Mid-Western Educational Researcher

Volume 10 | Issue 4 Article 2

1997

Problems Related to Participants' Roles and Programmatic Goals in Student Teaching Supervision

Donald A. Williams
The Ohio State University - Lima

Hema Ramanathan
Butler University

Doug Smith
Coastal Carolina University

Josue Cruz
University of South Florida

Laura Lipsett
The Ohio State University

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarworks.bgsu.edu/mwer

How does access to this work benefit you? Let us know!

Recommended Citation

Williams, Donald A.; Ramanathan, Hema; Smith, Doug; Cruz, Josue; and Lipsett, Laura (1997) "Problems Related to Participants' Roles and Programmatic Goals in Student Teaching Supervision," *Mid-Western Educational Researcher*: Vol. 10: Iss. 4, Article 2.
Available at: https://scholarworks.bgsu.edu/mwer/vol10/iss4/2

This Featured Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Journals at ScholarWorks@BGSU. It has been accepted for inclusion in Mid-Western Educational Researcher by an authorized editor of ScholarWorks@BGSU.

Problems Related to Participants' Roles and Programmatic Goals in Student Teaching Supervision

Donald A. Williams
The Ohio State University, Lima

Hema Ramanathan
Butler University

Doug Smith
Coastal Carolina University

Josue Cruz
University of South Florida

Laura Lipsett
The Ohio State University, Columbus

Abstract

Current practices regarding the roles of cooperating teachers and university supervisors and the goals of student teaching were examined through an analysis of student teaching handbooks from midwest teacher education programs. Handbooks, representing 61 of the 340 teacher education programs in 13 midwest states, were analyzed to determine the roles assigned to cooperating teachers and university supervisors and to compare the goals of these programs to the outcomes measured in their evaluation instruments. The study found that student teaching materials lacked clear statements of program goals and objectives and lacked clear definitions of the roles of cooperating teachers and university supervisors. Correlation analysis indicated a lack of congruence between the stated program goals and the outcomes assessed in evaluative criteria. Recommendations relate to the clarity in defining roles and tasks and consistency between goals and outcomes.

Introduction

Resounding support is given to the belief that student teaching is singularly the most influential experience in preservice teacher education. However, student teaching generally is not accorded the attention warranting such support and rarely is it implemented in a strategic manner commensurate with its perceived importance.

A number of studies have revealed entrenched problems in the structure of student teaching. They call attention to incongruent role expectations of cooperating teachers and the university supervisors and a lack of congruence between the perceptions of participants in the triad (cooperating teacher, university supervisor, and student teacher) concerning the goals of student teaching (Grimmett & Ratzlaff, 1986; Guyton & McIntyre, 1990). It is these problems that have been identified as constraining the successful implementation of student teaching programs that serve as the foci of this study.

Objectives

The purpose of this study was to investigate the stated practices in student teaching as reflected in the supervision handbooks of midwestern colleges and universities. The two major areas examined were (a) the roles of university supervisors and cooperating teachers, and (b) the goals of the student teaching practicum and their corresponding outcomes derived from the institutions' evaluative instruments. The findings were compared to current theoretical frameworks of student teaching and to the extant reform proposals in order to generate recommendations that will define practice in student teaching programs.

In order to conduct this investigation, it was necessary to operationalize the terms "roles" and "tasks." Roles subsume a related group of tasks, and conversely, tasks define the major role categories. For the purpose of this study, *role* and *task* were defined as follows:

1. Role: An essential *function* performed in student teaching which is descriptive of the relationship intended between a cooperating teacher or university supervisor and a student teacher. For example, a cooperating teacher might take on the role of an *instructor* to student teachers.
2. Task: Any prescribed *activity* that a cooperating teacher or university supervisor undertakes in reference to the student teaching experience. For example, in the role of instructor, a cooperating teacher might be assigned the task of "guiding student teachers in their planning."

Additionally, the following questions were addressed:

1. What tasks were specified for cooperating teachers and university supervisors in student teaching handbooks, and consequently, what roles could be inferred from the tasks assigned to these individuals?
2. Were the goals of student teaching specified in cooperating teacher and university supervisor handbooks congruent with the intended outcomes reflected in the evaluative instruments found in those same handbooks?

Review of Literature

Student teaching is commonly viewed as the key element in the development of preservice teachers and a "critical site for the implementation of any educational reform agenda" (Borko & Mayfield, 1995, p. 502). Teachers consistently support this view by ranking student teaching as the most beneficial element of their preservice preparation (Guyton & McIntyre, 1990). Indeed, 77% of university supervisors and 70% of cooperating teachers surveyed believe that student teaching prepares students more than adequately for their first full-time teaching assignment (American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, [AACTE], 1991).

In view of the perceived importance of student teaching to the development of preservice teachers, it is reasonable to believe that the goals of student teaching and the roles of cooperating teachers and university supervisors would be well defined and clearly articulated. However, student teaching programs, in general, lack clearly stated expectations regarding the roles and tasks of the cooperating teacher and university supervisor and typically lack goals that are congruent with proposed outcomes (Guyton & McIntyre, 1990). Guyton and McIntyre have observed that "The members of the triad experience intrapersonal and interpersonal role confusion during student teaching, uncertainty about their own and others roles, and divergent role expectations of themselves and others" (p. 523). Consequently, the potential for student teaching to produce disappointing outcomes is high, and it is unlikely in such a setting that participants would experience a sense of accomplishment of goals.

Role of Cooperating Teachers

Members of the triad typically hold conflicting views regarding the roles of cooperating teachers and university supervisors (Duquette, 1994). A survey by Grimmett and Ratzlaff (1986) revealed that student teachers, cooperating teachers, and university supervisors disagreed in 35 of 50 categories defining the tasks of cooperating teachers. Where they did agree, participants perceived the role of cooperating teachers to include tasks of evaluation, orientation, and professional development and assistance in planning and instruction. The findings of Grimmett and Ratzlaff confirmed similar findings from previous studies by Castillo (1971) and Copas (1984). Although their specific findings varied, these studies in general revealed conflicting perceptions among members of the triad regarding the role of cooperating teachers.

Agreement concerning the essential function of cooperating teachers has not been forthcoming through national efforts to standardize the roles and responsibilities of student teaching participants. The National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (1995) requires, in the Category I standards, that field experiences encourage reflection and provide feedback from the university and school faculty and peers and that such experiences should be a minimum of ten weeks or equivalent. It also stipulates that student teaching be a joint agreement between the schools and cooperating professionals. Category III, Professional Education Faculty, notes that unit faculty who supervise, have preparation and experience in school settings. Graduate students who have responsibility for field experiences should be qualified in terms of study, experience, and training. Lastly, Category III limits 1 full-time faculty member to 18 full-time students. No mention is made of the roles and responsibilities that the different members of the triad should play. Similarly, the 1986 Association of Teacher Educator's (ATE) national guidelines contained only general descriptions of the tasks for cooperating teachers and university supervisors, advancing no specific tasks (Guyton & McIntyre, 1990). Typical of the ATE (1986) guidelines are statements such as "establish and maintain open channels of communication" (p. 17). Guyton and McIntyre point out that such broad statements promote a variety of interpretations by members of the triad who bring individual role expectations to their experience.

While the intended role of cooperating teachers remains poorly defined, the effect of the role assumed by cooperating teachers in student teaching reveals a consistently bothersome pattern. As social agents, cooperating teachers exert the most profound influence on student teachers (Borko & Mayfield, 1993; Calderhead, 1988) yet often exert negative influences (Richardson-Koehler, 1988). Richardson-Koehler's study found that after two weeks in student teaching, preservice teachers had aligned their practice with their cooperating teacher. In general, student teachers' attitudes become more custodial and negative during field experiences (McIntyre, 1984). In addition, cooperating teachers also exercise influence through their evaluation of student teachers. However, the value of cooperating teachers' assessment of student teachers is questionable since they place a premium on being positive in their relationships with student teachers in an effort to bolster their confidence (Dunne & Dunne, 1993). Therefore, given the potential of cooperating teachers to impact the development of preservice teachers, there is substantial reason to define and clarify their role in student teaching.

Role of University Supervisors

The place and value of university supervisors in student teaching is difficult to define given the varied conclusions of individuals who have investigated this subject. Some studies suggest that the effectiveness of student teaching is

related to the assistance and mentoring provided by the cooperating teacher and university supervisor (Glickman & Bey, 1990), and that university supervisors improve a student teacher's performance (Zahorik, 1988) and are an essential component of student teaching (McIntyre, 1984). However other research indicates that the potential of mentoring relationships in student teaching frequently goes unrealized (Smith, 1990).

University supervisors report different views of their importance, seemingly based on their role perceptions. When university supervisors perceive their role to be evaluative, they experienced little satisfaction or accomplishment in their work (Koehler, 1984). However, when university supervisors consider their role to be one of providing intellectual, professional, and emotional support to student teachers, they experienced a strong sense of satisfaction and efficacy (Koehler).

The traditional evaluative role of university supervisors may very well hinder their ability to provide real assistance to student teachers since they are perceived by student teachers more in an assessment role than an assistance role (Calderhead, 1988). Regarding this, Borko and Mayfield (1993) recommended that university supervisors should spend their limited time in the field to help cooperating teachers develop knowledge and skill in serving as teacher educators. In this role, university supervisors would spend their time modeling appropriate supervisory strategies and facilitating the supervision process.

Goals and Outcomes

In addition to the confusion that exists in student teaching regarding the roles and responsibilities of participants, there is a similar lack of clarity with regard to the goals of student teaching. The expectations of cooperating teachers and university supervisors in student teaching was studied by Applegate and Lasley (1986). They found little agreement among the triad in terms of common goals or shared expectations. In addition, Applegate and Lasley found that cooperating teachers, university supervisors, and student teachers focus upon different problems and view specific problems with different levels of concern. Guyton and McIntyre (1990) assert that this finding is an indication of the triad's lack of shared expectations. This lack of congruence in the expectations of triad members contributes to their confusion over perceived goals of student teaching (Guyton & McIntyre, 1990; Grimmett & Ratzlaff, 1986) and presents a significant obstacle in the successful implementation of student teaching programs.

Clinical Supervision

A strong argument for clearly identified and well established roles for cooperating teachers and university supervisors has been made in the research substantiating a clinical approach to student teacher supervision, involving a team effort between the cooperating teacher, the university supervisor, and the student teacher and focusing on systematic and formative evaluation (Glickman & Bey, 1990). Increased control (Armstrong & Ladd, cited in Guyton & McIntyre, 1990); positive self-assessment (Cook, cited in Guyton & McIntyre, 1990); improved supervision (Shuma, cited in Guyton & McIntyre, 1990); and improved teaching and attitude towards teaching (Krajewski, cited in Guyton & McIntyre, 1990) are outcomes related to a clinical supervision approach. Gitlin, Ogawa and Rose (1982) found that shared evaluation among members of the triad promoted self-analysis and reflection on the part of student teachers and resulted in more complex analyses of teaching and in more favorable attitudes toward pupils. However, this gulf between what is known about the clinical approach to supervision and what actually is practiced in the supervision of student teachers persists.

In summary, the student teaching experience seems to lack agreed upon purposes and is plagued with a confusion over the roles and corresponding responsibilities that participants should assume. Solutions to these problems seem to involve the convergence of goal perceptions among student teaching participants (Guyton & McIntyre, 1990). An obvious key to such convergence is clear communication in providing detailed and "better explicated guidelines, role definitions, and instructions" (Guyton & McIntyre, 523). However participants must have common goals and purposes and, in order to build agreement and a shared commitment to goals, participants need to interact in discussing the purposes of student teaching and their perception of one another's roles (Guyton & McIntyre).

Methodology

Sample

This study focused on a content analysis of student teaching handbooks. Accredited institutions offering teacher education programs in the Midwest were identified from lists obtained from the state department of education in the target states. *Midwest* was defined to comprise the following states: Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, Ohio, South Dakota, and Wisconsin. The 340 state-accredited institutions were placed into categories using four major Carnegie classification levels (liberal arts colleges, comprehensive colleges and universities, doctoral granting institutions, and research institutions), and a stratified random sample of 110 teacher preparation programs was selected. Student teaching handbooks and information and policies pertaining to cooperating teachers and university supervisors were requested by telephone from each institution in the sample. From this appeal, 61 handbooks were obtained representing one-fifth of the midwestern teacher education programs. In this sample, the Carnegie classification levels were represented in percentages equivalent to those found in the larger population of midwestern institutions: liberal arts colleges (34%), comprehensive colleges and universities (38%), and doctoral granting institutions (12%), and research institutions (15%).

Instrumentation

Two instruments were used for the purpose of systematically coding handbook statements. The first was designed to record *task* statements found in the handbooks. This instrument was organized according to the six major roles (assumed by either the cooperating teacher or the university supervisor):

1. Orienter - Describes, interprets, the student teaching program to participants, and acquaints student teachers to school culture.
2. Counselor - Engages student teacher as a colleague.
3. Instructor - Organizes, plans, and facilitates learning experiences for the student teacher during the practicum.
4. Facilitator - Promotes effective interaction of triad members in order to achieve the goals of student teaching.
5. Model - Demonstrates professional practices to the student teacher.

These roles had been identified through a review of the literature and preliminary content analysis of student teaching handbooks. The task subcategories, which were compiled from the pilot study, were organized within the major role categories according to the established definitions for these roles.

The second instrument was designed to record the presence of goals and outcomes in the handbooks. Similar to the development of the first instrument, categories of goals and outcomes (see Table 3) were compiled from a pilot study. Goals were defined as statements found in student teaching handbooks concerning the knowledge and skills student teachers were expected to achieve. Outcomes were defined as statements found in evaluative instruments of handbooks concerning the exit competencies necessary for successful completion of the student teaching program. The rationale for documenting and comparing the relationship between stated goals and measured outcomes in student teaching programs was based on the idea that congruence between objectives and the evaluation of those objectives is indicative of consistency of purpose and practice in a program.

The handbooks were analyzed by considering separate statements within the text of the handbooks. Prior to the analysis, four handbooks (not included in the sample) were analyzed to establish rater-reliability, and the four raters were able to achieve an inter-rater reliability of 90% agreement on coded statements. Raters were initially asked to code five handbooks along with one that was coded by all four individuals. The analysis of the common handbook was used as a further reliability check. This procedure was repeated in two more coding cycles until all of the handbooks were coded. Inter-rater reliability (percent agreement of coded statements) for the coding of the common handbooks fell between 85% and 90%.

Findings

Descriptive statistics were generated for the combined role categories and goals and outcomes. These data are summarized in Tables 1, 2, and 3. An examination of Table 1 reveals that of the 836 statements coded for the cooperating teacher, 34% involved instructing tasks, 28% involved evaluating tasks, and 27% involved orienting tasks.

Table 2 presents data for the university supervisor's role and reveals that of the 394 statements coded , 46% involved evaluating tasks, 21% involved instructing tasks, 15% involved facilitating tasks, and 14% involved orienting tasks.

Table 3 shows that the observed frequencies of outcomes stated in the handbooks were consistently higher than the observed frequencies of corresponding goal statements. Outcomes were coded nearly twice as frequently as goals. The total of outcome observations was 608, while goals were coded 337 times.

Correlation analysis was performed on the data gathered through the coding of goals and outcomes. Since both correlates were dichotomous, a phi-coefficient (ϕ)was generated for the observations on each of the handbooks. Additionally, a coefficient of determination (r^2) also was calculated to reflect the degree of interdependence of these two variables. It should be noted that 19 of the 61 handbooks did not include goals or outcomes and therefore could not be analyzed. This analysis is summarized in Table 4 and reveals that statistically significant correlations ($p<.05$) were found between the goals and outcomes in seven handbooks ($.21 \leq r^2 \leq .33$). The correlations (r^2) for the other 35 handbooks ranged from .00 to .13. Therefore, this analysis indicates that in 35 handbooks (84%) no statistically significant correlation was found between the stated goals and outcomes of those handbooks, and even the strongest interrelationship of goals and outcomes ($r^2 = .33$) reflects a rather weak link between program goals and outcomes.

Other findings include the following:

- In the sample of handbooks, 7% (n=4) directly described the role of cooperating teachers and 5% (n=3) directly described the role of the university supervisors.
- Over twice as much space or attention is devoted to the tasks of cooperating teachers as is given to the tasks of university supervisors.
- All of the handbooks delineate the tasks for cooperating teachers.
- Although 84% of the handbooks (n=51) define the tasks of university supervisors, in 16% of the handbooks no mention was made of the university supervisors' tasks. In another 16% of the handbooks the university supervisors' tasks were limited to one or two paragraphs.
- Less than 15% of the handbooks contained a formal statement of the goals of their student teaching program.

Table 1

Frequencies of Coded Statements for Cooperating Teachers' Responsibilities (N=61)

	Freq. Total	% of Role	% of Total
Orienter			
Describes, interprets ST goals to ST	2	1	
Describes, interprets ST goals to CT, Principal	0	0	
Describes & interprets roles, tasks of CT, US	0	0	
Acquaints ST w/ school's philosophy	8	4	
Acquaints ST w/ school's procedures	37	16	
Acquaints ST to CT's classroom procedures	39	17	
Introduces ST to students	39	17	
Acquaints ST to school's physical environ.	33	15	
Acquaints ST to school's social environment	38	17	
Provides workspace, materials, resources	29	13	
Total	225		27%
Counselor			
Assists in job search/writes letters of recommendation	14		
Accepts ST as partner	31		
Inquires w/ ST into teach.-learning process	3		
Total	48		6%
Instructor			
Schedules teaching experiences	40	14	
Guides ST in planning & implementation	44	15	
Promotes application of theory into practice	5	2	
Involves ST w/ clerical aspects of teaching	27	9	
Promotes ST's extra-curricular involvement	19	7	
Arranges for ST to observe other classrooms	18	6	
Provides opportunity for prof. growth	23	8	
Promotes reflection & self-evaluation	19	7	
Helps CT schedule activities for ST	3	1	
Helps ST develop personal teaching style	12	4	
Mentors ST in classroom management	29	10	
Serves as resource person for CT	0	0	
Promotes ST's experimentation & innovation	15	5	
Promotes professional relationships w/ students, parents & faculty/staff	15	5	
Helps ST develop pedagogical skills in teaching	14	5	
Conducts seminar for STs	0	0	
Promotes use of correct written & oral expression in instruction	2	1	
Totals	285		34%
Evaluator			
Conferences, gives feedback to ST	51	22	
Provides ratings & written assessment of ST	45	19	
Confers w/ US regarding ST's progress	18	8	
Confers w/ CT regarding ST's progress	1	0	
Confers w/ US regarding ST's problems	24	10	
Confers w/ CT regarding ST's problems	1	0	
Conducts triadic conferences other than midterm & final	3	1	
Conducts extended conferences w/ US & ST to review midterm & final evaluations	12	5	
Conducts extended conferences w/ CT & ST to review midterm/ final evaluations	1	0	
Periodic evaluation of ST by CT apart from midterm, final evaluation	13	6	
Periodic evaluation of ST by US apart from midterm, final evaluation	1	0	
Assigns final grade for ST	3	1	
Manages the formal evaluations	6	3	
Manages the pre/ post conference cycle	2	1	
Conducts mid-term, final evaluation	50	22	
Totals	231		28%
Facilitator			
Promotes achievement of goals of STg	3	17	
Promotes teamwork between triad members	3	17	
Promotes solution to problems in STg	3	17	
Schedules supervisory visits	0	0	
Maintains communication w/ Principal	0	0	
Serves as a resource for ST	9	50	
Totals	18		2%
Model			
Demonstrates reflective approach in teaching	3		
Demonstrates professional behavior in relational skills	9		
Demonstrates effective teaching & pedagogical practice	17		
Totals	29		3%
Total Statements Coded for CTs	836		

Discussion

The problems cited in the review of literature regarding the confusion of cooperating teacher and university supervisor roles and the lack of agreement concerning the goals and outcomes of student teaching may in part be rooted in the materials disseminated to cooperating teachers and university supervisors. A significant finding from this study involves the paucity of information concerning the roles and tasks of cooperating teachers and university supervisors provided in student teaching handbooks.

These handbooks appear to provide little assistance in helping cooperating teachers and university supervisors to understand their essential roles in student teaching, including the kind of relationship they are expected to develop with each other and with student teachers. Five of the 61 handbooks included formal role statements for both cooperating teachers and university supervisors. None of these five contained definitions of the stated roles. An average of 13.7 statements per handbook related to the tasks of cooperating teachers, and an average of 6.5 statements per handbook related to the tasks of university supervisors. This suggests that a rather limited amount of information concerning participants' responsibilities is available in student teaching materials. When one recognizes that cooperating teachers and university supervisors do not effectively communicate about their respective expectations and goals (Bhagat, Clark, & Combs, 1989; Hoover, O'Shea, & Carroll,

Table 2

Frequencies of Coded Statements for University Supervisors' Responsibilities (N=61)

	Freq. Total	% of Role	% of Total
Orienter			
Describes, interprets ST goals to ST	14	26	
Describes, interprets ST goals to CT, Principal	23	43	
Describes & interprets roles, tasks of CT, US	12	22	
Acquaints ST w/ school's philosophy	2	4	
Acquaints ST w/ school's procedures	1	2	
Acquaints ST to CT's classroom procedures	0	0	
Introduces ST to students	0	0	
Acquaints ST to school's physical environ.	0	0	
Acquaints ST to school's social environment	2	4	
Provides workspace, materials, resources	0	0	
Total	54		14%
Counselor			
Assists in job search/writes letters of recommendation	9	60	
Accepts ST as partner	4	27	
Inquires w/ ST into teach.-learning process	2	13	
Total	15		4%
Instructor			
Schedules teaching experiences	3	4	
Guides ST in planning & implementation	20	24	
Promotes application of theory into practice	7	8	
Involves ST w/ clerical aspects of teaching	1	1	
Promotes ST's extra-curricular involvement	1	1	
Arranges for ST to observe other classrooms	0	0	
Provides opportunity for prof. growth	1	1	
Promotes reflection & self-evaluation	9	11	
Helps CT schedule activities for ST	8	10	
Helps ST develop personal teaching style	1	1	
Mentors ST in classroom management	2	2	
Serves as resource person for CT	8	10	
Promotes ST's experimentation & innovation	2	2	
Promotes professional relationships w/ students, parents & faculty/staff	3	4	
Helps ST develop pedagogical skills in teaching	5	6	
Conducts seminar for STs	13	15	
Promotes use of correct written & oral expression in instruction	0	0	
Totals	84		21%
Evaluator			
Conferences, gives feedback to ST	36	20	
Provides ratings & written assessment of ST	33	18	
Confers w/ US regarding ST's progress	1	1	
Confers w/ CT regarding ST's progress	23	13	
Confers w/ US regarding ST's problems	0	0	
Confers w/ CT regarding ST's problems	4	2	
Conducts triadic conferences other than midterm & final	11	6	
Conducts extended conferences w/ US & ST to review midterm & final evaluations	0	0	
Conducts extended conferences w/ CT & ST to review midterm/ final evaluations	10	6	
Periodic evaluation of ST by US apart from midterm, final evaluation	9	5	
Periodic evaluation of ST by CT apart from midterm, final evaluation	0	0	
Assigns final grade for ST	31	17	
Manages the formal evaluations	14	8	
Manages the pre/ post conference cycle	5	3	
Conducts mid-term, final evaluation	3	2	
Totals	180		46%
Facilitator			
Promotes achievement of goals of STg	6	10	
Promotes teamwork between triad members	11	19	
Promotes solution to problems in STg	7	12	
Schedules supervisory visits	13	22	
Maintains communication w/ Principal	7	12	
Serves as a resource for ST	14	24	
Totals	58		15%
Model			
Demonstrates reflective approach in teaching	0	0	
Demonstrates professional behavior in relational skills	2	67	
Demonstrates effective teaching & pedagogical practice	1	33	
Totals	3	1%	
Total Statements Coded for CTs	394		

1988), the absence of programmatic expectations is even more glaring.

The tasks assigned to cooperating teachers cast these individuals primarily in the roles of evaluator, instructor, and orienter. The role of evaluator seems to focus on formal and informal critiquing of the student teacher's performance, including a strong emphasis on the process of formal midterm and final evaluations. The role of instructor seems to focus primarily on practical concerns such as organizing student teaching experiences; assisting student teachers with planning; and mentoring them in the craft of teaching. Similarly, the role of orienter focuses on acquainting students with practical procedures of the school and classroom.

Given less attention than the cooperating teacher, *the university supervisor is cast primarily in the role of evaluator and secondarily in the roles of instructor, facilitator, and orienter*. The tasks predominating in the role of evaluator are essentially the same as the cooperating teacher's evaluative tasks: to conference, to provide feedback, and to prepare periodic written evaluations.

Table 3

Goals and Outcomes Frequency Totals and Ratios by Categories (N=61)

	Goals		Outcomes	
	Total	Ratio of Hndbks	Total	Ratio of Hndbks
Develop confidence in assessment	23	.38	39	.64
Develop ability to analyze & reflect on teaching	13	.21	9	.15
Link theory to practice	19	.31	5	.08
Accept and act on criticism	11	.18	26	.43
Develop skill in the use of instructional technology	8	.13	18	.30
Develop skill in reflectivity and self-evaluation	18	.30	20	.33
Develop an individual teaching style	10	.16	6	.10
Develop correct use of written & oral expression	10	.16	34	.56
Demonstrate the desire to be a life-long learner	12	.20	3	.05
Develop competence in planning	31	.51	47	.77
Develop sensitivity for individual differences	22	.36	40	.66
Develop skill in classroom management	24	.39	51	.84
Develop professional behavior (responsibility/collegiality)	31	.51	38	.62
Maintain professional appearance	16	.26	28	.46
Gain competence in using a variety of methods	16	.26	36	.59
Develop competence in questioning skills	4	.07	31	.51
Develop competence in instructional skills	12	.20	30	.49
Develop effective communication skills with students	9	.15	34	.56
Develop communication skills with parents and colleagues	13	.21	31	.51
Develop competence in motivational techniques	6	.10	26	.43
Develop ability to determine content to achieve objectives	10	.16	19	.31
Demonstrate competence in content knowledge	19	.31	37	.61

There were two important distinctions between the cooperating teachers and the university supervisors concerning the evaluation of student teachers:

(1) Eighty-six percent of the handbooks specifically require the cooperating teacher to conduct midterm and final evaluations while only 5% assign this task for the university supervisor.

(2) The handbooks do not charge cooperating teachers with assigning the final grades for student teachers but rather assign this task to university supervisors.

It appears contradictory that the cooperating teacher would be assigned the task of summative midterm and final evaluations and not the university supervisor who is responsible for assigning final grades for the student teachers. Since these handbooks do not explain the ways in which student teaching participants are expected to work together in the student teacher's evaluation, the overlapping tasks of evaluation and the contradiction in the assignment of the final grade may contribute to the kind of role confusion found in the research cited earlier.

There are indications that the handbooks in this study do not establish formal structures to enhance teamwork and to create an understanding of the cooperating teacher and university supervisor roles. Only 14 of the 61 handbooks charge cooperating teachers and/or university supervisors with the responsibility to promote teamwork within the triad. The major portion of the university supervisors' orienting and facilitating roles were concerned with organizing and interpreting the student teaching experience. However, only 12 of the 61 handbooks specifically state that the university supervisor is to interpret the student teaching program to school personnel and to student teachers.

In addition to a lack of clearly stated and well defined roles, *this study revealed a lack of congruency between articulated goals and their corresponding outcomes provided in evaluative instruments in the student teaching handbooks*. Only 42 of the 61 handbooks articulated programmatic goals.

Table 4
Correlation Coefficients by Institution

Institution	ϕ^a	r^{2b}	Institution	ϕ	r^2
Handbook #1	.351	.12	Handbook #22	.289	.08
Handbook #2	.010	.00	Handbook #23	.567	.32*
Handbook #3	.226	.05	Handbook #24	.462	.21*
Handbook #4	.024	.00	Handbook #25	.243	.06
Handbook #5	.000	.00	Handbook #26	.140	.02
Handbook #6	.179	.03	Handbook #27	.140	.02
Handbook #7	.216	.05	Handbook #28	.218	.05
Handbook #8	.025	.00	Handbook #29	.189	.04
Handbook #9	.574	.33*	Handbook #30	.283	.08
Handbook #10	.118	.01	Handbook #31	.466	.22*
Handbook #11	.332	.11	Handbook #32	.356	.13
Handbook #12	.482	.23*	Handbook #33	.277	.08
Handbook #13	.108	.01	Handbook #34	.199	.04
Handbook #14	.087	.01	Handbook #35	.056	.00
Handbook #15	.540	.29*	Handbook #36	.187	.03
Handbook #16	.199	.04	Handbook #37	.094	.01
Handbook #17	.462	.21*	Handbook #38	.059	.00
Handbook #18	.149	.02	Handbook #39	.089	.01
Handbook #19	.092	.01	Handbook #40	.302	.09
Handbook #20	.325	.11	Handbook #41	.059	.00
Handbook #21	.262	.07	Handbook #42	.138	.02

Note. $n = 42$ Only 42 of the 61 handbooks contained statements of program goals.

[a] ϕ: phi coefficient. [b] r^2: coefficient of determination.

* $p < .05$

Moreover, the frequency of outcomes found in the student teaching handbooks examined was consistently higher than the corresponding goals (see Table 3). Consequently, these student teaching handbooks demand more of students through the evaluative instruments than through what is explicated in the goals found in the same materials. This finding raises a serious question: How can student teachers be held accountable for expectations not established in the goals of the student teaching program? This finding may also help to explain the lack of agreement among triad members regarding program goals in the student teaching experience (Applegate & Lasley, 1986; Castillo, 1971; Copas, 1984; Grimmett & Ratzlaff, 1986; Guyton & McIntyre, 1990).

Recommendations

The analysis of the handbooks in this study provides additional insight into the findings of other researchers who have documented role confusion within the triad and a similar confusion in the goals and outcomes of student teaching. Given the limited information found in the handbooks concerning the roles participants are intended to play and the established goals of student teaching, it is not surprising that cooperating teachers, university supervisors, and student teachers hold conflicting perspectives on their collective roles and express confusion over the goals and outcomes of student teaching.

In the absence of explicitly written materials to guide cooperating teachers and university supervisors, individuals are left to establish their own priorities based on their respective experiences. Given the constraints upon communication between cooperating teachers and university supervisors (AACTE, 1991; Bhagat et al., 1989; Hoover et al., 1988), it is unlikely that supervisors will establish stable expectations for student teaching. However, it is quite possible that clear and formal articulation of programmatic goals and related participant roles would facilitate communication within the triad.

The current "state of the art" in the supervision of student teachers, as reflected in student teaching handbooks, does not project the rigor or integrity one would expect of such a key program element. In general, the program materials analyzed in this study were quite traditional in philosophy and structure and did not reflect an application of the research and theory which supports the effectiveness of a clinical approach to supervision.

In order to make student teaching as meaningful and beneficial as possible, teacher educators must know what contributes to the success of the student teaching process. One step in that process is to know what roles cooperating teachers and university supervisors should play. In order to reach such an understanding, current practice must be assessed and compared with theoretical models of ideal practice. Guyton and McIntyre (1990) suggest three necessary conditions to produce appropriate roles, tasks and goals: (a) written role definitions of triad members and written goals for student teaching, (b) interpretation of roles by triad members, and (c) implementation of these roles.

It is incumbent upon professional organizations and accrediting bodies to trumpet the significance of student teaching supervision. As the single most influential experience in preservice preparation, student teaching should be accorded a prominent position in professional standards. As the data suggests, when it comes to actual practice, student teaching supervision has been neglected and not given the thoughtful attention befitting the culminating experience of preservice training.

A prudent response to the concerns addressed in this paper would be for teacher education faculty to engage K-12 teachers in a collaborative development of student teaching program goals and the related roles and responsibilities of student teaching participants. Additionally, effective means of communicating these structures to various participants in student teaching should be developed in order to insure that the goals of student teaching programs are in-

deed realized. Well-conceived and well-communicated program purposes and structures that are developed between university and K-12 faculty have the potential to promote two vital interests in teacher education:

1. Collaboration around program goals has the potential to promote reform in student teaching wherein university and K-12 faculty work collaboratively to marry the cultures of both institutions in a concerted effort to maximize the development of prospective teachers. Such teamwork in student teaching would likely foster a more open exchange of ideas and stimulate the development of new insights and a richer understanding of teaching and learning for all participants.
2. Valuing the expertise of K-12 teachers and engaging them as true colleagues in program development and in mentoring student teachers has the potential to promote the professional development of cooperating teachers and thereby furnish a piece of the reform puzzle.

Thus, the student teaching experience should be thought of as much more than just a bridge from preservice to inservice; it should be conceived as an essential structure to span the rather imposing chasm that separates the cultures of universities and K-12 classrooms.

References

Applegate, J.H., & Lasley, T.J. (1986). *Early field experience: A synthesis of role-perspective studies*. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 310 065)

American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education. (1991). *RATE IV: Teaching teachers: Facts and figures*. Washington, DC: Author.

Association of Teacher Educators (1986). *Guidelines for professionals experiences in teacher education: A policy statement*. Reston, VA: Author.

Bhagat, D., Clark, C., & Combs, G. (1989). *A study of shared self-interests in a university-school partnership*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, CA. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 307 668).

Borko, H., & Mayfield, V. (1995). Supervision in learning to teach. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 11* (5), 501-518.

Calderhead, J. (1988). The contribution of field experiences to primary teachers' professional learning. *Research in Education, 40*, 33-49.

Castillo, J.B. (1971). *The role expectations of cooperating teachers as viewed by student teachers, college supervisors, and cooperating teachers*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Rochester, Rochester.

Copas, E.M. (1984). Critical requirements for cooperating teachers. *Journal of Teacher Education, 35* (6), 49-54.

Dunne, E., & Dunne, R. (1993). The purpose and impact of school-based work: The class-teacher's role. In N. Bennett, & C. Carre (Eds.), *Learning to Teach* (pp. 135-148). London: Routledge.

Duquette, C. (1994). The role of the cooperating teacher in a school-based teacher education program: Benefits and concerns. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 10*, 345-353.

Gitlin, A., Ogawa, R.T., & Rose, E. (1982). Horizontal evaluation: Its impact in three case studies. *CCBC Notebooks, 3* (11), 1-13.

Glickman, C.D., & Bey, T.M. (1990). Supervision. In W.R. Houston, M. Haberman, & J. Sikula (Eds.), *Handbook of research in teacher education*. New York: Macmillan.

Grimmett, P., & Ratzlaff, H.C. (1986). Expectations for the cooperating teacher role. *Journal of Teacher Education, 37* (6), 41-50.

Guyton , E., & McIntyre, J.D. (1990). Student teaching and school experiences. In W.R. Houston, M. Haberman, & J. Sikula (Eds.), *Handbook of research in teacher education*. New York: Macmillan.

Hoover, N. L., O'Shea, L. J., & Carroll, R. G. (1988). The supervisor-intern relationship and effective communication skills. *Journal of Teacher Education, 39* (2), 22-27.

Koehler, V. (1984). *University supervision of student teaching*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA.

McIntyre, D. (1984). A response to the critics of field experience supervision. *Journal of Teacher Education, 35* (3), 42-44.

National Council of Accreditation of Teacher Education. (1995). *Standards procedures, and policies for the accreditation of professional education units*. Washington, D.C.: NCATE.

Richardson-Koehler, V. (1988). Barriers to effective supervision of student teaching. *Journal of Teacher Education, 39* (2), 28-34.

Smith, D. J. (1990). Intern satisfaction with cooperating teacher supervision. *The Alberta Journal of Educational Research, 63,* 133-140.

Zahorik, J. A. (1988). The observing-conferencing role of university supervisors. *The Journal of Teacher Education, 38* (2), 9-16.