DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 368 677 SP 035 022

AUTHOR Shen, Jianping
TITLE A Study in Contrast: Visions of Preservice Teacher Education in the Context of a Professional Development School.
PUB DATE Feb 94
NOTE 33p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (Chicago, IL, February 16-19, 1994).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Administrator Attitudes; Case Studies; *College School Cooperation; Cooperating Teachers; Higher Education; Intermediate Grades; Junior High Schools; Middle Schools; Models; Partnerships in Education; *Preservice Teacher Education; Program Implementation; Research Methodology; *School Role; Student Teachers; *Student Teaching; *Teacher Attitudes; Time Management
IDENTIFIERS *Professional Development Schools; Puget Sound Professional Development Center WA

ABSTRACT

This study began with a thorough review of the literature on the professional development school (PDS) and developed a conceptual framework underlying the rhetoric for the PDS movement. It then constructed, by employing a case study approach, the school-based PDS faculty's vision on preservice teacher education in the PDS context and the individual and institutional difficulties in realizing their ideal roles. This study also contrasted the expectations in the literature and voices from the field and explored the discrepancies among them. The practically-oriented vision held by the school-based faculty lacked some of the most important ideas expressed in the theoretical conceptual model. Some suggestions have been made to improve preservice teacher education in the PDS context. The PDS sampled for this case study was a middle school associated with the Puget Sound Professional Development Center in Washington State. Interviews, which supplied some of the data collected for the study, were conducted with seven informants: the principal, the teacher leadership coordinator, the site supervisor, three cooperating teachers, and one non-cooperating teacher. Findings from the study indicate that there were three significant differences between the vision of the PDS found in the literature and that revealed by the voices from the field. In contrast to the literature, the school-based faculty members' visions did not include: (1) the concept of student teacher cohort groups; (2) an awareness that the PDS model is supposed to supply an exemplary setting for student teaching; or (3) the concept of inquiry as part of the PDS mission. The study's findings suggest that successful implementation of the PDS model requires more interaction between school faculty and university faculty to develop a shared vision. (Contains 30 references.) (Author/IAH)

A Study in Contrast: Visions of Preservice Teacher Education in the Context of a Professional Development School

Jianping Shen

Center for Educational Renewal
College of Education
University of Washington

Presented at the 1994 Annual Meeting
of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education
February, 1994
Chicago

(abstract)

This study began with a thorough review of the literature on the professional development school (PDS) and developed a conceptual framework underlying the rhetoric for the PDS movement. It then constructed, by employing a case study approach, the school-based PDS faculty's vision on preservice teacher education in the PDS context, and the individual and institutional difficulties in realizing their ideal roles. This study also contrasted the expectations in the literature and voices from the field and explored the discrepancies between them. The practically-oriented vision held by the school-based faculty lacked of some of the most important ideas expressed in the theoretical conceptual model. Some suggestions have been made to improve preservice teacher education in the PDS context.

A Study in Contrast: Visions of Preservice Teacher Education in the Context of a Professional Development School

A relatively recent suggestion for the school-university partnership has been that universities and school districts collaborate on creating "teaching schools," which are referred to variously as professional development schools (Holmes Group, 1986,1990), clinical schools (Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy, 1986), professional practice schools (Levine, 1988), professional development academies (Senate Labor and Human Resources Committee, 1989), and partner schools (Goodlad, 1990). Goodlad estimates that by the end of the decade, all relevant teacher education programs in the United States will have moved significantly in this direction (Goodlad & Soder, 1992).

What should preservice teacher education in the professional development school (PDS) context look like? While many professors have responded to this question, a literature review before conducting this study revealed that in this PDS movement, no voice from the field had been heard. The study thus attempted to explore school-based PDS faculty members' vision of preservice teacher education and their perceptions of the difficulties facing individuals and the PDS in realizing their desirable roles.

Conceptual Framework

The idea of establishing the PDS is embedded in two trends. The first of these trends is the movement to reform teacher education. Holmes Group's Tomorrow's Teachers and Tomorrow's Schools, Carnegie Forum's A Nation Prepared: Teachers for the 21st Century, and Goodlad's Teachers for Our Nation's Schools, have all

recommended, among other things, that future teachers be trained in a PDS to gain hands-on experience and develop professional beliefs, attitudes, and abilities.

The second trend is the school-university partnership movement. School-university partnerships became a popular phenomenon in the mid-1980's. The relationships between schools and universities vary and the school-university partnerships have different orientations. They can be staff-oriented, student-oriented, task-oriented, or institution-oriented (Su, 1990b). Among these orientations, the institution-oriented school-university partnership focuses on the mutually beneficial relationship between schools and universities with regard to teacher preparation: "For schools to get better, they must have better teachers, among other things. To prepare better teachers (and counselors, special educators, and administrators) universities must have access to school settings exhibiting the very best practices" (Goodlad, 1986, pp. 8-9). The blueprints of the PDS vary in different reports. However, they all emphasize the role of the PDS in preservice teacher education.

More and more research has attested to the importance of student teaching in preservice teacher education programs. Both university faculty members and prospective teachers perceive that among the program segments, student teaching contributes most to one's future career as a teacher (Goodlad, 1990). Student teachers' sense of efficacy, orientation to pupil control, and associated attitudes are related to the organizational socialization of student teaching (Hoy & Woolfolk, 1990; Su, 1990a).

Student teaching is extremely important in the development of future teachers. This is perhaps one of the reasons that both the recent teacher education reform and the school-university partnership movement came to focus on, among other things, creating the PDS as a context for student teaching. However, literature is not reality. To translate the ideas in the literature into reality is very complicated.

The dissemination of information cannot guarantee success in educational change (Goodlad, 1975).

In creating a PDS, much of the power for change lies in the hands of "street-level bureaucrats" (Lipsky, 1969) --- that is, the school-based faculty members. The rhetoric for establishing a PDS will be filtered by the school-based PDS faculty before it materializes in practice. Only when principals, along with teachers, become responsive to the problems facing their emerging PDS through a continuous process of dialogue, decision, action, and evaluation (Goodlad, 1975), can the new PDS be successfully created. In order to successfully create PDSs, voices of school-based faculty must be heard and taken into account. This study was intended to contribute to this goal.

A PDS has several purposes: to improve the education of prospective and practicing teachers; to strengthen knowledge and practice in teaching; and to strengthen the profession of teaching by serving as models of promising and productive programs for student learning (Schlechty et al., 1988; Abdal-Haqq, 1989). These goals are interrelated.

After reviewing the major literature on the PDS, Abdal-Haqq (1991) observes that as far as preservice teacher education is concerned, the PDS's role is twofold. The first role is that the PDS must be an exemplary setting. Only in such an exemplary setting can student teachers be better educated. The role of PDSs in improving practice and preparing teachers is analogous to the role of "teaching hospitals" in the medical profession. They are clinical sites where professional standards of practice are developed, refined, and institutionalized; where cohorts of student teachers participate in rigorous induction programs; where both teaching practice and induction are knowledge based. The PDS must also be a self-renewing setting so that it maintains its exemplary status.

The second role of the PDS is reflected in how student teaching is organized. The traditional model for organizing student teaching puts student teachers in an "apprenticeship" situation (Lortie, 1975; Su, 1990a). A student teacher is usually assigned to work solely with one cooperating teacher. In this role, the student teacher is just like an apprentice. Moreover, there is little to suggest that student teaching induces a sense of solidarity with colleagues. Because of the lack of a supportive infrastructure, "the student adjusts his actual methods of teaching, not to the principles which he is acquiring, but to what he sees succeed and fail in an empirical way from moment to moment" (Dewey, 1904, p. 14.). He becomes an agent for maintaining the status quo after the apprenticeship of student teaching. Therefore, in order to produce better teachers, the PDS must pay attention to socialization, development, and inquiry in student teaching experiences. Student teaching is an induction experience to socialize future teachers. Student teaching in the PDS, along with the coursework on the university campus, should also help future teachers inquire into schooling, and develop professional beliefs, knowledge, and skills. The above model is based on synthesizing the major literature on PDS (Holmes Group, 1986,1990; Carnegie Forum, 1986, Levine, 1988; Darling-Hammond, 1989; Lieberman & Miller, 1990; Goodlad, 1990).

Difficulties facing the PDS in realizing its role were also identified in the existing literature (King & Smith, 1990; Zimpher, 1990; Nystrand, 1991; Abdal-Haqq, 1991). The difficulties mentioned in the literature are: 1) principals and teachers will be overwhelmed by additional work; 2) resources are inadequate; 3) equitable treatment of teachers may be problematic; the change in the PDS may divide faculty members into haves and have-nots; 4) PDS is innovative; therefore, no single set of standards or attributes exists to characterizes effective sites.

The aforementioned models and difficulties are based on the existing literature, almost all of which was authored by university faculty members.

Although many university faculty members have been actively involved in creating PDSs, their theorizing may not necessarily be consistent with that of school-based PDS faculty members. The literature written by PDS school-based faculty members is largely concerned with logistics of implementation rather than visions of the PDS (for example, McDaniel, Rice, & Romerdahl, 1990). Nonetheless, there is always an interaction between teachers and policies. Teachers' beliefs, knowledge, and existing practice are active in this interaction (Cohen & Ball, 1990). We have already learned a lot from history. The national curriculum reform spurred by the Sputnik launching was unsuccessful behind the classroom door (Goodlad, 1974). Even the California Mathematics Curriculum Framework, which was of small scale and required less organizational change, has not been translated appropriately into classroom use (Cohen, 1990). It is imperative to listen to voices from the field so that preservice teacher education in the PDS context may proceed successfully.

Research Methodology

The purpose of this study was two-fold. The central purpose was to elicit the school-based PDS faculty members' vision of the role of PDS in preservice teacher education. However, as voices of the field had barely been heard, a second purpose of this study was to identify possible discrepancies between the literature and the reality.

This study addressed the following research questions:

1) What do the PDSs' school-based faculty members envision as appropriate pre-service teacher education in the PDS context?

2) What, from the school-based faculty members' perspective, are individuals' and the PDS's difficulties in realizing their desirable roles?

3) What is the discrepancy between expectations in the literature and school-based PDS faculty members' vision of preservice teacher education in the PDS context?

Since the central purpose of this study was to generalize to a theoretical framework about school-based faculty members' vision of the PDS's role in preservice teacher education, this inquiry used a case-study methodology. The case study approach allowed the gathering of in-depth data on the school-based faculty members' vision. The PDS sampled for this study was one of the best among the Puget Sound Professional Development Center (PSPDC). It is a middle school which has been a professional development school for four years. Because of the governance structure of the activities pertaining to preservice teacher education in this school, seven informants were selected. They are the principal, the teacher leadership coordinator, the site supervisor, three cooperating teachers, and one non-cooperating teacher. Five of them are female.

The data of this study included one structured interview with each informant. The interview protocol consisted of nine questions, such as "3) How do you think that student teaching should be organized? (Why?) Are there any changes in the organization of student teaching in your school since it became a PDS?" The interview protocol was piloted in a PDS which agreed to participate in the study but was not selected because of the sampling strategy. The interviews were focused on eliciting school-based faculty members' vision of preservice teacher education in the PDS context. Each interview lasted 40-60 minutes. In addition to the interviews, I observed a weekly meeting among the site supervisor and student teachers. I also collected some documents pertaining to preservice teacher education in the PDS context, such as school newsletters, meeting minutes, reference materials for cooperating teachers, annual plans and reports, and an ethnographic study report on its becoming a PDS.

The documents were reviewed to form the foundation of understanding of this school and the PDS-related activities. The interviews were audio-taped and

transcribed verbatim. Three coding systems were developed by progressive analysis of the data. They are 1) "school-based faculty members' vision of how student teaching should be organized in the PDS context," 2) "difficulties individuals are facing in realizing their ideal roles in preservice teacher education in the PDS context," and 3) "difficulties the school is facing in realizing its ideal role in preservice teacher education in the PDS context." In the second coding system, for example, there are the following codes: LT (lack of time), GT (get tired), MW (matching with student teachers), ES (empty nest-syndrome), I (intrusion), SU (school-university discoordination), IC (institutional commitment), LR (lack of resources other than time), and M (miscellaneous). There are further explanations under each code.

The coding systems were developed from the interview data. They were gradually developed on the basis of reading the transcribed interview protocols. They were refined with each reading, and were finalized after the fourth reading. All the interview data were encoded by the final coding systems. The data were separated into coding units following Miller's (1984) system. As will be described later, decision rules were made to report the findings.

Samples of the data were also coded by a person who was not familiar with the study and was blind to the informants. Cohen's (1960) interrater agreement coefficients were calculated: .82 for "school-based faculty members' vision of how student teaching should be organized in the context of PDS," .74 for "difficulties individuals are facing in realizing their ideal roles in preservice teacher education," and .76 for "difficulties the school is facing in realizing its ideal role in preservice teacher education." Disagreements were solved by discussion. The results of these analyses revealed both commonalities and discrepancies between voices from the field and the literature.

How Student Teaching Should Be Organized

The organization of student teaching is the most important part of the school-based faculty members' vision of preservice teacher education. The vision was largely elicited by posing the question, "How do you think student teaching should be organized?", although the vision was scattered throughout the transcribed interview protocols. The categories for school-based faculty members' vision of preservice teacher in the PDS context were developed by reviewing the transcribed interview protocol repeatedly, and inductively. The categories were codes in the finalized coding system. The decision rule here was to report the visions elaborated by at least four informants. What follows was their visions of how student teaching should be organized.

1. A year long commitment. All of the seven informants of this study envision that student teaching experience should be one year long, with one even arguing for a year and a half. As the site supervisor put it:

> I like the way that we have organized it now and that the student teachers are working with us for at least a year, three quarters for people getting a secondary certificate, four quarters for people getting an elementary certificate. Because they have a chance to work up to full time teaching, they do lots of observation, they work with small groups of students for a while, and gradually taking over the time they work in a classroom. And I really like that. I really like this way (interview transcription, p. 3).

There is a difference of opinion between the teachers and the administrator on why the student teaching should be one year long. The administrator hopes that the student teachers will become a part of the school faculty, and she may use the service of the student teachers. The teachers emphasize the nature of the teaching job. They want student teachers to know all of the work that teaching involves and

to strengthen their commitment to teaching. They want student teachers to see the whole year process, from the beginning to the end of the school year. "There are lots of other things involved than being teaching in the classroom, the end of year grades, and wrap ups, and the activities that go on at the end of the year in Spring" (p. 27). They also want them to see the growth of the students during the school year. The last reason is that they envision the best way to organize student teaching is to stage student teachers' responsibilities, to gradually enlarge their responsibilities. This is the second part of school-based faculty members' vision .

2. Gradually enlarging student teachers' responsibilities. One of the cooperating teachers summarized her student teaching experience as "just in and out" (p. 63). She took full responsibilities for the classroom two days after she got into the classroom and totally withdrew from the classroom just one month later. The informants talked about the progression in which student teachers move from their seminar classes to taking over a classroom completely. They think "it's very manageable not only for the cooperating teacher but for the preservice person as well" (p. 74).

In a document circulated for the cooperating teachers, the responsibilities for student teachers are clearly stated. For instance, for the second quarter, "The student teacher is in the classroom 14 hours per week. During this quarter she/he teaches two classes concurrently for at least three weeks and prepares for the full-time commitment third quarter." Following this statement, there are 11 entries to elaborate on student teachers' responsibilities. In the third quarter, the emphasis is on refining skills and assuming total teaching responsibilities for a minimum of six weeks. Cooperating teachers were informed of the idea of gradually enlarging student teachers' responsibilities, and this idea has become part of their vision for organizing student teaching.

Because the student teachers are involved in their internship in school for one year, the internship should progress in well-organized stages, and the relationship between the student and the cooperating teacher should be more intimate and cordial. Therefore, matching a student teacher with a cooperating teacher becomes a part of school-based faculty members' vision.

3. Matching a student teacher with a cooperating teacher. The conventional way to place a student teacher with a cooperating teacher is merely to make assignments on the basis of subject area and availability of cooperating teachers. According to the informants, better ways to place a student teacher with a cooperating teacher would include the following: student teachers should first pay a visit to the PDS, expressing interests in the one-year program. The student teachers would be received by the teacher leadership coordinator and interviewed by potential cooperating teachers. Would-be cooperating teachers meet with a number of interns before deciding whether or not they want to be a cooperating teacher and with whom. Student teachers should also have the opportunity to express their preferences.

There are several reasons for matching a student teacher with a cooperating teacher, such as to avoid interpersonal conflicts and to optimize student teachers' service and learning opportunities. As a cooperating teacher commented:

> I believe that we need to interview prospective student teachers. There has to be an interview so that you can touch base on your and his strengths.... It gives two people an opportunity to meet and share backgrounds, philosophies, and also that the student teachers might do some observations of some teachers in the classroom, too.... I think the opportunity for them to discuss and share what might be a part of the program for the coming year certainly is important, rather than here is the name, this person is within your subject area, therefore, they should be assigned to you, because that doesn't work. So just because a person is in my particular subject area does not mean that we should match up, that we need to discuss, we need to talk about our goals (p. 59).

This PDS did not match student teachers and cooperating teachers in the first year. The student teachers were interviewed only by the teacher leadership coordinator. However, starting from the second year, they followed exactly what was described in the foregoing. This idea arises largely from cooperating teachers' personal experience of interacting with student teachers. One of the cooperating teachers described an unhappy experience she went through because of the mismatch.

4. A site supervisor responsible for coordinating and evaluating student teaching. The site supervisor is, in his own words, "a sort of person that they (student teachers and cooperating teachers) can come to me and talk to me about things" (p. 2). The informants regarded it "an incredible advantage to be able to have a site supervisor that's on staff, that's here all the time." (pp. 74-75) The site supervisor is the liaison between the student teacher group and the cooperating teacher group. He is familiar with the school, the faculty, and the student teachers. He is on staff and in the school all the time. Therefore, he can effectively act as a coordinator for the preservice teacher education program in the PDS context.

The site supervisor is also a person who is there when student teachers need someone other than their cooperating teachers to talk to. He brings information from the university to the site and organizes meetings once a week with students teachers to provide a time and place for them to meet as a group. I observed one such weekly meeting. Three student teachers attended. They talked about their teaching experience in the previous week, the somewhat conflicting schedule of internship work in school and coursework on campus, and plans for the weeks to come. They also asked for help in reflecting on their experience and coordinating the internship and campus coursework. The site supervisor gave them her advice and offered to talk with their cooperating teachers to reschedule their internship

work. During the meeting, other student teachers also gave their advice on how to overcome difficulties in the classroom. The meeting lasted about an hour. Throughout the meeting, the site supervisor encouraged the participants to discuss whatever they wished. The meeting ended with a schedule for the site supervisor to observe classes to build up student teachers' internship portfolios. On the way back to the university campus, the student teacher I attended the meeting with told me that she had found the weekly meeting very helpful.

The site supervisor was also responsible for evaluation of student teaching. The Washington state requires an evaluation which is usually done by persons hired by the university who go from school to school to observe student teachers. They evaluate individual lessons and write recommendations that go into student teachers' files. These evaluators usually bring a check list and are not familiar with the settings. As illustrated in the following quotation, informants argued for having the site supervisor evaluate student teaching:

> The person who is doing the evaluation is on site. It's me. It's not someone who just comes from the university, doesn't know the students, doesn't know the people in the school.... It's a kind of personal connection.... And I think that the student teachers will say that they like that because very often they are having troubles with the classroom students. I probably know that student, you know. And they have experience the day I observe them. Well, we can talk about it right away. It's not like I will disappear and go back to the university. So I think this is one of the main things that I really like. And I would suppose that this is also one of the main things that student teachers like, too (pp. 3-4).

As illustrated here, the reason for having the site supervisor evaluate student teachers is to have a contextualized evaluation, and to use it as a diagnostic device to improve student teachers' teaching repertoires.

5. Beyond classroom teaching. Connected with a year-long commitment and gradual enlarging of student teachers' responsibilities is the idea that the student teacher should move beyond classroom teaching. Cooperating teachers would like to see student teachers take on additional roles: not only to do wrap-ups at the end of the school year and supervise students field trips, but to become more and more visible in the professional life as well, particularly to attend parent meetings.

The administrator would like to see student teachers become more actively involved in all the activities going on in the building and become a part of the building, including attending faculty meetings. She also envisions that "The school district and the school should make a commitment to that individual, to say to that person if you do well in a year and a half, you have a job here or within the school district" (p. 16). Under such circumstances, student teachers will be encouraged to move beyond classroom teaching.

6. Working with a team of teachers and transcending student teachers' preconceptions regarding teaching. The conventional way of organizing student teaching is to place a student teacher with *one and only one* cooperating teacher, and the relationship between the student teacher and the cooperating teacher is such that when the student teacher walks into the classroom, the cooperating teacher walks out. This way of organizing student teaching merely reinforces the apprenticeship student teachers have experienced through their own education and does not help students to transcend their preconceptions regarding teaching (Goodlad, 1990, chap. 6).

By contrast, in this PDS context, student teachers are in a more supportive structure and they are encouraged to observe and work with other teachers. The PSPDC encourages student teachers to work with a team of cooperating teachers whenever possible. The teacher leadership coordinator also commented that

"Generally, what we would like to see them do is work with teams of teachers, although it hasn't always worked that way. Students are encouraged to observe more classes" (p. 74). One cooperating teacher of language arts mentioned that her student teacher was also working with a math teacher and taught math classes.

All three cooperating teachers have a strong desire to encourage student teachers to identify with a more diversified culture of teaching. As one cooperating teacher said:

> I certainly do not want them to copy me. I want them to learn from me. I should be available to them. And I should not tell them what to do. I should let them experience that, and be a shoulder for them. If they come with an idea, then we talk it through. If they come with a problem, let them solve the problem (p. 27).

Still another cooperating teacher observed:

> (Part of my responsibilities as a cooperating teacher is) to show one way that you can approach the job, all of the teachers have different styles. It is important that they work with a variety of teachers, and this program is good at that. These student teachers do work with several teachers, to get a feeling about the different ways you can still approach to the same situation (p. 47).

7. School-university coordination. The middle school teacher education program was jointly developed by the university faculty members and the site schools. Students in this program are assigned to work in the field. They concurrently enroll in an integrated core seminar taught by a team composed of professors from curriculum and instruction, special education, and educational psychology, and a teacher from one of the PDSs. There is one doctoral student coordinating the team.

The interview with school-based faculty members revealed a vision of school-university coordination. From the programmatic perspective, the site supervisor observed:

> And I also like the organization that they are doing seminars with the university at the same time, so when they are doing more in the university, they are doing less in the school. And they are a sort of switching over until they are doing full-time teaching. We are having now two student teachers right now doing the full-time teaching. And they are totally responsible for the whole day (p. 3).

Another teacher mentioned the increasing familiarity between faculties of the university and the school and envisioned the probability of increasing school-university coordination. He commented:

> I think as the program has been going longer, the staff over in the University of Washington knows more about the teaching staff here. And just that personal knowledge back and forth is helpful communication. And I think as the staff over there becomes more and more familiar with the staff here, what we are doing here, it will be easier for them to tie in, to train at the U with what's happening here at [the name of the school] (pp. 48-49).

The informants also expressed their vision of school-university coordination from the perspective of what should be improved in this regard. The administrator wants to know more about the structure of college of education so that the school-university coordination will be more effective. One teacher observed that "Over there, in the University of Washington, it (the coursework) is not tied directly to real work, real students. Somewhat theoretical ... too theoretical" (p. 48) Although he did not mention directly the idea of school-university coordination, it is obvious that the idea has become a part of his vision.

Some informants also mentioned the idea of school teachers as a unit, and the articulation of preservice teaching and later employment. Because they do not meet the decision rule set forth, they will not be discussed in detail here.

One interesting point found in constructing school-based faculty members' vision of preservice teacher education in PDS context was that their vision was largely a reflection of what they had already done rather than what they ought to do. This finding will be further elaborated in the discussion section.

What are Difficulties Facing Individuals and the School in Realizing Ideal Roles in Preservice Teacher Education

The informants were asked two questions about the difficulties they face from the individual and institutional perspectives. The first was "What has made it difficult for you to realize your ideal role in preservice teacher as a cooperating teacher (or a site supervisor and so on)?" The second was "What has made it difficult for your school to realize its ideal role in preservice teacher education?" Because of the different roles the several categories of informants play in preservice teacher education in the PDS context, they are facing different difficulties and they view these difficulties from different perspectives. In terms of the nature of the answers to these questions, the decision rule was that the difficulties reported in the following should be elaborated by at least three informants.

The answers to the question on their individual difficulties were coded and sorted into two categories: personal and contextual.

1. Lack of time. All informants except for the non-cooperating teacher (who was not asked this question) reported that lack of time was a big issue. One of the cooperating teachers said:

> It's a time commitment. You want to tell them why I did this, or if I would do this once again, these are the things I would change. So every all of that takes time. So it's a big time, the time commitment that you need to share... (p. 61).

The time issue is more serious for the site supervisor and the teacher leadership coordinator. One of them commented:

> It's less difficult now. When I first started doing this, I wasn't allocated a period to do it. And I had to do a lot of juggling within my own classroom.... But now I am allocated one class period.... I do have the allocated time so that we can do the thing we have to do. Well, again, right now I feel like I have time although I do find that sometimes I take time from my own personal part of time to do observations or the other things (p. 6).

The other also commented that "the district allocated a period of time for me (to fill this role). So I have been allocated an extra period. It is not nearly enough ..., so that I feel it's a constraint" (p. 78).

2. Matching with compatible student teachers. Some cooperating teachers found that it was difficult to match with student teachers. One cooperating teacher described an unhappy experience she went through:

> I would say one year, there was a difficult match, and I felt like I was an ombudsman, trying to be an arbitrator between student teacher and parents, and student teacher and students. Sometimes, in some cases, that was only one situation where it was not a good match, and students had a very difficult time and student teachers had a very difficult time. And there was that added pressure and stress of trying to make everybody happy, trying to have everybody get through this situation. And yeah, that was very difficult. If the match isn't quite right, there is a problem (p. 62).

The site supervisor and the teacher leadership coordinator also mentioned this difficulty. For them, the difficulty arises from the unavailability of cooperating teachers. They want to place student teachers with the best teachers and hope that the existing cooperating teachers will not burn out.

3. The empty nest-syndrome. The third personal difficulty is, as a cooperating teacher put it, "the empty nest-syndrome." When student teachers assume total teaching responsibility for a minimum of six weeks at the end of their internship, cooperating teachers feel it is difficult to let their children go. They asked the question, "Can the students let go of the regular teacher?" One cooperating teacher said: "I am having a hard time letting my children go. I love my classes, and now my student teacher is teaching them, and I am going [the sentence was incomplete]. They talk about mothers when all the daughters go away to college" (p. 28). Another cooperating teacher talked about her attachment to students in her class.

4. The need to improve school-university coordination. Some informants perceived the need to improve school-university coordination as a contextual difficulty. The administrator suggested that "the schools and the university need to do a whole lot more cooperating on the selecting [of teacher candidates into the program]" when he talked about sometimes it was hard to place "very, very difficult" student teachers with cooperating teachers (p. 19). One cooperating teacher elaborated on the occasional conflicting schedule of the internship in school and the coursework on campus.

Some other personal difficulties mentioned by the informants included getting tired and a feeling of intrusion because somebody is around for the whole year; contextual difficulties include lack of institutional support for cooperating teachers, lack of resources and so on. The first question on difficulty was focused on individual difficulties, therefore, the contextual difficulties had been mentioned but not elaborated.

The answers to the second question, the difficulties faced by the PDS, can also be divided into two categories: intrainstitutional and interinstitutional. The first three difficulties are intrainstitutional, with the last being interinstitutional

1. Partial institutional commitment. The first difficulty is that not everyone is involved in preservice teacher education. Although the faculty of this PDS voted for continuing to take part in the PSPDC, and the teacher leadership coordinator perceived that 80% of the faculty was supportive of the program, four of them still felt that "not having everybody involved" is a difficulty facing their school. It was reported that some of the faculty members lacked enthusiasm for the PSPDC program. Part of the reason for lack of enthusiasm is that there are too many programs going on in the school. This is the second difficulty: competing programs.

2. Competing programs. The site supervisor commented that "We have many special programs. And to some people, I think, this (the PSPDC program) appears to be one more special program in that long list. And because of that, not everybody is working on the same thing and that's difficult." (p. 7). This difficulty was also reflected in the non-cooperating teacher's remarks. She argued that the PSPDC program was competing for resources with other programs, and "they (the people involved in the PSPDC program) need to look at the commitment to it, either abandon it or become more involved" (p. 45).

3. Limited resources of cooperating teachers. The third difficulty was observed particularly by the site supervisor and the teacher leadership coordinator. The site supervisor remarked that "finding cooperating teachers year after year after year is difficult because it requires a big commitment" (p. 7).

4. Difficulties in placing student teachers. Connected with the third difficulty is the fourth one: placement of student teachers. This difficulty is twofold. First of all, it was perceived that there are too many student teachers in the building. Secondly, because it is a year long program, the limited resource of cooperating teachers has been further depleted.

5. Lack of interinstitutional coordination. The difficulty of coordination between the school and the university was raised again when talking about the

interinstitutional difficulties. One informant regarded the campus coursework as not being tied to the internship work. Another informant complained about unfamiliarity with and the rigidity of the university .

> I think that part of it is we have never been taught. We participated in what the university is by the fact we went to the university. But we have not been taught what you have to deal with on a daily basis... or the political realities of the college of education. We don't have a really clear idea about you, and what happens is that does create problems. The reason that creates problems is that we get frustrated because we come up with an idea, it seems incredibly logical to us. And we are met with by the people from the university, they say "we cannot do that." It is really frustrating.... By having these relationships with the University of Washington, what the individual teachers in the schools are asked is to make changes.... If you draw a picture as the degree to which schools are changed as opposed to the university... I think you would always see, my conception is, we changed at least twice as much as the university has done (p. 21).

This interinstitutional difficulty was also expressed in discussing the contextual difficulty facing individuals.

Rhetoric and Voices from the Field: A Contrast

Based on the major literature on PDS (Holmes Group, 1986,1990; Carnegie Forum, 1986, Levine, 1988; Darling-Hammond, 1989; Lieberman & Miller, 1990; Goodlad, 1990), some expectations for the PDS in terms of its role in preservice teacher program have been developed. These expectations are shown in Table 1, Expectations for Preservice Teacher Education in the Context of PDS.

In addition to school-based faculty members' vision of preservice teacher education reported in the "how student teaching should be organized" section, Table 2 was compiled according to the theoretical model in order to contrast more vividly voices from the field and expectations in the literature.

Comparing voices from the field with the literature, we may find that school-based faculty members' vision of preservice teacher education in the context of a PDS is largely focused on the socialization and development of student teachers. A year-long commitment, gradually enlarging student teachers' responsibilities, matching a student teacher with a cooperating teacher, having a site supervisor, beyond classroom teaching, working with a team of teachers, and school-university coordination all pertain to the logistics of socializing and developing student teachers. However, the school-based faculty members had not mentioned the concept of "cohort group" (Goodlad, 1990, pp. 329, 207-211; Su, 1990a) --- a group of prospective teachers going through the whole program together which can be identified as the classes of 1992, 1993 and so on. The weekly meeting among student teachers and the site supervisor is an opportunity for student teachers to meet as a cohort group, but the informants of this study justified the weekly meeting from the perspective of facilitating communications between cooperating teachers and student teachers. The concept of cohort group has not become a part of school-based faculty members' vision and, therefore, has not been purposefully institutionalized as a mechanism to strengthen the cohort group in the PDS.

In addition to the absence of the concept of cohort group, there are two significant differences between the literature and voices from the field. The first is that the school-based faculty members hardly took into account the idea that student teaching should take place in an exemplary setting. There is an assumption underlying voices from the field that once a school has been selected as a PDS, it is exemplary. The lack of this vision in voices from the field needs attention, for two of the PDS's goals are to provide exemplary programs for students and to conduct student teaching and inservice teaching in such an exemplary setting.

When the question "What should the PDS be or become so that it can best realize its role in preservice teacher education" was asked, no informants elaborated

on the point that it should be an exemplary setting. The issue of exemplary setting was intentionally brought up by this author when interviewing one informant, and she interpreted "being exemplary" as "being realistic" (pp. 7-8). Another informant apparently had difficulties in finding a metaphor to denote what she described. She confirmed "like a teaching hospital" after the interviewer prodded (p. 24). However, she did not go on elaborating the parallel between teaching hospitals in medicine and professional development schools in education.

When one informant discussed how to solve the problem of burn-out among cooperating teachers, she suggested schools take turns in being PDSs. This conception of rotation has its assumption that all the schools are exemplary. Still another informant argued that there was no connection necessarily between PDS and student teaching. It is clear that school-based faculty members did not hold the vision that student teaching should take place in exemplary settings.

The second difference between the rhetoric and voices from the field is that "inquiry" has been neglected in informants' vision. In the literature, "inquiry to strengthen the profession of teaching" is the third goal of the PDS. The PDS must help student teachers inquire into the nature of education, schooling, and teaching as a profession, establish an inquiring attitude, and do so as a natural part of their careers.

When the question "What's your working definition of the concept of PDS" was asked, no informant elaborated on the goal of providing exemplary programs for students, all informants discussed the goal of improving preservice and inservice teacher education, and only one informant mentioned the goal of inquiry to strengthen the profession of teaching. The fact that the school-based faculty members hardly envision the role of inquiry in student teaching is due to their conception of the PDS. If the two key elements of exemplary setting and inquiry are missing in the school-based faculty members' vision, and the student teaching is

one year long, the image of having student teachers in schools is perhaps closer to that of ;ing an apprentice (cf. Lortie, 1975).

Another interesting finding resulting from contrasting the literature and the school-based faculty members' vision is that the site supervisor's and teacher leadership coordinator's conceptions are closer to the literature, which means that the persons who have more opportunities to work with university people have developed conceptions which are closer to the literature. This finding was confirmed by analyzing informants' answers to the question "How have you shaped your vision of PDS's role in preservice teacher education." Three of them, including the site supervisor and the teacher leadership coordinator identified "working with people from the University of Washington" as their major source.

Conclusions

This study revealed the discrepancy between voices from the field and the literature. It is clear that the vision of school-based faculty is practice-oriented; that is, their vision largely consists of what they have done rather than an ideal to be realized. Furthermore, when they were reflecting on difficulties they and their institution were facing in realizing their best roles in preservice teacher education, they actually talked about the logistics in doing better what they have already done. None of them envisioned the difficulty as being conceptual. There is an inertia in the practice. These findings suggest the importance of interaction between the school faculty and the university faculty so as to develop a shared vision. These findings also reveal the necessity of school-university partnership in educating future teachers. Schools, colleges, and departments of education (SCDEs) alone cannot educate prospective teachers well. Neither can schools. To move the teacher education enterprise entirely into schools is heading in a wrong direction due to the

inertia embedded in the practice. To confine teacher education entirely on campus is also unacceptable. The success of teacher education requires the partnership of schools and universities.

In view of the difficulties facing individuals and the institutions in realizing their perceived roles in preservice teacher education, it is clear that there must be more intrainstitutional support for the program, and there also must be more school-university coordination. More efforts must be made in this respect. The SCDEs must also undergo changes. The idea of simultaneous renewal of school and the university must be put into practice. Nothing short of the simultaneous renewal of both schools and universities will succeed. Furthermore, school-university partnership should not be viewed as a strategy for a special project for a short period of time. Rather, it should be perceived as a way of being for both schools and universities.

References

Abdal-Haqq, I. (1989) The Nature of Professional Development Schools. ED 316 548.

Abdal-Haqq, I. (1991) Professional Development Schools and Educational Reform: Concepts and Concerns. ED 335 357.

Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy. (1986), A Nation Prepared: Teachers for the 21st Century. Washington, DC.: Author. ED 268120.

Cohen, D. K. (1990), A Revolution in One Classroom: The Case of Mrs. Oublier. Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis 12, 311-329.

Cohen, D. K., & Ball, D. L. (1990), Relations between Policy and Practice: A Commentary. Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis 12, 249-256.

Cohen, J. (1960) A Coefficient of Agreement for Nominal Scales. Educational and Psychology Measurement 20, 37-46.

Darling-Hammond, L. (1989), Accountability for Professional Practice. Teachers College Record 91, 59-80.

Dewey, J. (1904), The Relation of Theory to Practice in Education. In McMurry, C. A. (Ed.), The Relation of Theory to Practice in the Education of Teachers, The Third Yearbook of the National Society for the Scientific Study of Education, Part 1. Chicago: University of Chicago.

Goodlad, J. I. (1974) Toward Responsive Schools: A Strategy for Educational Change. In Programs and Practices for the Exceptional Individual, Proceedings of the Second National Conference on Physical Activity. Fullerton, CA: Agape Typing and Design.

Goodlad, J. I. (1974), Looking Behind the Classroom Door. Worthington, Ohio: Charles A. Jones.

Goodlad, J. I. (1975), The Dynamics of Educational Change: Toward Responsive Schools. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Goodlad, J. I. (1986), Toward a More Perfect Union. State Education Leader 5 (2),1,8-9.

Goodlad, J. I. (1990), Teachers for Our Nation's Schools. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Goodlad, J. I., & Soder, R. (1992), School-University Partnership: An Appraisal of an Idea. Seattle: Occasional Paper No. 15, Center for Educational Renewal, University of Washington.

Holmes Group. (1986), Tomorrow's Teachers: A Report of the Holmes Group. East Lansing, MI: Author.

Holmes Group. (1990), Tomorrow's Schools: Principles for the Design of Professional Development Schools. East Lansing MI Author

Hoy, W. K. & Woolfolk, A. E. (1990), Socialization of Student Teachers. American Educational Research Journal 27, 279-300.

King, I. L., & Smith, J. R. (1990), The Role of the Partnership School in the Undergraduate Teacher Training Program at the University of Hawaii. ED 330 643.

Levine, M. (ed.) (1988). Professional Practice Schools: Building a Model (Washington, D. C.: American Federation of Teachers. ED 313 344.

Lieberman, A., & Miller, L. (1990), Teacher Development in Professional Practice Schools. Teachers College Record 92,105-122.

Lipsky, M. (1969), Toward a Theory of Street-Level Bureaucracy. Madison: University of Wisconsin.

Lortie, D. C. (1975), Schoolteacher: A Sociological Study. Chicago: University of Chicago.

McDaniel, J. E., Rice, C., & Romerdahl, N. S. (1990) Building Teacher Leadership in an Emerging Professional Development Center. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, April 1990, Boston.

Nystrand, R. O. (1991), Professional Development Schools: Toward a New Relationship for Schools and Universities. ED 330 690.

Schlechty, P. et al. (1988), Inventing the Professional Development Schools. Educational Leadership 46, 28-31.

Senate Committee on Labor and Human Resources. (1989), A Bill to Provide Financial Assistance for Teacher Recruitment and Training, and for Other Purposes. ED 323 395.

Su, Z. (1990a), Exploring the Moral Socialization of Teacher Candidates. Oxford Review of Education 16, 367-391.

Su, Z. (1990b), School-University Partnership: Ideas and Experiments (19861990). Seattle: Occasional Paper No. 12, Center for Educational Renewal, University of Washington.

Williams, D. D. (1991), Student Teachers as Naturalistic Inquirers, paper presented at the 1991 Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association. ED 334178.

Zimpher, N. L. (1990) Creating Professional Development School Sites. Theory into Practice 29, 42-49.

Table 1 Expectations for Preservice Teacher Education in the PDS context

1) Exemplary Settings

- The PDS must be a self-renewing setting with exemplary practices
- The PDS must be committed to the moral obligation of teachers to ensure equitable access to the best possible K-12 education for all children and youth
- The PDS must be characterized in all aspects by the conditions that future teachers prepare to establish in their own schools and classrooms in the future
- The PDS faculty must have a comprehensive understanding of the aims of education and the role of schools in our society, and be fully committed to their beliefs
- Individual faculty must be able to articulate their own professional responsibilities as these pertain to student learning, professional collaboration, and the mission of the institution. All teachers, particularly cooperating teachers, must be good role models
- The PDS must be the school where inquiry, research, and reflection are used to practice, test, and refine the knowledge base of teaching practice and induction

2) Organization of Student Teaching

a) Socialization

- Student teachers must progress as a cohort group, learning from each other
- Student teaching must be characterized by a deliberate socialization process through which candidates transcend their self-oriented student preoccupations to become more other-oriented in identifying with a culture of teaching
- The PDS must have well-designed means to make the school culture known to students and assimilate students into a non-isolated profession

b) Development

- Student teaching experience must continue to internalize and develop core professional values and beliefs, and help student teachers adopt appropriate professional behaviors that these values prescribe
- The PDS must engage future teachers in the problems and dilemmas arising out of the inevitable conflicts and incongruities between what works or is accepted and the research and theory supporting other options
- The PDS must develop and strengthen student teachers' initial commitment to the moral, ethical, and enculturating responsibilities to be assumed
- The PDS must model a professional form of accountability as it might ultimately be seen in all schools. As an induction center, the PDS must implement a key accountability function for the profession as a whole. The PDS must also support and help to build the foundation on which professional accountability ultimately rests
- The level of responsibility of student teachers must be carefully staged, student teachers must become responsible for establishing goals and selecting their own actions
- The induction of student teachers into the teaching profession is structured to provide maximum opportunity for responsible experimentation and reflection on teaching and learning

c) Inquiry

- The PDS must help student teachers inquire into the nature of education, schooling, and teaching as a profession
- The PDS must help student teachers move beyond being students of organized knowledge, facilitating inquiry into both knowledge and, particularly, its teaching
- The PDS must help future teachers not only know schools as they are but also in alternatives, the assumptions underlying alternatives, and means of effecting needed changes in school
- The PDS must provide student teachers with some hands-on experience to handle the issues and dilemmas facing schooling
- The PDS must help student teachers establish an inquiring attitude toward education, schooling, and teaching as a profession, and do so as a natural part of their careers
- The PDS must involve student teachers in strengthening knowledge and practice in teaching by providing an exemplary site for research, experimentation, inquiry, and eventual dissemination of innovative programs

Table 2 Display of School-based Faculty Members' Vision in terms of the Theoretical Model

	Exemplary Settings	Organization of Student Teaching		
		socialization	development	inquiry
1	"I think that is one of the things [being realistic] that make an exemplary thing. We are doing this within a regular school setting. "	"with us for at least a year," "a liaison between themselves (student teachers) and cooperating teachers," "personal connection"	"have a chance to work up to full time teaching," "do lots of observation," "gradually taking over"	
2	"like a teaching hospital"	"should be a year and a half, minimum," "take part in faculty meeting"	"learn through experience, very experiential, very hands-on"	
3		"matching," "person-to-person attachment," human contact," "being here all year long"	"should be a model," "let them experience," "let them solve the problem"	
4		"takes a year,"	"being a model," "take on more and more responsibilities"	"reflect on what is good teaching"
5		"work with several teachers," "spend more more time at the school," "work with a variety of teachers"	"decide this is something what they want to do," "to show one way that you can approach the job," "quality teaching experience," "learn from existing teachers"	
6		"making suggestion and encouragement," "help them become comfortable," "match up," "all year long"	"assume new roles in the classroom," "give them more roles and opportunities," "encompassing every aspect that you would at the school"	
7		"having student teachers involved with the staff the entire year," "bonding," "they [site supervisor and student teachers] become a group"	"to see them work with a team of teachers," "move from ... to be in the classroom to take over completely," "go to different building", "see different fares"	"to see more research going on, action research," "opportunity for inquiry," "opportunity for developing research"