DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 429 975 SP 038 479

AUTHOR Lemlech, Johanna K.; Hertzog, Hillary H.
TITLE Reciprocal Teaching and Learning: What Do Master Teachers and Student Teachers Learn from Each Other?
PUB DATE 1999-04-23
NOTE 21p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Montreal, Quebec, April 19-23, 1999).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research (143) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Classroom Techniques; Collegiality; *Cooperating Teachers; Discipline; Elementary Education; Elementary School Teachers; Faculty Development; *Feedback; Higher Education; *Master Teachers; Preservice Teacher Education; *Reciprocal Teaching; *Student Teachers; Teacher Improvement; *Teacher Influence

ABSTRACT

This study investigated what master teachers and student teachers learned from one another during reciprocal teaching. Data came from two exploratory case studies at elementary schools in southern California. The first study focused on the contributions of partner elementary student teachers to the professional development of their master teachers. It involved 16 elementary student teachers, their 8 master teachers, and 3 additional supervising teachers who did not have students at the time of the study. The second study involved 56 elementary student teachers at the end of their student teaching experience. It questioned what they believed were the strengths of their master teachers and how those strengths contributed to their personal professional development. The two studies spanned 1 academic year. Both studies used observation data, questionnaires, journal entries, and interview data. Findings fell into the following categories: professional development and interaction; tacit learning of how schools and classrooms ran; practice of generic and specific instructional models/strategies; translating knowledge from the disciplines into appropriate curriculum concepts, lesson planning, and assessment; practice of situational appropriate discipline; and classroom management. Student and master teachers found the partnering experiences positive and supportive and the feedback helpful. (Contains 21 references.) (SM)

RECIPROCAL TEACHING AND LEARNING: WHAT DO MASTER TEACHERS AND STUDENT TEACHERS LEARN FROM EACH OTHER?

By

Johanna K. Lemlech

University of Southern California

and

Hillary H. Hertzog

California State University Northridge

Paper prepared for the Annual Meeting of the
American Educational Research Association

Montreal, Quebec Canada
1999

Reciprocal Teaching and Learning: What Do Master Teachers and Student Teachers Learn From Each Other?

Teaching is not only complex, but it is a developmental process. Therefore, is it possible that beginning teachers in student teaching and an experienced teacher responsible for modeling, advising, and coaching can learn from each other? Most studies of the master teacher and the student teacher focus on the traditional nature of the apprenticeship period (Kapuscinski, 1997; Posner, 1993; Johnston, 1994; Valli, 1992; Guyton & McIntyre, 1990). These studies point out the copycat nature of the relationship as student teachers try to emulate their supervising teacher's behavior, the unequal nature of the relationship, the fear of the student teacher to question teaching practices, and the conflicts between university theory and clinical practice.

An early study of student teaching by Fuller and Bown (1975) reminds us of the complexity of the triadic interaction of the master teacher, student teacher, and the university supervisor. These authors note how little influence the student teacher has on the relationship. Fuller and Bown comment also on the lack of experience and training of the master teachers for performing the modeling role and the pittance they receive for their efforts.

The student teaching period often accounts for about one third of the professional preparation of the beginning teacher. Expectations for student teaching by the university, the school district, master teacher, and the student often differ. For example, the university may want the student to demonstrate specific pedagogical strategies and demonstrate ability to diagnose, assess and teach diverse groups of students. The school district and the master teacher may be more interested in discipline, adherence to the district's course of study, and emulation of the master teacher. The student wants to develop a teacher persona and figure out how schools and classrooms are organized. Though these goals are not necessarily incompatible, they may demonstrate differing agendas. Darling-Hammond (1997) notes that most teachers want to adapt curriculum and instructional methods to the needs of their own children and as a consequence tend to resist imposed curriculum. This appears to be true whether the curriculum is prescribed by the state, the district or by the teacher preparation institution. To resolve these different perspectives of beginning teacher preparation, professional development schools have been created in some school districts to encourage collaboration and teaming of preservice teacher educators and experienced teachers.

Kleinsasser & Paradis (1997) described the temporal restructuring of a teacher education program at the University of Wyoming. They noted greater support from the experienced school district teachers when they were included in university program planning. However, the mentor teachers still complained that on occasion they had to develop contrived situations so that the preservice teachers could practice specific teaching strategies.

Several studies have focused on the concerns of the supervising (master) teachers. Koerner (1992) found that the supervising teachers were concerned because they felt displaced in

the eyes of the children by the student teacher. These experienced teachers also resented the extra time needed for curriculum and instructional processes and the altering of established classroom routines. An earlier study by Balch & Balch (1987) concluded that supervising teachers sometimes were concerned about legal ramifications related to supervision of noncredentialed teachers and classroom discipline problems.

Hamlin (1997) studied a partnership between university teacher education programs and a school district. She found that a majority of the supervising teachers noted changes in their own teaching behavior that they attributed to the impact of supervising a student teacher. A small percentage reported that the supervisory process led them to reexamine their beliefs about teaching.

Partnership programs have the potential to develop closer relationships between university educators and school district educators; however, they rarely change the basic elements of the preservice program. University designed teacher education preparation programs have similar components: foundation studies, professional education, and clinical practice. These programs offer a conventional route to a state approved credential. Typically these programs differ only slightly in emphasis; usually differences focus on the required number of college units, sequence of course work, hours of field experience, and whether the programs are oriented to undergraduate or graduate preparation. Though students *practice teach* in a variety of school situations, the traditional program is considered an *apprenticeship;* the master teacher demonstrates, and the student teacher emulates.

Perspectives of the Study

The focal point of the study was the clinical practice component which was restructured to change the social configuration of the student teaching experience. Instead of the traditional one-on-one relationship between the master teacher and the student teacher, the student teachers were *paired* (in the same clinical classroom) for clinical practice to develop collegial behaviors. As a consequence, the structure and dynamics of the experience changes. Since the traditional relationship between the preservice teacher and the master teacher was altered, we questioned whether it would affect supervision and the teaching/learning process of the participants.

Conventional preparation for teaching considers the relationship between the "master" and the "novice" as sacrosanct. But what if it were not? In our nontradtional preparation program the partner student teachers engage in *two* semesters of student teaching with two different supervising teachers. Their responsibilities and requirements in the clinical classroom include:

. collaborative curriculum planning
. coaching each other
. providing lesson feedback
. engaging in professional reflection and talking together about teaching.

The experience is constructivist in orientation. By changing the social configuration of the

student teaching experience, the traditional apprenticeship relationship is altered. The role of the master teacher is modified from that of a mentor/supervisor to that of a team leader because the partners are actively engaged in learning to teach and learning to guide their colleague/partner (Lemlech & Kaplan, 1990; Lemlech & Hertzog, 1993; 1998). The temptation to simply mimic the master teacher is lessened while reflective, collegial decision making is heightened.

Through college course work novice teachers learn the language of teaching, knowledge of subject matter, factors that affect children's learning and motivation, and an appreciable knowledge of pedagogy, yet it is rarely considered significant. Our interest in the study of reciprocal teaching and learning was piqued by our realization that our candidates, in addition to their need to practice and reflect about teaching, may have something to contribute to the professional development of their master teachers.

The Case Studies

Two exploratory case studies were designed to provide data on the supervising teachers and the student teachers. The first study focused on the contributions of partner elementary student teachers to the professional development of their master teachers (Kiraz, 1997). A second study of elementary student teachers, at the end of their student teaching experience, questioned what the preservice teacher candidates believed were the strengths of their master teachers and how these strengths contributed to their personal professional development (Hertzog & Lemlech, 1997-98). The two studies spanned an academic year. Both studies used observation data, questionnaires, journal entries, and interview data.

Four different school districts in southern California were the settings for the subject population. All of the schools serviced a diverse student population. Both the student teachers and the supervising teachers were of mixed ethnicity. The supervising teachers varied in number of years of teaching and their professional experiences. The population for the first study (Kiraz, 1997) included: sixteen (16) elementary student teachers, their eight (8) master teachers plus three (3) additional supervising teachers who did not have students at the time of the study, and four (4) university coordinators. (See Table #1.) These individuals were interviewed and observed. Field notes of the coordinators were examined and journal entries of the students were read. In the second study (Hertzog & Lemlech, 1998), questionnaires were distributed in the methods class after the second semester of student teaching. Fifty-six (56) elementary student teachers responded to the questionnaire and a sample of the student teachers were interviewed. The sixteen (16) student teachers of Case Study # 1 were members of the student teaching class of Case Study # 2.

Findings

Content analysis of the two studies allowed us to categorize the data. While professional development is certainly the major question investigated and serves as the umbrella for all others, we classified the findings using these categories:

. Professional development and interaction

. Tacit learning of how schools and classrooms run
. Practice of generic and specific instructional models/strategies
. Translate knowledge from the disciplines into appropriate curriculum concepts, lesson planning and assessment
. Practice of situational appropriate discipline
. Classroom management

Professional Development and Interaction

Supervising two partner student teachers, what did the master teachers learn about professional relationships and their own leadership role? The major question of the study related to the supervising teachers' leadership role, commitment to teaching, and acceptance of professional responsibilities. The category also reflects the student teachers' need to develop a sense of themselves as professionals in their relationships with colleagues as well as their interactions with students and parents. Their field placement represents a time when they observe the professional identities of others and begin to develop their own. The partner student teachers in this study focused on two dimensions of professional development: their observation of how master teachers interacted with children, and how the master teacher created a relationship with the novices and other adults at the school site.

The Supervising Teachers

Of the supervising teachers studied, three were graduates of our program, two were first time supervisors of our students, and six had varying degrees of experience with supervising students in our program. In the area the university serves, we are the only institution that asks supervising teachers to mentor *partner* student teachers. Some experienced teachers are aghast at the very idea; others are more open and willing to be convinced that there is professional value to the concept. A very positive statement made by one of the supervising teachers (not a graduate of the program) serves as an introduction to the data.

> *It is refreshing to discover that a preparation program has a philosophy centered on teaching strategies and not manuals. The program has had a profound impact on my teaching. In a sense it is like having a second student teaching experience.*

Though in fact the philosophy is focused on collaborative/collegial professional development, the statement conveys the astonishment and rarity of the structural change experience for most of the master teachers.

Observation notes of both supervising teachers and university coordinators revealed three different role interpretations of supervising teachers. Role #1 was traditional - that of the *trainer* of teachers; role # 2 was the belief that teachers are born not prepared - (*I don't think people can be taught to be teachers*). Role # 3 was the emerging professional role.

Daily conferences continue to be the dominant means for helping student teachers. Two of the supervising teachers tended to dominate these conferences leaving little time for the

students to ask questions and participate. The other six supervising teachers served as facilitators usually initiating a concept for discussion, but then providing time for the partners to share. The three participants (partner student teachers and supervising teacher) acted as a teaching team and would discuss and reflect on different aspects of teaching . Substance of the conferences related to the improvement of teaching and the development of a teaching repertoire.

The conferences appeared to be as valuable for the supervising teachers as they were for the student teachers. Observation notes and interviews revealed that the conferences promoted reflection by the supervisors on the feedback process and its importance. The conferences also caused them to reflect on their supervisory style. Supervising teachers were impressed by the use the student teachers made of feedback from the three-way conferences.

> *They use the feedback from their partner, me, and their coordinator. They alter their lessons accordingly.*

Several of the supervising teachers were surprised by the student request that they give their feedback in written form. University coordinators underscored the request by supplying the supervising teacher with a copy of their own written feedback to the student every time they observed a lesson. One of the supervising teachers, acceding to the request realized the reason:

> *Hypothetically, if I were a student teacher, I would want written feedback. I learn better when I read things and see them on paper so I like written feedback.*

Of course the legal ramifications, as well, were not lost on most of the supervising teachers.

The conferences made supervising teachers reflect and sharpened their ability to view both teaching and learning as this teacher reflected:

> *Participating in a conference with the partners is like replaying a video tape; it lets me see what they are seeing. I get to hear from them, see what they are doing, and it improves me.*

In Case Study # 1 it was noted that when supervising teachers and the partner students shared the same institutional background their communication pattern and dialogue was more fluent. The shared philosophy helped to create a more effective and collegial environment.

The Student Teachers

At school sites where the master teachers were deeply involved in curriculum and instructional decision making, the student teachers were affected in several ways. At these sites, the student teachers were included at planning meetings and were able to observe their own supervising teacher working professionally with other teachers. One partner group commented:

> *Our master teacher handled cooperative/collaborative work professionally. She was a great model for us and we feel completely prepared for next year.*

A significant effect of supervising teacher participation and leadership was that in these classrooms the teachers were more secure about their own relationships, and as a consequence

they allowed the partners greater freedom to experiment in their own teaching. Several responses referred to the value student teachers put on freedom, flexibility, and validation for trying new strategies:

> *She was very flexible and allowed us to do what we wanted/needed to do.*

> *Our teacher wanted to learn from us. She had a hunger for new ideas and strategies. We were surprised at that. We taught her a new instructional model, and she had us coach her on how well she did with it.*

Narrative responses on the questionnaire and interview responses demonstrated that student teachers were significantly influenced by how their supervising teachers interacted with children. For example, a student teacher made the following comment:

> *She was very dedicated to her job. She went the extra mile to provide the best possible learning experience for students. She was a great role model.*

The student teachers own relationship with their supervising teacher influenced their practice:

> *Our supervising teacher was very easy to talk to and always reachable. She helped us maintain a planning routine and was very open to any new curriculum ideas we wanted to try.*

> *Our supervising teacher gave us such an enormous amount of guidance. Although Miss W was not very generous with many compliments, we thoroughly felt that we grew as teachers. She was an incredible influence and I only hope to be as great of a teacher and have as much of a positive impact on kids as she does.*

The student teachers did not respond well to master teachers who were perceived as having poor interaction skills. The following comment illustrates:

> *We needed a person who wasn't afraid to express opinions and thoughts - both positive and negative. We wanted to know what she was thinking and to talk about the good and bad.*

In addition, student teachers did not respond well to supervising teachers who had difficulty providing freedom and time for developing a professional identity.

> *I didn't have a very good semester, compared to last semester's student teaching. Our teacher was very flexible with time, but she practically forced us to be her copycat in order to be doing well, based on her assessment. She really did not allow us to ever do our own thing.*

Tacit Learning About Schools and Classrooms

This category related to the culture of the school and the classroom. School sites and districts varied greatly in terms of teacher decision making and general empowerment. Supervising teachers and the partner student teachers were affected by the established routines and regularities of the rules, procedures, flexibility or inflexibility of time, the use of supplies and equipment, patterns of interaction, and relationships with the community.

The Supervising Teachers

Experienced master teachers, (those who had prior experience with student teachers) were impressed with the way the partners took care of each other. They recognized that the partners shared information, and in some ways this lessened their responsibility and focused their attention on professional relationships.

The use of *time,* a scarce commodity in schools, is another element that reflects the culture of the classroom and school. Both the partner student teachers and the supervising teachers complained about the absence of time. Observing the student teachers, the supervising teachers learned that one of the first requirements of teaching was efficient use of time, and that the novice teachers were not able to anticipate the duration of lessons. One of the supervising teachers commented,

> *It isn't lack of organization but rather inability to think about what will happen during a lesson.*

The problem with *time* also helped the supervising teachers become more organized in their before school planning conferences with the partners. They realized that they had to prepare the student teachers far in advance concerning school events and deviations from standard practices in order to help the student teachers recognize how instructional practices will be affected.

> *I have become more organized in communicating their tasks. I know what they need. I've learned that things I take for granted, the novice teacher needs help.*

The Student Teachers

Typically student teachers are subjected to information overload as master teachers attempt to indoctrinate them into classroom life. The student is expected to "fit in" to the existing structure of the classroom. The student teacher is dependent on the master teacher for knowledge about classroom standards, time schedules, curriculum, seating chart, texts, resources, and school rules and routines. In most situations the student teacher must ply the master teacher with questions related to the routines as well as substantive issues about teaching.

Because the student teachers have partners, instead of burdening the master teacher with questions, the partner student teachers asked each other, "Do you remember where. . . when. . . how. . .?" The partners absorbed school culture from their master teachers, but they derived

emotional support in the form of assistance, helping behaviors, and reminders from each other. They were less "needy" and less dependent on the master teacher.

The partner student teachers also attended to their master teacher's responsibilities at the school site. At two of the sites they were included in informal meetings among small groups of teachers. The partners recognized that they were influenced by their master teacher's assumption of, or isolation from, school activities and decision making.

Practice of Generic and Specific Instructional Models/Strategies

The integration of subject matter and pedagogy was a major focus of the student teachers' methods class. Within subject fields the students were taught and expected to practice four specific teaching models: concept attainment, advance organizer, group investigation, and direct instruction. The students were instructed in inductive and deductive strategies, reading techniques, and methods for the differentiation of instruction; however, it was anticipated that many generic strategies such as, the use of manipulatives and textbooks, and discussion skills would be learned in the clinical classroom.

The Supervising Teachers

The supervising teachers included in the study ranged in teaching experience from 40 years to 3 years. Neither the subject group or the general population of supervising teachers that we used for our students demonstrated differences in flexibility related to age or number of years of teaching experience. It was a requirement of the program that students be allowed to practice the use of a variety of teaching strategies and models. Most of the supervising teachers respected this aspect of the program and were receptive to the knowledge the student teachers contributed. A very experienced supervising teacher reflected on the "give and take" process.

> *One thing is they(the student teachers) make me much more self-conscious which is a good thing. Something you do everyday for the last twenty years you do without thinking and you are blind to areas that need improvement. The student teachers make me aware of what's new in education and keep me on my toes.*

One supervising teacher attributed the synergy of two student teachers as contributing to her professional development.

> *Recently my two student teachers have come up with some very innovative ways of teaching that have kind of never occurred to me and on the surface look like very simple ideas. But they're very exciting, very challenging. And the kids love them. I kind of regret that I didn't think of them first, but I tell them that I'm going to steal them and use them. I learn a great deal from my student teachers.*

Of course, the simple ideas were in reality from Joyce and Weil's *Models of Teaching* (1996).

Six of the supervising teachers (Case Study # 1) did not have experience with teaching models, but they readily admitted that they were learning them from their student teachers. One supervising teacher shared this experience:

> *I learned a lot of new teaching models I never learned before and I've tried to incorporate them in my lessons. . . .I got a little bit more bold and did some after the student teachers left for the day and I was all by myself.*

Another commented:

> *I learned about the different teaching models. Things I was never taught. They (the student teachers) got me thinking about the different types of strategies in teaching.*

Observing the student teachers as they taught provided opportunity for the supervising teachers to view their own students, and at times this contributed great insights. They noted how different teaching strategies motivated certain children while others were indifferent. One teacher commented on a group investigation lesson that "missed." She recalled approving the lesson plan and thinking that it was a great lesson, but when it was taught, the children were disinterested. The incident caused her to problem solve.

> *I had to think of different approaches and how they might contribute to the lesson.*

The Student Teachers

The student teachers were clearly aware that they were learning current pedagogical ideas in their methods class, and they took pride in their knowledge. However, as they practiced what they were learning, most realized that they needed feedback and coaching. The partners depended on each other for feedback, but often regretted and were quite critical, that their supervising teacher did not provide specific feedback on the models of teaching.

Translating Knowledge from the Disciplines into Curriculum Concepts, Lesson Planning and Assessment

The student teachers readily acknowledged they needed help with lesson planning, selecting curriculum content, and assessment more than other aspects of learning to teach. Their concerns were: (1) recognizing what a given community of learners needs to be taught, (2) how the content should be sequenced, (3) what resources to use, and (4) how to assess what students have learned. The student teachers in this study were typical preservice teachers. Though these students had a strong background in pedagogy, they were dependent on their supervising teachers to demonstrate the subject fields and provide insight about the learners' experiences in order to help them interpret curriculum. They needed assistance in planning their lessons to correspond with the children they were to teach.

The Supervising Teachers

Lesson planning for experienced teachers and novices is quite different. Experienced teachers include in their planning: content, sequence, instructional time allocation, teaching method, resources, and evaluation (Clark & Peterson, 1986). All of this may occur in a short written form and/or in the teacher's head. The student teachers are so dependent on their written plan that most hold the lesson plan in their hands, as they might a security blanket!

Inexperience with the lesson planning process used by the student teachers caused conflict between the supervising teacher and the partners. Supervising teachers used short, concise notes; student teachers were required to script their lessons anticipating student responses. But as supervising teachers (six, Case Study #1) began to view lesson planning from the student teachers' perspective they gained insight about the learning to teach process. Perhaps of most significance was that as the supervising teachers participated in talking about lessons with the partners, they began to see how sharing ideas, giving suggestions, and reflecting improved the lessons. Teamwork, mutual support, and coaching appeared to improve the quality of curriculum content and instruction.

Both the supervising teachers and the student teachers were aware of current curriculum standards. Those supervising teachers with years of teaching experience were able to utilize their experiences to plan curriculum, but the students needed help. Most of the supervising teachers were very strong in the teaching of language arts and mathematics, and they demonstrated these subject fields. However, in most of the clinical assignments the student teachers believed that they did not receive help in all curriculum areas. Social studies, science, and the arts were most often neglected.

Though subject field disciplines should be fresh in the minds of the student teachers, they were often at a loss as to how to incorporate their knowledge into the curriculum. Without the tutelage of the master teachers most were unable to create appropriate analogies for motivation and to transform knowledge into appropriate curriculum concepts. Once again, those supervising teachers who reflected on the learning to teach process recognized novice teacher needs, but they did not necessarily provide appropriate guidance.

The assessment of children's work was another area that sometimes created conflict. Student teachers were accustomed to portfolio assessment and peer review as used in their methods class. Supervising teachers were confronted by multiple pressures from the school district, the local culture of the school, and the community. One supervising teacher shared the following:

> *A parent came to see me about the use of portfolios for judging her son's work. She said that it seemed to her that her son did not select his best work for the portfolio and his reasons for selection were silly. The parent's real concern was that the portfolio was used for grading purposes.*

One might judge that the community, as represented by this parent, may not have been adequately prepared for the use of portfolios as one assessment tool. Clearly the data from the two studies revealed that grading children's work was frequently an area of disagreement between the supervising teachers and the partner student teachers.

The Student Teachers

The student teachers were envious of their supervising teachers' knowledge about what to teach and their ease at lesson planning.

> *Our master teacher had a lot of experience and, therefore had many great hints about the content and how to teach specific concepts.*

The partners appreciated the participation of the supervising teacher in team planning of thematic units.

> *We worked as a team to develop a unit on the rainforest. Our classroom actually became a rainforest. It was awesome. Just walking into the room every day was a treat.*

The student teachers also expressed their dismay when the supervising teachers failed to demonstrate all of the subject fields as this statement indicates:

> *We really wanted to see science get taught before we started teaching it. But she just threw us in. After watching each other and then talking about the lessons afterward, we ended up learning a lot about science. Our university supervisor even said it was one of the best chemistry lessons she had seen.*

Most significantly, the student teachers consistently found the most critical element of the curriculum planning process was the ability of the master teacher to orchestrate the process to include the teaching of three classroom teachers. To create a seamless curriculum for the children, continuous conversation was required about the success of previously taught lessons, modification of subsequent lessons and how to achieve continuity for the students. This conversation led to reflection about student achievement, differentiation of instruction, sequencing of concepts and content, and the relationship between learning goals and activities. The curriculum planning process needed to be flexible, responsive to the success, or failure, of individual lessons and involve continuous assessment. In those situations where the student teachers perceived that this process happened, they valued the entire student teaching experience more; where it didn't happen, the student teachers were highly critical of their supervising teachers.

Discipline

New teachers fear the lack of discipline in their classrooms, and experienced teachers advocate the need to maintain discipline in their classrooms. How teachers go about the task of

developing classroom standards and retaining student interest, reveals a great deal about them personally, such as: their personal control needs, beliefs about how children learn, and their understanding of a democratic classroom community (Lemlech, 1999). Dewey comments that the "problem of discipline" occurs because teachers sometimes value "physical quietude . . . rigid uniformity of posture and movement . . . machine-like simulation of the attitudes of intelligent interest" (1916, 1944, p. 141).

The Supervising Teachers

It is natural that supervising teachers want to retain the standards they have set-up in their classrooms and sometimes look upon the student teacher as an intruder. The student teachers were versed on the need to motivate children and advance intrinsic motivation. As a consequence in some classrooms, there was conflict of aims if supervising teachers relied on extrinsic rewards, such as using candy and free time to maintain discipline, or writing a child's name on the chalkboard for tallying consequences.

However, five of the supervising teachers (Case Study # 1) noted improved student interest resulting from the use of different teaching models, and this interest was reflected in the children's behavior. One supervising teacher commented:

> *The partners had a profound impact on my teaching and discipline plan. I liked what the student teachers were doing and moved away from extrinsic rewards.*

This supervising teacher was in a school district that advocated the Jones and Jones *Comprehensive Classroom Management*, a system that relies on teacher enforcement of rules and consequences.

The Student Teachers

The student teachers had strong feelings about the way to set standards in the classroom and the enforcement of consistent behavior. Overwhelmingly their comments reflected their concerns:

> *We learned that discipline needs to be consistent. Her discipline wasn't. It made our job more difficult because she wasn't. She wanted to use points on the board but didn't follow through. We didn't like the idea of using points at all.*
>
> *It's really hard when your beliefs about discipline don't match your teacher's. Our teacher was really into extrinsic rewards. She would stop a lesson to give points. We didn't want to do that.*

Though the student teachers were disappointed with the discipline practices of some of the supervising teachers, they also appreciated and learned from them when it came to resolving conflicts among the children. The student teachers reflected on how good their supervising

teacher were as this comment indicates:

> *My teacher was so good at handling problems between kids, that I used to watch everything she did and said, especially with conflict resolution between students. I wanted to imitate her language patterns.*

Classroom Management

Classroom management was defined as ". . . the orchestration of classroom life: planning curriculum, organizing procedures and resources, arranging the environment to maximize efficiency, monitoring student progress, anticipating potential problems" (Lemlech, 1999, p. 4).

The Supervising Teachers

Supervising teachers strongly believed that the partner student teachers needed to follow their schedules, business procedures, use of materials and resources and means for monitoring student progress. It was not always clear whether the supervising teachers were differentiating between classroom management and discipline.

> *Classroom management, they do it my way. This is my class and if I didn't set the procedures, then they (the children) would get out of hand.*

However, when it came to the classroom environment most supervising teachers were more flexible and granted the partners creative freedom.

Early in the semester the supervising teachers attempted to alert the student teachers to potential problem situations that would affect the implementation of their lessons, but as the partners gained experience, the supervising teachers took a wait and see approach. Clearly they wanted the student teachers to begin to anticipate problems on their own.

In several of the classrooms the supervising teachers decided on the composition of groups. The student teachers did not always agree with the way the groups were formed. In one of the classroom, the partners insisted on fewer students in each group and the supervising teacher was somewhat surprised with the results. The supervising teacher commented:

> *The partners came to me and showed the possible seating arrangement. It obviously bothered them. They placed the students in smaller groups. The next lesson was much more enjoyable. I should have done it before.*

The Student Teachers

Both conflict and admiration were dominating responses from the student teachers. For example:

> *She was very organized, structured and strict.*

She had high expectations and had created a community of learners. The classroom was like a family. Students had lots of responsibilities, and were made responsible for their actions. She was very dedicated to her job. She went the extra mile to provide the best possible learning experience for students.

Student teachers were required to design learning centers in the classroom to differentiate instruction for children, but supervising teachers did not always recognize the value of learning centers in the classroom, and the student teachers had a difficult time fulfilling their requirements.

Classroom management is hard. We all have our ideas about what the classroom should be like. My partner and I talked about it a lot. But, what we would like to do didn't match her management. We wanted to try centers, but she doesn't use them. We waited until the end of the semester when we were basically teaching everything between the two of us. Then, we set up centers for the few weeks we were in charge. The kids loved them, and we loved them.

The student teachers had strong feelings about the ways they would run the classroom, if it were their own. In some cases, student teachers felt inhibited by an imposed structure; however, most of their reflections expressed their gratitude to the supervising teachers for the opportunities extended to try out their own ideas in a fail-safe environment.

Conclusions

Professionalism. The value of pairing student teachers for the development of collegiality affected not only the professional relationships of prospective teachers, but the master teachers as well. Listening to the partners provide each other with lesson feedback and coaching advice, the supervising teachers learned about the value of talking to peers about teaching. The partnering caused and required more conversation about teaching, and as supervising teachers entered into the conversation during conference time, they began to talk *with* the partners instead of *to* the partners. As a consequence, the partners and the supervising teachers would compare accepted practice, best practice and the needs of children in the classroom.

As the partners struggled with tactful feedback, the supervising teachers contributed professional support and sensitive interchange. Supervising teachers became more objective and open to professional talk and developed insight about the value of professional relationships for learning about teaching. In a sense the student teachers became role models for the supervising teachers as the partners developed as colleagues. Both the student teachers and the supervising teachers gained a better sense of themselves as professionals and they clearly valued the professional dialogue, reflection, and collegiality.

Pedagogy. Observing, listening, and engaging in conversation with the partner student

teachers, the supervising teachers gained new language of teaching and understanding of the teaching process. Many became risk-takers as they experimented with new teaching models. Three factors contributed to the motivation for learning teaching models. (1) In order to enter into and contribute to the professional dialogue with the partners, the supervising teachers needed to understand and practice the teaching models. (2) The supervising teachers felt excluded if they could not critique and coach the student teachers. (3) Through observation of the children while the partners were teaching, the supervising teachers recognized increased interest and engagement of the students.

As the supervising teachers reviewed and infused new ideas for lesson planning and the integration of subject fields, the partner student teachers gained content specific knowledge for teaching conceptually, and nonspecific routines for managing instruction. The partners gained deeper understanding of children's needs and interests, and practice in monitoring understanding. The partners also gained practical knowledge of classroom management, organization, and the planning process, although at times they opted for "their way". Frequently the student teachers questioned the philosophy under which classroom management and discipline decisions were made. This became a significant factor in their evaluation of the value of the student teaching experience.

Reflection. As supervising teachers conscientiously observed teaching, they learned to anticipate student teachers' difficulties with lesson plans. Observation of and discussion with the partner student teachers caused them to question and problem solve about teaching approaches and instructional strategies for different purposes. Some began to question their own beliefs about discipline and how children learn. Most gained respect for the developmental process of learning to teach.

The student teachers recognized the conflict related to beliefs about how children learn and the difference it makes in classroom practices. Some of the student teachers perceived the transformation of professional practice as supervising teachers accepted or became more open to different ideas, new theory and applications.

The partner student teachers' reflective processes were enhanced by the situational knowledge and experience of the supervising teachers. Even in cases where the supervising teacher was not pedagogically grounded in the teaching models, they frequently facilitated the reflective process.

Interview data confirmed the significance of the school culture and teacher decision making. At the school sites where supervising teachers engaged in professional activities involving decision making, student teachers participated in a wider range of professional tasks and enjoyed greater freedom to implement and experiment with the classroom environment, the curriculum and instructional strategies.

After-thoughts. By changing the social configuration of the clinical classroom for student

teaching, reciprocal teaching, learning, and reflection for supervising teachers and student teachers became a practical reality. Teacher educators need to engage in discussion about the potential and means for reciprocal professional development when student teachers are assigned for clinical practice in the public schools.

References

Balch, P. & Balch, P. (1987). *The cooperating teacher: A practical approach for the supervision of student teachers.* Lanham, MD: University Press of America.

Clark, C. M. & Peterson, P. L. (1986). Teachers' thought processes. In M. C. Wittrock (Ed.) *Handbook of research on teaching - third ed.* New York: Macmillan.

Darling-Hammond, L. (1997). *The right to learn.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Dewey, J. (1916, 1944). *Democracy and education.* New York: Macmillan.

Fuller, F.F. & Bown, O. (1975) Becoming a teacher. In K. Ryan (Ed.) *Teacher education Part II.* Chicago: National Society for the Study of Education

Guyton, E. & McIntyre, D. J. (1990). Student teaching and school experiences. In R. W. Houston (Ed.) *Handbook of research on teacher education* (pp. 514-534). New York: Macmillan.

Hamlin, K. (1997). Partnerships that support the professional growth of supervising teachers. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 24(1) 77-88.

Hertzog, H. & Lemlech, J.K. (1998) . Student teachers' evaluation of their supervising teachers. Unpublished study. Los Angeles: University of Southern California

Johnston, S. (1994). Experience is the best teacher; Or is it? An analysis of the role of experience in learning to teach. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 45(3) 199-208.

Joyce, B. & Weil, M. (1996). *Models of teaching.* Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Kapuscinski, P. (1997). The collaborative lens: A new look at an old research study. In H. Christiansen, L. Goulet, C. Ktentz & M. Maeers (Eds.), *Recreating relationships, collaboration and educational reform.* New York: State University of New York Press.

Kiraz, E. (1997). In what ways do student teachers contribute to the professional development of their supervising teachers? Unpublished dissertation. Los Angeles: University of Southern California.

Kleinsasser, A. M. & Paradis, E. E. (1997). Changing teacher education in the context of a school-university partnership: Disrupting temporal organizational arrangements. *Teacher Education Quarterly.* 24(2) 63-74.

Koerner, M. E. (1992). The cooperating teacher: An ambivalent participant in student teaching. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 43(1) 46-56.

Lemlech, J. K. (1999). *Classroom management -third ed.* Prospect Heights, Ill.: Waveland Press.

Lemlech, J. K. & Hertzog, H. (1993). Linking school and university through collegial student teaching. *Teacher Education Quarterly.* 20(6) 19-27.

Lemlech, J. K. & Hertzog, H. (1998). Preparing teachers for leadership roles. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Diego, CA.

Lemlech, J. K. & Kaplan, S. N. (1990). Learning to talk about teaching: Collegiality in clinical teacher education. *Action in Teacher Education*, 12(1) 13-19.

Posner, G. J. (1993). *Field experience: A guide to reflective teaching.* New York: Longman.

Valli, L. (1992). Beginning teacher problems: Areas for teacher education improvement. *Action in Teacher Education,* 14 (1) 18-25.

Zeichner, K. M. & Liston, D. D. (1996). *Reflective teaching an introduction.* NJ: Laurence Erlbaum Associates.

Table 1
Demographics of the Case Studies

	Case Study # 1	Case Study # 2
Supervising Teachers	8+3 (not supervising at time of study)	28 (all supervising at time of study)
Teaching Experience of Supervising Teachers	Ranged from 3 years to 40 years	Ranged from 3 years to 40 years
Gender	10 female, 1 male	25 female, 3 male
Ethnicity	Mixed	Mixed
Institutional Background	Varied (8), Same as student teachers (3)	Varied (23), Same as student teachers (5)
Experience with Partner Student Teachers	From 0 - 7 years	From 0 - 7 years
Student Teachers	16 - 8 groups	56 - 28 groups
University Coordinators	4	0

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
National Library of Education (NLE)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

REPRODUCTION RELEASE

(Specific Document)

I. DOCUMENT IDENTIFICATION:

Title: Reciprocal Teaching and Learning: What do Master Teachers and Student Teachers Learn From Each Other?	
Author(s): Johanna K Lemlech and Hillary H. Hertzog	
Corporate Source: Univ. Southern Calif.	Publication Date: AERA '99 Presentation

II. REPRODUCTION RELEASE:

In order to disseminate as widely as possible timely and significant materials of interest to the educational community, documents announced in the monthly abstract journal of the ERIC system, *Resources in Education* (RIE), are usually made available to users in microfiche, reproduced paper copy, and electronic media, and sold through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). Credit is given to the source of each document, and, if reproduction release is granted, one of the following notices is affixed to the document.

If permission is granted to reproduce and disseminate the identified document, please CHECK ONE of the following three options and sign at the bottom of the page.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 1 documents	The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2A documents	The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2B documents
PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY Sample TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) 1	PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE, AND IN ELECTRONIC MEDIA FOR ERIC COLLECTION SUBSCRIBERS ONLY, HAS BEEN GRANTED BY Sample TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) 2A	PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY Sample TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) 2B
Level 1 ↑ ☑	Level 2A ↑ ☐	Level 2B ↑ ☐
Check here for Level 1 release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche or other ERIC archival media (e.g., electronic) *and* paper copy.	Check here for Level 2A release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche and in electronic media for ERIC archival collection subscribers only	Check here for Level 2B release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche only

Documents will be processed as indicated provided reproduction quality permits.
If permission to reproduce is granted, but no box is checked, documents will be processed at Level 1.

I hereby grant to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) nonexclusive permission to reproduce and disseminate this document as indicated above. Reproduction from the ERIC microfiche or electronic media by persons other than ERIC employees and its system contractors requires permission from the copyright holder. Exception is made for non-profit reproduction by libraries and other service agencies to satisfy information needs of educators in response to discrete inquiries.

Sign here, → please

Signature: Johanna K Lemlech	Printed Name/Position/Title: Johanna K Lemlech Prof of Educ	
Organization/Address: Univ. Southern Calif. L.A., CA 90089-0031	Telephone: (213) 496-0449	FAX: (213) 496-0179
	E-Mail Address: lemlech@pacificnet	Date: 5/1/99

(over)