DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 240 105 SP 023 812

AUTHOR O'Neal, Sharon F.
TITLE Developing Effective Instructional Planning and Decision-Making Skills: Are We Training Teachers or Technicians?
INSTITUTION Texas Univ., Austin. Research and Development Center for Teacher Education.
REPORT NO RDCTE-9046
PUB DATE Mar 83
NOTE 38p.
PUB TYPE Information Analyses (070)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Classroom Research; *Cooperating Teachers; *Decision Making; Higher Education; *Instructional Development; Lesson Plans; Preservice Teacher Education; *Student Teacher Relationship; *Student Teachers; Student Teacher Supervisors, Teacher Attitudes; Teaching Experience

ABSTRACT

A review of research on teacher decision making and planning outlines findings on teachers' judgments and classification of students, development of lesson plans, and decisions made while actively involved in instruction. Findings from a major study on student teaching are discussed as they apply to teacher decision making. Because the classroom experience is the student teacher's first exposure to instructional judgments, planning, and decision making, review of the study findings focused on the nature of that experience. Analysis was made of audiotaped conferences between cooperating teachers and their student teachers, individual interviews, and personal journals. Descriptions are given of supervisory conferences as well as the participants' perceptions of feedback; these perceptions were then compared to actual supervisory incidences. Findings indicated that student teachers participated little in supervisory conferences and took a minor role in instructional planning and decision making. Recommendations are made for teacher training programs to acquaint student teachers and their cooperating teahers with a variety of models for planning. (JD)

Research and Development Center for Teacher Education

The University of Texas at Austin

Austin, Texas 78712

DEVELOPING EFFECTIVE INSTRUCTIONAL PLANNING AND DECISION-MAKING SKILLS: ARE WE TRAINING TEACHERS OR TECHNICIANS?

Sharon F. O'Neal

Report No. 9046

Research in Teacher Education Division

Gary A. Griffin, Program Director and Principal Investigator

March 1983

DEVELOPING EFFECTIVE INSTRUCTIONAL PLANNING AND DECISION-MAKING SKILLS: ARE WE TRAINING TEACHERS OR TECHNICIANS?

Introduction

Extended observations in 40 or more classrooms over the past two years have shown me that even in highly constrained classroom environments, where curriculum is mandated and monitored, instructional decision making is a part of every teacher's day-to-day existence. Many educational researchers would agree and have pointed out that the most important teaching skill is decision making (Shulman & Elstein, 1975; Yinger, 1982' Shavelson, 1983).

In an effort to shed new light on work in the area of teachers' instructional decisions and on the importance of that field's impact on teacher education this paper will (1) review the state of the art of research and work on teacher decision making and planning, (2) discuss findings from a major study on student teaching as they apply to teacher decision making, and finally (3) provide suggestions for teacher education. This paper draws from two data sources; literature in the area of teacher decision making and a major investigation of student teaching. The purpose of this paper is to use both sources of information to provide the reader with recommendations for the training and supervision of student teachers.

Research in Teacher Decision Making: The State of the Art

Perhaps the most comprehensive review of research in the area of teacher decision making is Richard Shavelson's "Review of Research on Teachers' Pedagogical Judgments, Plans and Decisions' (1983). Investigations reviewed by Shavelson reveal that teacher decisions occur at three different points in time. First, at some point teachers judge and classify students, as well as materials. Such judgments may be based on information about students' previous performance on achievement tests and subsequently provide the basis

for the formation of ability based reading groups. At another point, teachers plan for instruction by formulating a course of action, more commonly known as developing lesson plans. Finally, teachers make decisions while actively involved in instruction. These decisions are made on a daily basis as teachers go about the business of teaching. Some of the major findings associated with these three areas of instructional decision making follow.

With regard to teachers' judgments, research shows the following:

1. Teachers tend to rely heavily on achievement data and information about problematic behavior when making judgments about students. (Borko, Note 1; Russo, Note 2; Shavelson, et al., 1977)
2. Teachers are fairly accurate at estimating students' intelligence and achievement levels. (Borko, Note 1; Russo, Note 2; Shavelson, et al., 1977)
3. Teachers are fairly inaccurate at predicting students' interests. (Byers & Evans, Note 3)
4. Teachers are not consistent among themselves when making judgments about the diagnosis and remediation of students. (Gil, Note 4; Vinsonhaler, Note 5)

Findings from studies dealing with teacher planning reveal the following:

1. Teachers are trained to plan by specifying behavioral objectives, noting entry behaviors, selecting and sequencing learning activities and finally evaluating outcomes. Studies show, however, that teachers rarely begin instructional planning at the "objective" level. (Doyle, Note 6; Yinger, 1982)
2. Teachers' most frequently made planning decision related to

pupil activities. In addition, the most frequent decision made first has to do with content. (Zahorick, 1975)

3. Teachers at the beginning of the year set forth plans that guide subsequent planning for the year. (Joyce, 1978, 1979)

Finally, research on teachers' interactive decision making found that:

1. Teachers' plans serve as mental "scripts". This guides their interactive teaching. Major changes in this script rarely occur during active instruction. (Shavelson & Stern, 1981; Joyce, 1978, 1979; Zahorick, 1970)
2. Teachers main concern during active teaching is to maintain a "flow" of instruction. (Joyce, 1978, 1979; Shavelson , 1976)
3. Teachers reporting that their teaching went as planned were associated with high student achievement. (Zahorick,1970)

The next section of this paper will detail findings from a major research effort into the student teaching experience. It is hoped that the findings from the research noted above, coupled with the knowledge of the student teaching experience will contribute to the formulation of active plans for the preservice experience.

Research In Preservice Teacher Education: One Perspective

A major research investigation of preservice clinical teacher education, or student teaching, was conducted during the fall of 1981 by the Research in Teacher Education (RITE) program division of the Research and Development Center for Teacher Education (Griffin, et al., Note 7). The overall purpose of the study was to describe the student teaching experience in detail. Three major questions were addressed in this research effort.

1. How do personal, professional, and demographic characteristics of the cooperating teachers, the student teachers, and the

university supervisors impact on the student teaching experience?

2. How do the formal and informal institutional contexts influence the student teaching experience?
3. What is the nature of the classroom experience in the preservice clinical setting?

Because the classroom experience is the student teachers' experience with instructional judgments, planning and decision making, the discussion of the student teaching study will be limited to the last question.

To answer this question it was necessary to describe in detail the nature of the feedback student teachers received regarding their performance from their cooperating teachers. If, as educational researchers and practitioners contend, educational decision making is a crucial teaching skill (Shavelson, 1973), then the supervision of student teachers must be, to a large degree, the supervision of student teachers as they make instructional judgments, formulate instructional plans and make decisions during instruction.

Data were collected from two sites. Two universities and three school districts were involved. At each site university supervisors, principals and others were asked to identify 10 effective cooperating teachers. These cooperating teachers (10 at each site) and the student teachers and university supervisors with whom they worked composed an "intensive" sample (20 cooperating teachers, 20 student teachers, 9 university supervisors).

The intensive sample was drawn in order to gain more comprehensive data from a group of 196 participants. Data sources included nine quantitative instruments, journals, supervisory conferences, interviews, classroom observations, and university documents.

The major data sources for this report were audiotaped conferences between cooperating teachers and their student teachers, individual interviews and personal journals. The audiotaped conferences provided an accurate picture of actual supervisory situations, while journals and interviews tapped the participants' perceptions of supervision. Together, both data sources provided the research team with the most complete picture of the supervision of student teachers. More specific information regarding data collection and analyses is contained in Preservice Teacher Education: A Final Report (Griffin, et al., Note 7).

Supervision of Student Teachers

To describe the supervision of teachers in training as they make instructional decisions, 76 audiotapes of supervisory conferences conducted by cooperating teachers and their student teachers were analyzed.

Conference tapes were first transcribed and then coded using a variation of Weller's (1971) MOSAIC system of analysis. This coding system was developed to provide information about the process and the content of the conferences. In terms of process, the coding focused upon describing the exchange of information between the cooperating teacher and the student teacher. Who did the talking, to whom the talk was directed, and what type of talking occurred were described. In terms of content, the nature of the topics discussed in the conferences was examined. Three major categories were included under content: "teaching," "organization of student teaching," and "other." A summary of all categories and examples are provided in Supervision of Student Teachers: Feedback and Evaluation (O'Neal, Note 8). An overview of the analysis of the conference data is provided in Figure 1.

Process data for all conferences were collapsed. Mean frequencies and percentages were used to describe these conferences. Frequencies were derived

Figure 1

Coding Categories Used in the

Analysis of Conference Data

Number of Lines	Process			Content														Appl
				Teaching											Organization of Teaching			
				Generality		Focus				Domain								
	Who	Type	Direction	Classroom-Specific	General	Objectives	Methods and Materials	Execution and Instructional Interactions	Other	Cognitive	Affec...	Social-Disciplinary	Other		Student Teaching Protocol	Student Teaching Activities		

from the number of typed lines contained within each statement. A statement was defined as one participant's turn in the conversation and may therefore have contained information about more than one topic.

As the data in Table 1 indicate, across all conferences, cooperating teachers tended to dominate the interactions. A mean total of 330.45 lines of type were transcribed for each conference. Of these 330 lines, cooperating teachers spoke approximately 72% of them, while student teachers uttered 28% of the total lines.

Nine categories were used to describe the type of talk that occurred. Data describing the type of talk are displayed in Table 2. When examining the cooperating teachers' talk, the most frequently occurring type was "review". More specifically the cooperating teacher was coded as interacting by reviewing or commenting on classroom events or student teaching activities more often than any other type of interaction. For example one cooperating teacher reviewed the following incident for a student teacher.

> "I had a little girl two years ago who was partially blind ... her mother came up and registered her and didn't say a thing."

When examining the mean total of typed lines, the cooperating teachers reviewed or commented on classroom events in approximately 37% of these lines. The second most frequently occurring type of teacher interactive behavior was "direction giving". Cooperating teachers gave their student teachers specific directions regarding instruction in approximately 21% of typed lines. For example, one cooperating teacher explained the following to her student teacher.

> "The language unit you are going to be working on will be dictionary skills."

Table 1

Cooperating Teacher-Student Teacher

Conference "Talk"

	Cooperating Teacher	Student Teacher	Total
Mean Number of Lines* per Conference	229.86	100.59	330.45
Mean Percentage of Talk by Participant per Conference	71.89	28.11	100.00

* "Lines" refers to the typed lines of a transcribed conference. An average count of 12 words appeared in each typed line of conference data.

Table 2
Process Data From Cooperating Teacher-
Student Teacher Conferences

		Type of Comment								
		** 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Cooperating Teacher	Mean Frequency of Occurrence	46	12.01	15.56	81.91	16.79	23.41	6.03	*	26.86
	Mean Percentage	21.20	7.24	8.29	35.79	5.95	10.17	2.79	*	7.36
Student Teacher	Mean Frequency of Occurrence	*	*	1.88	20.95	*	15.68	19.76	7.70	23.32
	Mean Percentage	*	*	4.35	32.41	*	18.65	23.50	9.12	9.86

* Blank cells indicate that the code was not used for that participant.

** Types of comments:
1. Gives directions
2. Asks about interests
3. Provides evaluative feedback
4. Reviews or comments on classroom events or student teaching events
5. Provides options
6. Describes interests and concerns
7. Acknowledgement
8. Offers suggestions
9. Other

The least frequently occurring type of cooperating teacher statement was "acknowledgement or endorsement". This type of statement contained little information and consisted of the teacher providing his/her partner with a remark such as "yes", "right", "fine", etc. Cooperating teachers' typed lines were classified as acknowledgements in approximately 3% of their statements.

On the other hand, student teachers' statements were classified as acknowledgements in almost 24% of tneir typed lines. However, student teachers proved to be like their cooperating teachers in that when they participated in an interaction, the majority of their talk focused on classroom events. Approximately 32% of the student teachers' statements dealt with the review of classroom events or student teaching activities. The least frequently occurring type of student teacher interactions were those coded as "evaluation". An example of an evaluation statement by a student teacher follows.

"I feel good about the way the students are working independently at my spelling center. Children need to learn how to work on their own."

In addition to classifying conference information as to the process of the interaction, conference statements were also analyzed with regard to what was said. Table 3 summarizes content information across all conferences and all participants. Three categories were included under content: "teaching," "organization of student teaching" and "not applicable." Each conference statement was classified in terms of one or more of these categories. As the data in Table 3 indicate, the majority of all conferences focused on teaching as opposed to the organization of student teaching. The teaching category included all talk dealing with the classroom teaching experience. For

Table 3
Content Data From Cooperating Teacher/
Student Teacher Conferences--All Participants

	Teaching	Organization of Student Teaching	Not Applicable
All Participants (i.e., Cooperating Teachers and Student Teachers)	*79.11%	18.42%	8.12%

*Percentages equal more than 100% because the "Teaching" category and the "Organization of Student Teaching" category were not mutually exclusive.

example, if a cooperating teacher said the following to his/her student teacher it would be classified as a teaching remark.

> "I noticed during your lesson that students were responding without raising their hands."

The organization of student teaching category referred to the training and supervision of the student teachers. An example of a statement coded under this category follows.

> "Before I observe your teaching I will always meet with you for a concerns conference ... at this conference you should be prepared to tell me what you want me to focus on during my observation."

On the average, 79.11% of each conference focused on teaching while 18.42% focused on the organization of student teaching.

Table 4 summarizes content information across all conferences by participant. As is evident from the data displayed in Table 4, when cooperating teachers' and student teachers' talk was examined separately no substantial differences were noted.

For the most part, talk about teaching events occurred most often. In approximately 80% of all statements cooperating teachers focused on teaching events. Approximately 75% of the student teachers' statements dealt with teaching. In addition the teaching category was broken down into three subcategories; "generality", "focus", and "domain". Codings under the generality category indicated whether the teaching events discussed were specific to the immediate classroom and student teaching experience or were more general in nature. These more general statements might include information about past experiences or the application of theory from educational thought or related behavioral sciences. Weller (1971) stated that

Table 4

Content Data From Cooperating Teacher/

Student Teacher Conference by Participants

	Teaching	Organization of Student Teaching	Other
Cooperating Teacher	*80.06%	18.33%	7.61%
Student Teacher	74.53%	20.00%	10.17%

*Percentages equal more than 100% because the "Teaching" category and the "Organization of Student Teaching" category were not mutually exclusive.

this might be considered "clinical analysis" vs. "the curriculum and methods course." An example of a specific statement made by a cooperating teacher to a student teacher follows.

> "Explain that they need to bring a piece of paper to the spelling center."

A general statement, however, would be as follows:

> "Research says that it helps if you state your expectations at the beginning of the lesson."

The focus category analyzed interactions for information dealing with instructional content and objectives, methods and materials, or the actual execution of the lesson. Statements coded as instructional content and objectives dealt with expected educational outcomes and/or the subject matter related to those outcomes. For example, a teacher's statement would be coded as instructional content and objectives if he/she said the following:

> "They are going to write, 'Is the cow purple?' instead of 'The cow is purple.'"

Statements coded as methods and materials dealt with the materials of instruction and/or those strategic operations designed to achieve objectives. An example of one of these "how to" statements follows.

> "Just go through and review them at that point ... then take them through the word cards one at a time."

The subcategory, execution of lessons, focused on instructional interactions between the teacher, pupils and content or curriculum. An example of a statement coded as this subcategory follows.

> "What I was trying to get them to do was write their answers in complete sentences but half the class never seemed to understand. I guess I'd better go back over this."

The third category determined what domain the instructional interaction focused upon (i.e. cognitive, affective, or social/disciplinary).

The dimension of instructional domain was adapted from Bloom (Bloom, et al., 1956). Typed lines coded as pertaining to the cognitive domain focused on cognition, knowledge, understanding and learning. The cognitive domain was here restricted to cognitive interactions between pupils and subject matter. For example the following statement was coded as pertaining to the cognitive domain.

> "I'm going to put a check-sheet up so they can check off when they've done each set of questions."

Typed lines pertaining to the affective domain focused on pupil interest, involvement and motivation. Typed lines coded as dealing with the affective domain follow.

> (cooperating teacher speaking to student teacher about a certain pupil's behavior): "She was a non-volunteer and you encouraged her by saying 'Don't be nervous' and 'Very good.'"

When typed lines were coded as pertaining to discipline, control and social interactions they may have resembled the following statement.

> "I think there should be a time limit or some people would spend an hour at the spelling center. They should be limited to four at a time."

As the data in Table 5 indicate, all participants tended to be highly specific when discussing teaching events. Typed lines were specific in approximately 91% of all statements dealing with teaching events. In addition, most teaching interactions focused on the methods and materials of instruction. Approximately 49% of each conference focused on the methods and materials of the teaching event, approximately 28% of each conference focused

Table 5

Content Data from Cooperating Teacher/Student Teacher Conferences Dealing with Teaching - Mean Number of Typed Lines and Percentages for All Participants*

		Generality		Focus				Domain			
		1*	2	1**	2	3	4	1***	2	3	4
All Participants i.e., Cooperating Teachers and Student Teachers	Mean Frequency of Occurrence	211.06	31.83	41.42	126.23	63.36	12.41	155.32	6.86	58.91	22.14
	Mean Percentage	90.71	9.29	18.45	49.20	27.53	5.12	69.14	3.41	21.42	6.12

ote that percentages may not total to 100 due to rounding error.

ategories
1. specific statements
2. general statements

* 1. content and objectives
2. materials and methods
3. execution
4. other

** 1. cognitive
2. affective
3. social/disciplinary
4. other

on instructional interactions and execution, while 18% of the conference time was devoted to the content and objectives of the teaching events being discussed. Under 6% of the data in this area dealt with a different focus than those stipulated. When the third subcategory, domain, was examined, mean frequencies indicated that cooperating teachers and student teachers tended to be most concerned with the cognitive domain. Concerns with the cognitive domain were addressed more often in instructional conversations dealing with teaching events than the other dimensions of instructional domain (i.e. affective and social/disciplinary). Talk dealing with the cognitive domain dominated 69% of the teaching event statements whereas approximately 21% of all teaching conversations addressed social/disciplinary concerns. The least frequently addressed area within instructional domains was the affective domain. Only 6% of the teaching event statements dealt with concerns in the affective domain.

Data were also categorized by participant. Student teachers and cooperating teachers were not substantially different when the content of their teaching statements were examined. For example, both cooperating teachers' and student teachers' statements about teaching were most often specific in nature. In addition, both participants' statements focused for the most part upon the methods and materials of teaching.

In addition to examining the content of the cooperating teacher-student teacher conversations in terms of teaching, these conversations were also examined for talk about the organization of the student teaching experience. All statements that referred to the training and supervision of the student teacher were included in this category and were coded in terms of "protocol" and "activities".

Protocol included all information about the structure, formal procedures, and the administration of student teaching. For example, one cooperating teacher said the following to her student teacher in reference to a university-provided list of requirements for student teaching:

> "Sending and escorting children to special classes, you are doing that. Continue recording needs and accomplishments of children, saving examples of writing. You need to do that."

Activities included all information about events in which the student teacher participated. These events might include observations, preparation of projects for methods classes, and/or the scheduling of teaching times. The following statement, made by a student teacher, was coded as pertaining to student teaching activities:

> "On Thursday I have a seminar. I'll ask (supervisor) about an observation time then since she didn't get to me this week."

Table 6 summarizes the conference data categorized as dealing with the organization of teaching.

As the data in Table 6 indicate, when the organization of student teaching was addressed, participants usually focused on the protocols of student teaching. Approximately 81% of the typed lines dealing with the organization of student teaching were devoted to the protocols of student teaching. The activities of student teaching were discussed in 13% of these typed lines.

When the content of the student teachers' and the cooperating teachers' conversations were examined individually a similar pattern emerged. Again individual participants did not vary from the pattern established by the group as a whole. For the most part, cooperating teachers and student teachers spent the majority of time, when discussing the organization of student

Table 6
Content Data from Cooperating Teacher/Student Teacher Conferences Dealing with the Organization of Student Teaching - Mean Numbers of Typed Lines and Percentages for All Participants

		Activities	Protocol
All Participants (i.e., Cooperating Teachers and Student Teachers	Mean Frequency of Occurrence Per Conference	6.80*	48.24
	Mean Percentages Per Conference	13.29	80.64

*Note that percentages do not add to 100% because they are the averages for all conferences; i.e., each conference contributed equally to the average regardless of each conference's duration.

teaching, focusing on the protocols involved. Cooperating teachers focused on protocols in approximately 80% of their statements dealing with the organization of student teaching and student teachers focused on protocols in approximately 73% of their statements. In addition, cooperating teachers devoted around 12% of these statements to the activities themselves whereas student teachers spoke of the specific activities of student teaching in less than 11% of their teaching event conversations.

Thus, supervisory conferences were one avenue of feedback for student teachers. The following section will describe participants perceptions of supervision.

Participants' Perceptions of Supervision

Journal and interview data were examined to determine if participants' perceived supervision as it actually took place. If incongruities were found between what participants thought was occurring during supervision and what, in fact, did occur, implications for the training of those who supervise student teachers would be in order. All journal entries of the student teacher and the cooperating teacher were examined for any comments dealing with the supervision and evaluation of student teachers. Interviews, which were conducted with each member of the triad, were examined and any information dealing with feedback to the student teachers regarding their instructional decisions was extracted and analyzed.

Journals. Five categories were established to identify information contained in journals. These five categories are: (1) Background; (2) Teaching; (3) Supervision; (4) Goals, Expectations and Ideals; and, (5) Context. Trained coders classified information contained in journals according to these five categories. To obtain information with regard to

participants' perceptions of supervision and formative evaluation, category three, Supervision, was examined.

The information in the journals dealing with supervision was subdivided further. Data guided the development of these categories to avoid the forcing of information into a preconceived classification system. Percentages were derived from frequency counts of journal lines devoted to individual categories. Four general subcategories within supervision emerged: (1) Teaching; (2) Protocols of Student Teaching; (3) Personal Relationships; and, (4) Other.

Information coded as "teaching" dealt with all supervisory statements focusing on the performance of the student teacher and/or the pupils during classroom instruction. For example, the following cooperating teacher's journal statement was coded in the teaching category:

> "She (student teacher) seems to be doing an excellent job. The only criticism is that she has been cautious in trying new instructional techniques."

Journal information coded as "Protocols of Student Teaching" focused on comments dealing with the university's and school district's expectations for supervision of the student teacher. An example of a cooperating teacher's comment classified as protocol follows:

> "Tomorrow morning I'm teaching because the student teachers have their regular methods class (DUMB - in the middle of their all day assignment - they lose continuity).

The personal relationship category included all general statements regarding the association of the cooperating teacher and student teacher. The following statement was extracted from a student teacher's journal and exemplifies a comment coded in the personal relationship category.

"My cooperating teacher is great. She shows concern for me."

The data in Table 7 indicate that while cooperating teachers and university supervisors focused on teaching more than any other area, student teachers appeared to be more concerned with personal relationships. When cooperating teachers made comments, which were classified as dealing with supervision, 62.6% of their journal lines focused on teaching. Likewise, university supervisors comments dealing with supervision focused on teaching in 75.3% of their journal lines. Further examination of this category revealed that both cooperating teachers and university supervisors made general evaluative statements about the student teacher most often. Following these general statements their specific concerns dealt with the student teachers' ability to manage pupils' behavior, student teachers' lesson delivery and the student teachers' ability to write lesson plans.

When student teachers' journals were examined for comments dealing with supervision, 45.8% of their journal lines were devoted to general statements about their personal relationships with their cooperating teacher. On the other hand, cooperating teachers were least concerned with personal relationships. Only 8.6% of their journal lines dealing with supervision were devoted to the personal relationship with their student teacher. University supervisors were rarely concerned with the protocols of student teaching. Only 4.1% of their journal lines devoted to supervision dealt with protocols. Student teachers, like university supervisors, were seldom concerned with the protocols of student teaching. Approximately 20% of their journal lines dealing with supervision focused on the protocols of student teaching.

Interviews. In addition to examining journal data, interview data was also analyzed in an attempt to determine participants' supervisory concerns.

Table 7
Content Data from Journals
Percentage of Journal Lines Devoted to Topic
by Participant

	Teaching	Protocols of Student Teaching	Personal Relation-ships	Other
Cooperating Teachers	62.6%	21.1%	8.6%	7.9%
Student Teachers	24.3%	19.6%	45.8%	10.3%
University Supervisors	75.3%	4.1%	11.3%	9.3%

As with the journal data, interview questions and answers classified according to the same five categories: (1) Background; (2) Teaching; (3) Supervision; (4) Goals, Expectations and Ideals; and, (5) Context. The following section will explore the interview data found in the Supervision category and attempt to further determine participants' perceptions of supervision and formative evaluation. Again all three participants' (i.e., cooperating teachers', student teachers', university supervisors') concerns were reported.

Of the 20 student teachers who were asked whether or not they were satisfied with their student teaching experience, 18 reported yes, one said no and one did not choose to answer. When asked to express why they were satisfied with the experience 14 stated that their satisfaction was directly related to their cooperating teachers' experience and knowledge. Four explained satisfaction as a result of the context of the classroom situation (i.e., classroom size, resources available, and good students). In addition, 13 reported an "excellent" relationship with their cooperating teachers and 6 reported a "good" relationship with the cooperating teachers. These student teachers based this opinion, in part, on their cooperating teachers' supervisory skills. Such qualities as constructive criticism, high expectations, a willingness to share ideas and a collegial rapport were mentioned as reasons for these excellent and good relationships.

In addition cooperating teachers were asked to describe the major responsibilities associated with their roles. Cooperating teachers reported that they wanted to give the student teacher a "good experience." They defined a good experience as one in which the student teacher learned to be confident about her/his teaching through effective control of the classroom and effective teaching methodology. Cooperating teachers were asked to expand this notion of "effectiveness" and describe exactly what they focused on when

supervising the student teacher. Most mentioned lesson plans, time management, behavior management and material preparation. One cooperating teacher focused on what the students were learning.

Summary and Discussion

Previous sections in this report have described supervisory conferences of student teachers and their cooperating teachers as well as cooperating teachers' and student teachers' perceptions of feedback. Participants' perceptions, as previously reported, were gathered through journals and individual interviews. These perceptions will now be compared to actual supervisory incidences.

Cooperating teachers' perceptions of supervision and the formative evaluation of the student teacher appear somewhat consistent with what actually occurred in the supervisory conference. Cooperating teachers' journals reflected a concern for their student teachers' capabilities in behavior management, lesson planning and lesson delivery. When cooperating teachers were asked in interview situations what their primary responsibilities were, they said they wanted to guide student teachers into effective, competent instructors. This notion of effectiveness included competence in lesson planning, time management, behavior management and in material preparation.

When the content of conferences was examined it was noted that cooperating teachers were indeed interested in explaining to their student teacher how to teach. They commented most often on classroom teaching events. These comments were specific in nature, usually focusing on an immediate classroom situation. In addition cooperating teachers spoke of the materials and methods involved in teaching. When their comments were classified

according to instructional domain, it was noted that the cognitive domain was focused upon most often.

Therefore, in many ways the concerns of cooperating teachers, as noted throughout their individual journals and interviews, were reflected in the formative evaluation and supervision of their student teachers. In other ways, however, differences were noted. For example, cooperating teachers made evaluative remarks in their journals regarding their student teachers' performance in the classroom. During supervisory conferences however, few evaluative statements were found. Thus cooperating teachers appeared to be able to make judgments about their student teachers instructional capabilities but seemed unwilling to share these judgments.

Student teachers' concerns however were quite different a: l may not have coincided with what actually occurred during supervisory conferences. Both the journals and individual interviews of student teachers showed a dominant concern with personal and professional relationships with their cooperating teachers. While journal comments were, for the most part, of a general nature, the interviews provided more insight into what constituted a "good" relationship. Such supervisory skills as offering constructive criticism, establishing high expectations, a willingness to share materials and ideas and a collegial rapport were credited with having solidified the student teacher/cooperating teachers' relationship.

When the process of conferences was examined it was noted that student teachers rarely participated in most interactions. When they did participate, although 32% of their comments focused on classroom events, 24% of their comments were of an acknowledgement-type nature, (e.g., "yes," "OK," "fine," etc.). Such interactions might better typify a "teacher-student" relationship rather than one exemplifying collegiality. Because good personal

relationships were important to the student teacher it is possible that being "seen and not heard" in a conference was safer than making a substantial comment that might be viewed as incorrect or in direct disagreement with their cooperating teachers.

Implications for Teacher Training

The question now emerges: "How do findings from research in teacher planning and decision-making as well as findings from a major investigation into the supervision of student teachers impact teacher training programs?"

First, the study of the supervision of teachers in training indicated that student teachers participated little in supervisory conferences with their cooperating teachers. When they did participate they often only acknowledged what the cooperating teacher had said. In addition, findings from research in teachers planning indicate that a prescriptive model for planning (i.e., stating behavioral objectives, specifying students' entry behavior, selecting and sequencing learning activities and evaluation) is the one model most consistently taught in teacher education programs. However, the prescriptive model is not used by teachers when planning instruction. Shavelson (1982) attributes this mismatch to the differences between the prescriptive model and the demands of classroom instruction.

Therefore, the following conclusions emerge. Student teachers may not take an active role in instructional planning and decision-making even though their cooperating teachers view quality lesson plans as essential to instruction. In addition, the way student teachers are instructed to develop plans at their teacher training institutions may be in direct conflict with the "real world" of the classroom. Therefore one recommendation for teacher training programs is to acquaint student teachers and their cooperating teachers with a variety of models for planning. By providing alternatives,

those who supervise will have models which will meet the demands of the classroom as well as provide a schema for interacting with student teachers regarding instructional planning.

Secondly, findings from research in teacher planning indicate that teachers most frequently made planning decisions which were related to pupil activities. The study of the supervision of student teachers yielded a complimentary finding. When cooperating teachers were engaged in conferences with their student teachers they focused on the "how-to's" of instruction. Cooperating teachers most often shared specific methods and materials of instruction with their student teachers.

One could conclude from these findings that teachers view the activities of instruction and how they are organized as essential to effective teaching. Teacher training programs may therefore want to pay particular attention to quality instructional activities and their organization.

Lastly, the subject of evaluation is absent from supervisory conferences. Cooperating teachers rarely, if ever, explicitly mentioned evaluation of their students or their student teachers. Yet, cooperating teachers were willing to make evaluative remarks about their student teachers in their journals. Such results indicate that those who supervise student teachers may be competent in evaluation, but lack the necessary tools for communicating this information to their student teachers. Teacher training programs may therefore need to provide cooperating teachers with guidance in communicating evaluative remarks to their student teachers.

In addition, research findings show a lack of visible attention to evaluation procedures as teachers go about making instructional plans and decisions. Again such a void may be the result of a mismatch between the prescriptive model for planning (i.e., stating objectives, specifying

students' entry behavior, selecting and sequencing learning activities and evaluation) and the actual demands of the classroom. By providing teachers with alternative models, such as those suggested by Clark (Note 10), the evaluation issue could possibly be addressed. Also, workable planning models could provide the cooperating teacher with an objective starting point for providing their student teachers with evaluative feedback.

Concluding Remarks

More work is needed in the complex areas of teacher judgments, planning, and decision-making. How such knowledge applies to teacher training programs, and especially to classroom instruction, may be critical if we are to maintain classrooms where, as Maxine Greene (Note 9) said, we are "...releasing people to learn how to learn...and in time begin teaching themselves."

Reference Notes

1. Borko, H. An examination of some factors contributing to teachers' preinstructional classroom organization and management decisions. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Toronto, Ontario, 1978.
2. Russo, N.A. Capturing teachers' decision policies: An investigation of strategies for teaching reading and mathematics. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Toronto, Ontario, 1978.
3. Byers, J.L., & Evans, T.E. Using a lens-model analysis to identify factors in teaching judgment. Lansing, MI: Michigan State University, Institute for Research on Teaching, 1980.
4. Gil, D. The decision-making and diagnostic processes of classroom teachers. Lansing, MI: Michigan State University, Institute for Research on Teaching, 1980.
5. Vinsonhaler, J.T. The consistency of reading diagnosis. Lansing, MI: Michigan State University, Institute for Research on Teaching, 1979.
6. Doyle, W. Student mediating responses in teaching effectiveness: Final report. Denton, TX: North Texas State University, Department of Education, 1980.
7. Griffin, G., Barnes, S., Hughes, R., O'Neal, S., Defino, M., Edwards, S., & Hukill, H. Clinical preservice teacher education: Final report of a descriptive study. Austin, TX: The University of Texas at Austin, The Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, 1983.
8. O'Neal, S.F. Supervision of student teachers: Feedback and evaluation. Austin, TX: The University of Texas at Austin, The Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, 1983.

9. Greene, M. Student teaching as human project: Pursuing possibility in schools. In G. Griffin and S. Edwards (Eds.) Student teaching: Problems and promising practices. Austin, TX: The University of Texas at Austin, The Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, 1982.

10. Clark, C.M. Instructional planning and decision making. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, Detroit, Michigan, 1983.

References

Bloom, B.S., Engelhart, M.D., Furst, E.J., Hill, W.H., & Krathwohl, D.R. Taxonomy of Educational Objectives: Cognitive Domain. New York: Longmans, Green & Co., 1956.

Joyce, B. Toward a theory of information processing in teaching. Educational Research Quarterly, 1978-79, 3, 66-67.

Shavelson, R.J. What is the basic teaching skill? Journal of Teacher Education, 1973, 14, 14-151.

Shavelson, R.J. Teachers' decision making. In N.L. Gage (Ed.), The Psychology of Teaching Methods. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1976.

Shavelson, R.J., Atwood, N., & Borko, H. Experiments on some factors contributing to teachers' pedagogical decisions. Cambridge Journal of Education, 1977, 1, 51-70.

Shavelson, R.J., & Stern, P. Research on teachers' pedagogical thoughts, judgments, decisions and behavior. Review of Educational Research, 1981, 51, 455-498.

Shavelson, R.J. Review of research on teachers' pedagogical judgments, plans and decisions. The Elementary School Journal, 1983, 83(4), in press.

Shulman, L.S., & Elstein, A.S. Studies of problem-solving, judgment, and decision-making. Review of Research in Education, 1975, 3.

Weller, R.H. Verbal communication in instructional supervision. New York: Teachers College Press, 1971.

Yinger, R.J. A study of teacher planning. In W. Doyle and T. Good (Eds.), Focus on Teaching. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1982.

Zahorick, J.A. The effect of planning on teaching. Elementary School Journal, 1970, 3, 143-151.

Zahorick, J.A. Teachers' planning models. Educational Leadership, 1975, 33, 134-139.