their own practice and to develop a personal, principled framework for their teaching.

Moderating standards between schools.

Mediating where necessary between partners.

Supporting student teachers in the process of applying for teaching posts.

PASTORAL ROLE.

Counselling students on course and non-course related issues.

Referring them to other agencies inside or outside the University.

ASSESSMENT ROLE.

Devising and updating assessment tasks.

Monitoring and discussing assessment tasks with mentors.

Marking and offer feedback and support.

Helping to make decisions about passing\failing practice teaching.

Attending and participating in University Assessment Committees.

These changes in the roles and responsibilities of the university supervisor will lead, it is hoped, to a far more productive relationship between the university supervisor and other members of the triad, namely the student teacher and the mentor. Importantly, it will also lead to a better understanding by schools of the nature and purpose of the university's teacher education program.

This model accepts the importance of the university tutor\supervisor in the overall scheme of things. The research emphasized the importance of this role if the innovations of partnership and mentoring are to be successful. As stated often in this study the supervisor remains the important link between the university's teacher education program and the practicising schools. The listed role duties emphasize this importance. The format in which they are presented attempts to answer the shortcoming of present practicum methods in that they are designed for use in inservice workshops specifically for university supervisors.

7.2. PARTNERSHIPS WITH SCHOOLS.

The people interviewed had no experience of a closer relationship with schools as per the 'partnership model' outlined and described earlier in this research, but the questions specifically formed to consider this issue obtained very positive response from all parties. Previous research by Lortie (1975) found that teachers stated that "they had too little preparation in classroom management, routines and discipline to aid student teachers". More recent research (McIntyre, 1993; Furlong,et.al. 1996) found that these factors could be corrected by better forms of school-based teacher education.

The student teachers in the present study felt that a closer link with schools would go a long way to remove the feeling of 'being strangers in the school' and, at worst being a burden on the teaching staff. Zeichner (1979) supported this feeling with his research into induction programs for first year teachers in American schools, without which, he stated, beginning teachers frequently resorted to learning by trial and error and developing coping strategies that help them survive in the classroom. Coupled to this, they saw a lot of merit in the idea of being appointed to a school rather than a subject department. How this could be successfully implemented was not discussed, as student teachers felt that it was beyond their control to consider ways in which the principal of a school and its executive could provide the necessary conditions for appointment to a school. One must add here that student teachers spoke highly of schools where they were invited to staff meetings, welcomed in other departments, and generally made to feel like members of staff.

Cooperating teachers considered the issue of partnership with some caution. They felt that schools were already burdened with tremendous responsibility and work loads. Certainly, if the model espoused by Proctor (1984) was followed, teachers would find themselves involved in all levels of teacher

education, from interviewing prospective candidates for teaching to the planning and operation of teacher education courses. One cooperating teacher stated that a school needed occasionally to be given a break from being a practising school, and that the idea of being 'locked' in as a Partnership School would lead to an inflexibility that would not augur well for a school (CT6). All supported the idea in principle of a much closer relationship with tertiary institutes. If anything, it would avoid the suddeness of the practice teaching episode - backed by a 'mountain of paper work' (CT3) from the university explaining the requirements of a very artificial period in the school year.

The question of the cost of the partnership was also considered. Was the University prepared to meet the added expense of the partnership? The requirement to free staff for in-service opportunities would need funds to be made available to provide relief staff (CT5,6). Some teachers expressed disquiet with the possibility of being 'saddled' with a student teacher who was poor in the classroom, and even in some cases a personality clash. The general feeling in this matter, was that the university should have some mechanism for the removal of the student to another school, or atleast discussions to correct the problem (CT1,5).

The supervisors, generally, were in favour of the partnership concept except that they saw it as an added burden on their already heavy lecturing and research commitments. The partnership would require numerous visits to the practising schools throughout the year and there was a general consensus (S1,2,3,4,5,6) that the University would have to change its philosophy towards practice teaching, to recognize more explicitly its important contribution to teacher training. The idea of a student being appointed to a school rather than a subject department was applauded, but again, how this would be implemented remained conjecture.

7.3. THE DEVELOPMENT OF MENTORS.

Student teachers supported the idea that the traditional cooperating teacher's role could be enhanced by the notion of a mentor - a person who would be 'trained' to be fully aware of the needs of the student teacher, the tertiary institute's teacher education program, and ways in which the school's day to day activities could become part of the teacher training program(ST1,4,6). Although many students supported the present organization, they believed that there was a 'hit or miss' element in the choice of cooperating teachers. Good relationships with the cooperating teacher led to a worthwhile practicum experience; the corollary was also true. The research conducted by Booth (1993) found that student teachers emphasized the importance of the general support they received from the mentor, and this support was described in terms of accessibility of the mentor and the sympathetic and positive support that was given. Awareness of the university's philosophy with regard to the practicum was vital according to one student teacher(ST1). A school needed to be fully aware of what the university was about, and vice versa. There was general support that the provision of a trained mentor would alleviate many of these difficulties.

Cooperating teachers, initially, saw little value in the concept of mentorship, but when explained more fully they warmed to the idea and saw merit in the scheme for both the student teacher and the school, and more importantly, themselves. Previous research by Wilkin (1991) saw this difficulty, where she states that there is confusion and little agreement about what is meant by the term 'mentor' and that there is wide variation across school-based training programs with regard to their philosophies and hence their expectations for mentoring practices. With regard to the development of mentors, the problem highlighted, once again, was the time factor. The need to attend in-service courses would place a burden on individual schools. Replacement by relief

staff was the only solution, and as stated previously, a cost that the tertiary institute must consider before such an innovation was commenced. Unfortunately, this is highly unlikely in the current climate of economic restraint

University supervisors saw merit in the mentoring program as in the development of partnership with practising schools. It was felt that both went hand in hand, and could not be separated. The research by Booth (1993) found that mentors should be involved in the planning, structure and delivery of the whole training course, and that training institution lecturers and mentors should determine the procedures for the mentoring of student teachers. The main advantage seen was that mentors would be far more aware of the University's needs and could apply this knowledge in their overall care and responsibility for the student teachers. The idea of university run in-service courses was welcomed for it would give the opportunity for mentors from many practising schools to be together and learn of each others needs and challenges. It would also allow the university to reach some form of 'standardization' in measuring school against school, which is valuable when forms of grading of the practicum are considered. However, a word of caution from the research conducted by Huling-Austin (1987) who found that beginning teachers are hesitant to seek assistance from persons responsible for conducting their formal assessments, 'most educators agree on the need to separate the assistance and assessment roles of program facilitators'(Huling-Austin,1987).

Perhaps the most important issue emerging from the research is the application of changes to roles and relationships within the triad. The implementation of a worthwhile partnership program, the development of mentoring and improved standards for student teachers requires that the roles

and relationships be specifically articulated through discussion and inservice courses prior to the commencement of practice teaching episodes, so that they may become part of the teacher development program at the university and the basis for in-service courses for both mentors\teachers and supervisors.

The findings from the present research suggests that there is need for changes to the structure of the present practice teaching organization, and careful consideration of the changes in the roles and relationships will go a long way towards successful implementation of a new model. This chapter has already illustrated my ideal of the roles of members of the practicum triad as a result of this study.

In each case I have used the same format to suggest what I think should be the specific roles that members of the triad should exhibit towards each other. There are obviously, management roles, professional roles, pastoral roles and assessment roles that can be identified. These will vary in degree between student teacher, university supervisor and school mentor, but all will have the same basic aim; and that is to encourage and support the professional development of the student teacher.

The final section of this chapter considers the implications and conclusions of this study. Specifically, it looks at ways of strengthening the triadic framework, but at the same time protecting and nurturing independence and negotiation. The chapter closes with the reconsideration of the salient questions that were posed at the outset of this study.

Many pressures that student teachers experience on teaching practice are unavoidable, even a necessary part of a student's professional development; teaching is, after all, an exacting craft that requires expertise in a wide range of skills. From this current enquiry, however, a number of issues have emerged, concerning some pressures on student teachers that may be avoidable, or

atleast, reduced. These issues affect all the parties involved in the interviews, but may be of particular concern to supervisors and cooperating teachers, who share a responsibility for the professional well-being and development of student teachers. In brief there are three:

7.4. STRENGTHENING THE TRIADIC FRAMEWORK.

The triadic (student teacher - cooperating teacher - supervisor) relationship harbours many contradictions. On the evidence of the interviews one of these is that the student teacher's own self-view of on the one hand wanting independence and professional status during teaching practice, and on the other also wanting support, advice and constructive criticism on sometimes quite basic points of classroom teaching. Among the supervisors and cooperating teachers, much variation and considerable uncertainty was observed, about the kinds of provision that would be of the most benefit to their student teachers. As one supervisor put it: "the roles need to be more clearly defined...I think student teachers need to know what they can expect of their supervisor, and be able to demand it" (S 2).

Boydell's 1986 review of issues in teaching practice supervision research concluded that, where supervisory training programmes are set up, this may impel a tertiary institute to address the issue of providing a theoretical base in its entirety, namely the education of supervisors, students and teachers. In the search for such a base there are atleast three features that Boydell suggested deserve particular attention:

i) the development of partnerships between universities and schools, so that each is fully aware of the requirements of the teacher development program, and that each is fully aware of the constraints and challenges to the implementation of the program;

ii) a program of in-service opportunities which would provide a further professional bond between supervisors and cooperating teachers, who would become 'mentors' in the full sense of the word; and

iii) a level of payment to be given to cooperating teachers that recognizes the skills and abilities that they bring to the practice teaching experience, for their contribution to the personal development of student teachers and\or financial provision to practising schools so that cooperating teachers \mentors may be freed from classroom duties to improve their own expertise in mentoring and to improve the overall supervision of student teachers.

These features could play their part in the building of a strong theoretical base for teacher education, especially through providing a clearer sense of the individual roles of supervisor and cooperating teacher.

It should be emphasised that such changes would aim to strengthen and refine, not to weaken or even dismantle the triadic framework. The overwhelming evidence of the interviews is that, whatever particular criticism might be levelled at this individual person or that point of convention, students need secure links with both their tertiary institute and with their schools, during training. This is, arguably, especially true of average or weaker students. Such students may meet a number of difficulties during training but, given good support, may well develop into valuable members of the teaching profession.

A revised triadic framework should not only house relationships, but be a framework of consultative management, arched by the professional bond between supervisor and cooperating teacher. This implies an enhanced role

for both cooperating teacher and supervisor, so that a student teacher's needs on the practicum are fully met. Furthermore, supervisors would have a particular responsibility in overseeing the triadic framework, defined by theory and tested through practice. Inevitably, better partnership in this area, has resource implications and these would be necessary to ensure increased funding for in-service education of cooperating teachers and mentors.

7.5. INDEPENDENCE AND NEGOTIATION.

The recurring emphasis in modern advice on management and training, that management should be consultative, has implications for teacher education as in all other fields of professional training. Genuine negotiation is not easy in the early stages of initial teacher education, especially during the first, crucial teaching practice. Yet without it an unquestioning conformity ("this is the way we have always done it, so this is the way you will do it") can grow. A notable feature of student teacher interviews was the assertiveness shown by some - even maybe biting the hand that feeds on occasion - in their comments on their experience of supervisory teacher education. This may be commended as evidence of a confident progress to full professional independence. There are, after all, particular pressures on student teachers and teachers that stem from a) the sheer diversity of curriculum provision in secondary education, and b) the influences for change, which seem at times to be pulling in different directions. A student teacher's capacity for choice and for robust criticism will be an important tool for survival in coping with this flux of sometime contradictory influences.

To encourage criticism in student teachers may seem to be in apparent contradiction with the emphasis that all interviewees placed on harmony in teaching practice and relations. Yet without such contraries there can be no progression. As in all contexts of formal learning, student teachers need both a

'protective perimeter', and also 'creative space'. They need the support of supervisors and teachers, in harmonious relationship; they also need space, for candid interrogation of the huge apparatus of conventions called the 'education system'. Where either support or space is lacking there can be little credibility in the claims for 'equality' of relationship that both supervisors and cooperating teachers made in the interviews. Interrogation and criticism are essential to true enquiry in education; this justifies the research role of the universities in teacher education. Space for criticism is an essential condition for growth in the student teacher, as long as it is within a framework that is both strong and flexible enough to cope with the dialectic. At a time when changes in patterns of initial teacher education are being considered and implemented, the twin principles of 'protective perimeter ' and 'creative space' should not be ignored.

7.6. THE SALIENT QUESTIONS RECONSIDERED.

In the Abstract of this study four salient questions were referred to. It is now pertinent to reconsider them:

1. *Do the data from the participants in this study indicate that the development of partnerships, as defined previously between tertiary institutions and practising schools will lead to a better understanding by both parties of the needs of the student teacher on practicum?* It was very clear throughout the investigation that there was the need for better lines of communication between universities and practising schools. The development of partnership (as defined in this study) will bring the university and the schools into much closer relationship, because of the physical requirements of the program, namely the visiting of schools far more often by university staff and the attendance at in-service courses by school staff. These courses would be organized by the university within school settings and at the

university. One of the major aims of the practicum is to satisfy the needs of the student teacher in order that he or she may become far more competent in the teaching and learning situation. This better understanding between all parties should enhance this aim.

2. *Do the data from the participants indicate that the innovation of mentor, as defined in this study, to replace the traditional cooperating teacher on the practicum would result in the development of student teachers far more able to cope with the needs of the classroom and the profession as a whole?* For many years the traditional cooperating teacher's role in the practicum has been at best, tenuous. Many have done excellent service in providing for the needs of student teachers, but quite often this was fortuitous rather than planned. The innovation of mentor, a person, who would be fully aware of the requirements of the university teacher education program, and thus the needs of the student teacher would go a long way to remove the element of chance in the choice of persons to help student teachers. Again, a well constructed mentor program will result in individual schools being far more aware of the requirements of practice teaching segments, and not just something that is an appendage to the school year. This awareness can only help the student teacher to cope more with the needs of the classroom and the school as a whole, and, in the long term become a valuable member of the teaching profession..

3.*Do the data from the participants in this study indicate that the role of the university supervisor can be clearly delineated to support the notion of partnership and mentoring as defined in the study?* Under the traditional organization of the practicum the supervisor has usually been considered to be an 'outsider'. He or she was outside the school system and away from the university when performing supervisory duties. In my experience, the fact that practice teaching was considered an appendage to the

academic year by many tertiary institutions, led some lecturing staff to look upon school visits as onerous, at worst, as the opportunity for a holiday from the chores of university. The conscientious supervisor sometimes came up against a school executive, who honestly believed that the university (and therefore its staff) was out of touch with the reality of the school situation. The implementation of the partnership model would set out a clearly defined role for the university supervisor. This person would be in constant touch with practising schools and similarly with teaching staff, who had offered their services as mentors. The resulting communication could only improve the position of the supervisor in the triad. As stated often, previously, the supervisor would be the major link between university and practising schools; he or she would be responsible for the dissemination of university policies and philosophy with regard to the practicum, responsible for the well being of the student teachers under his or her control and for any assessment of their capabilities that may be requested from time to time. An input into the development of mentors would also be required of the supervisor. As a result of these responsibilities the position would become clearly delineated.

4. *Do the data from the participants in this study indicate that the roles and relationships of the triad would be improved by the introduction of a system of partnership between schools and universities and the development of training of teachers to act as mentors?* Quite often interviewees in the research referred to the need for better communication within the triad. The introduction of a partnership model would enhance this communication by formalizing the roles and responsibilities of each member of the triad. Little would be left to chance as it may have been in the traditional practice teaching experience. The student teacher would be able to count on a mentor, who fully understood the university teacher education program and its requirements, and who was fully acquainted with the process of supervision and support in the teaching

situation. Similarly, the mentor would have immediate and direct lines of communication to the university for any support that may be necessary. They would also have contact with other mentors in their own school and in other practising schools. This would lead to the valuable sharing of ideas, problems and general challenges presented by the practice teaching program. The university supervisor remains the main link between tertiary institution and the schools, but now the link is far more obvious as this person becomes the main channel throughout the school and university year for information with regard to the practicum, the development of mentors and any help and advice a practising school may need to perform its practicum duties efficiently. Again, recognition by the practising school of the importance of this person in the overall scheme of things would signal to the student teacher, as well, the value of the supervisor.

Further research, obviously, needs to be conducted into these relationships which are exposed by the practicum. Particularly, there is need for research into the viability of the changes to the practicum supervision process envisaged in this study. Research into partnership schemes as portrayed and the success or otherwise of mentor programs would be particularly valuable in the continuing effort to develop programs of professional preparation that result in higher quality teachers. The data from the interviews conducted in this study unequivocally support a clear definition of the roles and responsibilities of the practicum triad and the development of mentors within a framework of partnership between universities and practising schools. They also show the need for further research to develop these concepts.

BIBLIOGRAPHY.

Acheson,K.A., & Gall,M.D. (1992). *Techniques in the Clinical Supervision of teachers.* (3rd ed). New York: Longman.

Adey,K. & Speedy, G. (1993). *End-on innovation: A school-based approach to secondary education.* The Australian Journal of Teacher Education, 18 (2) 34-39.

Anderson,E. & Shannon,A. (1988). *Towards a conceptualization of mentoring.* Journal of Teacher Education, 34 (1) 53-59.

Andrews,G. (1978). *The case for school-based decision sharing: A discussion paper.* N.S.W. School-based Decision Sharing Project, Sydney.

Appleberry,M. (1976) *What did you learn from student teaching?* Instructor, 85 (6) 38-40.

Applegate,J. (1985). *Early field experiences: Recurring dilemmas.* Journal of Teacher Education, 32 (2) 60-64.

Applegate,J. &Lasley,T. (1982). *Cooperating teachers' problems with preservice field experience students.* Journal of Teacher Education, 33 (2) 15-18.

Applegate,J. & Lasley,T. (1985). *Students' expectations for early field experiences.* Texas Technical Journal of Education, 12(1) 27-36.

Arnstine,D. (1975). *Apprenticeship as the mis-education of teachers. philosophy of education,* In Proceedings of 31st Annual Meeting of the Philosophy of Education Society, San Jose, California, 113-123.

Ary,D.,Jacobs,L., & Ravavieh,A. (1990). *Introduction to research in education.* Fort Worth: Harcourt Brace.

Ashcroft,K. & Griffiths,M. (1989). *Reflective teachers and reflective tutors: School experience in an initial teacher education course. Journal of* Education for Teaching, 15(1) 35-52.

Ashton,P.,Henderson,P.,Merritt,J., & Mortimer,D. (1983). *Teacher education in the classroom: Initial and inservice.* London: Croom Helm.

Australian Committee of National Enquiry into Teacher education. (Auchmutty,J.J., Chairman). (1980). *Report of the national enquiry into teacher education.* Canberra: Australian Government Publishing Service.

Banton,M.(1970). *Policeman in the community.* London: Tavistock.

Barber,M. (1993). The Truth about partnership. *Journal of Education for Teaching, 19(3) 255-262.*

Barrettt,E. & Galvin,C.(1993). *The licensed teacher scheme: A MOTE Report.* London: University of London, Institute of Education.

Barrows,L.(1979). *Power relationships in the student teaching field.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Education Research Association, San Francisco.

Barton,L.,Pollard,A. & Whitty,G. (1992). Experiencing C.A.T.E.: The impact of accreditation upon initial training Institutions in England. *Journal of Education for Teaching, 18 (3) 41-57.*

Beattie,M. (1995a). New prospects for teacher education: Narrative ways of knowing teaching and teacher learning. *Educational Research, 37(1), 53-70.*

Beattie,M. (1995b). *Constructing professional knowledge in teaching: A narrative of change and development.* New York, Teachers College Press.

Beaudry,M. (1990). Post Carnegie developments affecting teacher education:The struggle for professionalism. *Journal of Teacher Education, 41 (1) 63-70.*

Beazley,K. (1993). *Teaching Counts.* Canberra: Australian Government Printing Service.

Beeson,G.(1983). Why a common curriculum for teacher education? in Price,D. & Ungerer,B., (Eds.). *Meeting the needs of teachers.* Proceedings of 13th Annual Conference of Teacher Education, Brisbane.

Beeson,G. (1991). Perspectives on change in australian teacher education. suggestions for action. *South Pacific Journal of Teacher Education, 19 (1) 49-57.*

Benton,P. (1990). *The Oxford Internship Scheme: integration and partnership in initial teacher education.* London: Calouste Gulbenkian Foundation.

Berliner,D. (1984). The half full glass: A review of research on teaching. In P. Hosford,(Ed.). *Using what we know about teaching.* Alexandria, V.A: Association of Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Berliner,D. (1985). Laboratory settings and the study of teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education, 36 (1) 2-8.*

Berliner,D. (1986). In pursuit of the expert pedagogue. *Educational Researcher, 9 (1) 4-8.*

Berliner,D. (1987). *Ways of thinking about students and classrooms by more and less experienced teachers.* In J.Calderwood,(Ed.). Exploring Teachers' Thinking. London: Cassell.

Beswick,D.,Burnett,P. & Mann,L. (1990). Validation of the Flinder's decision-making questionnaires on course decision- making by students. *Australian Psychologist, 24 (2) 46-49.*

Beyer,L. (1984). Field experience, ideology and the development of critical reflectivity. *Journal of Teacher Education, 15 (3) 36-41.*

Biddle,B. (1979). *Role theory: Expectations, identities, behaviour.* New York: Academic Press.

Biddle,B. & Thomas,E. (Eds.), (1966). *Role Theory: Concepts and research.* New York: Wiley & Sons.

Blumberg,A. (1976). Supervision: Some images of what it is and what it might be. *Theory into Practice, 11 (4) 284-292.*

Board of Teacher Education, Queensland. (1984). *School experience in Queensland preservice teacher education programs.* 1. Research Report (Toowong, Brisbane, Board of Teacher Education, Queensland).

Bogdan,R. & Biklen,S. (1992). *Qualitative research for education: An introduction to theory and methods.* Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Bolin,F. (1998). Helping student teachers think about teaching. *Journal of Teacher Education, 39(2), 48-54.*

Booth,M. (1993). The effectiveness and the role of the mentor in school: The Students View. *Cambridge Journal of Education, 23 (2) 184-197.*

Bowman,B. (1989). Self reflection as an element of professionalism. *Teachers College Record, 90(3), 444-451.*

Boydell,D. (1986). Issues in teaching practice supervision research: A review of the literature. *Teaching and Teacher Education 2 (2) 115-125.*

Brady,L. (1987). Community practicum: The integration of experience. *Journal of Teaching Practice. 1 (2) 33-42.*

Bramer,L. (1973). *The helping relationship: Process and skills.* Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall.

Brand,M. (1985). Does student teaching make a difference? *Music Education Journal, 71 (8) 117-129.*

Bridges,E. (1986). *Managing the incompetent teacher: The challenge and response.* Philadelphia: Falmer Press.

Brizman,D. (1991). *Practice makes practice: A critical study of learning to teach.* Albany: SUNY.

Buchmann,M. &Schwille,J. (1983). Education: The overcoming of experience. *American Journal of Education, 92 (2) 30-51.*

Bullough,R. & Gitlin,A. (1994). Challenging teacher education as training: Four propositions. *Journal of Education for Teaching, 20 (1) 67-78.*

Bullough,R.,Goldstein,S. & Holt,L. (1984). *Human interests in the curriculum: Teaching and learning in a technological society.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Burgess,W. (1975). The competencies student teachers say they need. *Californian Journal of Teacher Education, 2 (3) 127-132.*

Burgess,R.(Ed.) (1987). *Strategies of educational research: Qualitative methods.* London: Falmer Press.

Burn,C. (1992). Collaborative teaching, in Wilkin,M.(Ed.) *Mentoring in schools,* London: Kogan Page.

Butt,R.& Raymond,D. (1987). Arguments for using qualitative approaches in understanding teacher thinking: The case for biography. *Journal of Curriculum Theorizing, 7(1), 6-93.*

Cairns,L. & Eltis,K. (1982). The Practicum: Views of students and teachers associated with two universities. *Australian Journal of Teaching Practice. 3 (1) 49-64.*

Calderhead,J. (1981). A psychological approach to research on teacher classroom decision-making. *British Educational Research Journal 7 (3) 51-57.*

Calderhead,J. (1987). *Cognition and metacognition in teachers' professional development.* Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Washington, D.C.

Calderhead,J. (1988). The contribution of field experiences to student primary teachers' professional learning. *Research in Education, 40(3), 34-49.*

Calderhead,J. (1989). Reflective teaching and teacher education. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 5 (1) 43-52.*

Calderhead,J. (1991). "The nature and growth of knowledge in student teaching', *Teaching and Teaching Education. 7(5/6.*

Cameron,R. & Wilson,S. (1993). The Practicum: Student teacher perceptions of teacher supervision styles. *South Pacific Journal of Teacher Education. 21 (2) 168-169.*

Campbell,L. & Williamson,J. (1983). Supervising the student teacher: What is really involved? *NASSP Bulletin 67(465), 77-79.*

Carmichael,L. (Chair). (1992). *The Australian vocational certificate training system.* Report from the Employment and Skills Formation Council to the National Board for Employment, Education and Training. Canberra, Ausieprint.

Carnegie Task Force on Teaching as a Profession. (1986). *A Nation prepared: teachers for the 21st Century.* New York: Carnegie Foundation.

Carr,W. & Kemmis,S. (1986). *Becoming critical: Education, knowledge and action research.* London: Falmer Press.

Cates,W. (1986). *A Practical Guide to Educational Research.* New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.

Chadbourne,R. (1995). Student reluctance to take up school-based teacher education: One university's experience. *Journal of Education for Teaching, 21 (2) 219-224.*

Charles,R.,Ferguson,P.,Henry,J.,Morris,D. & Tinning,R. (1984). *The school-based teacher education project.* Report No. 3 Geelong, Deakin University, School of Teacher Education.

City Art Institute (1981). *B.ED(ART) Internship Program,* Sydney: City Art Institute, Paddington.

Clarke,C. (1988). Asking the right questions about teacher preparation: Contributions of research on teacher thinking, *Educational Researcher, 17 (1) 5-12.*

Clarke,K. (Secretary of State for Education). (1992). *Speech at the North of England Conference.* (London, DES).

Clifford,G. & Guthrie,J. (1988). *Education School.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Clift,R.,Houston,W. & Pugach,M.(Eds.). (1990). *Encouraging reflective practice in education.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Committee to Advise on *Desirable developments in teacher education in Queensland.* (Bassett,G.W.Chair) (1978). Brisbane: Government Printer.

Committee of Review of New South Wales Schools (1989). J Carrick, (Chair) Sydney: NSW Government.

Conant,J.(1963). *The education of American teachers.* New York: McGraw Hill.

Cope,E. (1973). *School experience and student learning.* In D. Lomax, (Ed.) The Education of Teachers in Britain. London: Wiley.

Copeland,W. (1977). *The nature of the relationship between cooperating teacher behaviour and student teacher classroom performance.* Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New York.

Copeland,W. (1980). Clinical experience in the education of teachers. *Journal of Education for Teaching, 7(2), 32-36.*

Copeland,W. (1982). Student teachers' preference for supervisory approach. *Journal of Teacher Education, 3 (2) 32-36.*

Cornbleth,C. & Ellsworth,J. (1994). Teachers in teacher education: Clinical faculty,roles and relationships. *American Educational Research Journal, 31 (1) 49-70.*

Coulter,F. & Ingvarson,L. (1985). *Professional development and the improvement of schooling: Role and responsibilities.* A Report to the Commonwealth Schools Commission, Canberra.

Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education, (CATE), (1985-86). *Catenotes 1-4.* (London, DES)

Cruickshank,D. (1987). *Reflective teaching: The preparation teachers.* Reston, V.A: Association of Teacher Educators.

Cruickshank,D. & Applegate,J. (1981). Reflective teaching as a strategy for teacher growth. *Educational Leadership. 38(7), 43-48.*

Cruickshank,D. & Armaline,W. (1986). Field experiences in teacher education: Consideration and recommendations. *Journal of Teacher Education, 37(3), 34-40.*

Cruickshank,D. & Cruz,J. (1989). Trends in teacher preparation. *Journal of Teacher Education, 40(3), 49-56.*

Dawkins,J. (1988). *Higher education-A policy discussion statement (White Paper)* Ministry of Employment, Education and Training, Australian Government Printing Services, Canberra.

Dawkins,J. (1992). Post compulsory education and training: The national challenge. *Unicorn, 18(1), 6-12.*

Department of Employment, Education and Training. (1991a). *Australia's Workforce in the Year 2001.* Canberra: Australian Government Publishing Service.

Department of Employment, Education and Training. (1991b). *Australia's youth survey,* Monograph Series 9, Canberra: DEET Economic and Policy Analysis Division.

Department of Education and Science. (1982). *The new teacher in school.* A Report by Her Majesty's Inspectors. London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office.

Department of Education and Science. (1983). *Teacher quality.* London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office.

Department of Education and Science. (1989). *Perspectives on teacher education: Other trainers' views.* London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office.

Department of Education and Science, Her Majesty's Inspectors, (1991). *School-based initial teacher training in England and Wales.* London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office.

Department for Education, (1992a). *Initial teacher training (Secondary Phase)* Circular, 9/92. London: HMSO.

Department for Education and Science, (1992b). *Choice and diversity: A new framework for schools.* London: HMSO.

Dey, (1993). *Qualitative data analysis: A user friendly guide for social scientists.* London: Routledge.

Diamond,C. (1991). *Teacher education as transformation.* Milton Keynes: Open University Press.

Dunlap,D.,Carroll,B,Collay,M. & Wilkes,P. (1989). Three studies of supervision and implications. *South Pacific Journal of Teacher Education, 17(1), 121-128.*

Dussault,G. (1970). *A theory of supervision in teacher education.* New York: Teachers' College Press.

Ebbeck,F. (1990) *Teacher Education in Australia.* Report prepared for the National Board of Employment, Education and Training. Commissioned Report No.6 Canberra: Australian Government Publishing Service.

Edwards,S. (1992). Schools of education: Their work and their future. In J.Thomas, (Ed.) *British universities and teacher education.* Lewes: Falmer Press.

Elliott,B. & Calderhead,J. (1993). Mentoring for teacher development: Possibilities and caveats. In D. McIntyre, H. Hagger 7 M. Wilkin (Eds.), *Mentoring: Perspectives on school-based teacher education* (pp166-189). London: Falmer Press.

Eltis,K.J. (1984). *Setting priorities for improving the practicum.* Paper presented at a conference on school experience organized by the Queensland Board of Teacher Education, Brisbane.

Eltis,K.J. (1992). *Much more than the Finn end of the wedge: Removing Barriers in Post Compulsory Education.* Paper presented at a Conference on Vocational Education and Training. University of Sydney, June.

Eltis,K.J. (1993a). *Whatever happened to general education?* Paper presented to N.S.W. Chapter Convention of the Australian College of Education, March.

Eltis,K.J. (1993b). *Competencies, standards and performance: What's it all about?* Paper presented for 5th National Practicum Conference. Sydney: Macquarie University, February.

Eltis,K.J.,Braithwaite,J.,Deer,C. & Kensell,H. (1983). Changing face of continuing education for teachers: New emphases, new problems. *South Pacific Journal of Teacher Education, 11(1), 1-14.*

Eltis,K.J. & Cairns,L. (1992). Perceived effectiveness of supervisors of the practicum. *The Australian Journal of Teaching Practice, 2(2), 49-55.*

Eltis,K.J. & Turney,C. (1987). Supervisor development programs: Field test 1 - The feedback role. *The South Pacific Journal of Teacher Education, 12 (1), 19.*

Ely,M.,Anzul,M.,Friedman,T.,Garner,D. & McCormack Steimetz,A. (1991). *Doing qualitative research: Circles within circles.* London: Falmer Press.

Emans,R. (1983). Implementing the knowledge base: Redesigning the function of cooperating teachers and college supervisors. *Journal of Teacher Education, 34(2), 14-27.*

Everton,T. & White,S. (1992). Partnership in training: The university of Leicester's new model of school-based teacher education. *Cambridge Journal of Education, 22(2), 143-155.*

Faire,M. (1994). *Improving the practicum: The professional development needs of lecturers, associate teachers and student teachers.* Paper presented at the 24th Annual Conference of the Australian Teacher Education Association, July, Brisbane.

Feiman-Nemser,S. & Buchmann,M. (1985). *The first year of teacher preparation: Transition to pedagogical thinking.* East Lansing, Michigan: Institute of Research on Teaching. Research Series No. 156.

Feiman-Nemser,S. (1990). Teacher preparation: Structural and conceptual alternatives. In W. Houston, (Ed.) *Handbook of research on teacher education,* (212-233), New York: MacMillan.

Feiman-Nemser,S.,Parker,M.,Zeichner,K. (1990). *Are mentors teacher educators?* Paper presented at the Annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Boston: Massachusetts.

Ferguson,P. (1989). A reflective approach to the methods practicum. *Journal of Teacher Education, 40(2), 36 - 41.*

Field,B. (1993). *Partnerships in teacher education.* Paper presented at the National Practicum Conference. Sydney: Macquarie University, February.

Fielding,A. & Cavanagh,D. (1983). *Curriculum priorities in Australian higher education.* Sydney: Southwood Press.

Finlayson,D. & Deer,C (1979). The organizational climate of secondary schools: A cross- cultural comparison. *Journal of Educational Administration, 17 (2), 150-156.*

Finn,T. (Chair), (1992). *Young people's participation in post compulsory education and training.* Report to the Australian Education Council Review Committee, Canberra: Australian Government Printing Service.

Freeman,D. (1993). Renaming experience/reconstructing practice: Developing new understandings of teaching. *Teaching & Teacher Education, 9(5/6), 485-497.*

Friedman,M.,Brinleep,P. & Hayes,P. (1980). *Improving teacher education: Resources and recommendations.* New York: Longman.

Fuller,F. & Brown,O. (1975). Becoming a Teacher. In K. Ryan,(Ed.) *Teacher Education.* 74th Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Part II 25-52, Chicago: Chicago University Press.

Fullerton,T.,Gill,J. & James,B. (1993). *A collaborative approach to field experience: An internship.* A paper presented to 5th National Practicum Conference, Sydney: Macquarie University.

Funk,F.,Hoffman,J.,Keithley,A. & Long,B. (1992). Student teaching program: feedback from supervising teachers. *Clearinghouse, 55(7), 5-9.*

Furlong,V.,Hirst,P.,Polkington,K. & Miles,S. (1988). *Initial teacher training and the role of the school.* Milton Keynes: Open University Press.

Furlong,V. (1990). School-based training: The students' views. In M.Booth,J Furlong & M.Wilkin, (Eds.) *Partnerships in initial teacher training.* London: Cassell.

Furlong,J.,Witty,G.,Whiting,C.,Miles,S.,Barton,L. & Barrett,E. (1996). Redefining partnership: Revolution or reforming initial teacher education? *Journal of Education for Teaching, 22(1), 39-55.*

Galton,M. (1984). The quality of teaching. *Curriculum, 5(1), 4.*

Galvez-Hjornevik,C. (1986). Mentoring among teachers: A review of the literature. *Journal of Teacher Education, 1(2), 7-9.*

Gardner,P. (1993). The early history of school-based teacher training. In D.McIntyre,H.Hagger & M.Wilkin (Eds.), Mentoring: Perspectives on school-based teacher education (pp.21-36). London: Kogan Page.

Garland,C. (1965). *An exploration of role expectations for student teachers, cooperating teachers and college supervisors.* Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis, University of Rochester.

Gay,L. (1981). *Educational research: Competencies for analysis and application.* Ohio: Merrill Publishing Company.

Gephart,W. & Ayers,J. (1988). *Teacher education evaluation.* Boston: Kluwer Academic Publications.

Gerwinner,M. (1968). *A study of the results of the interaction of student teachers and their supervising teachers.* Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis, Mississippi State University.

Gettone,V. (1980). Role Conflict of Student Teachers. *College Student Journal, 14(1), 92-100*

Gilroy,D. (1992). The political rape of initial teacher education in England and Wales: A J.E.T. Rebuttal. *Journal of Education for Teaching, 18(1), 5-21.*

Gitlin,A. (1985). Why supervisors behave as they do: Relationships of beliefs, socialization and practice. *Journal of Education for Teaching, 11(1), 51-59.*

Gitlin,A. (1990). Educative research,voice and school change, *Harvard Educational Review, 60, 443-466.*

Glaser,B. & Strauss,A. (1967). *The discovery of grounded theory: Strategies for qualitative research.* Chicago: Aldine.

Glickman,C. & Bey,T. (1990). Supervision. In W.Houston, (Ed.) *The education of teachers: A look ahead.* New York: Longman.

Goetz,J. & Le Comte. (1981). Ethnographic research and the problem of data reduction. *Anthropolgy and Education Quarterly, 12, 14-21.*

Goodfellow,J. (1995). *Cooperating teachers images: A study in early childhood settings.* Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis, University of Sydney.

Goodlad,J. (1984). *A place called school.* New York: McGraw Hill.

Goodlad,J. (1991). Why we need a complete redesign of teacher education, *Educational Leadership, November, 4-10.*

Goodman,J. (1985). *Making early field experiences meaningful: An alternative approach.* Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago.

Goodman,J. (1985). What students learn from early field experiences: A case study and critical analysis. *Journal of Teacher Education, 36(6), 44-49.*

Gore,J & Bartlett,L. (1988). *Pathways and barriers to reflective teaching in an initial teacher education program.* Research Grant Series 4, Brisbane, Queensland Board of Teacher Education.

Gottleib,E. & Cornbleth,C. (1989). The professionalization of tomorrow's teachers: An analysis of U.S. teacher education reform rhetoric. *Journal of Education for Teaching, 15(1), 3-12.*

Griffin,G. (1983). *Clinical preservice teacher education, final report of a descriptive study.* Austin,Texas Research and Development Centre for Teacher Education.

Griffiths,m. & Tann,S. (1992). Using reflective practice to link personal and public theories, *Journal of Education for Teaching, 18(3), 69-84.*

Gross,N.,Mason,W.,Ross,T. & McEarshern,A. (1958). Role conflict and its resolution In E. Maccoby,T.Newcomb, & T Hartley, (eds.). *Readings in social psychology.* 3rd Ed. New York: Holt.

Guyton,E. (1986). *Incentives for working with student teachers.* Paper Presented at the 1st Summer Workshop of the Association of Teacher Educators, Flagstaff: Arizona.

Guyton,E. (1987). Working with student teachers: Incentives, problems and advantages. *Professional Educator, 10(1), 21-28.*

Guyton,E. & McIntyre,D. (1990). Student teaching and school experiences. In W. Houston, (Ed.) *The education of teachers: A look ahead.* New York: Longman.

Hagger,H.,Burn,K. & McIntyre,D. (1995). *The school mentor handbook.* London: Kogan Page.

Hargreaves,D. (1993). *The future of teacher education.* London: Hockerill Educational Foundation.

Hatton,N. & Smith,D.(1995). Facilitating reflections: Issues and research. *Forum of Education, 50(1), 49-65.*

Hawk,P. (1984). *Making a difference: Reflections and thoughts of first year teachers.* Greenville, N.C: East Carolina University.

Hegley,K. & Dudley,R. (1987). Beginning teacher induction: A progress report. *Journal of Teacher Education, 38(1), 4-17.*

Henry,J. (1983). Collaborative relationships within school-based experiences. In D.A. Price and B.J.Ungerer, (Eds.) *Proceedings of 13th annual conference.* South Pacific Association of Teacher Education, Brisbane.

Henry,J.,Charles,R.,Morris,D. & Tinning,R. (1984). *School-based teacher education project.* Report No 3 Geelong, Victoria: School of Teacher Education, Deakin University.

Hewitson,M.(Ed.), (1979). *Research into teacher education: The practical skills.* Canberra: Education Research and Development Committee. 19, Australian Government Publishing Service.

Hillgate Group, (1989). *Learning to teach,* London: The Claridge Press.

Hittleman,D. & Simon,A. (1992). *Interpreting educational research: An introduction for consumers research.* New York, Macmillan Publishing Company.

Hogan,P. (1983). The central place of prejudice in the supervision of student teachers. *Journal of Education for Teaching, 9(2), 30-45.*

Holly,M. (1985). *Keeping a personal, professional diary.* Geelong: Deakin University Press.

Holmes Group, (1986). *Tomorrow's teachers: A report of the Holmes group.* East Lansing, Michigan: Holmes Group Inc.

Holmes Group, (1990). *Tomorrow's schools: A report of the Holmes group.* East Lansing, Michigan: Holmes Group Inc.

Holsti,O. (1969). *Content analysis for the social sciences and humanities.* London: Addison Wesley.

Hopkins,D. & Reid,K.(Eds.), (1985). *Rethinking teacher education.* London: Croom Helm.

Hoy,W. & Rees,R. (1977). The bureacratic socialization of student teachers. *Journal of Teacher Education, 28(2), 23-25.*

Hughes,G. (1994). The normative dimensions of teacher/student interaction, *South Pacific Journal of Teacher Education, 22(4), 189-205.*

Huling-Austin,L. (1990). Teacher induction programs and internships. In W. Houston,(Ed.) The education of teachers: A look ahead. *New York: Longman.*

Huling-Austin,L. & Murphy,S.C. (1987). *Assessing the impact of teacher induction programs: Implications for program development.* Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago.

Hull,R. & Baker,R. (1984). A reconsideration of the practicum as the critical element of teacher education. *South Pacific Journal of Teacher Education, 12 (2) 2-10.*

Hunt,D. (1976). Teachers' adaption: Reading and flexing to students. *Journal of Teacher Education, 27(3), 268-275.*

Hunt,D. (1987). Beginning with ourselves. In *Practice, theory and human affairs.* Cambridge, M.A: Brookline Books.

Jacques,K.(1992). Mentoring in initial teacher education. *Cambridge Journal of Education. 22(3), 339-345.*

Jeans,B. (1993). *How central is the practicum?* Paper presented at 5th National Practicum Conference: Practical Experience in Professional Education, Sydney: February.

Johnston,S. (1992). Images: A way of understanding the practical knowledge of student teachers. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 8(2), 123-126.*

Johnston,S. (1994). Experience is the best teacher: Or is it? An analysis of the role of experience in learning to teach. *Journal of Teacher Education, 45(3), 199-202.*

Joyce,B. & Clift,R. (1984). The phoenix agenda: Essential reform in teacher education. *Educational Researcher, 13(4), 5-18.*

Joyce,B. & Showers,B. (1983). Improving inservice training: The messages of research. *Educational Leadership, 37(5), 163-172.*

Judge,H.,Lemosse,M.,Paine,L. & Sedlak,M. (1994). *The university and the teachers: France, the United States, England.* Oxford Studies in Comparative Education, vol.4 (1/2). Triangle Books.

Kagan,D. (1992). Professional growth among pre-service and beginning teachers. *Review of Educational Research, 62(2), 129-169.*

Kahn,R. & Cannell,C. (1957). *The dynamics of interviewing.* New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Kaplan,L. (1967). *An investigation of the role expectations for college supervisors of student teachers as viewed by student teachers, supervising teachers and college supervisors.* Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Rochester.

Kapel,D. & Sadler,E. (1978). *How much involvement in student teaching: A study of cooperating teachers.* Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association of Teacher Educators, Las Vegas.

Kemmiss,S. (1987). Critical reflection. In M. Wideen and A. Andrews,(Eds.) *staff development for school improvement: A focus on the teacher.* Lewes: Falmer Press.

Kennedy,M. & Zeichner,K. (1989). Kenneth Zeichner reflecting on reflection. *Colloquy, 2(2) Newsletter of the U.S. National Center for Research on Teacher Education.*

Kerlinger,F. (1965). *Foundations of behavioral research.* New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston Inc.

Killian,J. & McIntyre,D. (1988). Grade level as a factor in participation during early field experiences. *Journal of Teacher Education, 2(4), 367-376.*

Kilgore,A. & Kozisek,J. (1988). *The effects of a planned induction program on first year teachers: A research report.* Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association of Teacher Educators, San Diego.

Killen,R. & Killen,A. (1991). Reflective teaching defined. *Australian Teacher Education Association Newsletter, 13(4), 8-10.*

Koehler,V. (1984). *University supervision of student teaching.* National Institute of Education Report No 9061. Austin, Texas. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No ED 270 349).

Koehler,V. (1988). Barriers to the effectve supervision of student teaching. *Journal of Teacher Education, 39(2), 28-35.*

Koener,M. (1992). The cooperating teacher: An ambivalent participation in student teaching. *Journal of Teacher Education, 43(1), 45-56.*

Kohlberg,L. (1975). The cognitive developmental approach to moral role taking. *Phi Delta Kappan, 56 (10) 17-26.*

Krippendorff,K. (1986). *Content analysis: An introduction to its methodology.* London: Sage Publications.

Lacey,C. & Lamont,T. (1977). *Partnership with schools: An experiment in teacher education.* University of Sussex Education Area Paper 5. Brighton, U.K.: University of Sussex.

Lamb,C. & Montague,E. (1982). *Variables pertaining to the perceived effectiveness of university student teaching supervisors.* Paper

presented at the annual meeting of the South west Educational research Association, Austin. (ERIC No. ED 212613).

Lancy,D. (1993). *Qualitative research in education: An introduction to the major traditions.* New York: Longmans.

Lanier,J. & Little,J. (1986). Research on teacher education. In M.Wittrock,(Ed.) *Handbook of research on teaching.* 3rd Edition, New York: MacMillan.

Linnell,A. (1987). *The internship program: Students' views.* City Art Institute, Sydney: N.S.W. (unpublished).

Linnell,A. (1994). *The supervision process of the practicum: Cooperating teachers' views,* University of Sydney, N.S.W. (unpublished).

Linton,R. (1947). *Concepts of role and status.* Readings in Social Psychology. New York: Holt.

Liston,D. & Zeichner,K. (1987). Critical pedagogy and teacher education. *Journal of Education, 169(3), 117-137.*

Liston,D. & Zeichner,K. (1990). Reflective teaching and action research. in pre- service teacher education. *Journal of Education for Teaching, 16 (4) 235-253.*

Little,J. (1990). The mentor phenomena and the social organization of teaching. *Review of Research in Education, 16(4), 307-325.*

Long,J. (1994). Teaching strategies through microteaching. *South Pacific Journal of Teacher Education, 22(2), 129-137.*

Lortie,D. (1975). *School teacher: A sociological study.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Lovat,T. & Smith,D. (1995). *Curriculum: Action on reflection revisited,* (3rd ed.) Wentworth Falls, NSW. Social Science Press.Macdonald,F. (1980). *The problems of beginning teachers: A crisis in training:* Vol.1 Study of Induction Programs for Beginning Teachers. Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service.

McCullough,M. & Lock,N. (1992). Student teachers' school experience: The managerial implications for schools. *Cambridge Journal of Education, 22(1), 69-77.*

McDermott,P.,Gormley,K.,Rothenberg,J. & Hammar,J. (1995). The influences of classroom practical experiences on student teachers' thoughts about teaching, *Journal of Teacher Education, 46(3), 184-191.*

McIntyre,D. (1983). *Field experiences in teacher education: From student to teacher.* Washington, D.C: Foundation for Excellence in Teacher Education and the ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education.

McIntyre,D. (1990). The Oxford university model of teacher education. *The South Pacific Journal of Teacher Education, 19(2), 117-128.*

McIntyre,D. (1993). *The partnership between university and schools.* A Paper delivered at the Oxford University/NUT/Education Conference on Teacher Education Today and Tomorrow.

McIntyre,D.,Hagger,H. & Wilkin,M.(Eds.), (1993). *Mentoring perspectives on school-based teacher education.* London: Kogan Page.

McIntyre,D. & Killian,J. (1987). The influence of supervisory training for cooperating teachers on pre-service teachers' development during early field experience. *Journal of Educational Research, 80(5), 227-282.*

McLelland,V. & Varma,V., (Eds.), (1989). *Advances in teacher education.* London: Routledge.

McNally,J.,Cope,P.,Inglis,B. & Stronach,I. (1994). Current realities in the student teaching experience: A preliminary enquiry. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 10(2), 213-219.*

McNamara,D. (1990). Research on teachers' thinking: Its contribution to educating student teachers to think critically. *Journal of Education for Teaching, 16(4), 13-18.*

McNamara,D. (1992). The reform of teacher education in England & Wales: teacher competency, panacea or rhetoric. *Journal of Education for Teaching, 18(3), 273-284.*

MacNamara,D. (1995). The influence of student teachers' tutors and mentors upon their classroom practice: An exploratory study. Teaching and Teacher Education, 11(1(, 51-61.

McWilliam,E. & O'Brien,P. (1993). Towards teaching in partnership: Lessons still to be learned. *South Pacific Journal of Teacher Education, 21(1), 45-49.*

Mahlios,M. & Maxson,M. (1995). Capturing pre-service teachers' beliefs about schooling, life and childhood, *Journal of Teacher Education, 46(3), 192-199.*

Martinez,K. (1993). *Supporting the reflective teacher.* A Paper Presented to 5th National Practicum Conference, Macquarie University. February.

Mayer,E. (Chair), (1992). *Putting general education to work. The key competencies report.* Canberra:AEC and Ministers for Vocational Education Employment and Training.

Merton,R. (1949). *Social theory and social structure.* Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press.

Ministry of Education & Youth Affairs, (1989). *Excellence and equity.* Sydney: N.S.W. Department of School Education.

Mitchell,M. & Jolley,J. (1996). *Research design explained.* Fort Worth: Harcourt Brace.

Monaghan,J. (1992). Mentoring: Person, process, practice and problems. *British Journal of Educational Studies, 40(3), 248-256.*

Morris,J. (1974). The effects of the university supervisor on the performance and adjustment of student teachers. *Journal of Educational Research, 67, 358-362.*

Mouly,G. (1963). *The science of educational research.* New York: American Book Company.

Murphy,S. & Huling-Austin,L. (1987). *The impact of context on the classroom lives of beginning teachers.* Paper Presented at the Annual Meeting of American Educational Research Association, Washington, D.C.

Musgrave,P. (1979). *The sociology of education.* London: Methuen.

Nance,D. & Fawns,R.(1993). Teachers' working knowledge and training: The Australian agenda for reform of teacher education. *Journal of Education for Teaching, 19(2), 159-173.*

Neil,S. (1993). Practice teaching: Old and ineffective. *Education Canada, 33(1), 10-13.*

Newcomb,T. (1950). *Social psychology.* New York: Dryden Press.

New South Wales Committee to Examine Teacher Education (Correy,P., Chair) (1980). *Teachers for tomorrow.* Sydney: Governement Printer.

Nisbett,J. & Entwhistle,N. (1970). *Educational research methods.* London: University of London Press.

Northfield,J. (1993). A school-based initiative: An opportunity to better understand the practicum. *The Australian Journal of Teacher Education, 18(2), 40-45.*

Odell,S. (1987). Teacher induction: Rationale and issues. In D.Brooks, (Ed.) *Teacher induction: A new beginning.* Reston, V.A.: Association of Teacher Educators.

O'Hear,A. (1988). *Who teaches the teachers?* London, Social Affairs Unit.

O'Shea,D. (1984). Teacher education: An empirical study of problems and possibilities. *Journal of Education for Teaching, 10(1), 1-22.*

Patton,M. (1990). *Qualitative evaluation and research methods* (2nd ed.). Newbury Park: Sage.

Poirier,C. (1992). A student-teacher's voice: Reflections on power. *Journal of Education for Teaching, 18(4), 85-91.*

Popkewitz,T. (1977). *Ideology as a problem of teacher education.* Paper presented at the Annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association. New York.

Popkewitz,T.,Tabachnick,R. & Zeichner,K. (1979). Dulling the senses: Research in teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education, 30(5), 52-59.*

Poppleton,P. & Pullin,R. (1992). Distant voices: English teachers' views on change in initial teacher education. *Journal of Education for Teaching, 18(2), 115-129.*

Powney,J. & Watts,M. (1987). *Interviewing in educational research.* London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Price,D. (1987). *Field studies: Cost implications and future changes.* A Report Prepared for Brisbane College of Advanced Education, 1987.

Price,D. (1989). The practicum: A recent review of the literature. *South Pacific Journal of Teacher Education, 17(2), 14-23.*

Price,D. & Sellars,N. (1985). A synthesis of effective supervising teacher behaviours in the final year of primary practicum. *South Pacific Journal of Teacher Education, 13(2), 15-19.*

Price,D. & Sellars,N.(Ed.), (1986). *Models of supervision - styles and strategies.* In the Collected Papers for Third National Conference: The Practicum in Teacher Education, Geelong: Victoria.

Proctor,N. (1984). Towards a partnership with schools. *Journal of Education for Teaching, 10(3), 219-231.*

Reed,K. (1990). Students' perceptions of practicum supervisors. *South Pacific Journal of Teacher Education, 18(2), 96-101.*

Richardson,V. (1990). Significant and worthwhile changes in teaching practice. *Educational Researcher, 19(7), 10-18.*

Richerts,A. (1990). Teaching teachers to reflect: A consideration of program structure. *Journal of Curriculum Studies, 22(4), 33-37.*

Sadler,W. (1978). *Developing a cognitive skills approach to teaching.* Paper presented at Conference of American Association of Higher Education, Washington DC. April.

Sax,G. (1968). *Empirical foundations of educational research.* New Jersey: Prentice-Hall Inc.

Schon,D. (1982). *The reflective practitioner.* New York: Basic Books.

Schon,D. (1987). *Educating the reflective practtitioner.* San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

Seifferth,B. & Samuelson,M. (1984). *Cooperating teachers: Why not the best?* Research Report (143) ED 264176.

Siedontop,D. (1981). The Ohio State supervision research program summary report. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education. Introductory Issue, 1. 30-38.*

Shulman,L. (1987). Knowledge and teaching: Foundations of the new reform. *Harvard Educational Review, 57(1), 1-22.*

Silvernail,D. &nCostello,M. (1983). The impact of student teaching and internship programs on pre-service teachers' pupil control perspectives, anxiety levels and teaching concerns. *Journal of Teacher Education, 34(4), 33-37.*

Smith,D. & Hope, J. (1992). *The health professional as researcher.* Australia: Social Science Press.

Smyth,J. (1982). *Teaching as learning: Some lessons from clinical supervision.* A Paper presented at the Annual Conference, Australian Association for Research in Education, Brisbane.

Smyth,J. (1984). Teachers as collaborative learners in clinical supervision: A S state of the art review. *Journal of Education for Teaching, 10(2), 29- 38.*

Smyth,J. (1989). Developing and sustaining critical reflection in teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education, 40(2), 29-38.*

Smyth,J. (1991) *Teachers as collaborative learners,* Milton Keynes: Open University Press.

St. George Institute of Teacher Education, (1981). *B.ED internship program.* Sydney: University of New South Wales.

St. George School of Teacher Education, (1993). *B.ED internship program,* Sydney: University of New South Wales.

Stenhouse,L. (1984). Artistry and teaching: The teacher as a focus of research and development, in D.Hopkins & M.Wicleen, (Eds.) *Alternative perspectives on school improvement.* London: Falmer Press.

Stones,E. (1977). Meta-meta teaching: A suitable case for study? *British Journal of Teacher Education, 3(5), 97-109.*

Stones,E. (1978). *Self confrontation in supervisor training.* Paper presented to the Conference for the Improvement of University Teaching. Aachen, Germany.

Stones,E. (1984). *Supervision in teacher education.* London: Methuen.

Stones,E. (1986). Towards a systematic approach to research in teaching: The place of investigative pedagogy. *British Educational Research Journal, 12(2), 167-179.*

Stones,E. (1987). Teaching practice supervision: Bridge between theory and practice. *European Journal of Teacher Education, 10(3), 67-79.*

Stones,E. (1992). *Quality teaching: A sample of cases.* London: Routledge.

Strauss,A. (1987). *Qualitative analysis for social scientists.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

Swan,D. & McKinnon,K. (1984). *Future directions of secondary education.* Sydney: N.S.W. Government Printer.

Tabachnick,B. & Zeichner,K. (1984). The impact of the student teaching experience on the development of teacher perspectives. *Journal of Teacher Education, 35(6), 28-36.*

Tabachnick,B. (1980). Intern teacher roles: Illusions, disillusions and reality. *Journal of Education, 16(2), 122-137.*

Tabachnick,B. (1989). Needed for teacher education: Naturalistic research that is culturally responsive. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 2(1), 12-29.*

Thies-Sprintall,L. (1980). Supervision: An educative or miseducative process. *Journal of Teacher Education, 31(4), 17-21.*

Thies-Sprintall,L. (1984). Promoting the developmental growth of supervising teachers: Theory, research, programs and implications. *Journal of Teacher Education, 35(3), 53-60.*

Thies-Sprintall,L. (1986). A collaborative approach for mentor training - a working model. *Journal of Teacher Education, 37(6), 13-20.*

Thursby,P. (1980). An extended practice teaching program: Preparing art teachers. In W. Newman and B.Arkins,(Eds.). *The role of school experiences in teacher education: Recent trends and future developments.* Collected Papers of a National Conference on the Practicum. Armidale College of Advanced Education.

Tinning,K. (1984). The student teaching experience: All that glitters is not gold. Australian Journal of Teaching Practice, 4(2), 25-32.

Tisher,R. (1987a). *A decade of research on teacher education in Australia* Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Washington, DC, April.

Tisher,R. (1987b). Australian research on the practicum during the last decade. *South Pacific Journal of Teacher Education, 15(1), 82-91.*

Tittle,C. (1974). *Student teaching: Attitude and research bases for change in school and university.* New Jersey: Methuen, Scarecrow Press.

Tomlinson,P. (1995). *Understanding mentoring. Reflective strategies for school-based teacher preparation.* Open University Press, Buckingham.

Tripp,D. (1990). The ideology of educational research. *Discourse, 10(2), 51-74.*

Tripp,D, (1993). *Critical incidents in teaching: Developing professional judgement.* London: Routledge.

Turney,C.,Clift,J.,Dunkin,M. & Traill, (1973). *Microteaching: Research, theory and practice.* Sydney University Press.

Turney,C. (1977). *Innovation in teacher education: A study of the directions, processes and problems of innovation in teacher preparation.* Sydney: Sydney University Press.

Turney,C. (1989). Progress in Australian teacher education: Integration and disintegration. *South Pacific Journal of Teacher Education, 17(1), 2-13.*

Turney,C.,Cairns,L.,Eltis,K.,Hatton,N.,Thew,D. & Towler,J. (1982). *The practicum in teacher education: Research , practice and supervision.* Sydney: University Press.

Turney,C,.Cairns,L.,Eltis,K.,Hatton,N.,Thew,D.,Towler,J. &Wright,R. (1982). *Supervisor Development Programmes, Role Handbook.* Sydney University Press.

Turney,C.,Eltis,K.,Towler,J. & Wright,R. (1985). *A new basis for teacher education: The practicum curriculum.* Sydney: Sydmac Academic Press.

Van Dalen,D. (1966). *Understanding educational research.* New York: McGraw-Hill.

Veenmans,S. (1984). Perceived problems of beginning teachers. *Review of Educational Research. 54(2), 143-178.*

Watts,D. (1987). Student teaching. In M.Haberman & J.Backus, (Eds.). *Advances in teacher education.* Norwood, New Jersey: J Ablex. 151-167.

Weiss,S. (1993). What should teachers know and be able to do? *NEA Today, 11 (7) 3.*

Westwood,P. (1987). Teacher effectiveness and process product research: Another look. *South Pacific Journal of Teacher Education, 15(2), 1-17.*

Wheeler,P. (1989). *Cooperating teachers as instructional supervisors: Student teachers' perceptions of training effects.* Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco.

Whitaker,K. &Moses,M (1988). Does learning theory influence teaching practices? *European Journal of Teacher Education, 11(2), 143-146.*

Whitty,G.,Barrett,E.,Barton,L.,Furlong,J.,Galvin,C. & Miles,S. (1992).

Initial teacher education in England and Wales: A survey of current practices and concerns. *Cambridge Journal of Education, 22(3), 152-170.*

Wilkin,M. (1992a). The challenge of diversity. *Cambridge Journal of Education, 22(3), 307-320.*

Wilkin,M. (1992b). On the cusp: From supervision to mentoring in initial teacher training. *Cambridge Journal of Education, 22(1), 80-83.*

Williams,E. (1993). *Roles and responsibilities in initial teacher training - students' views.* University of Birmingham, Unpublished MIMEO.

Williams,E.,Butt,G. &Soares,A. (1992). Student perceptions of a secondary post graduate certificate of education course. *Journal of Education forTeaching, 18(3), 297-309.*

Wilson,R. (1979). Community involvement: Is anything really happening?

Radical Education Dossier, 9, 12-21

Wilson,S. & Cameron,R. (1996). Student teacher perceptions of effective teaching: A developmental perspective. *Journal of Education for Teaching, 22(2), 181-195.*

Winnicott,D. (1971). *Playing and reality.* London: Tavistock Press.

Woods,P. (1985). Sociology, ethnography and teacher practice, *Teaching and Teacher Education, 2(4), 51-62.*

Wubbels,T & Korthagen,F. (1990). The effects of a pre-service teacher Education program for the preparation of reflective teachers. *Journal of Education for Teaching, 16(2), 29-43.*

Yarrow,A. (Ed.) (1992). *Teaching role of supervision in the practicum: Cross faculty perspectives.* Brisbane: Queensland University of Technology.

Yates,J. (1981). Student teaching: Results of a recent survey. *Educational Research, 32(5), 44-47.*

Yee,A. (1967). *The student teaching triad: The relationship of attitudes among student teachers, college supervisors and cooperating teachers.* Austin , Texas. University of Texas College.

Zahorik,J. (1988). Observing - conferencing role of university supervisors.. *Journal of Teacher Education, 39(2), 9-16.*

Zeichner,K. (1983). Alternative paradigms of teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education, 34(3), 3-9.*

Zeichner,K. (1986a). The practicum as an occasion for learning to teach. *South Pacific Journal of Teacher Education, 14(2), 12-25.*

Zeichner,K. (1986b). Content and contexts: Neglected elements in studies of student teaching as an occasion to teach. *Journal of Education for Teaching, 12(1), 5-25.*

Zeichner,K. (1989). *Promising directions in research on the practicum.* Paper presented at 4th National Conference on the Practicum in Teacher Education, Rockhampton: Queensland.

Zeichner,K. (1990). Changing directions in the practicum: Looking ahead to the 1990s. *Journal of Education for Teaching, 16(2), 105-126.*

Zeichner,K. (1992). Rethinking the practicum in the professional development school partnership. *Journal of Teacher Education, 43(4), 296-307.*

Zeichner,K. & Liston,D.P. (1987). Teaching student teachers to reflect. *Harvard Educational Review, 57(1), 23-48.*

Zeichner,K. & Tabachnick,B. (1982). Belief systems of university supervisors in an elementary student teaching program. *Journal of Education for Teaching, 8(2), 35-54.*

Zeichner,K. & Teitlebaum,K. (1982). Personalized and enquiry oriented Teacher education: An analysis of two approaches to the development of curriculum for field- based experiences. *Journal of Education for Teaching, 8(2), 95-117.*

Zey,M. (1984). Local and cosmopolitan orientations of faculty: Implications for teaching. *Journal of Teaching in Sociology, 12(1), 111-117.*

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. & Rieger,S. (1988). Mentoring teachers: What are the issues? *Theory into Practice 27(3), 5-17.*

Zumwalt,K. (1991). Alternative routes to teaching: Three alternative approaches, *Journal of Teacher Education, 42(2), 83-92*

APPENDICES.

APPENDIX 1.

STUDENT TEACHERS, PRACTISING SCHOOLS AND DISCIPLINE AREAS

ST1	DULWICH HILL SECONDARY SCHOOL .	HISTORY/GEOGRAPHY
ST2	DULWICH HILL SECONDARY SCHOOL.	SCIENCE
ST3	DULWICH HILL SECONDARY SCHOOL.	SOCIAL SCIENCE.
ST4	J.J. CAHILL, HIGH SCHOOL.	ENGLISH/HISTORY.
ST5	J.J. CAHILL, HIGH SCHOOL.	ENGLISH/HISTORY.
ST6	NEWTOWN SCHOOL FOR THE PERFORMING ARTS.	ENGLISH/HISTORY.

APPENDIX 2.

UNIVERSITY OF SYDNEY.

FACULTY OF EDUCATION.

PARTICIPANT CONSENT FORM.

I,.....

OF.....

HAVE READ AND UNDERSTOOD THE INFORMATION FOR PARTICIPANTS IN THE RESEARCH ON ROLES AND RELATIONSHIPS IN THE PRACTICUM AND HAVE DISCUSSED IT.....

SIGNATURE.

I AM AWARE OF THE PROCEDURES IN THE STUDY, AND FREELY CHOOSE TO PARTICIPATE IN THIS STUDY AND UNDERSTAND THAT I CAN WITHDRAW AT ANY TIME.

I ALSO UNDERSTAND THAT THE RESEARCH STUDY IS STRICTLY CONFIDENTIAL.

I HEREBY AGREE TO PARTICIPATE IN THIS RESEARCH STUDY.

NAME.....

SIGNATURE.....

DATE.....

WITNESS.....

APPENDIX 3

UNIVERSITY OF SYDNEY.

FACULTY OF EDUCATION.

DOCTORATE IN EDUCATION RESEARCH PROGRAM. ALAN LINNELL.

RESEARCH STATEMENT.

THANK YOU FOR OFFERING TO ASSIST ME IN MY RESEARCH INTO THE PRACTICUM SEGMENT OF THE TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAM CONDUCTED AT THE UNIVERSITY OF SYDNEY, WITHIN THE FACULTY OF EDUCATION.

I AM INTERVIEWING A SMALL GROUP OF THIRD YEAR BACHELOR OF EDUCATION STUDENTS, THEIR COOPERATING TEACHERS AND THEIR UNIVERSITY SUPERVISORS TO ASCERTAIN THE ROLES AND RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN MEMBERS OF THIS TRIAD IN RELATION TO POSSIBLE CHANGES TO THE FORMAT OF THE PRACTICUM.

INDIVIDUAL INTERVIEWS WILL TAKE APPROXIMATELY 30 MINUTES OF YOUR TIME, AND STRICT CONFIDENTIALITY WILL BE MAINTAINED THROUGHOUT THE INVESTIGATION. FOR EASE OF RECORDING RESPONSES, I TRUST THAT YOU WILL ALLOW ME TO USE A TAPE RECORDER. ALL RESPONSES WILL BE PLAYED BACK TO THE INTERVIEWEE SHOULD THEY SO DESIRE.

THERE IS NO COMPULSION WHATSOEVER TO ANSWER PARTICULAR QUESTIONS OR CONTINUE IN THE INTERVIEW.
MY SINCERE THANKS, AGAIN, FOR AGREEING TO PARTICIPATE.

Alan

ALAN.

31 MAY 1995.

APPENDIX 4 INTERVIEW SCHEDULES.

APPENDIX 4 (a)

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE FOR THE STUDENT TEACHER:

1. ABOUT THE SUPERVISOR.

1.1 How do you see the role of the supervisor?

1.2 What sort of relationship would you like to have with this person?

1.3 What happens when your supervisor visits you?

1.4 How do you deal with any differences that emerge between your own views of the process of teaching and learning and those of your supervisor?

2. ABOUT THE COOPERATING TEACHER RESPONSIBLE FOR YOU.

2.1 What role would you like the Cooperating Teacher to play?

2.2 What sort of relationship would you like to have with this person?

2.3 What has the teacher done in helping you to prepare lessons, in visiting your classes and in discussing them with you?

2.4 How does your teacher react when your supervisor visits you?

2.5 How do you deal with any differences that emerge between your own views of the process of teaching and learning and those of your cooperating teacher?

3. ABOUT THE SYSTEM.

3.1 If the practice teaching period was extended to 10 - 12 weeks continuous in-school experience, would you support the change?

3.2 If this idea was developed, you would be expected to

become more closely linked with a particular school, do you see any advantage in this?

3.3 Are there any shortcomings in this idea (in your opinion)

3.4 Schools would be expected to develop closer relationships with Faculties of Education. Would you support this? It could lead to less time in the lecture situation in professional studies. What are your views on this?

4.5 The cooperating teacher would become a mentor with far greater responsibility towards you as a student. This could include assessment responsibility. What are your views on this innovation?

APPENDIX 4 (b)

UNIVERSITY OF SYDNEY.

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE FOR THE UNIVERSITY SUPERVISOR.

1. ABOUT YOU AND THE STUDENT

1.1 How would you characterize your relationship with your students?
How would you like your students to view your visits?

1.2 Do you have an agreed agenda for supervisory visits which is known to the student teacher in advance?

1.3 Students often say that regardless of your attitude to the supervisory process, you represent a mark. What are your comments to this?

1.4 How do you deal with any differences that emerge between your own views of the process of teaching and learning and those of the student?

2. ABOUT THE COOPERATING TEACHER.

2.1 Is there liaison between you and the cooperating teacher responsible for the student before the practice?

2.2 How does the role of the cooperating teacher differ from your own role?
In what ways do they complement each other?

2.3 How do you think the cooperating teacher regards your visits?
How would you like them to consider them?

3. ABOUT THE SYSTEM.

3.1 If the practice period was extended in duration to 12 weeks continuous in-school experience, would you support th

3.2 If the Faculty developed the notion of partnership with particular schools, you would be expected to become more closely linked with that school throughout the

the school year. Do you see advantages or disadvantages in this innovation?

3.3 Cooperating teachers would take a new role as mentors, and would have greater responsibility including assessment duties. Would you support this?

3.4 The mentors would have to attend inservice courses led by persons such as yourself, where carefully structured programs would be delivered. Do you think that this is a good idea?

3.5 There would also be a need for academic staff to attend in-service workshops to be aware of the requirements of the partnership and mentoring. Would you be prepared to attend?

3.6 In the British Model of Partnership academic staff are expected to return to teach in the classroom themselves, every five years, for a short period of time. Should such a system be introduced here?

APPENDIX 4 (c)

UNIVERSITY OF SYDNEY.

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE FOR THE COOPERATING TEACHER.

1. ABOUT YOU.

1.1 How do see your present role as far as the student teacher is concerned?

1.2 How much freedom do you give the student in lesson preparation?

1.3 Why do you agree to supervise student teachers?

1.4 How would you describe the ideal relationship between you and the student?

2. ABOUT THE STUDENT.

2.1 How would you deal with any differences that emerge between your own view of the process of teaching and learning and those of the student?

3. ABOUT THE SUPERVISOR.

3.1 How do you see the current role of the university supervisor;

a) in preparing the student for teaching practice;
b) in supervising them on practice?

3.2 What sort of relationship would you most like to exist between you and the supervisor?

4. ABOUT THE SYSTEM.

4.1 If the practice teaching period was extended in duration to 10 -12 weeks continuous in-school experience, would you support the change?

become more closely linked with a particular school, do you see any advantage in this?

3.3 Are there any shortcomings in this idea (in your opinion)

3.4 Schools would be expected to develop closer relationships with Faculties of Education. Would you support this? It could lead to less time in the lecture situation in professional studies. What are your views on this?

4.5 The cooperating teacher would become a mentor with far greater responsibility towards you as a student. This could include assessment responsibility. What are your views on this innovation?