COOPERATING TEACHERS IN ACTION: TRANSFORMING THEORY INTO PRACTICE

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Fakhra Aziz (Lahore College for Women University, Pakistan)

fakhraaziz@hotmail.com

Assoc. Prof. Dr Uzma Quraishi (Lahore College for Women University, Pakistan)

uzmaquraishi@yahoo.com

Ms. Naila Latif (Lahore College for Women University, Pakistan)

Abstract

This qualitative study examined the role of cooperating teachers in transforming theory into practice. It assumed that cooperating teachers engage their student teachers in dialogues about their practices, listen their concerns, motivate for self-awareness, encourage their classroom observations and also help them in practicing new strategies and methods. Convenience and purposive sampling were used to collect data from cooperating teachers and student teachers placed in partner girls' schools of the department of professional studies of Lahore College for Women University during their teaching practicum. The existing practicum theory provided ground for development of the interview protocols for both cohorts. Thematic analysis was carried out to analyze the collected data. Following themes were identified unrealistic expectations about corresponding roles, dissatisfaction with the others' performance and serious concerns in interrelationships which hindered transforming theory into practice.

Key words: Teacher training; Cooperating teacher; Professional development; Student teacher; Novice teachers; Preservice teachers; Teaching practicum; Qualitative research.

Introduction

Practicum is a well acknowledged and critical component of pre-service teacher development (Clift & Brady, 2005; Darling-Hammond, 2006; Grossman, 2010; Hammerness & Darling-Hammond, 2005; Hollins & Guzman, 2005). It is a period of work experience compulsory for all prospective teachers to get their certification. Practicum is considered as the supervised practical application of learned theories. It provides best opportunity for applying research, philosophy, concepts and best practices they have learned in university classrooms; receiving recurrent, expert support and feedback; and reflecting on and learning from their practice. During practicum student teachers develop their own teaching styles as well as understanding of school systems. Cooperating teachers are expected   to help them develop professional efficacy, a commitment to high standards, and the habits of mind of a good teacher, including the habits of reflective practice, continuous improvement, and lifelong learning.

Cooperating teachers are considered to be providers of feedback, gatekeepers of the profession, modeler of practice and supporters of reflection (Broad & Tessaro 2010 ; Nolan & Hoover, 2008; Kabadayi, 2007; Calderhead & Robson,1991; Schon ,1983; Kabadayi, 2006). According to others they are conveners of relations and agents of socialization (Edwards & Briers,2001; Anderson, 2007). Feiman-Nemser (2001) called them teachers of children while Wang e`s Odell (2002) acknowledged them as advocate to practical work; Clarke (2006) considered them as gleaners of knowledge.

On the other hand, student teachers (also called prospective teachers or practice teachers) are college or university students studying within the education program(s), who teach in a classroom under the supervision of a cooperating teacher and teacher educator from the university. The teaching practicum is a crucial time for developing the careers of prospective teachers. They undergo the struggle to teach students and experience success or failure in delivering their knowledge. Kabadayi (2010) emphasized that there is much to learn about pre-service students and their cooperating teachers with regard to perception of preschool teaching as a profession, i.e. educational technology, textbooks, school, etc. Zeichner (2010) reported that in America the teacher education programs have been previously characterized by unstructured and disconnected field experiences. Structural and theoretical logic between university-based courses and field

placements were realized important in supporting student teacher' learning and emerged as a key factor in ideal teacher education program.

It is generally agreed that effective learning does not occur if pre-service teachers are left unsupervised; rather, management, mentorship and peer support are important factors of practicum that allow for the modeling, training and feedback that pre-service teachers need. Cooperating teachers receive little prescribed preparation for their role as a mentor, guide and facilitator in teacher education programs and often experience difficulties in finding willing and skilled cooperating teachers.

Teaching practicum is based on the premise that prospective teachers get first hand exposure in actual classroom settings, use the learned skills under guidance of cooperating teacher during the practicum. They also become aware of and try to overcome their own weaknesses in the light of feedback provided to them by their mentors. A successful practicum not only means the first experience of teaching for the student teachers but also leads to quality learning with practice. Quality in learning during practicum depends on roles assigned to cooperating teachers and student teachers.

Cooperating teachers are believed to provide student teacher with greater opportunities for learning during practicum. Anting and associates (1998) listed four ways in which student teachers can benefit from cooperating teachers: (a) obtaining information about teaching that is relatively new to them (b) understanding their mentors' teaching and the nature of teaching (c) accepting their mentor teachers' mentoring and developing personal theories of teaching.

(d) Integrating theory with practice.

Zanting et al. (2008) also suggested how cooperating teacher can articulate their practical knowledge to student teachers as they can make clear their own thinking about teaching during discussions of the student teachers' lessons; they can share reflections on their own teaching with their student teachers and they can jointly plan, teach, and analyze lessons with their students teachers.

Research Questions

This study was planned to probe into the role of cooperating teachers in transforming theory into practice. For this purpose, the following research questions were developed:

- How student teacher of a teacher education program at graduate level perceived the cooperating teacher's role in teaching practicum?

- How cooperating teacher of a teacher education program at graduate level perceived their own role in teaching practicum

- How cooperating teacher perceived the role of student teachers of a teacher education program at graduate level, in teaching practicum?

Methodology

The present study was based on grounded theory because it intends to explore the perceptions of cooperating and student teachers regarding their roles in transforming theory into practice. It focuses on several perspectives related to practicum. The study contributes to the theory either cooperating teacher facilitates student teachers by their active role or hinders their learning process.

Overview of the Research Design

The study was conducted in qualitative paradigm to capture subtle perceptions and feelings of student and cooperating teachers as experienced during practicum. Grounded theory approach was adopted to bring to light critical moments of students and cooperating teachers and their perceptions about their roles. It was an in-depth study to explore the enablers and disablers of effective practicum too. Research addressed all cooperating teachers and student teachers, placed in the public girls' elementary schools of Lahore city. By using convenience and purposeful sampling technique, 10 student teachers and their cooperating teachers were selected for collecting the required data. An interview protocol was developed based on literature review and existing practicum theory. It has two versions, one for cooperating teacher and the other for student teachers. Interview protocol were based on four major questions each with five to six probing questions. The interview schedule was accompanied with the cover letter about participants' written consent and essential demographics of the informants.

Pre-interview

The researchers made due appointments with participants before interview through phone calls and personal meetings. They briefed the interviewees about the rationale of research, collected demographic information through a questionnaire and received their written consent. The respondents were assured that they could withdraw at any moment

from the interview and that the information would not be used other than research purpose. It was also clarified that their confidentiality would be strictly maintained.

The interview process

The participants were informed of the purpose of the research; they were also told that it could take 45 to 50 minutes to answer the questions. The researcher probed wherever they intended to elicit examples or details or to explore about their roles. All the interviews were recorded using two audio recording devices.

Data analysis

The research followed grounded theory and inductive approach was used to derive themes, sub themes and patterns of cooperating and student teachers' experiences and opinions.

Results

Findings of thematic analysis of participants' interviews were presented under both perspectives:

Table 1: Cooperating Teacher Perspectives

Responsibilities and Facilitation	Mostly cooperating teachers found student teachers responsible and few found them not responsible enough.
Conflict Management	Most of cooperating teachers have no conflicts regarding time management, responsible behavior and qualification of student teachers and a very few had issues.
Rapport	Most cooperating teachers found student teachers cooperating and enthusiastic and a few said they are irresponsible.
Expectations	Most of cooperating teachers found student teachers according to their expectations and a very few said they need more training.

The audio files were transcribed and heard by the researchers again and again to match transcriptions with the real data. The researchers worked individually to sort out themes emerging under each research question and then shared for cross checking. Finally, they

worked together to shape up the derived theory in order to probe the perceptions of both cohorts.

Most of the cooperating teachers were satisfied with student teachers and found themselves responsible but they did not know the exact role of student teacher, they described student teachers' role according to their own perspectives. They have assessed student teachers according to their own parameters and according to schools' rules and regulations and describe them accordingly. Seven out of ten cooperating teachers were satisfied with student teachers, only three of them were not fully satisfied.

Table 2: Student Teacher Perspectives

Responsibilities and Facilitation	The majority of student teachers said cooperating teachers never facilitated them; but a few said cooperating teacher facilitate them well.
Conflict Management	A few student teachers gave positive response regarding guidance and management, assistance of cooperating teacher and most of them said cooperating teacher never bothers to even come into class rooms.
Rapport	Mostly student teachers found cooperating teachers less motivated, un-trained, old school teaching and a very few presented positive views for cooperating teacher.
Expectations	A large number of student teachers was disappointed as their cooperating teachers were not according to their expectations and only a very few which means only one or two of the whole population thinks they get what they expected.

Student teachers had a relatively more negative perspective towards cooperating teachers. Student teachers expected cooperating teacher to be more accessible, cooperating and a guide but they found non-cooperative and were not sufficiently trained. Eight out of ten student teachers said that they were not happy with their cooperating teachers only two of the student teachers were found their cooperating teachers as their facilitator.

Table 3: Cooperative teachers' self -perceptions

Responsibilities and Facilitation	All Cooperating teachers reported that they fulfill their responsibilities and facilitate student teachers during practicum by helping and guiding them in successful implementation of their lessons.
Conflict Management	Majority of the Cooperative teachers said that they had never been any conflict with their student teachers, while few other told that they had on certain occasions .When student teacher misbehaved with them and did not show any concern with their presence .
Rapport	About fifty percent of the teachers report good rapport with their student teachers while other said they tried to build good friendly relationship with their students but due to personality clashes and generation gap, they were not successful.
Expectations	Majority of Cooperating teachers thought they were playing their role as expected by administrators and student teachers. One said what I could do if one expects me for supernatural things.

Majority of the Cooperative teachers perceived their active positive role during practicum for successful implementation of student teachers' lesson plan. They thought they were well aware of their responsibilities and role during practicum. A contradiction was found between self-perception of cooperative teachers and student teachers' perceived their role .

Discussion

The study aimed to shed light on the role of cooperating teacher in transforming practicum theory into practice. The findings revealed that cooperating teachers are required to apply new teaching methods and train themselves to match the new standards of education. Knowledge can also be presented in the curriculum orientation which is held by

student teachers and cooperating teachers and the ways in which they put knowledge into practice.

The role of the cooperating teacher has always been considered as the most important factor in teacher education period. In a report based on the practicum experience, which is known as the Flowers Report (Flowers, 1948) the Committee of the American Association of Teachers Colleges in a three-year study of more than 200 American laboratory schools recommended that practicum should be considered a fundamental part of the professional core course. Findings of present study was not in accordance with past studies because present study concluded that cooperating teachers lack training and not doing well in practicum for student teachers.

Any process to make teacher education programs strengthen must include a vigilant study of student teaching because it is usually the final education course that students take and the most influential field experience in a teacher education program. As a result, many teacher education programs use student teaching as the primary estimation of student competencies (Kirk, Macdonald, & O'Sullivan, 2006). The findings relatively reflected the past studies for student teachers as they have workshops, training sessions and seminars to strengthen their teaching in present era.

Conclusions

It can be concluded that in-service teachers who said to be cooperating teacher need more training to guide, mentored and facilitate in coming student teachers. They should adopt new strategies to facilitate and mentor student teachers. In most cases it was reported that the role of cooperating teachers was limited to allot classes and making time table of student teachers and further to check either student teachers are taking classes or not. Cooperating teachers in the present research had serious concerns about responsible behavior and punctuality of student teachers. It can be said on the bases of results that both groups have their own perspectives and expectations for each other. Student teachers had a fixed mind set about their cooperating teachers as traditional public school teacher who had lack of subject knowledge and skills. This mind set led them not to follow the directions of their cooperating teachers. On the other side, cooperating teacher thought that they had experience and these student teachers are students and do

not know how to teach, which led them to act in an authoritative way. It was revealed that almost half of the cooperating teachers had issues with student teachers' irresponsible, un-punctual and non-professional behavior but the majority of the student teachers had issues with cooperating teachers' old teaching methods and non-cooperating behavior.

Recommendations

As mentioned earlier, there is a need of upgrading teaching standards in educational field. The themes of the study under research suggest that the nature of the relationship shared by the student and cooperating teacher are important for professional development but more attention may be needed to assist both pre-service and in-service teachers in examining, planning and implementing the critical perspective of theories into real situations. Student teachers may need further assistance in developing skills in communication regarding their curriculum perspective. Cooperating teachers who still follow the old school teaching methods should learn new teaching techniques to upgrade teaching and guide the student teachers well.

The student teachers and cooperating teachers should also go through the examination of their curriculum perspectives and potential differences and establish structures for implementing instruction based on these perspectives.

Cooperating teacher should be there with student teacher in classroom during lecture and guide them in managing the classroom, pre-plan the lessons and most importantly understands the students' level of understanding and teach accordingly and should give student teachers space to apply their activity based teaching methods to make students more attentive towards the lesson.

Student teachers should follow the lead of cooperating teacher in a positive way. Student teacher should also follow the rules and regulations of the school and follow the time table of the school and adjust their time table accordingly. Student teachers should understand the position of a teacher and guide and behave accordingly in the classroom. The study shows a strong sense about cooperating teachers lacking expert preparation to be able to match high quality and expert support for student teachers they seen underprepared as mentors. As in most feedback offered by cooperating teachers is based on

observations and therefore moving beyond reporting on to inquiring into practice is un-realized in many practicum settings. Most substantive engagement with a focus on analysis may provide many possibilities for student teachers and provide share learning opportunities for cooperating teachers.

Acknowledgement

References:

Adey, K. (1997). First impressions do count: Mentoring student teachers. *Teacher Development,1,* 123–133. doi:10.1080/13664539700200009

Allen, D. D., Cobb, J. B., & Danger, S. (2003). Inservice teachers mentoring aspiring teachers.*Mentoring& Tutoring: Partnership in Learning, 11*, 177–182.doi:10.1080/13611260306854

Alexander, D & Galbraith, P. (1997). Stories of transition: From students to teachers.*Queensland Journal of Educational Research,* 13(1), pp. 17-32.http://education.curtin.edu.au/iier/qjer/qjer13/alexander.html

Al-magableh, A. M. F. (2010). An evaluation of Englishpracticum at Yormuk University from cooperativeteachers and student-teachers perspectives.*InternationalJournal of Language Studies, 4*, 263–300.

Almikhalafi, M. (2005).A suggested programme for developingpracticum in the school of education at Ebb University.*University Researcher, 8*, 133–154.

Anderson, D. (2007). The role of cooperating teachers' powerin student teaching.*Education, 128*, 307–323.

Arnold, E. (2006). Assessing the quality of mentoring: Sinkingor learning to swim? *ELT Journal, 60*, 117–124.

Arnold, P. (2002). Cooperating teachers' professional growththrough supervision of student teachers and participationin a collegial study group.*Teacher Education Quarterly,29*, 123–132.

Barab, S.A., Squire, K., &Dueber, B. (2000).Supporting authenticity through participatorylearning.*Educational Technology Research and Development, 48*(2), 37-62.

Brandy, L. (2000). School-University partnership in teacher education.*Education Practice andtheory, 22*(2), pp 55-65

Beck, C., &Kosnik, C. (2000). Associate teachers in pre-service education: Clarifying and enhancing their role. *Journal ofEducation for Teaching, 26*, 207–224.http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/713676888

Beck, C., &Kosnik, C. (2002). Components of a good practicum placement: Student teacher perceptions. *TeacherEducation Quarterly, 29*, 81–98.

Birrell, J. R., &Bullough, R. V. (2005). Teaching with a peer:A follow-up study of the 1st year of teaching. *Action inTeacher Education, 27*, 72–81.http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/01626620.2005.10463375

Book, C. L. (1996).Professional development schools.InJ. Sikula, T. J. Buttery, & E. Guyton (Eds.), *Handbook ofresearch on teacher education* (2nd ed., pp. 194–210). New York, NY: Macmillan.

Borko, H., & Mayfield, V. (1995).The roles of the cooperatingteacher and university supervisor in learning toteach.*Teaching and Teacher Education, 11*, 501–518.

Britzman, D. P. (2000).Teacher education in the confusion ofourtimes.*Journal of Teacher Education, 51*, 200–205.

Broad, K., & Tessaro, M. L. (2010). Authentic voices from the field. In T. Falkenberg& H. Smits (Eds.), *Field experience in thecontext of reform in Canadian teacher education programs*(pp. 79–90). Winnipeg: Faculty of Education, Universityof Manitoba. Retrieved from http://www.umanitoba.ca/education/TEResearch/Conference2009.html

Bullough, R.V.Jr., Hobbs, S.F., Kauchak, D.P., Crow, N.A., & Stokes, D. (1997).Long-termPDS development in research universities and the clinicalization of teacher education.*Journalof Education, 48*(2), 85-95

Calderhead, J., & Robson, M. (1991). Images of teaching:Student teachers' early conceptions of classroompractice. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 7*(1), 1–8.http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0742-051X(91)90053-R

Clarke, A. (2006). The nature and substance of cooperatingteacherreflection.*Teaching and Teacher Education, 22,*910–921. doi:10.1016/j.tate.2006.04.039

Cochran-Smith, M. (2005). The new teacher education: Forbetter or for worse? *Educational Researcher, 34*, 3–17.doi:10.3102/0013189X034007003

Coşkun, A. (2013). Stress in English language teachingpracticum: The views of all stakeholders. *HacettepeÜniversitesiEğitimFakültesiDergisi [HacettepeUniversityJournal of Education], 28*, 97–110.

Coulter, D., Coulter, D., Daniel, M., Decker, E., Essex, P., Naslund,J., … Sutherland, G. (2007). A question of judgment: Aresponse to "Standards for the education, competenceand professional conduct of educators in BritishColumbia". *Educational Insights, 11*(3), 1–12.

Crasborn, F., Hennissen, P., Brouwer, N., Korthagen, F., &Bergen, T. (2011).Exploring a two-dimensional model ofmentor teacher roles in mentoring dialogues.*Teachingand Teacher Education, 27*, 320–331. doi:10.1016/j.tate.2010.08.014

Crookes, G. (2003). *The practicum in TESOL: Professionaldevelopment through teaching practice*. New York, NY:Cambridge University Press.Darling-Hammond, L., Hammerness, K., Grossman, P., Rust, F.,& Shulman, L. (2005).The design of teacher educationprograms.

Darling-Hammond & J. Bransford (Eds.),*Preparing teachers for a changing world: What teachersshould learn and be able to do* (pp. 390–441). SanFrancisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

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

Goodman, J. (1988). University culture and the problem of reforming field experiences inteacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education, 39*(5), 45-53.

Guyton, E., & McIntyre, D. J. (1990).Student teaching and school experiences.In W. R.Houston (Ed.), *Handbook of research on teacher education* (pp514-534). New York:Macmillan.

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

Hastings, W. (2004). Emotions and the practicum: The cooperating teachers' perspective.*Teachers and Teaching: Theory and Practice, 10*, 135–148. doi:10.1080/1354060042000187991

Hawkey, K. (1998). Mentor pedagogy and student teacher professional development: A study oftwo mentoring relationships. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 14*, 657–670.doi:10.1016/S0742-051X(98)00015-8

Hobson, A. J., Ashby, P., Malderez, A., & Tomlinson, P. D. (2009).Mentoring beginningteachers: What we know and what we don't.*Teaching and Teacher Education, 25*, 207–216. doi:10.1016/j.tate.2008.09.001

Hodges, C. (1982). Implementing methods: If you can't blame the cooperating teacher who canyou blame? *Journal of Teacher Education, 33*(6), 25–29.doi:10.1177/002248718203300606

Holland, P. E. (1989). Implicit assumptions about the supervisory conference: A review andanalysis of literature. *Journal of Curriculum and Supervision, 4*, 362–369. Retrievedfromhttp://www.ascd.org/framejcs.html

Holmes Group. (1986). *Tomorrow's teachers*. East Lansing, MI: Holmes Group.

Houston, W. R. (2008). Settings are more than sites. In M. Cochran-Smith, S. Feiman-Nemser, J.Mcintyre, & K. Demers (Eds.), *Handbook of research on teacher education: Enduringquestions in changing contexts* (pp. 388–393). New York, NY: Routledge.

Hoy, W. K., & Rees, R. (1977). The bureaucratic socialization of student teachers.*JournalofTeacher   Education,   28*(1),   23–26. doi:10.1177/002248717702800107

Huffman, S., Holifield, M., &Holifield, A. (2003). Student management: Teacher internswrestling with assumptions. *Education, 124*, 120–125. Retrieved from http://www.projectinnovation.biz/index.html

Hynes-Dusel, J. M. (1999). Cooperating teachers' perceptions about the student teachingexperience.*Physical Educator, 56*, 186–196. Retrieved from http://www2.truman.edu/pek/public.html

Iannaccone, L. (1963). Student teaching: A transitional stage in the making of a teacher. *Theoryinto Practice, 2*, 73–80. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org/stable/1475628

Jansen, U. (1971). *Educational values perceptions and the student teaching experience:Assessing change in values perceptions which occur for student teachers, universitysupervisors, cooperating teachers and school administrators.* Nebraska, Lincoln:Nebraska University, Dept. of Secondary Education. Retrieved from http://www.eric.ed.gov.ezproxy.uow.edu.au/contentdelivery/servlet/ERICServlet?accno=ED055032

John, P. D. (2001). Winning and losing: A case study of university tutor-student teacherinteraction during a school-based practicum. *Mentoring & Tutoring: Partnership inLearning, 9*, 153–168. doi:10.1080/13611260120069372

Kabadayi, A. (2006). Analyzing Preschool Student Teachers' and Their CooperatingTeachers' Attitudes towards the Use of Educational Technology. The Turkish Online Journal of Educational Technology – TOJET, 5(4).

Kabadayi, A. (2007). Analyzing the cognitive teaching styles of preservice and cooperating preschool teachers in Turkey. *Early Child Development and Care, 177*, 275–293.doi:10.1080/03004430500473276

Kabadayi, A. (2010). Investigating Demographic Characteristics and Teaching Perceptions of Turkish Preschool Teachers. Early Child Development and Care, 809-822. doi: 10.1080/03004430802445501

Kagan, D. M. (1988). Research on the supervision of counselors and teachers-in-training:Linking two bodies of literature. *Review of Educational Research, 58*, 1–24.doi:10.3102/00346543058001001

Latour, B. (2005). *Reassembling the social: An introduction to actor-network-theory*. New York,NY: Oxford University Press.

Lave, J., & Wenger, E. (1991). *Situated learning: Legitimate peripheral participation*. NewYork, NY: Cambridge.

Lemma, P. (1993). The cooperating teachers as supervisor: A case study. *Journal of Curriculumand Supervision, 8*, 329–433. Retrieved from http://www.ascd.org/framejcs.html

Leslie, L. L. (1971). Matching student teachers with cooperating teachers: A fruitful effort?*Journal of Teacher Education, 22,* 303–309. doi:10.1177/002248717102200312

Lesley, M. K., Hamman, D., Olivarez, A., Button, K. & Griffith, R. (2009). "I'm prepared foranything now": Student teacher and cooperating teacher interaction as a critical factor indetermining the preparation of "quality" elementary reading teachers. *The Teacher Educator, 44*, 40-55.

Lincoln, Y. S, &Guba, E. G. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Lipscomb, E. E. (1965). A study of the attitudes of student teachers in elementary education asrelated to attitudes of cooperating teachers. *Journal of Teacher Education, 16,* 351–352.doi:10.1177/002248716501600324

Little, J. (1990).The mentor phenomenon and the social organization of teaching.*ReviewofResearch in Education, 16*, 297–351. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org/stable/1167355

Loughran, J. J. (1996). *Developing reflective practice: Learning about teaching and learningthrough modelling*. London, UK: Falmer Press.

Lourdusamy, A. Soh, K.C., Moo, S.N., Lim, S.B. &Sim, W.K. (2001).Development andevaluation of teaching competence in Singapore and Brunei Darussalam.*A paper presented atthe Australian Education Research Association Conference*, University of Notre Dame,Fremantle, Australia.

McIntyre, D. J., Byrd, D. M., Foxx, S. M. (1996).Field and laboratory experiences.In J. Sikula(Ed.), *Handbook of research on teacher education,* (2nd.Edition), pp171-193. New York:Macmillan.

Ramsey, G. (2000). Quality matters, revitalizing teaching: Critical times, critical choices.*Report on the review of teacher education in New South Wales*.http://www.det.nsw.edu.au/teachrev/reports/reports.pdf

Rate IV. (1990). *Teaching teachers: Facts and figures*. American Association of Colleges forTeacher Education, Washington, DC.

Sandholtz, J.H. &Finan, E.C. (1998).Blurring the boundaries to promote school-universitypartnerships.*Journal of Teacher Education,* 49(1), pp 13-25.

Schon, D. *The reflective practitioner*: how professionals thinking action. New York: Basic Books, 1983

Stein, M.K., Silver, E.A., & Smith, M.S. (1998).Mathematics reform and teacher developmenta community of practice perspective. In J. Greeno& S. Goldman (Eds), *Thinking practices inMathematics and science learning* (pp. 17-52). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates,Inc.

Teitel, L. (1998). Separations, divorces, and open marriages in professional development schoolpartnership. *Journal of Teacher Education, 49(2),* pp. 85-96.

Tisher, R.P. (! 990). One and a half decade of research on teacher education in Australia. InR.P. Tisher& M.F. Wideen (eds), *Research in Teacher Education: International Perspectives*(pp. 67-87). London: Falmer Press

Whiting, C., Whitty, G., Furlong, J., Miles, S. & Barton., L. (1996). Partnership in initialteacher education: *A Topography, Modes of Teacher Education Project (MOTE),* London.

Winitsky, N., Stoddart, T., & O'Keefe, P. (1992). Great expectations: Emergent professionaldevelopment schools. *Journal of teacher education,* 43(1), 3-18.

Wong, A. F.L. &Goh, K. C. (2002). The practicum in teacher training: a preliminary andqualitative assessment of the improved National Institute of Education- School PartnershipModel in Singapore. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher Education, 30*(2), 197-206.

Zimpher, N.L., &Howey, K.R. (1992).*Policy and Practice toward the improvement of teachereducation.* Oak Brook, IL: North Central Regional Educational Laboratory.

Zimpher, N.L., &Sherril, J.A. (1996).Professors, teachers and leaders in SCDES.In J. Sikula(Ed.), *Handbook of research on teacher education,* (2nd.Edition), pp. 279-305. New York:Macmillan.