ABSTRACT
        The lack of clear consensus among cooperating
teachers and university advisors about expectations for the student
teacher role ties in closely with the confusion that currently exists
about the respective supervisory roles. Student teaching continues in
many programs to be structured around the traditional triad which has
been characterized as lacking clear agreement about the roles played
by each member. This paper reports a Canadian replication of American
(1964-1971) research seeking to clarify role expectations for the
student teaching triad. Subjects were classroom teachers, students
enrolled in a teacher training program at the University of British
Columbia, and the university faculty who act as field advisors.
Results of the study revealed that while the advisors in the American
study felt that cooperating teachers should not inform student
teachers of the aims and objectives of teaching in the district, the
Canadian advisors strongly endorsed the expectation that cooperating
teachers initiate student teachers into the ethos and context of the
district in which the practice teaching takes place. These different
responses appear to reflect the general intellectual, moral, and
cultural climate of the times rather than differences between
American and Canadian cultures. The implications for teaching and
teacher education of those tendencies to move from a more liberal and
critial-reflective university-based program to a field-based,
practitioner supervised, on-the-job training as the preferred form of
teacher socialization are pointed out. (JD)

1

ROLE EXPECTATIONS FOR THE THREE POSITIONS

IN THE STUDENT TEACHING TRIAD

by

Harold C. Ratzlaff

and

Peter P. Grimmett

Paper presented to the 1985 American Educational Research Association

Special Interest Group for Teacher Preparation Curriculum Symposium on

"Canadian Research on Teacher Education"

April 4, 1985   Chicago, Illinois

Centre for the Study of Teacher Education

The University of British Columbia

2

Introduction

Student teaching is considered by many to be the critical component of teacher education (Campbell & Williamson, 1983; Ellenburg, 1981; Freeland, 1979; Funk et al., 1982; Gallemore, 1981; McAteer, 1976). Indeed, Karmos and Jacko (1977, p. 51) maintain that:

> Student teaching is the major unifying experience of most teacher training programs. It is a time for the student teacher to explore, experiment, and 'put it all together' before becoming a professional. The future teacher attempts to identify and meet the expectations which come from self, cooperating teachers, university supervisors, students and society in general. Significant others direct and guide role behaviors as they assume the role of coach, either directly or indirectly.

This experience, the quality of which has been found to relate positively to the professional abilities of the supervisors (Switzer, 1976), appears to have a profound effect on student teachers as they change from college students to beginning teachers (Campbell & Wheatley, 1983). Not surprisingly, then, Turney et al. (1982, p. 47) describe student teaching as "the single, most powerful intervention in a teacher's professional preparation." The case for student teachers having an opportunity to apply instructional knowledge and skills in a practical setting is a cogent one. What is not certain, however, is that the outcomes of student teaching are indeed helpful in the development of prospective teachers.

The traditional model of student teaching puts the would-be teacher under the supervision of a cooperating teacher and a university advisor. Together with the student teacher, these supervisors form the student teaching triad. The existence of the triad presupposes differentiated roles undertaken by the various members. This does not, however, appear to be the case in practice. Previous research (see Applegate & Lasley, 1983; Bowman, 1979; Diem & Schnitz,

1978; Ellensburg, 1981; Emans, 1983; Funk et al., 1983; Gallemore, 1981;
Grimmett et al., 1983; Horton & Harvey, 1979; Kilgore, 1979; Lipton & Lessor,
1978; Renihan & Schwier, 1980; Yates, 1981; Yoder & Arms, 1981) has found
evidence of role confusion and role conflict. In other words, there appears
to be a distinct lack of clarity and consensus about who will perform which
tasks in the student teaching triad. In some cases, this has led to
duplication of function, in others to omission.

Problem

Diem and Schnitz (1978) found that student teaching consists of a
tripartite partnership in which the relationships among the members remains
substantially undefined. Such a nebulous context is problematic for all three
members of the triad.

Renihan and Schwier (1970) suggest that conflicting role perceptions and
expectations present a major problem for student teachers. In a survey of
cooperating teachers and student teachers to determine what they most and
least appreciated about their respective partners, Beauchamp (1983) found that
student teachers least appreciated their supervisors' "failing to clearly
define their expectations of us." Role ambiguity can be particularly
problematic when cooperating teachers and university advisors hold different
and/or contradictory expectations for student teachers. Frequently, this can
lead to the dissonance, in student teachers, reported by Mahon and Lacefield
(1978) where they are torn between their own expectations and those of their
two supervisors. To reduce dissonance, student teachers generally adopted, on

a temporary basis, the expectations of one or both of the supervisors. This
problem is exacerbated when each supervisor holds different and contrasting
expectations for the student teacher role. Indeed, the instability of groups
consisting of three members (Emans, 1983) can precipitate the formation of
coalitions within the triad (Grimmett & Etchell, 1979) where two members play
off against the third.

The lack of clear consensus among cooperating teachers and university
advisors about expectations for the student teacher role ties in closely with
the confusion that currently exists about the respective supervisory roles.
In a study of triad member perceptions of the importance and achievement of
objectives in the student teaching experience, Gallemore (1981) found the
greatest similarity of views to b. between cooperating teachers and student
teachers and the greatest dissimilarity in views to be between the cooperating
teacher and the university advisor. In addition, she found a distinct lack of
relationship between what student teachers achieved and what all members of
the triad perceived as important for student teachers to achieve. She
concludes:

> Perhaps the lack of agreement about perceptions related to these roles is
> a result of disagreement between the purposes of student teaching. If
> significant agreement could be reached about expectations for the student
> teacher, the task of what roles the cooperating teacher and university
> supervisor would play in helping the student teacher achieve specific
> competencies might be more easily defined (p. 188).

Applegate and Lasley's (1982) study of cooperating teachers' problems
confirms the confusion that exists around the role of the classroom teacher

supervisor. They identify six major problems pertaining to cooperating

teachers and call for a clarification of their role:

> Cooperating teachers must know what they are to perform and what skills
> they are to encourage . . . . Problems arise for cooperating teachers
> because of unfilled expectations. (p. 18)

Yates (1981), in a British study examining the effectiveness of student

teaching supervision arrangements, found that most cooperating teachers were

unclear about their role and that only 18 per cent had a clear understanding

of college expectations. Lipke's (1979) study produced a similar finding. In

a survey of cooperating teachers, student teachers, principals, and university

advisors, she found that all respondents, with the exception of some

university advisors, stated a need for improved communication and a clearer

definition of roles.

The role of university advisor has been described as being both extremely

complex (Zimpher et al., 1980) and almost impossible to carry out (Knop,

1977). This has prompted some (see Bowman, 1979; Ellenburg, 1981; Emans,

1983; Horton & Harvey, 1979) to propose a change in the role of the university

advisor, based on the assumption that the current role performance is a waste

of resources. The problem with these proposals lies in the fact that they are

largely speculative and not empirically based. At this point in time, where

there is not clear understanding of which expectations are held by members of

the triad for the university advisor role, it would appear premature to label

the role performance a waste of resources. Further, as Olson (1981) points

out, versity advisors themselves experience intense role conflict and

confusion which may account for the frequent problems they encounter in their dealings with both cooperating teachers and student teachers.

It could be argued that clarity of role definition is a prerequisite for effective functioning in any organizational position. Student teaching, as a vital clinical component of teacher education, continues in many programs to be structured around the traditional triad which research has characterized as lacking in a clear definition of or consensus about the respective roles played by each member. The effectiveness of such an arrangement, then, is open to question, given the confusion that currently exists. Where "the single, most powerful intervention in a teacher's professional preparation" (Turney et al., 1982, p. 47) is constituted within the traditional triad, this represents a serious problem.

Studies of Triad Role Expectations

Garland (1982) reports three studies (Garland, 1964; Kaplan, 1967; Castillo, 1971) that attempted to address this. conducted to derive triad member expectations for the roles of student teacher, cooperating teacher, and university advisor. Using a framework for role analysis developed by Gross et al. (1958), which provided a set of consistent definitions for examining role conflict and role consensus in complementary roles viewed as interaction systems, these studies examined the expectations held by triad members for each role in relationship to the other two. The general purpose was to assess the amount of consensus or conflict that existed on role definitions as a starting point for planning and

implementing ways of bringing about increased effectiveness through clarity of
and consensus on role definitions.

Garland (1964) assessed conflict and consensus on expectations held for
the role of student teacher by cooperating teachers, university advisors, and
student teachers. Using a 76-item questionnaire specially constructed and
validated for the study, she asked respondents in all three groups of her
sample (48 student teachers, 33 cooperating teachers, 19 university advisors -
drawn from three different student teaching programs) to indicate which
functions (taken from the literature on student teacher performance) student
teachers should or should not be expected to perform using a four-point scale
(absolutely must, preferably should, preferably should not, absolutely must
not). The responses revealed significant differences between cooperating
teachers and student teachers on four items, between cooperating teachers and
university advisors on three items, and between student teachers and
university advisors on three items. On the opposite side, she found high
consensus (86 per cent or higher in all three groups indicated that the
function should or should not be performed) among the three groups on 24
items.

Kaplan's (1967) study used a similar analytical framework to investigate
the role expectations for university advisors held by student teachers,
cooperating teachers, and university advisors. Using a 40-item questionnaire
specially constructed and validated for the study, he asked respondents in all
three groups of his sample (88 student teachers, 46 cooperating teachers, 15
university advisors - associated with one student teaching program) to

indicate using the same four-point scale which functions a university advisor should or should not be expected to perform. The responses showed disagreement between cooperating teachers and student teachers on 11 items, between cooperating teachers and university advisors on five items. High consensus among all three groups was found on seven items.

Castillo (1971) conducted the third study using the Gross et al. (1958) framework and the same four-point, forced-choice questionnaire The focus of this study was on the cooperating teacher role. Using a 50-item questionnaire specially constructed and validated for the study, Castillo asked all respondents (75 student teachers, 75 cooperating teachers, 75 university advisors - a random sample drawn from seven different teacher education programs) to indicate which functions a cooperating teacher should or should not be expected to perform. The study found differences between cooperating teachers and university advisors on 14 items, between student teachers and university advisors on 12 items, and between cooperating teachers and student teachers on nine items. High consensus on seven items was found across all three groups.

Garland (1982), commenting on these three studies, suggests that:

> The results . . . clearly demonstrate that consensus on role definitions cannot be viewed as a condition to be assumed. Rather, it must be viewed as a condition to be developed. Only as expectations are examined for areas of disagreement and consensus can a basis for effective role relationships be established (p. 56).

In other words, previous studies have not found much evidence of consensus on the expectations held by incumbents and their respective alter groups which

define the roles associated with the three positions in the student teaching triad. These results may be explained by the fact that only one of the three studies had a sample drawn from a single program, and it could be argued that cross-program consensus is difficult to achieve. The study (Kaplan, 1967) that used only one program did not, however, produce startling findings of consensus. This, then, tends to suggest that even within-program consensus is difficult to achieve, although the particular focus of the Kaplan study (the university advisor role) may account for some of the variance in the sense that this role is a complex one to define. Perhaps the most plausible explanation of these studies' lack of consensus lies in the fact that they were conducted several years ago when the knowledge base for student teaching and its supervision was much more scant than it is today. In other words, the findings of the studies reported by Garland (1982) may be bound by time and (for those who live in a different culture) by the American context. Could it be, then, that a replication of these studies during the 1980s within a single student teaching program in a different cultural (Canadian) context would produce different findings? Further, the problem of how to conceptualize the various roles that make up the student teaching triad, while it has been addressed by the studies of Garland (1964), Kaplan (1967), and Catillo (1971), still remains a concern in the literature. In other words, we still know little about the student teaching triad and the roles each respective member is expected to play.

Purpose of the Study

The primary purpose of this study was to determine the role expectations held for all three positions in the student teaching triad by the incumbents of the position and the members of the counter positions. Specifically, the expectations held by student teachers, cooperating teachers, and university advisors for their own role and the roles of the other two were elicited. In so doing, the study was designed to identify the aspects of the expectations for each of the three roles on which the members of the triad registered agreement or disagreement.

A secondary purpose was to replicate in one study, drawing on a large sample from a single student teaching program in Canada, the surveys previously conducted by Garland (1964), Kaplan (1967), and Castillo (1971). Specifically, a comparison of items of agreement and disagreement would enable conclusions to be drawn about whether the definition of student teaching triad roles is bound by time and/or context, or whether certain aspects of the expectations held for the different roles can be said to be constant across time and/or context.

Research Questions

1. What expectations does each member of the triad hold for his or her position?

2. What expectations does each member of the triad hold for the two counter positions?

3. On which aspects of the expectations for each of the three roles do members of the triad agree?

4. On which aspects of the expectations for each of the three roles do members of the triad disagree?

5. What similarities and differences exist between the findings of the current study and the previous studies of Garland (1964), Kaplan (1967), and Castillo (1971)?

6. To what extent can the similarities and differences between the findings of this study and the previous studies be explained by a difference in time and/or context?

7. Are there similarities and differences constant over time and context that could be the foundation for developing profiles for each of the three roles in the student teaching triad?

Method

The three populations involved in this study are the classroom teachers of the province of British Columbia, the students enrolled in a teacher training program at the University of British Columbia, and the university-appointed faculty who act as field supervisors.

The three samples were the personnel involved in the May practicum. There being nothing unusual about this practicum, it was assumed that the three samples were representative of the three respective populations. Table 1 indicates the numbers involved and the rate of return for the distributed questionnaires.

Insert Table 1 about here

The student teaching component of the teacher-training program involves a three-week practicum in May. Students are assigned to various cooperating teachers throughout the province depending on the nature of their program and the availability of appropriate cooperating teachers. University advisors are similarily assigned to various geographic areas to fulfill their supervisory duties. Six hundred twenty-five of the student teachers were assigned at the elementary school level (i.e., grades 1-7) and three hundred twenty-five to secondary (i.e, grades 8-12).

One three-part questionnaire was intended for each person involved in the practicum with the university advisor consenting to distribute all questionnaires to persons in his assigned area. Each person was then requested to complete the questionnaire, place it in a sealed envelope, and return it to the university advisor or send it in by mail.

Data were transferred from the questionnaire to coding sheets, typed into a computer file, and computer analyzed.

Results

Every subject responded to one of three triad-specific demographic data sheets and the common three-part questionnaire involving a total of 166 items.

Each item used a four-point, quasi-interval scoring scale. Two items of the

demographic data sheet are summarized in Table 2, but it was not the intent of

this paper to analyze responses with respect to the demographic data

collected.

Insert Table 2 about here

The Garland/Castillo/Kaplan (GCK) research identified role expectations

for which the members of the triad (i.e., student, teacher, advisor) were in

agreement. Whenever 86% or more registered either in favor or not in favor of

a particular item, for each member of the triad, G/C/K ruled consensus. Our

(GR) criteria for consensus was the .01 level of statistical significance

using the chi-square goodness-of-fit test. The following questionnaire items

represent consensus items from both studies or from either study alone.

<u>Consensus Items</u>

A. Role expectations for the student teacher.

   1. Both studies: (86-100% criterion)

      i)   work with the cooperating teacher in planning a unit (2)
      ii)   develop written lesson plans for own teaching activities (4)
      iii)   use a consistent format for writing lesson plans (6)
      iv)   revise lesson plans in accordance with the cooperating
            teacher's suggestions (8)
      v)   seek to acquire an understanding of the characteristics of the
            community where school is located (20)

vi)   observe children at age levels above and below that to which the student teacher is assigned (21)

vii)   observe children in school situations outside of the classroom (23)

viii)   create own instructional materials in the absence of suitable materials (30)

ix)   teach at some time when the cooperating teacher is not in the room (31)

x)   assume responsibility for guiding the activities of temporary and/or permanent groups (33)

xi)   express own imagination and creativity in teaching (34)

xii)   teach groups of different abilities (36)

xiii)   use community resources in teaching (42)

xiv)   construct, give, and interpret tests (44)

xv)   guide children in developing group standards (48)

xvi)   attend staff meetings (59)

xvii)   keep attendance records (64)

xviii) be available either before or after school for conferences with the cooperating teacher (73)

xix)   organize a professional file of teaching material of both pictures and subject-matter (76)

2. Grimmett/Ratzlaff only:

xx)   study the cooperating teacher's unit and daily plans (1)

xxi)   study the cooperating teacher's plan before observing a lesson (12)

xxii)   observe in the classrooms of other teachers (18)

xxiii) assume responsibility for grouping an activity (37)

xxiv)   assume total responsibility for the teaching program before conclusion of student teaching experience (41)

xxv)   use non-test methods of evaluation (52)

xxvi)   visit classroom before student teaching begins (70)

xxvii) contact cooperating teacher prior to student teaching (71)

xxviii) discuss activities of student teaching seminars with the cooperating teacher (75)

3. Garland only:

xxix)   submit lesson plans to cooperating teacher prior to teaching (7)

xxx)   work with one child who needs special assistance (diagnosing deficiencies, applying remedial procedures) (32)

xxxi)   develop and maintain pupil progress charts (45)

xxxii) work at some time with consultants or special tec. r (54)

xxxiii) attend parent-teacher association meetings (61)

4. Grimmett/Ratzlaff: ($\alpha = .01$ criterion)

    i)   plan a unit independently (3)
    ii)   prepare daily plans a week in advance (5)
    iii)   submit lesson plans to the sponsor teacher prior to teaching (7)
    iv)   take notes while the cooperating teacher is teaching (13)
    v)   if notes are taken, make these notes available to the cooperating teacher (14)
    vi)   observe the teaching of another student teacher (19)
    vii)   use a specific form for recording observations of individual and group behavior (24)
    viii) study the abilities of mentally retarded children (25)
    ix)   begin teaching by working with a small group (29)
    x)   work with one child who needs special assistantce (diagnosing deficiencies, applying remedial procedures) (32)
    xi)   organize and conduct a field trip (39)
    xii)   follow the same instructional program as that of the cooperating teacher (40)
    xiii) teach at more than one grade level during the student teaching semester or period (43)
    xiv)   develop and maintain pupil progress charts (45)
    xv)   contribute information to cumulative records (46)
    xvi)   participate with the cooperating teacher in pupil conferences (47)
    xvii) conduct group evaluation sessions (49)
    xviii) conduct individual conferences with pupils to discuss their growth (50)
    xix)   work at some time with consultants or special teachers (54)
    xx)   assume major responsibility for lunchroom supervision at some time (55)
    xxi)   participate in parent-teacher conferences (58)
    xxii) become a member of a staff committee or group in an area in which he has special competence (60)
    xxiii) collect money for such purposes as milk, lunch, Community Chest, etc. (66)
    xxiv) evaluate reference books (68)
    xxv) keep a daily log of experience (69)
    xxvi) maintain anecdotal records for children in the classroom (72)

    xxvii) should not settle a disturbance while the cooperating teacher is teaching (16)
    xxviii)should not contribute to class discussions while the cooperating teacher is teaching (17)
    xxix) should not participate in changing school policies (56)
    xxx)   should not spend two or three days working with the school principal (57)

xxxi) should not conduct a parent-teacher conference alone (63)

xxxii) not sure about attending a conference of the principal and cooperating teacher when the cooperating teacher is discussing some aspect of his work (65)

B. Role expectations for the cooperating teacher

1. Both studies: (86-100% criterion)

i) provide the student teacher with place for personal materials (6)
ii) introduce student teacher to members of the administrative staff, co-teachers, and other school employees (9)
iii) involve student teacher in planning and directing learning activities of children (22)
iv) hold scheduled conference periods with student teacher (40)
v) evaluate the activities and progress of the student teacher with the university advisor at regular intervals (46)

2. Grimmett/Ratzlaff only:

vi) develop well-balanced program of student teaching activities for the student teacher (3)
vii) explain to pupils the responsibility of the student teacher (4)
viii) invite the student teacher to participate in staff meetings (10)
ix) explain all school routines, rules, and policies (11)
x) show student teacher physical set-up of the classroom, school buildings, and school grounds (12)
xi) inform student teacher of aims and objectives of teaching in the school district (13)
xii) explain the overall plan of the course of study for each subject (14)
xiii) explain the principles related to certain teaching techniques (16)
xiv) demonstrate for the student teacher different methods or procedures of teaching (19)
xv) share with the student teacher information about the interests and abilities of pupils (20)
xvi) tell the student teacher proven techniques of classroom management (21)
xvii) supply the student teacher with copies of the teacher's guide, teacher's manual, textbooks, and other types of teaching aids (28)
xviii) allow maximum freedom for student teachers as they assume more teaching responsibility (29)

xix)   share with the student teacher ideas, discoveries, and
         innovations in education (30)
xx)   make the student teacher aware of voice, pronunciation, and
         level of vocabulary (34)
xxi)   evaluate the progress of the student teacher (35)
xxii)   check unit or daily plans of the student teacher (39)
xxiii)   arrange for the student teacher to observe other classrooms in
         the school building or district (42)
xxiv)   keep a comprehensive record of the activities and progress of
         the student teacher (44)
xxv)   involve the student teacher in extracurricular activities
         sponsored jointly by school and community (47)

3. Castillo only:

xxvi)   work with the university advisor in planning the student
         teaching program (1)
xxvii)   participate actively in seminars and in-service training for
         cooperating teachers (2)

4. Grimmett/Ratzlaff: (α = .01 criterion)

i)   work with the university advisor in planning the student
         teaching program (1)
ii)   participate actively in seminars and in-service training for
         cooperating teachers (2)
iii)   plan for the student teacher the different phases of his
         training (15)
iv)   prepare a set of observation guidelines for the student
         teacher (17)
v)   show the student teacher how daily or unit plans are
         prepared (19)
vi)   instruct the student teacher how to establish "close" rapport
         with the pupils (23)
vii)   give precise guidance on how different types of teacher-made
         tests are prepared (24)
viii)   give the student teacher detailed information as to how report
         cards attendance forms, and permanent records are prepared,
         used, and kept (25)
ix)   demonstrate operation and use of the different audio-visual
         equipment and office machines (26)
x)   supply reference books, professional magazines to be used by
         the student teacher (27)
xi)   assist the student teacher to search for valid principles that
         would support his activities or teaching methods (32)
xii)   counsel the student teacher about "proper" grooming and decorum
         in the classroom (33)

xiii) develop the basic criteria for judging success of the student teacher (36)

xiv) act with vigilance in protecting the educational welfare of the pupils from the inefficiency of the student teacher (37)

xv) review the written report of the student teacher about his student teaching experiences (41)

xvi) help the student teacher interpret his observation notes of other classrooms (43)

xvii) clarify for the student teacher the provisions of the teachers' "code of ethics" (49)

xviii) take the student teacher to teachers' conventions and other organizational meetings (50)

xix) should not assume the sole authority in deciding the student teacher's readiness to assume full responsibility in teaching (38)

xx) should not shield the shortcomings of the student teacher from the critical view of the university supervisor (45)

C. Role expectations for the university advisor

1. Both studies: (86-100% criterion)

i) study the student teacher's unit and daily plans (3)

ii) should not designate the total responsibility of evaluation to the cooperating teacher (22)

iii) guide the student teacher toward the goal of self-evaluation (28)

iv) assist the student teacher's adjustment to public school and university policies (31)

v) serve as resource consultant for the student teacher (32)

vi) clarify the obligation of the school to the university and the university to the school (37)

vii) work with the university faculty in developing the total teacher training program (38)

2. Grimmett/Ratzlaff only:

viii) take notes while the student teacher is teaching (14)

ix) if notes are taken, make these notes available to the student teacher (16)

x) should not assume total responsibility for evaluating the student teacher (19)

3. Kaplan only: -

BEST COPY AVA!!.

4. Grimmett/Ratzlaff: (α = .01 criterion)

    i)   observe children in the classroom assigned to the student teacher (8)

    ii)   if notes are taken (cooperating teacher teaching), make these notes available to the cooperating teacher (15)

    iii)   share responsibility of evaluation with student teacher and cooperating teacher (21)

    iv)   use evaluation procedures designed by the university (23)

    v)   assist the cooperating teacher in fulfilling her role (29)

    vi)   act as liaison between student teacher and cooperating teacher (30)

    vii)   serve as resource consultant for cooperating teacher (33)

    viii) conduct student teaching in-service programs (36)

    ix)   should not work with the cooperating teacher in planning a unit(2)

    x)   should not take notes while the cooperating teacher is teaching (11)

    xi)   if notes are taken, should not make these notes available to the school principal (13)

    xii)   if notes are taken (student teacher teaching), should not make these notes available to the school principal (17)

    xiii) should not attend staff meetings in cooperating schools (39)

    xiv) not sure about conducting cooperative planning sessions with cooperating teacher and student teacher (6)

Disagreement Items

Table 3 reveals the number of items of disagreement for each member of the triad across both studies. A total of 19 of 76 (25%) student role items produced intra-triad disagreement in one or the other of the studies with only four in common; 26 of 50 (52%) cooperating teacher items with only three in common; 22 of 40 (55%) university advisor items with nine in common.

Insert Table 3 about here

The disagreement items are stated along with graphic indications suggesting both the direction and intensity of the disagreement (Table 4). Solid line segments indicate Grimmett/Ratzlaff (GR) results while broken line segments indicate results from the Garland/Castillo/Kaplan (GCK) studies. A line segment extending from scale value 1 to 2 indicates 'in favor' while 3 to 4 indicates 'opposed'. A line segment between 2 and 3 indicates 'divided response'. The 'o' (GR) and the 'x' (GCK) indicate 'intensity' according to the following scale:

1: Absolutely must (AM)

2: Preferably should (PS)

3: Preferably should not (PSN)

4: Absolutely must not (AMN)

Insert Table 4 about here

The information in Table 4 can be summarized in several ways. One way is to investigate the number of dyad differences in direction or intensity within these sixty-seven disagreement items. How many times did any two members of the triad disagree with each other? Table 5 represents a summary of the number of dyad (S-T, S-A, T-A) differences with respect to both direction and intensity for both studies (GR;GCK) separately.

Insert Table 5 about here

The tabled figures point in the direction of least difference, in both studies combined, for the student teacher role and the greatest number of disagreements for the cooperating teacher role. Separating the tw⌐ studies, one observes a greater number of differences in the GR study for the student role (i.e., more ⌐onfusion) than there are for the GCK studies. For the cooperating teacher role the reverse is true. Greater confusion is suggested by the GCK data. The advisor role appears to be equally confusing in both studies.

Another way of summarizing the Table 4 information is to identify and investigate the items on which the two studies resulted in role expectations that were opposite in direction ⌐⌐ ⌐⌐⌐⌐ ⌐⌐⌐ ⌐ ⌐⌐⌐⌐⌐ ⌐ ⌐⌐⌐⌐⌐⌐⌐ ⌐⌐⌐ summary.

Insert Table 6 about here

An exploration of the differences in these findings would facilitate an appraisal of whether the changing conception of the cooperating teacher role is tne result of the different contextual variables operative in the situation or whether, in fact, the change is representative of a diffrrent "zeitgeisc".

Discussion of Results

Differences in Expectations for the Cooperating Teacher Role

Table 6 demonstrates fourteen items on which one of the three groups of respondents in the Canadian study held contrastingly different expectations for the cooperating teacher role from their counterparts in the American research. Of these fourteen items, none was representative of a change in expectations across all three respondent groups. All except one item (36) registered with only one group. Moreover, the major differences in expectations were not with the cooperating teacher respondents but with the student teachers and university advisors. A close examination of the differences between the respective student teacher respondents suggests certain expectations among the Canadian sample that were not present in the 1971 American sample. These expectations clustered around the concerns for cooperating teacher planning and preparation for the practicum (items 4 and 15), for cooperating teacher involvement in the practice teaching evaluation process (items 36 and 39), and for greater emphasis to be placed on cooperating teacher socialization of prospective teachers (items 47 and 50). The items on which the Canadian sample of university advisors registered their

differences all clustered around the theme of the role of the cooperating

teacher in the professional socialization of student teachers. These six

items suggest a radically different orientation which could be the

consequence of the cultural milieu and/or the "zeitgeist" within which the

Canadian study was conducted.

Cooperating Teacher Socialization of Prospective Teachers

Whereas the advisors in Castillo's (1971) American study were of the view

that cooperating teachers should not inform student teachers of the aims and

objectives of teaching in the school district (item 13), the Canadian advisors

strongly endorsed the expectation that cooperating teachers initiate student

teachers into the ethos and context of the district in which the practice

teaching takes place. By contrast with the 1971 American findings, this

suggests that the context of teaching is seen as an important set of variables

to be taken into account in the professional socialization of student

teachers.

Further evidence of different expectations held by the American and

Canadian advisor groups is found on item 19. The Canadian study found a

tendency towards an expectation that the cooperating teacher socialize the

student teacher through demonstration of different methods or procedures of

teaching. This is in distinct contrast to the American advisors' view that

cooperating teachers should not demonstrate models of teaching for their

students at all. In the Canadian 1985 sample, then, there is a clear

expectation of coaching and modelling, whereas the advisors in the previous

study's sample were vehemently opposed to this form of socialization.

24

The tendency towards coaching as a more directive form of student teaching supervision is evident in the different findings on items 21 and 23. Where the advisors in Castillo's sample were opposed to the cooperating teacher telling the student teacher proven techniques of classroom management (item 21), all three groups in the Canadian sample were in favour of cooperating teachers doing this. Similarly, all three groups in the current study expected the cooperating teacher to instruct the student teacher in how to establish rapport with pupils (item 23), whereas previously the advisors were against this.

If the previous items represented the instructional side of the cooperating teacher's socialization role, then item 27 pertains to the supportive side. Accompanying the tendency in the current study towards greater emphasis on the instructional aspect of the socializing role of the cooperating teacher was an equally strong expectation that such socialization be carried out in a professionally supportive manner. Where the advisors in the Castillo study were opposed to the cooperating teacher supplying reference books and professional magazines for the student teacher to use, all three groups in the current study registered agreement.

The different findings pertaining to the expectations held by university advisors for the socializing aspect of the cooperating teacher role can be summarized as a tendency in the Canadian sample towards a more directive form of supervision together with close, professional support, where the approach is less one of "sink or swim" and more of "on-the-job coaching".

Cooperating Teacher role: Defined by Context or Zeitgeist?

The differences in expectations for the role of cooperating teacher between the American (1971) and Canadian (1985) study are important. The subjects in the Canadian survey expected greater collaboration between university and school personnel in the areas of program planning and the evaluation of student teaching while emphasizing a heightened, professionally responsible role for the cooperating teacher in the orientation, socialization, and evaluation of student teachers. The high number of consensus items in the Canadian survey suggests a leaning towards the field personnel taking a more active role in the education of teachers at the pre-service level.

Are these differences in findings the result of the Canadian context? Or are they more appropriately explained as a product of the time in which the Canadian study was conducted? The differences can be said to be a product of the context in the sense that the current study drew on a sample within a single student teaching program whereas the Castl''' :~ :' ~:- --- --- ~ the divergent perspectives of seven different institutions to bear on their responses. Further, all respondents in this study were actual members of a triad and active in the practice of student teaching and its supervision at the time of the survey. Our understanding of Castillo's sample (based on Garland 1982 and Dissertation Abstracts International 1971 only) would lead us to believe that a greater emphasis was placed on obtaining a random sample cross the different student teaching programs than on ensuring that each subject was at the time of the survey an active member of a triad upon which

they could base their responses. But these are minor points. It would seem

to us that the more plausible explanation for the different findings lies not

so much in the context as in the spirit (zeitgeist) of the 1980's. All over

the world there has been a trend in this decade towards a more conservative

worldview. This cosmic trend has affected education as much as any other

phenomenon and specific effects are to be found in teacher education. This

trend has culminated in three potent criticisms of the nature and substance of

teacher education; namely, (1) that teacher preparation programs are not

really that useful (see Joyce & Cliff, 1984), (2) that those who profess

teacher education know and do little about the knowledge base that does exist

on teaching and teacher education (see Denemark, 1970, Joyce & Cliff, 1984),

and (3) that teachers once they become certificated practitioners,

consistently move towards a relatively narrow didactic approach to teaching

(see Goodlad, 1983, Sirotnik, 1983). The tendencies evident in the 1985

Canadian survey of the cooperating teacher's role in the student teaching

triad appear to be related to these criticisms. Student teachers, classroom

teachers, and university advisors all perceive the need for the cooperating

teacher to play a more active role in the professional socialization of

would-be teachers. This stems in part from a general misgiving about teacher

education in the university setting where "few teacher preparation

institutions use research and development-based innovations even in teacher

training" (Joyce & Cliff, 1984, p. 6). It is also an indication that many of

the promises held out to practitioners for the improvement of teaching have

been largely unfulfilled (Sykes, 1983), resulting in the heavy resurgence of a

teacher-centred didacticism in classrooms - the "tried and true" method that works for busy practitioners faced with high class sizes - towards which teachers feel they must orient and socialize new entrants into the teaching workforce. Ultimately, however, the tendencies found in the present study represent the current questioning of whether teacher preparation should be part of a university program or whether, in fact, the training of would-be teachers is most effectively accomplished in field-based programs under the keen supervision of experienced, professional practitioners.

Conclusion

One final question needs to be raised. If the differences in findings (as illustrated by the examination of the cooperating teacher role) between the Canadian and American studies can be said to be more plausibly explained by time than by context, then to what extent are the different tendencies evident in the more recent study appropriate to the effective development of a professional teaching force capable of school renewal? It is not within the purview of this paper to address such a significant question. Nevertheless, the work of Zeichner (1980, 1984), Zeichner and Tabachnick (1981), and Goodlad (1983) would suggest the need for a serious examination of the implications for teaching and teacher education of those tendencies to move from a more liberal and critical-reflective university-based program to a field-based, practitioner supervised, on-the-job training as the preferred form of teacher socialization.

References

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

Beauchamp, L. (1983). Cooperating and student teacher expectations: Beefs and bouquets. Teacher Educator, 19, 2-6.

Bowman, N. (1979). College supervision of student teaching: a time to reconsider. Journal of Teacher Education, 30(3), 29-30.

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

Castillo, J. B. (1971). The role expectations of cooperating teachers as viewed by student teachers, college supervisors, and cooperating teachers. Dissertation Abstracts International, 32, 1374.

Denemark, G. W. (1970). Teacher Education: Repair, reform or revolution? Educational Leadership 27(6), 539-543.

Diem, R. A.; & Schnitz, J. E. (1978). The instructional alliance in student teaching. Contemporary Education, 49(2), 72-74.

Ellenburg, F. C. (1981). You can pay me now or you can pay me later. Clearing House, 54, 200-205.

Emans, R. (1983). Implementing the knowledge base: Redesigning the function of cooperating teachers and college supervisors. Journal of Teacher Education, 34(3), 14-18.

Freeland, K. (1979). Assessing student teaching. Teacher Education, 15(2), 11-16.

Funk, F. F.; Hoffman, J. L.; Keithley, A. M.; & Long, B. E. (1982). student teaching program: Feedback from supervising teachers. Clearing House, 55, 319-321.

Gallemore, S. L. (1981). Perceptions about the objectives of student teaching. Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport, 52(2), 180-190.

Garland, C. B. (1964). An exploration of role expectations for student teachers: Views of prospective student teachers, cooperating teachers, and college supervisors. Dissertation Abstracts International, 26, 1497-1498.

Garland, C. B. (1982). Guiding clinical experiences in teacher education. New York: Longman.

Goodlad, J. I. (1983). A place called school. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Grimmett, P. P.; Collins, J.; Dley, R.; yan, M.; & Wilson, D. (1983). "The challenge of the distributed practicum." Paper presented at the Canadian Society for the Study of Educational Annual Meeting, Vancouver, June, 1983.

Grimmett, P. P.; & Etchell, C. (1979). "The politics of the practicum: A socratic ploy or machiavellian web?" Paper presented to the Annual Meeting of the Western Canadian Association for Student Teaching, Edmonton, March, 1979.

Grimmett, P. P.; & Housego, I. E. (1985). A research-based response to the contemporary critique of teacher education. In Housego I.E.,; & Grimmett, P. P. (Eds.) Teaching and teacher education: Generating and utilizing valid knowledge for professional socialization. Vancouver: Wedge publications. (forthcoming).

Gross, N.; Mason, W. S.; & McEachern, A. (1958). Explorations in role analysis: Studies of the school superintendency role. New York: Wiley.

Horton, L.; & Harvey, K. (1979). Preparing cooperating teachers. The role of the university supervisor. Peabody Journal of Education. 57, 56-60.

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

Kaplan, L. (1967). An investigation of the role expectations for college supervisors of student teaching as viewed by student teachers, supervising teachers, and college supervisors. Dissertation Abstracts International, 28, 517.

Karmos, A. H.; & Jacko, C. M. (1977). The role of significant others during the student teaching experience. Journal of Teacher Education, 28(5), 51-55.

Knop, C. K. (1977). Developing a model for student teaching supervisor. Foreign Language Annuals, 10(6), 623-638.

Lipke, B. S. (1979). Give your (student) teachers a break. Journal of Teacher Education, 30(20, 31-34.

Lipton, A.; & Lessor, E. (1978). Teacher training at Stoney Brook: A model for conflict. Journal of Teacher Education, 29(6), 57-60.

Mahon, J. M.; & Lacefield, W. (1978). Educational attitude changes during year-long student teaching. Journal of Experimental Education, 46(3), 4-15.

McAteer, J. F. (1976). Student teaching Supervision: Roles and routines. Clearing House, 50, 161-165.

Olson, J. K. (1981). Dilemmas of supervision: Teacher perspectives. Teacher Education, 20, 74-81.

Renitran, P. J.; Schwier, A. (1980). Ten recurring ailments in field experience programs. Education Canada, 20, 22-27.

Sirotnik, K. (1983). What you see is what you get...consistency, persistency, and mediocrity in classrooms. Harvard Education Review 53(1), 16-31.

Switzer, R. (1976). Cooperating teachers: Strengths and weaknesses. Journal of Educational Research, 15(2), 37-45.

Sykes, G. (1983) Contraditictions, ironies, and promises unfulfilled: A contemporary account of the states of teaching. Phi Delta Kappan 65, 87-93.

Turney, C.; et al. (1982). The practicum in teacher education: Research, practice, and supervision. Sydney, Australia; University of Sydney Press.

Yates, J. W. (1981). Student teaching in England: Results of a recent survey. Journal of Teacher Education, 32(5), 44-46.

Yoder, W. H.; & Arms, W. E. (1981). Student teacher supervisors can be educated! Teacher Educator. 16, 39-44.

Zeichner, K. M. (1980). Myths and realities: Field-based experiences in preservice teacher education. Journal of Teacher Education 31(6), 45-55.

Zeichner, K. M. (1984). The Wisconsin studies of teacher socialization: Implications for policy, practice and research. Paper presented to National Conference on Teacher Education, (October) University of Texas at Austin.

Zeichner, K. M.; & Tabachnick, B. R. (1981). Are the effects of university teacher education wasted out by school experience? Journal of Teacher Education 32(3), 7-11.

Zimpher, N. L.; deVoss, G. G.; & Nott, D. L. (1980). A closer look at university student teacher supervision. Journal of Teacher Education, 31(4) 11-15.

Table 1

Questionnaires Distributed and Returned

	Distributed	Returned	Rate
Cooperating teachers (T)	1375	637	46.3%
Student teachers (S)	950	425	44.7%
University advisors (A)	75	54	72.0%

Table 2

Gender and Age of Participants

			Student	Teacher	Advisor
Gender:	a)	Female	321	371	24
	b)	Male	103	261	29
Age:	a)	Under 20	14	0	0
	b)	20-24	308	2	0
	c)	25-29	70	93	4
	d)	30-39	25	299	9
	e)	40-49	6	170	13
	f)	Over 49	1	7	

33

Table 3

Number of Intra-triad Role Expectation Disagreement Items

	Student role	Teacher role	Advisor role	Total
Both studies (common)	4	3	9	16
Grimmett/Ratzlaff	12	3	7	22
Garland/Castillo/Kaplan	3	20	6	29
Total	19	26	21	67

TABLE 4: Direction and intensity of disagreement items:
student (S); teacher (T); advisor (A)

A. Student Teacher Role Expectations:

	(Yes) 1	2	3	(No) 4

G/GR:1) rely on the recommendations provided by the teacher's manual for a lesson. (10)

S ——————o|
T ——————o|
A

2) observe in the classroom for a week before beginning to teach. (15)

S ——————o|
T ——————o|
A

3) administer a sociogram. (28)

S
T
A

4) correct papers and tests administered by the cooperating teacher. (67)

S
T
A

G:5) prepare daily plans a week in advance. (5)

S ——————o|
T ——————o|
A ——————o|

6) contribute information to cumulative records. (46)

S ——————o|
T ——————o|
A ——————o|

7) spend two or three days working with the school principal. (57)

S
T
A

GR:8) use the same format as that used by the cooperating teach   for planning. (9)

S
T
A ——————o|

TABLE 4. (cont'd)

		(Yes) 1	2	3	(No) 4
9) conduct cooperative planning sessions with children. (11)	S		o		
	T			o	
	A		⊢——⊣		
10) maintain an anecdotal record of the behavior of one child during student-teaching. (22)	S		⊢——⊣		
	T	⊢———o			
	A	⊢———o			
11) prepare an individual case study. (26)	S			o	
	T		⊢——⊣		
	A		⊢——⊣		
12) participate in one related community agency. (27)	S			o	
	T			o	
	A		⊢——⊣		
13) do substitute teaching in other classrooms. (35)	S		⊢——⊣		
	T			⊢————	
	A			⊢————	
14) do substitute teaching in assigned classroom. (38)	S	⊢———o			
	T			⊢——⊣	
	A			⊢——⊣	
15) administer an interest inventory. (51)	S	⊢————o			
	T	⊢————o			
	A		⊢——⊣		
16) requisition supplies and instructional materials. (53)	S	⊢————o			
	T	⊢————o			
	A		⊢——⊣		

TABLE 4 (cont'd)

		(Yes) 1	2	3	(No) 4

17) attend P.T.A. meetings (61) S T A

18) accompany the sponsor teacher on home visits (62) S T A

19) accept social invitations from parents (74) S T A

B. Cooperating Teacher Role Expectations:

C/GR:1) plan for the student teacher the different phases of his training (15) S T A

2) help the student teacher to develop interest and skill in doing simple educational research (31) S T A

3) explain to the student teacher the merits and demerits of the unsolved issues of the profession (48) S T A

C:4) explain to the pupils the responsibility of the student teacher (4) S T A

TABLE 4 (cont'd)

			(Yes)			(No)
			1	2	3	4

5) invite the student teacher to participate in staff meetings (10)
- S ————————X
- T X————————
- A ————

6) explain all school routines, rules, and policies (11)
- S o X————
- T o————
- A o————X

7) show the student teacher the physical set-up of the classroom, school buildings and grounds (12)
- S o X————
- T o X————
- A o————X

8) inform the student teacher of the aims and objectives of teaching in the school district (13)
- S ————
- T ————
- A o————

9) explain the overall plan of the course of study for each subject (14)
- S X————
- T ————
- A ————X

10) explain the principles related to certain teaching techniques (16)
- S ————
- T ————
- A ————

11) demonstrate for the student teacher the different methods or procedures of teaching (19)
- S ————o
- T ————o
- A ————

12) tell the student teacher proven techniques of classroom management (21)
- S ————
- T ————
- A ————

TABLE 4. (cont'd)

		1	2	3	4
13) instruct the student teacher how to establish "close" rapport with the pupils (23)	S		o		
	T		o		
	A		o		
14) give the student teacher detailed information on preparing/using and keeping report cards/forms/records (25)	S	x			
	T	x	o		
	A		x		
15) supply reference books, professional magazines to be used by the student teacher (27)	S		o		
	T		o		
	A		o		
16) supply the student teacher with copies of the teacher's guide, teacher's manual, textbooks, and other aids (28)	S	x			
	T	o	x		
	A		x		
17) allow maximum freedom for the student teacher as he assumes more teaching responsibilities (29)	S	o x			
	T	o	x		
	A	x			
18) develop the basic criteria for judging success of the student teacher (36)	S				
	T				
	A				
19) assume the sole authority in deciding the student teacher's readiness to assume full responsibility in teaching (38)	S			o	
	T				
	A				
20) check the unit or daily plans of the student teacher (39)	S		o		
	T	o			
	A				

TABLE 4 (cont'd)

		(Yes) 1	2	3	(No) 4
21) shield the shortcomings of the student teacher from the critical view of the university supervisor (45)	S			X	
	T			X	o
	A				X
22) involve the student teacher in extra-curricular activities that are sponsored jointly by the school and community (47)	S		o		
	T		o		
	A		o		
23) take the student teacher to teachers' conventions and other organizational meetings (50)	S		o		
	T		o		
	A		o		
GR:24) arrange for contact between parents of the pupils and the student teacher (5)	S			o	
	T			o	
	A				
25) assist the student teacher in finding accommodations in the community (7)	S				
	T				
	A				
26) take the student teacher for a tour of the community (8)	S				
	T				
	A				

C. University Advisor Role Expectations:

K/GR:1) study the cooperating teacher's unit and daily plans (1) — S, T, A

TABLE 4 (cont'd)

		(Yes) 1	2	3	(No) 4

2) observe co-oper. teacher prior to placement of student teacher (9)

- S ———————o
- X — — — —
- T — — — x
- A

3) observe co-oper. teacher during period of student teaching (10)

- S ———————o
- T o — — —
- A

4) if notes are taken, make these notes available to the co-oper. teacher (12)

- S ———————X
- T o — — —
- A

5) observe in the classrooms of other teachers for purposes of selecting co-oper. teachers (18)

- S ———————o
- T o — — —
- A

6) evaluate effectiveness of the co-oper. teacher in this capacity (25)

- S ———————o
- X — — — —
- T — — — x
- A

7) make this evaluation available to the co-oper. teacher (26)

- S ———————o
- T — — — —
- A x

8) make this available to the school principal (27)

- S x
- T
- A x

9) serve as resource consultant for all teachers in the school (35)

- S
- T
- A — — —

TABLE 4 (cont'd)

		(Yes)			(No)
		1	2	3	4

K:10) conduct cooperative planning
     sessions with co-oper. teacher
     and student teacher (6)

S
T
A

11) observe children in the class-
    room assigned to the student
    teacher (8)

S
T
A

12) if notes are taken (co-oper.
    teacher) make these notes
    available to the school
    principal (13)

S   X
T   X
A   o
          X

13) assume total responsibility
    for evaluating the student
    teacher (19)

S
T   X
A   X

14) share responsibility of
    evaluation with student
    teacher and co-oper. teacher
    (21)

S
T
A

15) use evaluation procedures
    designed by the university
    (23)

S
T
A

GR:16) work with the student teacher
    in planning a unit (4)

S
T   o
A   o

17) work with the student teacher
    in developing lesson plans
    (5)

S
T   o
A   o

TABLE 4 (cont'd)

	(Yes) 1	2	3	(No) 4
18) conduct in-service planning sessions with co-operating school staff (7)				
S			o———	
T			o———	
A		———————		
19) share responsibility of evaluation with the student teacher (20)				
S	———o			
T	———o			
A		———————		
20) use evaluation procedures designed by the school or school district (24)				
S		———————		
T		———————		
A			———————	
21) serve as consultant with local P.T.A. groups (34)				
S			o———	
T			———————	
A		———————		
22) work toward the improvement of the total school program (40)				
S	———o			
T			———————	
A		———————		

* Grimmett/Katzlaff: o———————o

  Garland/Castillo/Kaplan: x———————x

Table 5:   number of dyad differences in direction or intensity for the disagreement items.

	Direction						Intensity						Combined						
	GR			GCK			GR			GCK			GR			GCK			
	ST	SA	TA	ST	SA	TA	ST	SA	TA	ST	SA	TA	ST	SA	TA	ST	SA	TA	TOTAL
Student role	7	15	12	5	6	6	1	0	0	0	1	1	8	15	12	5	7	7	54
Teacher role	3	4	5	15	13	17	6	6	6	3	6	4	9	10	11	18	19	21	88
Advisor role	9	16	9	10	10	12	3	2	3	3	3	2	12	18	12	13	13	14	82
Total	19	35	26	30	29	35	10	8	9	6	10	7	29	43	35	36	39	42	224

Table 6: Items on which specified triad members responded in opposite directions in the two studies.

	Student respondents	Teacher respondents	Advisor respondents
Student role:	5 prepare daily plans a week in advance (GR:+) 10 rely on the recommendations provided by the teacher's manual for a lesson (GR:+)	28 administer a sociogram (GR:-) 46 contribute information to cumulative records (GR:+) 67 correct papers and tests administered by the cooperating teacher. (GR:-)	
Teacher Role:	4 explain to the pupils the responsibility of the student teacher (GR:+) 15 plan for the student teacher the different phases of his training. (GR:+) 36 develop the basic criteria for judging success of the student teacher (GR:+) 39 check the unit or daily plans of the student teacher. (GR:+) 47 involve the student teacher in extra-curricular activities that are sponsored jointly by the school and the community. (GR:+) 50 take the student teacher to teachers' conventions and other organizational meetings. (GR:+)	31 help the student teacher to develop interest and skill in doing simple educational research. (GR:+) 38 assume the sole authority in deciding the student teachers' readiness to assume full responsibility in teaching. (GR:-)	13 inform the student teacher of the aims and objectives of teaching in the school district. (GR:+) 16 explain the principles related to certain teaching techniques. (GR:+) 19 demonstrate for the student teacher the different methods or procedures of teaching. (GR:+) 21 tell the student teacher proven techniques of classroom management. (GR:+) 23 instruct the student teacher how to establish "close" rapport with the pupils. (GR:+) 27 supply reference professional books, magazines to be used by the student teacher. (GR:+)

Table 6 (continued)

		36 develop the basic criteria for judging success of the student teacher. (GR:+)

Advisor role:	23 use evaluation procedures designed by the university. (GR:+) 26 make this evaluation available to the cooperating teacher. (GR:+)	8 observe children in the classroom assigned to the student teacher. (GR:+) 18 observe in the classrooms of other teachers for purposes of selecting cooperating teacher. (GR:-) 27 make this evaluation available to the school principal. (GR:-)	21 share responsibility of evaluation with student teacher and cooperating teacher. (GR:+)