DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 285 857 SP 029 284

AUTHOR Price, David; Sellars, Neal
TITLE A Synthesis of Effective Supervisory Teacher Behaviours in the Final Year of the Primary Practicum. Research Grants Series No. 2.
INSTITUTION Queensland Board of Teacher Education, Toowong (Australia).
REPORT NO ISBN-0815-7243
PUB DATE Jul 85
NOTE 86p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Elementary Education; Elementary School Teachers; Foreign Countries; Higher Education; Preservice Teacher Education; *Student Teacher Supervisors; *Teacher Behavior; *Teacher Characteristics; *Teacher Effectiveness; *Teacher Supervision
IDENTIFIERS *Australia (Queensland)

ABSTRACT

This study focused on supervisory processes used by primary teachers in Queensland, Australia, who were perceived to be excellent student teacher supervisors. Structured interviews were conducted with 32 supervising teachers working with student teachers, some of whom were also interviewed. Synthesis of data collected from these interviews resulted in a broad profile of the supervising teachers and their behaviors. "Excellent" supervising teachers tended to prepare in advance for the student teacher; emphasize a positive beginning to student teaching; seek appropriate information from student teachers; convey expectations to student teachers; arrange and conduct effective pre-lesson and post-lesson discussion; provide opportunities for purposeful observation of student teachers; cooperate with training institution faculty; afford some autonomy to student teachers; and establish rapport with student teachers. (CB)

RESEARCH GRANTS SERIES

No. 2

RESEARCH GRANTS SERIES

No. 2

A Synthesis of Effective Supervisory Teacher Behaviours in the Final Year of the Primary Practicum

David Price, Brisbane College of Advanced Education
Neal Sellars, James Cook University of North Queensland

Board of Teacher Education,
P.O. Box 389, Toowong. Q. 4066.

July 1985

ISSN 0815-7[illegible]

National Library of Australia Card Number and ISBN

ISBN 0 7242 1518 2

ISSN 0815-7243

FOREWORD

In recent years, the Board of Teacher Education has instituted a small grants scheme to encourage research into teacher education. Under the scheme, limited funds are provided each year to a number of researchers to assist them in undertaking projects of particular interest to the Board.

As projects carried out with assistance from the scheme are completed, the Board will be publishing summaries of reports which it feels are of interest to a wider audience. In some instances, the Board may publish the full report.

The Board's policy is that its publications will not be the subject of copyright restrictions. Teachers, teacher educators and others are encouraged to make use of the material contained in these reports.

Further details concerning the research study may be obtained from the researchers concerned.

CONTENTS

* * *

ABSTRACT

This study focuses directly upon supervisory processes engaged in by primary teachers who are perceived to be excellent supervisors of student teaching. A structured interview was conducted with 32 supervising teachers working with final year student teachers associated with James Cook University of North Queensland's School of Education and with Mount Gravatt Campus of the Brisbane College of Advanced Education. A sample of student teachers was also interviewed. Interview data were synthesized to prepare a broad profile of supervisory behaviours of the sample of teachers.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

During the preparation of this research report several people have given support and assistance. In particular, the authors wish to express sincere thanks and acknowledge indebtedness to:

- the Research Committee of the Queensland Board of Teacher Education, for their generous funding of the study;
- Kay Martinez and Palma Carter, Research Assistants, Townsville;
- Barbara Wyper, typing assistance, Townsville;
- Anne Ekins, Research Assistant, Mount Gravatt;
- Clare Pennisi, Mount Gravatt, for the invaluable typing and organizational assistance, particularly in the preparation of the final manuscript;
- members of academic staff from James Cook University of North Queensland's School of Education, and from the Department of Education Studies, Mount Gravatt Campus, Brisbane College of Advanced Education, for assistance with student interviews.

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

Background

This study, funded by a grant from the Research Committee of the Queensland Board of Teacher Education, investigates the supervisory behaviours of a sample of teachers supervising final year (third year) primary student teachers from two institutions: James Cook University of North Queensland's School of Education and the Mount Gravatt Campus of the Brisbane College of Advanced Education.

Four major objectives were established for the study:

1. To identify a sample of supervising teachers in primary schools who are perceived to be highly effective supervisors.
2. To describe the supervisory behaviour of these teachers.
3. To identify those behaviours which appear to be key elements in successful supervision by these supervising teachers.
4. To determine ways in which such behaviours might be fostered with supervising teachers.

Review of Literature

Key issues pertinent to an exploration of practice teaching supervision are briefly explored in the following review of the literature.

A central component of the preservice teacher education program is the practicum. The practicum has been defined as a "... purposeful series of supervised professional experiences" (Turney et al., 1982a, p.1). It is through such experiences that student teachers have the opportunity to implement specific teaching skills, experiment with a variety of teaching strategies previously explored mainly in theory, and thereby develop their instructional competence.

The broad area of the practicum in teacher education has been one of extensive investigation in Australia, and elsewhere, for a considerable time, but particularly in the past decade. Australian teacher education generally has come under the close scrutiny of a range of national and state inquiries beginning with Queensland (Bassett, 1978), followed by the National Inquiry into Teacher Education (Auchmuty, 1980), and inquiries in all other states. Each of these inquiries gave close attention to the practicum as a significant area of preservice teacher education. The National Inquiry into Teacher Education report (Auchmuty, 1980), for example, noted the need for a close relationship between practicum experiences and the educational theory taught in the training institution. The New South Wales report (Correy, 1980), commenting on the several recent inquiries into teacher education, argues that such reports have established, at least on paper, "... the central place of the practicum in a preservice teacher education program". Furthermore, there is considerable focus on the practicum in the general literature on teacher education, (Hewitson, 1979; Turney et al., 1982a, 1982b).

Underpinning the practicum are objectives which govern the form which school practice will take. Both the objectives, and procedures which are designed to enable these objectives to be achieved, necessarily vary from one tertiary institution to another. However, it seems that certain objectives of the practicum are fundamental to most institutions in Australia. In their report of a national Australian survey conducted by the Supervision Development Project in 1980, Turney et al. (1982a), note that both tertiary supervisors and supervising teachers rated most highly the development by student teachers of effective teaching skills and strategies, including establishing suitable relationships with children, via practicum experiences. Students, tertiary staff, and supervising teachers involved in the practicum for the teacher primary education courses at James Cook University of North Queensland's School of Education and Mount Gravatt

Campus of Brisbane College of Advanced Education, indicated similar views regarding the aims of the practicum (Board of Teacher Education, Queensland, 1983). At both institutions the importance of students learning to interact with children, putting theory into practice, and gaining first hand experience of the day to day routine of classroom teaching was highlighted by the various groups closely associated with the practicum. Developing the student teachers' ability to self evaluate is another common objective (Cope, 1971; Turney et al., 1982a; Board of Teacher Education, Queensland, 1983), and was identified as important by both institutions participating in this study.

One major focus within the practicum area is supervision of student teaching. Effective supervision is recognized as a key factor in fostering quality in practice teaching. Turney et al. (1982b) argue:

> If, as the research indicates, practice teaching is the single most powerful intervention in a teacher's professional preparation, then supervision is the single most powerful process in such intervention. (p. 2)

The same authors, however, express considerable concern for more attention to be given to the training of supervisors (1982a. p. 12). There was particular emphasis in the report of the National Inquiry into Teacher Education or the need for careful selection of supervising teachers, and for training of supervising teachers for their role in the practicum (Auchmuty, 1980, p. 127). This theme was reiterated in the various inquiries into teacher education conducted by Australian States about this time (e.g. Bassett, 1978; Correy, 1980; Vickery, 1980; Gilding, 1980; Asche, 1980), as was the need for close liaison between schools and tertiary institutions in order to ensure adequate support for the supervising teacher.

The literature reveals the complexity of the supervisory process, and the problems that beset supervision of the practicum. Supervision of the practicum is a complex enterprise, for a variety of reasons. For example,

- it involves a close, almost "live in" relationship between the student teacher and supervising teacher for an extended period; (e.g. typically for a 2, 3 or 4 week "block" teaching practice; in this study the Townsville students were undertaking a 6 week block practice). In the final year of the preservice course, the student teacher virtually "takes over" the class for a period of continuous teachng;
- the supervisory relationship is triangular, with supervising teacher, tertiary lecturer and student teacher all closely associated in the practicum experience. Other school personnel are also involved, as are other tertiary staff. The possibilities for role conflict, and for the student teacher to receive conflicting supervisory guidance, are therefore considerable. For example, role conflict is at the core of a controversial aspect of the practicum, namely evaluation of the student's teaching competence. Turney et al. (1982a, p. 26) note Tibble's (1971) point that, by having to both support and make judgements of the student teacher, supervising teachers are most likely to experience some role conflict.

Turney et al. (1982a), refer to Cope's (1969) finding that there was a general lack of awareness of the nature of the relationship between the student teacher, supervising teacher and college staff; that is, a lack of knowledge of the "working partnership" between these three participants in the supervisory process (Turney et al., 1982a, p. 48). Students, supervising teachers and tertiary staff have found that their own role expectations are perceived differently by others in supervision (Yarrow et al., 1983). This situation reflects a need for these roles to be clearly defined, (Hewitson, 1981; Yarrow et al., 1983). Expectations held for student teachers by the other groups in the supervisory process also need to be clarified (Board of Teacher Education, Queensland, 1983). Tertiary staff and supervising

teachers believe that it would be beneficial to work more closely together, but state that time constraints experienced by tertiary staff make this goal difficult to achieve (Cope, 1971; Board of Teacher Education, Queensland, 1983; Yarrow et al., 1983).

According to Turney et al. (1982a), to ensure role clarification and suitable communication, a close working relationship between the cooperating schools and tertiary institutions is vital. Applegate and Laskey (1982, p. 17) go even further in highlighting the great value in teacher educators and school personnel being "aware of each others' needs and expectations". Martin (1982), concurring with these views, places (with teacher educators) responsibility for the communication of expectations to schools.

There is, increasingly, a focus on what supervising teachers do when they supervise students - that is, on the supervisory process. The literature on supervision in the practicum provides some insight into the supervisory process, and the personal and professional characteristics of supervising teachers considered by student teachers to be desirable. The term "clinical supervision" has evolved since the 1950s to describe a form of supervision which authorities in the teaching practice field regard as essential for enabling student teachers to grow professionally. Goldhammer, Anderson and Krajewski (1980, p. 19) tease out commonalities in various definitions of the term to explain such supervision as:

i) supervision deriving "data from first hand observation of actual teaching events";

ii) involving "face to face ... interaction between the supervisor and teacher" for the purpose of analysing "teaching behaviours and activities for instructional improvement".

The Supervision Development Project acknowledged the power of clinical supervision as a means of helping the student teacher develop instructional competence (Turney et al., 1982a, pp. 64/66). The major thrust of this project was to develop training materials to assist supervising teachers to learn their role, and the project's Role Handbook reflects a commitment to clinical supervision.

The literature has likewise revealed some personal and professional characteristics and behaviours of supervising teachers that appear to be associated with successful supervision. Personal characteristics of supervisors, such as honesty, openness, approachability and a supportive stance toward the student teacher, are highly valued by student teachers (Beauchamp, 1983; Sinclair and Nicoll, 1981; Yarrow et al., 1983). Providing constructive criticism, immediate and frequent feedback, encouraging student initiative in implementation of teaching skills and strategies, and showing genuine interest in the student's development, are seen as essential characteristics of good supervisors (Beauchamp, 1983; Board of Teacher Education, Queensland, 1983; Yarrow et al., 1983). The style of supervision adopted by the supervisor is also emerging as an aspect of practicum supervision. Copeland (1982, p. 32) suggests that student teachers can show a preference for:

> either
>
> a directive supervisory approach where the supervisor perceives student teacher needs and makes suggestions on this basis
>
> or
>
> a non-directive supervisory approach in which case the teacher uses less direct methods such as questioning in order to encourage the student teacher's own decision making.

In considering the findings of two previous studies, in 1976/77 and 1977/78, and a later study in 1978/79, Copeland (1982) considers a tentative implication for supervisors. Individual differences aside, student teachers in the early stages of this preservice practicum experience prefer a more

directive supervisory style. With increased confidence and experience gained through teaching practice their preference shifts towards the nondirective style. In either case, Beauchamp (1983, p. 2) sees a "good working relationship" between student teacher and supervisor (cooperating teacher) as "... fundamental to a rewarding student teaching experience". Such a relationship, Beauchamp suggests, would ideally have individuals being aware, accepting, and understanding of one another's expectations.

An aspect of practicum supervision that commands attention, and does receive some attention in the literature, is the problem of time. The need for close liaison between schools and tertiary institutions, cited earlier in this review, has clear implications for the time such liaison requires. For example, the Board of Teacher Education, Queensland (1984), study addresses this question in gathering its survey data. The national and various State inquiries cited previously similarly make reference, either directly or by implication, to the reality of the time demands effective supervision places on school and tertiary staff. What is highly relevant to this present study is the fact that supervising teachers need to find this time in addition to their rather full role in the classroom and in the school community. The Board of Teacher Education, Queensland (1984) study refers to this as a significant problem for supervising teachers. It may be, as one teacher said, that "... time has proved a major reason for ideals not being reached" (Board of Teacher Education, Queensland, 1984, p. 36).

In summary, the complexity of the practicum, organizationally and pedagogically, is very much highlighted in the literature as is the impact of the practicum on the student teacher. More recently, the central role of the supervising teacher, the need to prepare the supervising teacher for that role, and the need for the training institution to support the supervising teacher in that role, have emerged as central issues in the practicum. The contention by Turney et al. (1982, pp. 66/67) that "... supervisors,

especially co-operating teachers, have a considerable immediate influence on the developing professionel attitudes and teaching styles of student teachers" is both significant and widely supported, and behoves researchers, and teacher educators, to look very closely at the supervisory process. This process is at the core of the student teacher's learning experience in the practicum.

Thus, while it can be argued that effective supervision is a major ingredient of successful practice teaching, it can also be argued that the supervising teacher is of critical importance in effecting such supervision. Turney et al. (1982a; pp. 50/57) provide an excellent summary of studies stressing this critical role of teachers. Eltis, in a recent paper addressed to Queensland educators (1984, p. 9) highlights "... the kind of relationship established between supervisors and their student teachers" as a key factor in the supervision process. Eltis further argues that:

> The ultimate task of the supervisor is to encourage self sufficiency and to develop in students the capacity for autonomous functioning.

The achievement of such a task, however, depends so much on how the teacher operates as a supervisor.

The focus of this study, consequently, is upon the specific behaviours of a sample of teachers supervising the final year practice teaching of student teachers. The purpose is to describe and synthesize those behaviours which are most closely identified with teachers deemed to be "excellent" at the task of supervision.

CHAPTER 2: METHODOLOGY

Sample : Supervising Teachers

A sample of 12 supervising teachers from primary practising schools associated with James Cook University, and 20 from primary practising schools associated with Mount Gravatt Campus of the Brisbane College of Advanced Education, were used to provide data. Each teacher selected was deemed to be an "excellent" supervising teacher both by the principal of the school and by the student teacher supervised by the supervising teacher nominated.

Sample: Student Teachers

This comprised those student teachers who had been supervised by the teachers selected as the supervising teacher sample.

The samples were obtained by asking principals of all primary practising schools with final year students, and all final year students, to nominate supervising teachers deemed to be "excellent" supervising teachers. No definition of "excellent" was offered. Those supervising teachers identified on both lists became the sample.

Instruments

Data were collected for each sample using a structured interview schedule focusing on 16 key areas. The key areas were determined by reference to the more important aspects of supervision stressed in the literature. Each section of the schedule was designed to allow open ended responses.

The key areas explored were:

- pre-practice teaching preparation, including activities during pre-practice briefing;
- activities given emphasis upon the student teacher's arrival;

- information sought by the supervising teacher from each student;
- the supervising teacher's expectations of the student;
- pre-lesson discussion;
- collection of data about the student teacher's classroom teaching;
- post-lesson discussion;
- observation/demonstration lessons;
- evaluation of the student teacher's work;
- lecturers' visits;
- time spent in discussion with the student teacher;
- degree of initiative/autonomy given to the student teacher;
- establishing rapport with the student teacher;
- assisting the student teacher in gaining rapport with the class;
- key elements in successful supervision;
- poor supervision practices identified.

Appendices 1 and 2 provide samples of the interview schedules used.

Procedure

The following procedure was adopted:

i) All third year student teachers were asked to identify those supervising teachers whom they perceived to be excellent at supervision of practice teaching.

ii) At the same time Principals of practising schools with third year student teachers were also asked to identify teachers whom they perceived to be excellent at supervision of student teachers.

iii) Teachers common to both lists were identified as the potential sample of teachers; the student teacher sample

consisted of those student teachers who had been supervised by the sample of supervising teachers.

iv) Principals, supervising teachers and student teachers were contacted to seek cooperation in the study; 100% cooperation was given.

v) Interview schedules, designed cooperatively by the two researchers, were used as a basis for a brief training session with each research assistant.

vi) All supervising teachers were interviewed by the research assistants, using the interview schedule. Many were individual interviews, but small group interviews were conducted in some schools. All interviews were audio recorded.

vii) The research assistants prepared written transcripts of each interview.

viii) Student teacher interviews were conducted in a similar manner, with interviews being conducted by the researchers or, in some cases, by other members of lecturing staff. The interview schedule for student teachers was a slightly modified version of the one used for supervising teachers. Some interviews were conducted in small groups.

ix) Transcripts were analysed by the researchers, aided by the research assistants, and this analysis was used to provide the substance of the results presented in Chapter 3.

CHAPTER 3: RESULTS

Results from this study are presented as summaries of descriptive data derived from interviews of supervising teachers and student teachers. The data are presented as follows:

1. Data from supervising teacher interviews, Mount Gravatt Campus, Brisbane College of Advanced Education.

2. Data from supervising teacher interviews, James Cook University of North Queensland.

3. Data from student teacher interviews, Mount Gravatt Campus, Brisbane College of Advanced Education.

4. Data from student teacher interviews, James Cook University of North Queensland.

The following summaries do not systematicaly attempt to quantify data. With such a small sample, and with many disparate responses, such an exercise would have been of doubtful value, and of doubtful validity. Where appropriate, the frequency of particular responses will be indicated by terms such as "frequently", "often", "most", "some". At various points, particularly relevant or interesting comments are included by way of illumination.

The authors and research assistants who worked on this project were struck by the richness of the data gathered in the interviews. It is inevitable that this data base is distorted and diminished in the selective process of distilling key findings from the total volume of data, and it is regretted that the impact of the interviews on the listener (and initially on the interviewer) cannot be shared adequately in print. This, though regrettable, is a fact of life in research studies of this nature.

1. DATA FROM SUPERVISING TEACHER INTERVIEWS. MOUNT GRAVATT SAMPLE (N=20)

i) Pre-practice teaching preparation including activities during pre-practice briefing morning

Preparing the class:

Almost all supervising teachers in the sample stressed the importance of preparing the class for the visit of the student teachers, and advised their pupils in advance that a "visiting" teacher would be working with them (frequently "helping" was the word used)for a few weeks. In most cases this was emphasized as a positive event.

The name of the visiting teacher was given, usually written on the board, and in many cases some broad idea of the work the visiting teacher would be doing was briefly discussed. Some classes made name tags to assist the new teacher.

Overall, the general thrust here was in assisting to establish the status of the student teacher as a "teacher".

Preparing a work program for the student teacher:

Most teachers took care to ensure that a very clear work program, usually in the form of a C.C.P., was up to date and available for the student teacher to read, use, and in some cases, for taking home.

Allied with this, considerable thought was given to ways in which the student teacher could be meaningfully involved in assisting with teaching the class. This usually meant having a daily program prepared up to a week in advance, with likely areas highlighted for student teacher participation.

Frequently, this meant singling out some of the more interesting lessons, so that the student teacher could begin on a very positive note, and quickly develop a working rapport with the children.

Briefing day focus:

A major emphasis here was on assisting the student teacher to feel comfortable in the classroom, and to develop a friendly rapport.

Most teachers used this time to seek background information from student teachers, and to provide ("negotiate" in some cases) teaching expectations for the first day of practice. It was also an opportunity to encourage student teachers to discuss areas where they felt assistance would be most valuable.

Pre-preparation by the teachers:

Many teachers spent some time checking details from relevant sections of the practice teaching handbook. In some schools pre-practice teaching discussions were arranged by the Principal to involve all supervising teachers.

ii) Activities given emphasis upon the student teacher's arrival

Making the student teacher feel welcome:

This was considered very important by almost all teachers in the sample, and was achieved largely by friendly conversation, informality and by making the student teacher feel at home. Emphasis was given to such basic considerations as providing a personal "spot", be it merely a seat at spare table; by a brief positive reintroduction to the class; and by a consistent "happy to have you" approach.

Overall, the attitude expressed by teachers would best be described as "collegial", one seeking to give the student/ teacher reasonable status.

Introduction to other members of staff:

Most supervising teachers in the sample made a conscious effort to introduce student teachers to other teachers, usually as the occasion permitted. This occurred mainly in the staff room during breaks and was informal and friendly. A particular emphasis was given to cooperating teachers and to those in the same year level.

Many teachers made a point of introducing student teachers to support staff, including teacher/aides and groundsmen.

Initial communication to student teachers of information about pupils:

All teachers were concerned about the importance of communicating suitable pupil information, but displayed different ways of achieving this. Some deliberately wanted student teachers to work out problems for themselves. Most, however, on the first day, gave brief details about special cases, for example, children with learning difficulties and emotional problems, and provided some information about potential behaviour problems.

Much of this was done to give the student teacher a realistic understanding of the class but without "colouring" the student's ideas in any preconceived way. Some teachers outlined family factors pertinent to certain pupils.

Overall, teachers regarded such information about children as very important in assisting student teachers to understand and cater for different pupils in the class. In most cases, with time, discussion about individual pupils became more and more detailed and sophisticated.

Activities designed to help student teachers settle in:
Most teachers ensured the student teacher had a clear overview, in advance, of the teaching program for at least one week, and also that he/she had very clear expectations about teaching for the first day.

Coupled with this were carefully chosen lessons for the first day; lessons where the student could concentrate on developing a good teacher/class relationship and begin positively. Many teachers on the first day gave observational activities, teacher/aide work, and activities with small groups to help ensure that positive experiences were likely.

Most teachers also quickly involved the student teacher in basic classroom routines such as marking the roll, assisting individual pupils, taking short sessions with the whole class etc., all focusing upon the student teacher's "blending in" with the normal classroom procedures, and allowing him/her to settle in comfortably.

Information sought about previous practice teaching:
Generally, supervising teachers did not check back over previous practice teaching work, but rather set out deliberately to determine relevant information for themselves. Several expressed the wish to avoid

preconceived ideas about the student, and were content to gather information incidentally as occasions presented themselves.

iii) What information did you seek from your student?

Subjects/areas studied at college:

Most teachers explored this area to help establish student teacher strengths and weaknesses and to plan the practice experiences accordingly. Some were very interested in current emphasis in college work, e.g. the process approach to writing, and encouraged student teachers accordingly. Others looked for strengths the student could capitalize on, particularly in areas the teacher "didn't usually focus on"; in some cases student teachers were encouraged to seek opportunities and to try out new ideas.

Discussion of previous practice teaching:

This occurred with most teachers who used information obtained constructively to establish a "profile" of the student's experience. Many were interested in the nature of the experience gained: open area; cooperative; traditional; and in year levels previously taught. From this, opportunities were sought to capitalize on previous strengths/experiences.

Personal background of student teachers:

This detail was not deliberately sought but was obtained incidentally. Many teachers acknowledged the importance of this area, particularly where possible problems such as home diffculties, transport and health could affect practice teaching work.

Extra curricular activities:

Most teachers quickly discovered student teachers' strengths in this area to assist in planning positive experiences for the student teachers, and to make use of any strengths available.

Overall, teachers handled the above areas of discussion in a low -key manner through informal conversation. Such conversation generally increased as supervising teacher and student teacher got to know one another more.

iv) Your expectations of the student

All teachers made expectations of the student very clear; they regarded this as vitally important. This was usually achieved through deliberate discussion with the student teacher in some cases assisted by brief checklists.

Initial discussions were frequently followed up as the occasion demanded.

Most teachers used their program of work, the practice teaching handbook and, at times, assessment forms, to assist in such discussions.

Topics emphasized for teaching were mainly:

- Specific details of teaching required of the student, given as much in advance as possible. Most teachers in the sample gave at least a week's advance notice of teaching expectations.
- The degree of autonomy/flexibility the student could exercise particularly in content, method and classroom management.
- Preparation required included the emphasis to be given to written notes, daily programs and the like.

- Preferred ways of handling the children.
- Basic rules of the classroom; expected everyday routines.
- Basic rules for working as a student teacher in the classroom, e.g. planning, preparation before school; pre-lesson discussion; insistance of good standards; punctuality, etc. etc.

Expectation for duties outside the classroom were given brief but deliberate attention, and focused largely on playground duty, meetings to attend and extra curricular activities.

v) Pre-lesson discussion

Approach adopted:

Generally two levels of involvement were obvious in responses:

(a) discussion well before lessons were to be taught; and

(b) discussion much closer to the event, when very specific issues were considered.

At level (a) many teachers encouraged a great deal of mutual discussion of planning where general quidelines for the teaching were clearly established. Some teachers used a deliberate structure for this as follows:

- general guidelines discussed well in advance;
- detailed discussion/constructive advice after the student teacher had carried out individual preparation;
- brief discussion on the day of teaching, using student teacher's written preparation as a focus.

A key element for most teachers was interactive discussion.

Main areas for discussion:

- Content/objectives were given considerable stress by many teachers.
- Most teachers focused upon the essential detail of a lesson needed to ensure its success.
- Most teachers used pre-lesson discussion as an opportunity to refine student teacher ideas, consider options for teaching specific lessons, suggesting strategies for making the lesson more effective and considering various resources.
- In some instances the previous day's work provided ideas for pre-lesson discussion and offered opportunities for the teacher to present very specific ideas. For example: strategies for getting the lesson across; areas where the lesson could fall down; where the children should be for each stage of the lesson; how to keep control; what to do to make sure the class is listening; how to proceed from one activity to another.

Discussion about what you intended to observe:

The teachers were evenly divided on this. Some advised student teachers they would focus deliberately on specific areas, e.g. management, content, timing. Often these areas were generated from discussion of work performed earlier by the student teacher. Specific focus was given by such comments as:

"I'll be watching for ..."

"Try to conduct the lesson with particular concern for ..."

Those who did not pre-specify areas they would observe subsequently reacted generally to any issues needing attention.

General:

Teachers recognize pre-lesson discussion as an important area for final year students. It was used by many teachers as a means of increasing the student teacher's sensitivity to more sophisticated planning while still allowing for necessary assistance to be given in areas of basic need.

vi) Collection of data about the student teacher's classroom teaching

All teachers in the sample collected data about the student teacher's classroom teaching, but their methods varied considerably. Most, however, kept some form of written notes, jotted down as the occasion warranted, either in a separate notebook or in the student teacher's Preparation Book (Notes of Lessons).

Frequently, more negative comments were reserved for a separate notebook and used for ongoing constructive discussion, more obviously positive notes were witten in notes of lessons books, usually at the completion of a lesson or during a non teaching break.

A few teachers wrote notes and relied heavily on "mental" notes as a basis for later discussion with the student teacher.

A general feature of data collection was its unobtrusiveness. Teachers avoided any formal approacn and frequently observed while doing other things (e.g. working with small groups or individual children).

vii) Post-lesson discussion

How, when, where:

The overwhelming impression given for this area is that teachers were extremely keen to discuss the student's teaching wherever the two could get together, and as soon as possible after the event. Discussion was usually in the classroom and involved all or some or morning tea, lunch, after school and before school. Many teachers indicated they willingly stayed back after school to discuss work with the student teacher.

During continuous teaching by the student teacher many teachers took opportunities to give brief constructive feedback whenever possible, e.g. "Try this ..." or "Watch out for ... Could I help with ...?" In addition, major discussion occurred at the end of the day and focused upon the events of the whole day.

Where possible teachers sought unhurried searching discussions aimed at helping the student with subsequent teaching. Many teachers initiated discussion with:

"Let's talk about ..."

"How did you think your lesson went ..."

Role of student teacher self evaluation:

Self evaluation by the student teacher was seen as extremely important by nearly all of the teachers. Most required self evaluation in oral and written form, and used this deliberately as a basis for constructive discussion.

Many teachers provided opportunities for their student teachers to prepare written self evaluations as soon as

possible after teaching so that this could be used for discussion purposes.

Bases for discussion:

Teachers generally used a combination of oral and written comments as a basis for discussion, with most favouring oral, extensive informal discussion.

Most commented on the better opportunities for more honest, blunt constructive discussion, where oral comments or brief written notes (private, not in Notes of Lessons) and informal observations were used.

As outlined in the section above, student notes, particularly self evaluation comments, were used extensively here. In some cases pupil worksheets were used to advantage for discussion purposes.

Audio and video tapes were not used for this purpose.

Balance of negative and positive comments; conscious use of constructive discussion:

Considerable emphasis was given (by practically all teachers in the sample) to attempting to achieve such a balance. Similar emphasis was given to the conscious use of constructive discussion.

viii) Observation/demonstration lessons

Deliberate observations/demonstrations:

Several of the teachers deliberately modelled lessons or parts of lessons for the students to follow, but most were conscious of providing a model not the model, and encouraged student teachers to use "my" ideas and/or "your

own". Many expressed the need to allow individual styles to emerge, particularly with student teachers at this level.

Where demonstration was deliberate most teachers gave student teachers some focus, e.g. on a specific strategy, particularly if the focus was something "new" for that student teacher. Many also followed up after the demonstration with deliberate questions like:

"Did you notice ...?"

"What would you have done when ...?"

Non-deliberate observations/demonstrations:

Most teachers, however, stressed a less structured approach to demonstration, and relied heavily on student teachers observing generally, with considerable encouragement given to the student teachers to ask questions about the teachings observed. Teachers frequently said, for example:

"Ask me anything you want to about my teaching"

"Do you understand why ...?"

They felt that their normal style of teaching, therefore, should be used, with no "showy" lessons. Some teachers, however, were very conscious of preparing and teaching with observation by student teachers deliberately in mind.

ix) Evaluation of the student teacher's work

Discussion of assessment criteria:

All teachers in the sample went to considerable trouble to ensure that student teachers were aware of, and understood, the assessment criteria to be used. In most cases the criteria were considered, using the teacher's copy of the assessment form, during the second and third weeks. This

allowed for discussion of the quality of teaching demonstrated, and led to constructive assistance where appropriate.

Use of interim and final reports:

Interim reports, usually in oral form, with some written comments on the teachers "working" copy of the assessment form, were used largely for diagnostic constructive purposes.

For most students the final report presented few surprises and in many cases teachers discussed likely comments and some allowed student teachers to negotiate changes where these could be justified.

x) Lecturer's visits

For supervision purposes

About half the sample teachers took deliberate advantage of the lecturer's visits to seek assistance in overall supervision of the student teacher. This usually took the form of discussion, sharing of ideas and confirmation of judgements made.

A few teachers found the lecturer's visits of little use for assisting with supervision, the visits being too brief and/or comments made too general. One teacher said:

"I had to lasso the lecturer to get any assistance!"

For assessment purposes:

Most of the teachers used the lecturers to assist in assessment largely by seeking from them confirmation of standards likely to be awarded. This usually took the form of discussion of individual student teachers, and often involved the Principal.

xi) Time spent in discussion with your student teacher

How much time?:

All teachers gave a high priority to discussion time, with most of them estimating at least one hour per day or more, on average, given over to such discussion. A few estimated at least one and a half hours per day and one said three-quarters of an hour. One said discussion goes on "... all the time".

For most, the amount of time did not necessarily vary as the practice teaching session progressed, but the focus did.

Focus of discussion:

Almost all teachers stressed basic issues initially but quickly moved to more sophisticated discussion as the students gained more experience, and particularly in response to the student teacher's questions. This was described as "polishing".

The more frequently addressed issues were planning, possible strategies to use, individual children in the class and ways to handle them, improving the quality of teaching and learning, and personal matters.

It was difficult to estimate where the major focus was, but certainly effective planning, and the understanding of specific children in the class, were given considerable emphasis by most teachers.

xii) Degree of initiative/autonomy given to the student teacher

How much autonomy?

Almost all teachers in the sample gave students as much autonomy as possible, but the judgement about "how much"

was influenced by such factors as the quality of the student, experience with the class and other circumstances.

Much emphasis was given to careful monitoring of the student teacher's accommodation to increased autonomy, and to the effects of existing constraints such as: the need to work in preestablished ways with cooperating teachers in doublespace teaching areas; the requirements imposed by existing C.C.Ps in key areas, particularly Maths and Language Arts; and, established classroom management practices.

Also stressed was the concept of autonomy with support. Most teachers, while monitoring the student teacher's activities, were always ready to provide unobtrusive support where needed.

A general pattern was to give student teachers considerable freedom, from the first week, in planning, teaching and evaluating units of work or in handling sections of the curriculum, e.g. the reading program, or a reading group. This degree of freedom increased with time so that by the third week, given the factors described above, student teachers enjoyed considerable autonomy in a wide range of curriculum and management areas.

To what extent were you a model for the student teacher?: Most teachers in the sample did not generally set themselves up deliberately as models for student teachers to follow, although some did model key lessons on parts of lessons for this purpose.

Many expressed the opinion that student teachers at this level should be developing individual styles, so that demonstration by the supervising teacher should be an approach for consideration, and for understanding of why the teacher used the approach, but not for slavish imitation.

xiii) Establishing rapport with the student teacher

This was given considerable emphasis by all teachers in the sample. Most considered being friendly and personal, and expressing a genuine readiness to help as key factors in establishing rapport. Comments such as "... by talking quite a bit" or "I am in the background to help" or "If you want help, please ask" or "It's your class as much as mine for the three weeks", "... making them (student teachers) feel part of the team" were common.

In addition, most commented on the need to be open and honest, and to encourage student teachers to be the same. Fairness, not belittling the student teacher, engaging in relaxed talk, seeking and making opportunities available for friendly discussion, were all emphasized.

xiv) Assisting the student teacher in gaining rapport with the class

Importance of student teacher rapport with the class:
This was considered by all teachers to be very important. Most commented that good rapport was essential both for the class and for the student teacher.

Ways of assisting student teachers to gain rapport:
Most teachers recognized the importance of acting upon this before the student teacher arrived for block practice, and ensured that the class was prepared in advance for the

student teacher. In addition, many teachers carefully selected teaching experiences for student teachers' first contacts with the class so that such contacts were likely to be positive.

During the early stages of the practice teaching block most teachers tried to ensure that the class saw a "partnership" between teacher and student teacher with much deliberate (on the part of the teacher) interaction occurring between teacher and student teacher during the course of the teaching day. This was achieved by providing the student teacher with meaningful roles during lessons taken by the teacher; by at times publicly seeking the student teacher's opinions; or by such comments as:

"I'm busy at the moment .. Miss____ will be able to help you"

Many teachers also ensured a smooth introduction to the classroom by consciously helping the student teacher with insights about the children, and by giving basic tips on working with this "particular" class, e.g. being fair; carrying out plans set; correcting homework early in the day; being sincere. In this way they were attempting to help the student teacher feel a part of the classroom group.

xv) Key elements in successful supervision

Personal characteristics emphasized

Most teachers in the sample stressed the following -

- being a caring person; prepared to care about the student;
- being friendly and personal;
- being honest and realistic;
- one who enjoys teaching and working with student teachers;

- one who is positive in interpersonal relationships.

Professional characteristics emphasized:

- being prepared to help at all times;
- a good teaching model, respected by the class;
- prepared to discuss all aspects of teaching with the student teacher;
- well organized;
- having a flexible approach to supervision, i.e. not being overly rigid about what is deemed to be good teaching;
- being professional;
- treating the student teacher where possible as an equal.

What helped you develop supervision skills?:

Many felt this developed with experience. Other factors which helped included practice teaching handbooks; interacting with other supervisors; through trial and error; and in a couple of instances as reaction against negative supervision practices they had encountered themselves.

xvi) Poor supervision practices identified (i.e. through casual observation of supervision):

- mainly negative approach/over critical;
- being aloof, unfriendly, noncaring;
- too inflexible;
- not providing feedback;
- unprepared;
- one who fails to give necessary support;
- one who treats student teacher as an inferior;
- one who lacks interpersonal skills.

2. DATA FROM SUPERVISING TEACHER INTERVIEWS, JAMES COOK UNIVERSITY (N=12)

James Cook University of North Queensland - School of Education

(In the following summary the supervising teacher will on occasions be referred to as "supervisor", and the student teacher as "student").

i) Before the teaching practice - prior contact with supervising teacher

The students typically made pre-practice contact with the supervising teacher. This usually followed on telephone contact with the school, and a visit or visits to the classroom. In some cases after-school contact followed, in one case involving visits to the supervising teacher's house. The contacts had significant elements of the personal/social as well as professional, in that the supervisors endeavoured to begin the process of getting to know the student, and making the student feel welcome. The professional aspects included assignments of lessons to the student, prereading in curriculum content, and access to the supervising teacher's timetable and long-term planning.

ii) The beginning of the teaching practice - introducing the student to the class

The introduction to the class varied, particularly with the grade level involved. The introduction process started before the student arrived in most cases, in that the supervising teacher told the children that another teacher, or student teacher, would be coming "next week". At the lower grades "another teacher" was the usual term. At the upper grade level in some cases the supervising teacher told the class that a "special" teacher, a "young" teacher, or "student"

teacher was coming. In a number of cases the supervising teacher made the point that his/her class was quite accustomed to having student teachers, and other visiting adults, so little needed to be said. In at least one case, at upper school level, the "learner" aspect was mentioned, in that the class was told that the student was learning the role of a teacher, and therefore the supervising teacher may "interrupt" at various times to help the student out.

In most situations the supervising teacher similarly made a point of introducing the student teacher to other staff members. The keynote seemed to be "informal" introductions, in that they were made in the natural process of staff room interaction.

iii) Settling-in activities provided for the student teacher: information provided by the supervising teacher for the student teacher

These usually consisted of simple teaching tasks, "teacher aide" activities, and observational tasks. The purpose was clearly to encourage the student teacher to interact with the children, to get to know them, to become familiar with their abilities and interests, and with the class routines. The student teachers were shown the supervising teacher's timetable, planning and resources. Discussion about the nature of the class, and about particular children (e.g. children with special needs, in some cases children regarded as behaviour problems), and about teaching strategies used by the teacher were part of the settling in process. Group and individual teaching situations were frequently used in this early stage of the practice. However, a theme which came

through was that this information sharing by the supervising teacher was balanced by strategies to encourage the students to observe carefully, and to form their own impressions of the children. The need to learn children's names rapidly was emphasized, sometimes via seating charts. In one case a student was introduced to a few children who explained to the student how classroom routines operated. In another case the teacher had the student study the children's written work to encourage the student to get to know children's abilities and interests.

iv) Information sought by the supervising teacher about the student teacher

The point worthy of comment here is the decision by the supervising teacher about how much information to seek, and how much not to seek. Supervising teachers seemed, in most cases, to make their own judgements about the student teacher's teaching competence. The supervising teachers receive, by way of a Teaching Practice Preference Form completed by the student at the University, and subsequently posted to the school, information about previous grade levels taught on teaching practice, and subjects in which the student is majoring in third year. The supervising teacher had access to the student teacher's previous teaching practice report, which is also posted to the school, and the student's "teaching log" (mainly lesson and unit plans from previous teaching practices), which the student brings to the school. Seldom did the supervising teacher want to look at these documents.

The supervising teacher did, in an informal, seemingly incidental fashion, appear to prefer to get to know the student teacher at the personal level. Common interests were discussed, as might do friends or work colleagues. This appeared to be the starting point for the supervising teacher learning about the student; the professional qualities would be revealed in time.

v) How the supervising teacher made the student teacher aware of his/her expectations

The nature of this third year teaching practice is outlined in detail in the Teaching Practice Handbook. Supervising teachers and student teachers each have a copy of this handbook, together with a memo which summarises the nature of this practice, and associated policies and procedures.

> Students attend a teaching practice briefing in the University before going on this teaching practice, and this includes a unit on planning expectations for this practice of some four hours duration. They are given a booklet on Current Curriculum Program (C.C.P.) planning, and this booklet is also available to supervising teachers. University lecturers (referred to as teaching practice "moderators") also brief supervising teachers on the nature of this practice in their schools before the practice begins.

The point that emerged in the interviews was that supervising teachers made student teachers aware of their expectations by what they did rather than by specific reference to available documents. The student teacher, by observing the supervising teacher, became aware of the expectations in the area of routines, pupil behaviour, work standards, and social conventions. This was accompanied by discussions about planning formats, management and teaching strategies. It seemed that rather than saying to the student

teacher "This is how I want you to do it", the supervising teacher said "This is how I do it". The student was given the autonomy to use his/her own initiative, to try something different. Interestingly, the students and supervising teachers both made the point that the supervising teacher's expectations became clearer when the student made mistakes. The various documents referred to earlier were acknowledged as a source of expectations, as was the principal, who meets weekly with the students. There was also reference to considerable discussion early in the practice between student and supervisor (e.g. "one hour each afternoon for the first two days") to help clarify expectations.

vi) Pre-lesson discussion

This was typically about planning, management, teaching strategies, etc. Only occasionally student and supervisor discussed what the supervisor would observe while the student taught.

In one case the student was having problems with her movement around the class and the supervisor said that she would observe this during the student's lesson. It seemed that supervising teachers were observing all facets of a lesson, and it was assumed that they would be doing so by students. When it was felt necessary by either or both parties, then particular facets (typically perceived as weaknesses - in one situation the supervising teacher recorded the number of "o.ks" used by "the" student!) would be observed.

The following points also emerged:

- The supervisor reduced the level of guidance in planning as the practice progressed.
- The supervisor usually expected the student to choose the strategy and associated organization. Student autonomy and initiative were encouraged and expected.
- If the supervisor disagreed with the proposed strategy, he/she would diplomatically suggest an alternative, but not "put the student down".

vii) Data collection

Supervisors had comparatively little to say in this area. It seems that supervisors gathered data by a combination of written notes (frequently very full notes) and what they referred to as "mental notes" (as one supervisor said, "lots of mental notes"). It seemed that supervisors sometimes did the one, sometimes the other, but frequently a combination of both. There was, in one case, some unease expressed about "writing things down on pieces of paper". In one case an audio tape was used.

The question of whether to "interrupt" during this observational and data gathering phase was referred to here. For example, one supervisor felt it was acceptable to "interrupt" in the area of content and strategies, but not in the area of management.

What was interesting was that (in several cases) supervisors seemed to value giving "instant feedback" to the student during this phase. This feedback (cf. the reference to "interruptions" earlier) was seen to be supportive, not negative. It did, in some cases, take the form of modelling,

by the supervisor, the particular point the supervisor wished to make.

viii) Post-lesson discussion

A notable point, made by a majority of supervisors was that post lesson discussion began with the student's self evaluation rather than with the supervisor's data and evaluation.

However, a number of supervisors said that they always opened the discussion by giving the student some positive comment on the lesson observed. The necessity for lots of talking between supervisor and student was referred to in a few cases, in one case (over coffee) at the supervisor's home. The power of videotape analysis was cited in another case. One supervisor wrote comments that night on the student's lesson plan. Several supervisors stated that they chose only some of the weaknesses observed (e.g. "half" was mentioned) to discuss, and have the student work on in future lessons. Several supervisors considered that the students were "A bit hard on themselves" in their self evaluation. One supervisor made the point that the approach he/she used was different for each student.

ix) Observation by the student : demonstration by the supervisor

The responses to this item were rather brief. The nature of this six week teaching practice is such that there is little opportunity for observation by the student later in the practice. In the final three weeks the student is teaching continuously, with the supervising teacher frequently acting as a cooperating teacher. During the first three weeks the student is expected to teach on average two hours per day.

One would expect, therefore, that the student observes the supervisor most frequently and most closely early in the practice, and this was revealed to be so by the interview data.

A number of points did emerge, however:

- The student, it was agreed, has little choice but model the supervisor's management techniques because the class is "trained to them". One student tried to establish her own routines and management techniques at the beginning of the practice, but this "didn't work". The student then copied ome of the supervisor's techniques.
- Given that supervisors acknowledged this fact, they saw the need to encourage their students to develop their own style. One supervisor commented that her student modelled her totally to the extent of "becoming me" at one stage during the practice. Later, however, when she felt confident with the class, the student (female) "became her". The "becoming me", it was noted, even included body mannerisms used by the supervisor.
- Little reference was made to "demonstration" lessons in the sense of lessons especially taught for the student to observe. Observation was seen as more incidental, naturalistic. It seemed that rarely was this observation guided and systematic. In only one case did the supervisor indicate that he/she sometimes "directed" the student to watch a particular lesson or aspect of a lesson which the student could "try out" later. The supervisor made the point that this "might not work for another personality". In one case the supervisor asked the student if he/she wanted the supervisor to demonstrate anything.

Another supervisor invited the student to evaluate the supervisor's lesson.

- A supervising teacher referred to "more models" being available in an open area classroom. Several of the students were in such classrooms.

x) Evaluating student's teaching competence

The supervisor writes the teaching practice report at the end of the practice period, and this is countersigned by student, principal and University "moderator" (e.g. the lecturer who liaises closely with the particular school during the year). After the first two weeks of the six week practice the supervisor is required to give the student an interim report, using the third year teaching practice report form as a basis for doing so. This report, with an accompanying description of the categories, is included in the Teaching Practice handbook.

Although supervisors referred to feedback via the interim and final report, the strong consensus was that "day to day, minute to minute evaluation" was more important than "summative evaluation". There seemed to be little formal discussion of criteria for evaluation (as outlined on the report form). The encouragement given by supervisors for students to self evaluate was noted, as was the openness of the discussions about the student's teaching competence. This "sharing" and "open discussion" was reflected in statements by several supervisors that the final report held "no surprises" for the student.

The interim report was used as a basis for discussion. The implication was that weaknesses in their teaching were identified in the interim reporting process. One supervising teacher used a "daily green card giving a few points for the student to consider and work on".

xi) Lecturer's visits

Supervisors stated that the main contribution made by the visiting lecturer was that supervisors were provided with a "second opinion" on the student. This is consistent with the advisory role of the visiting lecturer; the visiting lecturer does not have an evaluative role. Reference was made to the visiting lecturer observing "things missed out" by the supervisor. Some supervisors referred to the lecturer's role as "minimal". Some supervisors followed up on the lecturer's comments by taking up some of the points the lecturer noted and discussed with the student. A three way discussion (supervisor, student, lecturer) was sometimes held. The need for the lecturer to confer with the supervisor was mentioned by one supervisor, because the supervisor considered that he/she had a "more rounded view of the student". In one situation a supervisor was "very upset" when a lecturer "refused" to write comments, and praised the student for a "hopeless" lesson. (The student concerned was initially regarded as "at risk" in this practice, when this lecturer's visit occurred, but subsequently taught satisfactorily).

Supervisors emphasized the "business as normal" situation when a lecturer visits. No "special" lessons were planned. Reference was made by one supervisor to a lecturer's visit being like "a shot in the dark". A student made the point

that the influence a lecturer's visit had depended on whether the supervisor "respected the lecturer".

xii) Time spent by supervisor in discussions with student

This was not easy for supervisors to quantify. It was clear that:

- considerable time was spent in such discussion (e.g. 30 to 45 minutes per day, 1 hour per day, sometimes 2 hours per day, two 3 hour sessions in a week away from school plus "bits and pieces at school");
- time was usually spent before and after school, during lunch hour, and often immediately after a student's lesson;
- more time was spent earlier in the practice than during the final three weeks' "continuous". (This was in part assisting the student with planning for this three week program; management skills were also referred to as frequently discussed, particularly early in the practice);
- one supervisor made reference to the "time and emotional drain of communication (with the student)";
- one supervisor said "all day - never unaware of each other".

xiii) Degree of initiative, autonomy, responsibility given to the student

The clear consensus among supervisors was that there was a high level of autonomy given to students by supervisors, and a considerable degree of initiative was expected. The following comments illustrate this:

- "as much as the student could handle";

- "suggest content and allowed student to develop strategies".

However, underpinning this was an indication that this autonomy was underpinned by a "support system" provided, albeit sometimes unobtrusively, by the supervisor. The following comments indicate this:

- "didn't hesitate to intervene if problems";
- "provide alternatives";
- "watch carefully the first few lessons and judge from that how much freedom to give; each student is different";
- "careful to engineer early success for student".

The other point which emerged was the increasing autonomy given as the practice progressed, as illustrated by the following comments:

- "very prescriptive at the start, then gave freedom";
- "told student he/she would be left to 'survive' alone at some stage during prac".

xiv) Establishing rapport with the student

This has been indicated to some extent under headings (i), (ii) and (iii) above. Many supervisors referred to the relationship as being "open and honest". For example, they made the point that they did not want to be seen as perfect, but would make "errors" which they would discuss with the student. The following comments by supervisors were made which are indicative of factors involved in establishing rapport:

- "whole approach, personal, informal, relaxed - gave student teacher home phone number, etc., but up to student to respond";

- "making student teacher welcome";
- "expect that student teacher will do well";
- "student teacher status equal in classroom to other two teachers (In a two-teacher situation);
- "encourage children to ask student teacher for help";
- "personality match";
- "enjoyed doing extra things for student teacher and student teacher enjoyed doing extra things for room";
- "encourage open discussion of written comments/reports";
- "explicitly said 'be honest, ask every questin you want, because tomorrow's lesson will show".

One supervising teacher made the comment that "some students become dependent on the 'mother superior' position of the supervisor".

xv) Key elements in successful supervision

The key points made by supervisors are:

- to really WANT to have students - to welcome them in your room, see their values;
- to share your commitment to the teaching profession;
- to be warm and open and honest and to be able to talk things out;
- to share your class, children, parents;
- positive approach - helpful, not just critical;
- to relax and enjoy children and have sense of humour;
- thorough preparation before student arrives;
- encourage student teacher to contribute a lot;
- make student teacher responsible for own teaching;
- clear guidelines and scope to develop own style;

- give lots of freedom at start;
- to give realistic expectation of what teaching is;
- to care about student teacher.

One supervising teacher said "Students are great for my children, therefore I work hard at being a good supervisor".

xvi) Supervisors' views on undesirable supervisory behaviour

The supervisors listed the following as major faults in a supervising teacher:

- too critical, too many negatives;
- supervising teacher setting self up as perfect;
- "correcting" student teacher in front of children;
- never throws away the support, never allows the student teacher to try out alone. (Good supervising teacher knows where and when to let go);
- interfering (very difficult for supervising teacher not to chime in with extra advice);
- being a "mother hen";
- negative attitudes to teaching or to people;
- say there's just one way to teach;
- don't encourage student teacher to experiment, have failures and develop personal style;
- being critical and not providing alternatives;
- ignores problems - they need to be worked out;
- is vague in setting expectations.

What Supervisors Considered Helped them Develop their Supervisory Skills

A variety of influences and factors were listed. The following were listed by several supervisors:

- experience - I better understand my own teaching - it takes a couple of years to know yourself as a teacher and put the theories into practice for yourself;
- other teachers who were very helpful with students;
- seminars given by the coordinators of practice teaching, especially questioning techniques.

The following were mentioned by particular supervisors:

- Raising Teacher Expectations of Student Achievement (án inservice program conducted by the former Townsville College of Advanced Education for classroom teachers in 1980) course taught coding and observing skills and innumerable other ways to assist a supervisor and a teacher to develop;
- using video of lesson with associated coding;
- Teacher Development (á teaching processes core subject in in the Diploma of Teaching) undertaken as a student was relevant and helpful for supervision;
- having had good supervisors when I was a student teacher;
- discussions with other supervisors at seminars;
- role playing by student teachers at seminar in 1980 at the then Townsville College of Advanced Education.

3. DATA FROM STUDENT TEACHERS, MOUNT GRAVATT CAMPUS, BRISBANE C.A.E. (N=16)

i) <u>When you arrived at the school</u>

Welcome/Introductions:

All student teachers were made to feel welcome by the supervising teacher and introduced to the class, usually as a "visiting" teacher. Introductions to other teachers,

particularly those in the year level, were usually deliberate but informal.

Overall, the impression given was one of emphasizing the student teacher's status as a teacher.

Discussion about the class:

This was stressed in all cases. The focus was largely upon special children in the class, e.g. medical, learning problems, as well as upon timetables and resources.

Settling in Activities:

These were perceived to be carefully thought out with obvious "settling in" activities given for early contacts with the class. Many students were conscious of experiencing a steady progression of expectations. Most were made aware of written planning for the work of the class over several weeks.

Notes from previous practice teaching:

These were generally not asked for or used. Many teachers advised students that they wanted to have no preconceived ideas about their work.

ii) What information did your supervising teacher seek from you?

Almost all student teachers said this was handled largely incidentally, particularly as a means of building rapport.

College background was explored marginally mainly to find out about teaching strengths and "new" ideas from college. Previous practice teaching was given very little emphasis.

Major emphasis, however, was given to discussion about extra curricular and personal interests, again as a means for establishing rapport. For example, one student described this as:

"She related to me as a person"

Students felt this was handled with sensitivity; no "intruding" into private lives appeared to occur.

iii) The supervising teacher's expectations

All students reported open discussion as the major means adopted. In most cases this was linked with the supervising teacher's written planning, was relatively explicit, and was given well in advance of tasks the student teacher was required to perform.

iv) Pre-lesson discussion

Several students commended the approach used where lessons were given well in advance and written preparation checked the day before.

In most cases the focus for pre-lesson discussion was on content and resources, with skills/strategies largely left to the student teacher.

Some were given a specific focus for the teacher's observation of their work, but most were not; observation in these cases was general.

Most student teachers expressed the view that teachers were very supportive in this area of supervision.

v) Post-lesson discussion

How? When?

Most students said these discussions were conducted in an informal, constructive and supportive manner. They occurred regularly, preferably on the same day as the teaching being observed, and as soon as possible after such teaching. Non-teaching breaks, particularly lunch time and after school were the most usual times, but many enjoyed incidental feedback at regular convenient times during the day.

In most cases the discussion was based upon the teacher's written notes and upon student teacher oral/written self evaluation.

Several students noted that as time went on discussion focused more on the day's work rather than upon individual lessons.

vi) Observation/demonstration lessons

The sample was evenly divided here between supervising teachers who deliberately gave observations and those who left it to the student teacher's discretion.

Several of the former group appreciated opportunities to profit from specifics of lessons demonstrated; as one student put it:

"Terrific, always gave points to think about!"

For some of the student teachers who were left to use their own initiative concerning observation, the teachers deliberately sought discussion about observations made.

vii) Evaluation

All student teachers were given plenty of thorough discussion and feedback about assessment expectations and progress. Most found such discussions to be positive, with progressive comments made at regular intervals.

viii) Lecturer's visits

These were generally used to confirm the supervising teacher's opinions, particularly about assessment.

Some found lecturer's visits useful and constructive; others felt they were not used very much, and in one case, they were "... an interruption!"

ix) Time spent on discussion with your supervising teacher

Most student teachers reported spending "much" or "a lot of" time in discussion with the teacher. Range was from about 20 minutes to about 60 minutes per day. They all saw this as important.

Major areas of focus:

- planning, including joint planning;
- objectives;
- resources;
- teaching effectiveness;
- sharing ideas;
- discussing individual children.

For many, discussion time increased as the practice teaching session progressed; for a few this decreased as they became more independent of the teacher.

x) Degree of autonomy/responsibility given

Almost all student teachers reported being given a great deal of autonomy once they had "proved" themselves. One student put it this way:

"I was the teacher. They were my kids!"

However, they were also conscious of the teacher being available for support when and if needed, and were generally conscious of keeping to established procedures, particularly in the area of management/control.

Deliberate modelling by supervising teachers was not usual.

xi) Establishing rapport with the supervising teacher

All student teachers reported very positively about this area. There was considerable agreement about procedures adopted by teachers. These were:

- making the student teacher feel at ease by friendly discussion, deliberately involving them in the every day work/life of the classroom;
- being honest and open in all matters;
- projecting a friendly, positive image;
- being ready to discuss matters.

xii) Key elements in successful supervision

There was considerable agreement across all of the sample about which elements of supervision were important for supervising teachers. These were:

Professonal characteristics

- well organized;

- a good teacher with interesting ideas to pass on, for example

  "One who challenged children to learn and enjoy learning";
- emphasized discussion/feedback about the student teacher's work;
- caring and dedicated.

Personal

- sincere and open;
- personal and friendly;
- interested in student teaching;
- treats the student teacher, within reason, as a colleague.

xiii) Examples of poor supervision by supervising teachers

(A general observation based on several teachers)

The following were the major issues identified:

- poor professional standards/poor teachers;
- poorly organized, e.g. not given sufficient advance notice;
- too dominant, inflexible (I.e. one right way!);
- little or no discussion/feedback;
- excessively negative;
- undermining the student teacher's confidence in front of the class.

4. DATA FROM STUDENT TEACHER INTERVIEWS, JAMES COOK UNIVERSITY (N=12)

In the following summary the supervising teacher will on occasions be referred to as "supervisor" and the student teacher as "student".

These data are summarised under the same headings as is the data from the Supervising Teacher interviews for James Cook. It became obvious to the interviewers that there was a high level of

agreement between the student teachers' reporting of the various aspects of the teaching practice, and of the supervising process, and the supervising teachers' reporting. This data summary will therefore make frequent reference to the data from Supervising Teacher interviews in order to avoid needless repetition.

i) Before the teaching practice: prior contact with supervising teacher

Students commented similarly to supervisors. Students referred to their supervisors as "welcoming", "relaxed", "helpful".

ii) The beginning of the teaching practice: introducing the student to the class

Students commented similarly to supervisors. Many students referred to being introduced to the class as "your" teacher. Students were introduced to the school staff in informal settings (e.g. staff room, over coffee).

iii) Settling-in activities provided for the student teacher: information provided by the supervising teacher for the student teacher

Students commented similarly to supervisors. The students were encouraged to observe the children, and interact with the children. They were frequently given some background information about the class, and about particular children (e.g. children with special needs or disabilities or behavioural problems).

iv) Information sought by the supervising teacher about the student teacher

Students' comments were consistent with those made by supervising teachers. Several students stated that their supervisor did not seek knowledge of their previous teaching practices, but that they were more interested to get to know them at the personal-social level, and to discover academic and other interests.

v) How the supervising teacher made the student teacher aware of his/her expectations

Student teachers highlighted the fact that supervisors revealed their expectations more by example and implication than by making specific reference to documents such as the Teaching Practice handbook. One student referred to an unstated message that the teacher conveyed, which was essentially:

"I work hard, you will too!"

Several students spoke of the high expectations the supervisor held for the children, and of the students. The students became aware of these expectations from what the supervisors did rather than from what they said.

vi) Pre-lesson discussion

The students reported this similarly to the supervisors. With new work, the supervisors usually outlined the content, but allowed (or expected) the student to choose the strategy and associated organisation.

Supervisors frequently made students aware of alternative approaches to a lesson, but the chosen alternative was left to the student. A number of students reported that they thought their supervisors were observing their teaching

"broadly", except where the student asked the supervisor to observe a specific aspect.

vii) Data collection

Students, like their supervisors, had little to say in this area, beyond what has been stated about under "Pre-lesson Discussion". Reference was made by several students to the fact that their supervisors never interrupted during a student's lesson. However, in a few situations students did refer to their supervisors "interrupting" for an on the spot demonstration or to guide the student in a "new direction" (e.g. "especially with questioning"). The students agreed that such interruptions and demonstrations were very "helpful" and seen as a good way to learn the skill or strategy, provided there was a good relationship between student and supervisor.

viii) Post-lesson discussion

The students mostly corroborated the views expressed by supervisors on this topic. There was some evidence from students that feedback was received only if the student sought this, and only if the supervisor "needed to comment". Lunchtime, playground duty, after school, were listed as times when such discussions were held. The non-threatening, collegial nature of these discussions were referred to by some students.

ix) Observation by the student: demonstration by the supervisor

Students stated that they observed, particularly in the first few days, their supervisor's teaching style and management techniques. Observation was rarely directed or structured by the supervisor, but was informal and unstructured. There was rarely, it seems, a direction by the supervisor to "watch

this". However, the students stated that they did observe, and ask "why" questions in reference to the supervisor's techniques.

x) Evaluating student's teaching competence

Students referred to the constant "daily" feedback as more beneficial than the formal assessment. Most referred to the interim assessment being given and discussed. Mention was made of self evaluation being encouraged. There were, in the words of two students "no surprises" in the final report, and evaluation was "never secretive or heavy" in the words of another student. Students seemed not to find the formal assessment procedures stressful or intrusive, but rather as a natural extension of regular feedback.

xi) Lecturer's visits

Students held much the same views of lecturer's visits as did their supervising teachers, in that they were mostly useful though not essential. They provided an extra source of feedback, and sometimes served as a basis on which the supervisor gave the student additional feedback. One student stated that the usefulness of the visit depended on whether the supervising teacher "respected" the lecturer. Several students emphasized that it was very much a "business as usual" situation as far as they were concerned, and that they did not stage a "special" lesson for the lecturer. No conflict was reported as a result of the lecturer's visit.

xii) Time spent by supervisor in discussions with student

The comments by students paralleled closely those of their supervisors. Various figures were quoted: 2 hours per day; 35 to 45 minutes per day in the first three weeks was

reported by several students; usually 1 hour per day during "continuous" (i.e. the final three weeks of the practice); 20 minutes in the morning; varied, 0-15-60 minutes daily; "lots" during the practice preparation week (during which students do no teaching, but prepare their C.C.P. for the three weeks' continuous teaching). The point which did emerge was the willingness of the supervising teachers to give whatever time was required. Several students said that their supervisors were "always available".

xiii) Degree of initiative, autonomy, responsibility given to the Student

Students corroborated supervising teachers' statements that students were given considerable autonomy. This was revealed in students' comments:

- "one hundred percent";
- given topics, "go for it";
- gave strategies and hints only when asked;
- supervisor said it is "my responsibility to plan it and make it work".
- "strategies and hints only when I asked";
- "supervisor occasionally suggested an approach".

There was reference by some students to

- "no pressure to change (our) strategies, even if the supervisor disagreed".

Students, however, made reference to

- "unconscious modelling";
- "(we did) a lot of modelling of the supervisor, because her ways were effective";

- (we) modelled at the beginning, then developed our own style".

xiv) Establishing rapport with the student

This has been indicated to some extent under headings, 1, 2 and 3. The procedures reported by the students were as reported by the supervisors. The following comments by students identify factors which they perceived as supervisory behaviours and characteristics which helped establish rapport:

- "was just there";
- "being free to discuss problems";
- "personality";
- "knew exactly where I stood";
- "no surprises";
- "comfortable";
- "no barrier";
- "being consistent";
- "sense of humour";
- "similarity of philosophies (not necessarily techniques) led to a good prac";
- "no clashes - any difference handled by discussion".

xv) Key elements in successful supervision

The key points made by students:

- recognised that a student is a learner who would make mistakes;
- open and friendly;
- encouraged the student's self development; gave freedom and responsibility to the student;
- treated as equal professional, not as a student;

- warm, supportive;
- made light of problems, giving lots of alternatives;
- easy two-way communication; no barriers, no surprises;
- lots of constructive feedback;
- prepared, organised;
- thorough explanation of where children were;
- clear expectations (not necessarily expressed);
- acknowledging student's style;
- encouraged self evaluation.

xvi) Students' views on undesirable supervisory behaviours

The students listed the following as major faults in a supervising teacher (based upon general observation/experience over time):

- inconsistent;
- "I am not your teacher, I'm the children's teacher ... barrier and no support;
- threatening (re evaluation);
- expect student to teach in supervisor's style;
- unable to accept difference between student and supervisor;
- degrading students in front of classes;
- not giving freedom to self evaluate;
- too many prescriptions and constraints on subject matter, style, etc.;
- lesson plans given the night before to do next day;
- assume students will know how to use all resources all the time;
- too blandly accepting - students need real help in diagnosing little problems and working on them constructively;

- lack of accurate feedback;
- focusing on problems, without maintaining student's confidence.

CHAPTER 4: A PROFILE OF THE 'EXCELLENT' SUPERVISING TEACHER

The data presented in Chapter 3 above have been used to derive the following generalized profile of the "excellent" supervising teacher of third year primary student teachers.

Such teachers consistently

1. Prepare in advance for the student teacher by:
   - preparing the class for a positive practice teaching experience;
   - preparing a work program for the student teacher so that initial contact with the class will be positive and well organized;
   - using briefing days, where they occur, to welcome the student teacher and provide advance notice of work to prepare.

2. Emphasize a positive beginning to practice teaching for the student teacher by:
   - providing a warm and friendly welcome; a degree of positive informality; helping the student teacher to feel "at home" in the classroom;
   - ensuring the student teacher is introduced to key persons, e.g. the class itself, other teachers, support staff;
   - communicating/discussing information about pupils in the class, but also encouraging the students to observe carefully and form their own opinions about the children;
   - planning activities for the student on the first day of teaching to help the student teacher develop a positive teacher/class relationship;
   - quickly involving the student teacher in classroom routine.

3. Seek appropriate information from student teachers by:

   - exploring areas of special study at college/university which could be useful during practice teaching;
   - informally discussing previous teaching practices to determine needs/strengths of the student teacher;
   - exploring personal interests/extra-curricular strengths of the student teacher.

4. Convey expectations to student teachers by:

   - having expectations clearly formulated in advance;
   - arranging early, deliberate discussion of these using necessary planning and other materials;
   - emphasizing issues of immediate relevance to the student teacher, e.g.

     i) specific details of teaching and other duties required of the student, given as much in advance as possible, but at least a week's advance notice;

     ii) the degree of autonomy/flexibility the student could exercise, particularly in content, method and classroom management;

     iii) preparation required, including the emphasis to be given to written notes, daily programs and the like;

     iv) preferred ways of working with/managing the children in the class;

     v) basic rules of the classroom; expected everyday routines;

     vi) basic rules for working as a student teacher in the classroom, e.g. planning, preparation before school; pre-lesson discussion; insistence of good standards; punctuality, etc.

- communicating expectations by example as well as by discussion, e.g. by having high expectation of the class and by the supervising teacher's own standards of teaching.

5. Arrange and conduct effective pre-lesson discussion by:
   - setting work well in advance and at the same time discussing it with the student teacher before extensive preparation occurs;
   - discussing the proposed teaching again, at a time closer to the event, to allow some "polishing" to occur;
   - using a collegial, interactive approach to discussion;
   - structuring discussion to focus on areas in which the student needs guidance;
   - focusing on key areas to be observed.

6. Deliberately collect information about the student teacher's classroom teaching by:
   - having a consistent means of recording ideas, in a special notebook or in the student's Notes of Lessons, or "mentally", or a combination of these;
   - being unobtrusive in the collection of such data, i.e. while working with other children in the class;
   - recording a balanced selection of data, noting both strengths and weaknesses.

7. Deliberately conduct post-lesson discussions by:
   - giving considerable emphasis to this aspect of supervision;
   - arranging discussion as soon as possible after the teaching has taken place;
   - using non-teaching times - morning tea, lunch, after school for this purpose;

- making conscious use of the student teacher's self evaluation, as well as the teacher's notes and recollections about the lesson(s);
- opening the discussion by some positive comment on the lesson;
- fostering honest, constructive and balanced discussion.

8. Provide opportunities for purposeful observation by:
   - establishing an open and honest relationship in order to encourage the student to observe critically;
   - deliberately providing a model rather than the model of teaching;
   - ensuring that the student teacher is conscious of the form and detail of observation required.

9. Ensure the student teacher is thoroughly conversant with assessment expectations by:
   - thoroughly discussing the written assessment criteria set down for the student;
   - expecting, and encouraging, the student to contribute to the assessment process via self evaluation;
   - regular use of assessment criteria for diagnostic constructive discussion;
   - discussing, at appropriate times, interim and final reports on the student's progress.

10. Make use of visits by the lecturer from the training institution by:
    - involving the visiting lecturer in the supervision process, particularly by using his/her visits to confirm the teacher's perceptions of the student teacher's overall performance;

- seeking discussion of standards likely to be awarded.

11. Spend time discussing, with the student teacher, key aspects of his/her practice teaching by:
    - giving such discussion high priority and adequate time, generally in the order of 1 hour per day;
    - varying the focus and increasing the sophistication of discussion to suit the developing needs of the student teacher and the class;
    - conveying the idea to the student that he/she is always available for discussion.

12. Provide for an appropriate degree of autonomy to be afforded the student teacher by:
    - carefully encouraging and monitoring the student teacher's capacity for operating "autonomously";
    - allowing as much autonomy as is appropriate;
    - providing autonomy with support.

13. Quickly establish rapport with the student teacher by:
    - recognizing that this is vital to a successful practice teaching experience for the student teacher, the teacher and the class;
    - expressing a friendly, personal and supportive approach to the student teacher;
    - establishing, and expecting from the student teacher, an open and honest approach to supervision activities.

14. Assist the student teacher to gain rapport with the class by:
    - recognizing the importance of this feature of practice teaching;

- preparing the class for practice teaching and providing carefully selected initial and other introductory experiences for the student teacher;
- deliberately fostering a "partnership" relationship between teacher and student teacher;
- consciously introducing the student teacher to an understanding of any unique features of the class, including details about children requiring special attention.

15. Project to the supervision process several key personal characteristics by:
    - being a caring person, prepared to care about the student teacher as a person;
    - being friendly and personal;
    - being honest and realistic;
    - one who enjoys teaching and working with student teachers;
    - one who is positive in interpersonal relationships.

16. Project to the supervision process several key professional characteristics by:
    - being prepared to help at all times;
    - being a good teaching model, respected by the class;
    - being prepared to discuss all aspects of teaching with the student teacher;
    - being well organized;
    - having a flexible approach to supervision, i.e. not being overly rigid about what is deemed to be good teaching;
    - being professional;
    - treating the student teacher where possible as a junior colleague.

CHAPTER 5: CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter considers several key implications emerging from the results presented above, and focuses upon some important recommendations resulting from the study.

Consideration of Key Implications

i) The data present a set of supervisory behaviours consistently demonstrated by most of the supervising teachers in the sample. This consistency of behaviours is supported by four sets of data from two distinct and widely separated institutions, both involved with the preservice preparation of teachers. For each institution the data are internally consistent in that data from student teachers provides clear support for the data collected from supervising teachers.

ii) The supervisory teachers' behaviours provide the substance for a descriptive profile of teachers who are perceived to be very successful at supervising final year primary practice teaching. This profile is highlighted in Chapter 4 of this report.

iii) Very strong support is provided by the results of this study for a clinical and cooperative style of supervision (see Acheson and Gall, 1980) for final year practice teaching. While teachers in the sample were not necessarily aware of the clinical supervision model, most (intuitively) were very sympathetic to one of its basic principles: a collegial, supportive style of supervision rather than a coercive style. Furthermore, the teachers in the sample constantly gave deliberate emphasis to pre-lesson discussion; observation of lessons taught; and, post-lesson discussion.

These three stages are key elements of clinical supervision. The sample teachers were able to blend these three stages into a continuous on-going cycle of supervision so that each teaching experience by the student teacher provided insights for the next. In addition, most supervising teachers very deliberately used the student teacher's self evaluation as a springboard for feedback and discussion, thus ensuring the student teacher's active and critical decision making about his/her teaching. In this way supervising teachers were able to foster the growth of the professional autonomy of the student teacher, a quality essential for effective clinical supervision and, of course, one essential for the professional development of the final year student teacher.

In some ways, the supervising teachers were able to modify the clinical model of supervision because of their excellent rapport with student teachers. This allowed, in some cases, for example, the provision of constructive feedback during a teaching task undertaken by the student teacher. One could speculate that such rapport would be enhanced by a cooperative working relationship in double teaching areas. This study, however, did not control for this variable.

iv) The data in the study clearly support evidence already in the literature that effective supervision of more experienced student teachers is best conducted in a non-directive style (Copeland, 1982, p. 32). Allied to this is the very consistent view, expressed by teachers and student teachers in the sample, that the teacher is not the model, but provides a model (or several) for the student teacher to make best use of. This, of course, is consistent with the important

supervisory skill of fostering professional autonomy, as discussed briefly in iii) above.

v) A very powerful theme running through all the data is the concept of the caring supervising teacher. A caring, collegial, supportive, positive, professional approach demonstrated by supervising teachers in the sample is consistently evident.

These qualities are given direct emphasis in those sections identifying key elements in successful supervision (both teacher and student teacher data); and are also clearly evident, directly and indirectly, in practically every sub-section of the data.

vi) There is some concern in the literature (e.g. Turney, 1982a) of potential conflict between the assessment role and the supervisory/helping role of supervising teachers. This was not an obvious problem with the teachers in this sample; such a problem did not manifest itself. It is reasonable to speculate that the close professional and personal rapport illustrated particularly by openness, honesty and frequency of discussion, considerably reduced the possibilities of such conflict.

vii) The problem of providing time for supervision is also featured in the literature (Eltis, 1984). While there is no evidence in this study that this problem was overcome, there is certainly considerable evidence that teachers made effective use of available time, particularly through good planning and organization.

A final comment here is upon the richness of the data generated in this study. Interviews, both with teachers and student teachers, provided a vast assortment of detail, some of which is lost in the process of synthesis of key issues. Consequently, the actual results presented are a concentration of original interview data, and the profile in Chapter 4 represents a further reduction of detail and consequent increase in generality.

Recommendations

i) That the report of this study be made available to supervisory personnel in both participating institutions, and be made available through appropriate channels to other relevant institutions and groups in the field of teacher education, through the agency of the Board of Teacher Education, Queensland.

ii) That the Board of Teacher Education, Queensland, explore the need for a similar study into supervision of the practicum in the first year of preservice teacher education programs. One could speculate that supervision at the first year level would, of necessity, be very different from that demonstrated by supervisors of third year student teachers. It is likely to be more structured or directed (Copeland, 1982).

iii) That the Board of Teacher Education, Queensland, explore the need for a similar study into the supervision of the practicum in the preparation of secondary teachers.

iv) That the Board of Teacher Education, Queensland, explore the feasibility of a research study in the use of clinical supervision at the inservice level.

v) That the Board of Teacher Education, Queensland, promote discussion between personnel from practising schools, training institutions and employing authorities in order to seek ways of enhancing the effectiveness of supervision. For example, the findings of this research study have implications for:

- the preparation of supervising teachers for their role;
- the development in student teachers of self evaluative skills in relation to their own teaching competence;
- ways of ensuring that supervising teachers have adequate time for supervision.

REFERENCES

Acheson, K. & Gall, M. (1980) Techniques in the Clinical Supervision of Teachers. New York: Longmans.

Applegate, J.H. & Lasley, T.J. (1982) "Cooperating Teachers' Problems with Students". Journal of Teacher Education, Vol. 33, No. 2, March-April, pp. 15/17.

Bassett, G.W. (Chairman) (1978) Review of Teacher Education in Queensland, Brisbane: Board of Advanced Education and Board of Teacher Education, Queensland.

Beauchamp, L. (1983) "Cooperating and Student Teacher Expectations: Beep and Bouquets". Teacher Educator, Vol. 19, No. 1, Summer, pp. 2/6.

Buckley, D. (Marland, P.W., Editor) "Notes on Training for Supervision" in Aspects of Supervision in Teaching Practice, Townsville: James Cook University of North Queensland.

Board of Teacher Education, Queensland (1983), Reports on School Experience, for James Cook University and Mount Gravatt Campus, Brisbane College of Advanced Education, Brisbane: Board of Teacher Education, Queensland.

Board of Teacher Education, Queensland (1984), School Experience in Queensland Pre-Service Teacher Education Programs. Research Report.

Cope, E. (1971) School Experience in Teacher Education. Bristol: University of Bristol.

Copeland, W.D. (1982) "Student Teachers' Preference for Supervisory Approach". Journal of Teacher Education. Vol. 33, No. 2, March-April, pp. 32/36.

Correy, P.M. (Chairman) (1980) Teachers for Tomorrow. Continuity, Challenge and Change in Teacher Education in N.S.W., Sydney: Government Printer.

Coulter, F. (1975) "Perceptions of Classroom Behaviour by Supervisors and Student Teachers", in The Practicum: Present and Future. Report on the National Conference on Teacher Education. Mt Lawley, W.A.: Mt Lawley College of Advanced Education.

Coulter, F. & Elsworth, G.R. (1977) An Evaluation of the Impact of Initial Student Teaching on Professional Self Perception, Commitment and Teaching Behaviour. Report to the Education Research and Development Committee, Canberra.

Eltis, J.J. (1984) "Setting Priorities for Improving the Practicum". Paper prepared for a conference on School Experience, organized by the Queensland Board of Teacher Education, Queensland.

Eltis, K. & Cairns, L. (1982) "Perceived Effectiveness of Supervisors of the Practicum". The Australian Journal of Teaching Practice, Vol. 2, No. 2, May, pp. 101/109.

Geary, B. (1975) "Communication between Colleges and Associated Schools", in The Practicum: Present and Future. Report on the National Conference on Teacher Education. Mt Lawley, W.A.: Mt Lawley College of Advanced Education.

Gilding, K.R. (Chairman) Report of the South Australian Enquiry into Teacher Education, Government Printer, South Australia, 1980.

Goldhammer, R, Anderson, R.H. & Krajewski, R.J. (1980) Clinical Supervision: Special Methods for the Supervision of Teachers. 2nd Ed., New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc.

Henry, J., Pateman, N., Robottom, I. & Tinning, R. (1981) "Evaluation of Teaching Skills". The South Pacific Journal of Teacher Education. April, Vol. 9, No. 1, pp. 61/65.

Hewitson, M. (1981) "A Survey of Student Opinion and Its Implications for School and Institutional Roles in Teaching Practice". The South Pacific Education, November, Vol. 19, No. 2, pp. 29/37.

Larking, L. (Marland, P.W., Editor) (1981) "The Conduction and Use of a Personalised Evaluation Schedule (P.E.S.) for First Semester Teaching Practice" in Aspects of Supervision in Teaching Practice, Townsville: James Cook University of North Queensland.

Martin, J. (1982) "Specifications Must Precede Practice and Feedback". The Australian Journal of Teaching Practice, Vol. 2, No. 2, May, pp. 81/89.

Povey, R.M. (1975) "A Comparison of Three Methods of Evaluating Teaching Performance in a College of Education". British Journal of Educational Psychology, Vol. 45, pp. 279/285.

Priestly, A. (1983) "What Guides the Advice I Give as a Cooperating Teacher?" The Australian Journal of Teaching Practice, Vol. 4, No. 1, pp. 39/42.

Sellars, N. (1981) (Marland, P.W., Editor) "A Training Course for Supervising Teachers: An Exercise in Nettle Grasping" in Aspects of Supervision in Teaching Practice, Townsville: James Cook University of North Queensland.

Sinclair, K. & Nicoll, V. (1981) "Sources and Experiences of Anxiety in Teaching Practice". The South Pacific Journal of Teacher Education. Vol. 9, No. 1, April, pp. 1/12.

Turney, C. et al. (1982a) The Practicum in Teacher Education Research, Practice and Supervision. Sydney: Sydney University Press.

Turney, C. et al. (1982b) Supervisor Development Programmes: Role Handbook. Sydney: Sydney University Press.

Yarrow, C.A. et al. (1983) A Study of (I) the characteristics required by supervising personnel, and (II) the desirable characteristics of schools, to maximise learning opportunities for student teachers during periods of block practice and school studies.

APPENDIX 1: INTERVIEW - SUPERVISION OF PRACTICE TEACHING - SUPERVISING TEACHERS

1. BEFORE STUDENT ARRIVED:

   . How did you prepare for your student? For example:

   What did you tell your class?
   What information did you seek about your student?
   How did you clarify expectations/procedures for that particular prac with your student? (e.g. Did you refer to the Teaching Practice Handbook?)
   Did your student contact you before the prac? If so, what did you discuss?

   . Anything else?

2. WHEN YOUR STUDENT ARRIVED

   . How did you welcome the student?

   . How did you introduce the student to your class?

   . Did you introduce your student to the rest of the staff? How?

   . Did you tell the student about the children in your class?

   . What "settling in" activities did you give your student (teaching, observing, teacher aiding, familiarisation with your planning)?

   . Did you look through student's teaching notes from the previous prac?

   . Other comments?

3. WHAT INFORMATION DID YOU SEEK FROM YOUR STUDENT?

   . Did you discuss his/her subjects studied at the College?

   . Did you discuss his/her previous pracs?

   . Did you encourage the student to give you some background about his/her personal/social life? Did he/she do so?

   . Did you discuss the student's ability in extra-curricular activities?

4. YOUR EXPECTATIONS OF THE STUDENT:

   . Did you make these clear to the student?

      . Teaching (Inside classroom)
      . Other (outside classroom)

5. PRE-LESSON DISCUSSION:

   . Was this invariably about planning? If so, was it usually about skills/about strategies/about resources/other? (e.g. Organisation, management, content).

- Did you discuss what you intended to observe when the student taught?

6. COLLECTION OF DATA ABOUT THE STUDENT-TEACHER'S CLASSROOM TEACHING:

   - How did you approach this (e.g. criteria used, format used, written notes, "mental" notes)?

7. POST-LESSON DISCUSSION

   - How, when and where did you conduct these discussions?
   - What role did student self evaluation play in this? (e.g. Did you expect this of your student?)
   - What was the relationship between written/oral comments?
   - To what extent did you base this on -

     formal observations (e.g. written data)
     informal observations (e.g. impressions, recollections of what occurred).

   - Did you ever use video/audio tape?
   - Did you consciously balance in some way positive and negative comment?
   - Did you consciously seek to be positive/constructive in your overall discussion?

8. OBSERVATION/DEMONSTRATION LESSONS:

   - Did you use your teaching as a basis for helping the student observe/analyse/model your teaching? How did you do so? To what extent (i.e. how often) did you do so?
   - Did you encourage your student to ask why you did certain things in your lessons?

9. EVALUATION:

   - Did you discuss with the student criteria and procedures for evaluation of his/her teaching competence? How often? In what way?
   - How did you use interim and final reports as a way of providing feedback to students?

10. LECTURER'S VISITS:

    - How did you utilise lecturer's visits to aid in supervision of your student?
    - How did you utilise the lecturer's visits for assessment purposes?

11. TIME SPENT IN DISCUSSION WITH YOUR STUDENT TEACHER:

- How much time did you spend on average per day in discussion with your student teacher? Did this vary as the student gained more experience with the class?
- On what activities/topics was this discussion time mainly spent?
- On which of these activities/topics did you spend most of the discussion time? (You may wish to indicate proportions spent on the major topics/activities discussed).

12. DEGREE OF INITIATIVE/AUTONOMY/RESPONSIBILITY GIVEN TO THE STUDENT TEACHER:

- Would you comment on the extent to which you expected your student teacher to plan, implement his/her own teaching strategies/management techniques. In other words, how much freedom did you give your student to plan and teach in his/her own way? Why?
- To what extent did you regard your teaching strategies/management techniques as a model for the student to follow? To what extent do you think your student modelled his/her teaching on yours?

13. ESTABLISHING RAPPORT WITH THE STUDENT:

- Did your encourage the student to be open and honest with you, to seek your advice and guidance? How?
- Was there any personality clash between you and the student? If so, how did you handle this?

14. ASSISTING THE STUDENT IN GAINING RAPPORT WITH THE CLASS:

- Did you see this as important?
- If so, what did you do in this regard?

15. KEY ELEMENTS IN SUCCESSFUL SUPERVISION:

- What do you consider are the key elements which make an effective supervisor?
- What helped you most to develop these skills of supervision? (Trial and error, other supervisors, attending courses on supervision, reading supervision).

16. POOR SUPERVISION:

- What do you see as the major faults in a supervising teacher? In other words, what should a supervising teacher avoid doing when he/she has a student teacher?

APPENDIX 2: STUDENT INTERVIEW - SUPERVISION OF PRACTICE TEACHING

1. WHEN YOU ARRIVED AT THE SCHOOL:

   - How did the supervising teacher welcome you?
   - How did your supervising teacher introduce you to the class?
   - How did he/she introduce you to the rest of the staff?
   - What did he/she tell you about the children in the class?
   - What "settling in" activities did he/she give you (teaching, observing, teacher aiding, familiarisation with planning)?
   - Did he/she look through your teaching notes from the previous prac?

2. WHAT INFORMATION DID YOUR SUPERVISING TEACHER SEEK FROM YOU?

   - Did he/she discuss your subjects at the college?
   - Did he/she discuss your previous pracs?
   - Did he/she encourage you to give some background about your personal/social life/ability in extra-curricular activities?

3. THE SUPERVISING TEACHER'S EXPECTATIONS OF YOU:

   - How did he/she make these clear to you?

     Teaching (inside classroom)
     Other (other classroom).

4. PRE-LESSON DISCUSSION:

   - Was this invariably about planning? If so, was it usually about skills/about strategies/about resources/other? (e.g. Organisation, management).
   - Did he/she discuss what he/she intended to observe when you were teaching?

5. POST-LESSON DISCUSSION

   - How, when and where did your supervising teacher conduct this?
   - To what extent did your supervising teacher base this on

     formal observations (e.g. written data)?
     informal observations (e.g. impressions, recollection of what had occurred).

   - Did your supervising teacher usually tell you his/her impressions of the lesson first, or ask you for yours first.

6. OBSERVATION/DEMONSTRATION LESSONS:

- How did your supervising teacher use his/her teaching as a basis for helping you observe/analyse teaching and improve your own teaching? To what extent did he/she do this?

7. EVALUATION

- Did your supervising teacher discuss with you criteria and procedures for evaluation/assessment of your teaching competence?

- How did he/she use interim and final reports as a way of providing feedback to you?

8. LECTURER'S VISITS:

- How did your supervising teacher utilise the lecturer's visits to aid in supervision and assessment?

9. TIME SPENT IN DISCUSSION WITH YOUR SUPERVISING TEACHER:

- How much time did you spend per day in discussion with your supervising teacher? Did this vary as you gained more experience with the class?

- On what activities/topics was this discussion time usually spent?

- On which of these activities/topics did you spend most of the discussion time? (You may wish to indicate proportions spent on the major topics/activities discussed).

10. DEGREE OF INITIATIVE/AUTONOMY/RESPONSIBILITY GIVEN BY THE SUPERVISING TEACHER:

- Would you comment on the extent to which your supervising teacher expected you to plan and implement your own teaching strategies/management techniques. In other words, how much freedom did you have to plan and teach in your way?

- To what extent did your supervisng teacher regard his/her teaching strategies/management techniques as a model for you to follow?

11. ESTABLISHING RAPPORT WITH YOUR SUPERVISING TEACHER:

- How did your supervising teacher encourage you to be open and honest with him/her, to seek his/her advice and guidance?

- How did he/she handle any personality clashes between you and him/her?

12. KEY ELEMENTS IN SUCCESSFUL SUPERVISION:

- What do you consider are the key elements which make an effective supervisor?

13. POOR SUPERVISION:

- What do you see as the major faults in a supervising teacher? In other words, what should supervising teachers avoid doing when they have a student teacher?