



Available online at:

<http://dergipark.ulakbim.gov.tr/eltri/>

International Association of Research

in Foreign Language Education and Applied Linguistics

ELT Research Journal

2015, 4(2), 58-100

ISSN: 2146-9814

Expectations of the triad members for the roles and responsibilities of university supervisors and cooperating EFL teachers during the pre-service practicum¹

İlkay Bülbül²

Bilgi University, İstanbul-Turkey

Ayşe Akyel³

Yeditepe University, İstanbul-Turkey

Abstract

This study aims at investigating the expectations of the triad members, namely university supervisors, cooperating teachers and student teachers, regarding the roles and responsibilities of the university ELT supervisors and cooperating EFL teachers in Turkey during the pre-service practicum. In this study, the researchers also investigate whether there are institutional differences in expectations for the university supervisors' and cooperating teachers' roles. Data are collected via two questionnaires with the participation of 17 university supervisors and 238 EFL student teachers from four universities in Turkey and 116 cooperating teachers from schools in the context of university-school collaboration program. Findings indicate a lack of clarity and consensus among the triad members regarding the roles of the university supervisors and cooperating teachers. While triad members achieve high consensus on some of the role definitions of the university supervisors, they cannot reach high consensus on any role definitions of the cooperating teachers. Findings also show that there are no institutional differences among university supervisors regarding their own roles and those of the cooperating teachers, whereas student teachers hold different expectations for the roles of the university supervisors and cooperating teachers in certain areas.

Keywords: language teacher education, role expectation, school practicum, triad members

¹ This paper is based on the MA thesis of İlkay Demirkol.

² Instructor of English, Istanbul Bilgi University.

³ Professor, Istanbul Yeditepe University, ELT Department. Email: aakyel@yeditepe.edu.tr

Introduction

It is undeniable that university supervisors and cooperating teachers have an important role in the professional development of student teachers during the student teaching experience. Several studies in the relevant literature demonstrated and/or pointed out the contribution of university supervisors and cooperating teachers to take the professional development of student teachers during the student teaching experience (Duquette, 1994, 1996; Fairbanks, Freedman, & Kahn, 2000; McNamara, 1995; Smith, 2005). Moreover, among various means of creating effective learning opportunities for pre-service teachers, there is a growing interest and emphasis on the school practicum component of the teacher education programs. As a part of this growing interest, teacher educators have started to give more importance to university-school partnerships within the framework of school based teacher education. Such an approach requires a change in the content, length, and timing of student teaching; type and intensity of supervision provided by the university supervisors and cooperating teachers; and roles and responsibilities of participants in the practicum (Aubusson & Schuck, 2013; Kane & Francis, 2013; Zeichner, 2010). However, even more important than these changes is a clear definition of the policies and procedures, and in light of these policies and procedures, making the roles and responsibilities known to all the participants in the practicum for positive practice teaching experiences (Slick, 1998a; Worford, 2011). Otherwise, no matter how long the student teaching period is, it would be unlikely to have an effective initial teaching experience for student teaching.

Studies conducted in the L1 and L2 context on the role expectations of the triad members

In the field there are various studies conducted to investigate the roles of the student teachers, university supervisors, and cooperating teachers (triad members). Some of them are qualitative case studies with relatively small samples focused basically on the role behaviors of one of the participant groups rather than investigating the expectations on the roles of the triad members, e.g. on the role of the cooperating teacher (Beck & Kosnik, 2000; Koskela & Ganser, 1998; Kyle, Moore, & Sanders, 1999; Smith, 2005); on the role of the university supervisor (Sinclair, 1997; Slick, 1997). These studies with small samples mainly focused on role behaviors of the triad members for the purpose of defining or redefining the roles of the participants in a particular program or the problems of the triad members. But few studies, using large samples, have examined the expectations of the triad members on the roles and responsibilities of all or one or two of the triad members in the student teaching experience (Bain, 1991; Castillo, 1971; Garland, 1964; Grimmert & Ratzlaff, 1986; Kaplan, 1967; Ryan, 1989; Shippy, 1989). As mentioned above, the earliest of the quantitative studies on the matter, which also constitute the scope of this study, dates back to 1991; studies conducted after this period are basically qualitative ones with much smaller scales.

Garland (1964) investigated the expectations of the triad members for the roles of the student teachers. Kaplan (1967) conducted a study on the role expectations of the triad members for the roles of the university supervisors. Castillo (1971) investigated the expectations of the triad members for the roles of the cooperating teachers. Grimmert and Ratzlaff (1986) combined the instruments of these three previous studies of Castillo (1971), Garland (1964) and Kaplan (1967) to investigate the roles of the triad members as expected

by the triad members in the Canadian context. Ryan (1989) conducted a similar survey extending the work of Grimmett and Ratzlaff (1986) by examining certain individual and contextual variables in relation to role expectations of the triad members. Shippy (1989) investigated the roles of the triad members using the same instruments in the USA. She ran factor analysis procedures to examine the construct validity and construct definition of the instruments for further statistical computations. Bain (1991) investigated expectations of the triad members focusing on the roles of the university supervisors and cooperating teachers, and kept the student teacher role out of the scope of investigation. Unlike the previous studies, Bain (1991) also asked the participants to indicate the degree of importance of each role definition by ranking the role definitions on a five-point scale from “most important” to “most unimportant”.

The findings of these particular studies indicated that student teacher experiences are unique in the sense that expectations of the participants may vary according to the cultural context; level, setting, and time of student teaching experience; the demographic features of the participants like gender, experience, background knowledge. Each time the context and participants change, the dynamics affecting the role expectations and role enactment of the participants will change. Bain (1991) concluded that “All members have their own unique contributions which can and should be developed for the betterment of the student teacher and the learning situation” (p. 76).

Studies conducted on the role expectations of the triad members in Turkey

Student teaching, for various reasons has not been given its due importance in Turkey, although there have been important restructuring reforms in Turkish teacher education system. Two major reforms took place in 1995 and 2006 consecutively. One of the aims of these reforms was the restructuring of the faculties of education to improve relationships between faculties and schools. A model of university-school partnership was developed by The Council of Higher Education (henceforward CHE) concerning the practicum component of the pre service teacher education. A redefinition of the roles and responsibilities of the participating groups was made with the understanding that the success of field experiences would partly be determined to the extent that the participants were aware of their own roles and responsibilities and those of the other members of the triad. Therefore, a handbook that would guide the participants in the practicum was published on the components and procedures of the field experiences as a whole as well as the roles and responsibilities of the participants in the practicum by CHE (Koç, Ergezen, Ayas, Baki, Çepni, & Kincal, 1998). Descriptions of roles and responsibilities were given in general terms in the handbook.

To the knowledge of the researchers, there is only one study particularly conducted on the roles of the cooperating English teachers (Tercanlioğlu, 2000); there are no studies investigating the selection criteria for university supervisors and/or cooperating teachers in the Turkish context. Some other studies were conducted on the problems the triad members faced in the practicum (Paker, 2000; Paker & Sendan, 1997; Tercanlioğlu, 2000). A recent study investigated the effectiveness of the roles of university supervisors as perceived by themselves and student teachers (Becerem, 2009).

Therefore, a study on the role expectations of the triad members could contribute to the field by uncovering certain areas of ambiguity and/or conflict among the triad members that would help improve the student teaching component of the teacher education programs, investigating whether the roles and responsibilities indicated in the handbook prepared by CHE are expected and/or fulfilled by the members.

Such a study could also contribute to the establishment and maintenance of partnerships involving university supervisors, cooperating teachers and student teachers participating in the practicum. Hence, our study aims at investigating the role expectations of the triad members regarding their roles in the practicum, and whether there are differences among different universities concerning these role expectations in an EFL context.

The theoretical background of the study

Role theory

The study focuses on the expectations of the triad members concerning the roles of the university supervisors and cooperating teachers within the framework of role theory, which suggests that expectations are the major generators of roles.

Role theory (henceforward RT) is considered an interdisciplinary theory by many scholars because it has evolved within a number of social sciences such as psychology, sociology and anthropology. Role, as a concept, has appeared in the late 1920s and early 1930s in the above-mentioned social sciences.

Basically, RT focuses on activities of participants in interpersonal relationships. Those activities could be observable such as role behaviors, or could be cognitive such as expectations of persons in social relationships. RT suggests that each role is related to a social position or status in the society. Persons who hold the same positions exhibit similar roles within the context of that role as long as they have the awareness of what their and others' roles and responsibilities should be (Biddle, 1986). However, the actual role behavior of the individual may not always match with the expectations of the society and the self if the expectations are not clearly stated and shared among the participants with complementary roles. In other words, when the expectations among individuals or groups for a certain role are inconsistent, unclear or ambiguous, this would make the expected behavior less predictable, resulting in ineffective and unsatisfactory social interaction (Sarbin & Allen, 1968). In order for the members of the society to share their awareness with each other for effective social relationships, roles must be taught to persons basically for the socialization process and to prevent ambiguity and conflict in role taking.

In that sense, RT concurs with the social constructivist approach to learning which suggests that knowledge is constructed through the interactions of participants in the teaching-learning process. RT and social constructivist theory point out the importance of interaction among individuals and the sharing of knowledge or role expectations through dialogue.

Besides the awareness of self and others' expectations, it is very important that self and others share the same expectations for the same role (Biddle, 1979), which is called consensus in relation to expectations. Degree of consensus is considered to be an important dimension of role expectations; as the degree of consensus decreases, that is, the members hold opposing

viewpoints on a particular role, their degree of satisfaction with each other decreases (Sarbin & Allen, 1968).

Dissatisfaction also occurs when others have clear expectations for the role of a person, while that person is not sure of his/her own role. In such cases, there exist discrepancies between groups, and the role behavior of the person is viewed as insufficient or inappropriate by others. The person who experiences conflict will suffer stress, and will try to cope with the problem in his/her own ways (Biddle, 1986).

Biddle (1979) argues that RT also plays an important role in teaching as much as in other social sciences. Teaching involves roles and role behaviors on the part of both teachers and students, and it is a situation where participants have certain expectations, beliefs, demands, rules, etc. for the maintenance of their relationship. One of those interactional situations that require clear role definitions of the participants and appropriate role behaviors in education is the student teaching component in teacher education programs.

Yee (1968) states that cooperating teachers and university supervisors are usually left alone in adjusting themselves to conflicting demands in the practicum and solving their problems. In other words, effective role performances of the cooperating teachers and the university supervisors in student teaching experiences are taken for granted. Therefore, for positive student teaching experiences, it is very important to study the processes of the establishment and maintenance of partnerships involving university supervisors, cooperating teachers and student teachers in the practicum.

The Study

The study originally consists of two parts. The first part of the study aims at adapting an instrument to explore the expectations of the triad members for the roles of the university supervisors and cooperating teachers in the student teaching experience and investigation of the validity and the reliability of the instrument adapted for the purposes of the study and for the EFL teaching context in Turkey.

The purpose of this paper is to focus on the second part of the study which aims at investigating the similarities and differences in expectations of the triad members for the roles of the university supervisors and cooperating teachers and whether there are institutional differences within each of the university supervisor and student teacher groups in terms of expectations for the role of the university supervisors and cooperating teachers.

Research Questions

The study originally aims to answer 10 research questions. For the purpose of this paper, the focus will be on the 8 research questions of the original study which were related with the findings of the questionnaires tapping the role expectations of the triad members: University supervisors, cooperating teachers, and student teachers.

1. Are there any differences among the university supervisors, cooperating teachers, and student teachers concerning the expectations for the roles of the university supervisors in the practicum? If there are any differences,

- a. What are the areas of differences among the triad members?
 - b. Between which triad members are the differences observed?
 - c. What is the nature of observed differences among the triad members?
2. Are there any similarities within each of the university supervisor, cooperating teacher and student teacher groups concerning the expectations for the roles of the university supervisors in the practicum? If there are any similarities,
- a. What are the areas of similarities within each of the triad members?
 - b. What is the nature and degree of agreement within each of the triad members?
3. Are there any similarities among the university supervisors, cooperating teachers and student teachers concerning the expectations for the roles of the university supervisors in the practicum? If there are any similarities,
- a. What are the areas of similarities among the triad members?
 - b. What is the nature and degree of agreement among the triad members?
4. Are there any differences among the university supervisors, cooperating teachers, and student teachers concerning the expectations for the roles of the cooperating teachers in the practicum? If there are any differences,
- a. What are the areas of differences among the triad members?
 - b. Between which triad members are the differences observed?
 - c. What is the nature of observed differences among the triad members?
5. Are there any similarities within each of the university supervisor, cooperating teacher and student teacher groups concerning the expectations for the roles of the cooperating teachers in the practicum? If there are any similarities,
- a. What are the areas of similarities within each of the triad members?
 - b. What is the nature and degree of agreement within each of the triad members?
6. Are there any similarities among the university supervisors, cooperating teachers and student teachers concerning the expectations for the roles of the cooperating teachers in the practicum? If there are any similarities,
- a. What are the areas of similarities among the triad members?
 - b. What is the nature and degree of agreement among the triad members?
7. Are there any institutional differences among the university supervisors and student

teachers concerning the expectations for the roles of the university supervisors? If there are any differences,

- a. What are the areas of differences among the members of different institutions?
- b. Between which institutions are the differences observed?
- c. What is the nature of differences among the members of different institutions?

8. Are there any institutional differences among the university supervisors and student teachers concerning the expectations for the roles of the cooperating teachers? If there are any differences,

- a. What are the areas of differences among the members of different institutions?
- b. Between which institutions are the differences observed?
- c. What is the nature of differences among the members of different institutions?

Participants

The participant of the study were 17 university supervisors, and 238 student teachers from the departments of Foreign Language Education of four universities- 2 located in İstanbul/ 2 outside İstanbul, 116 cooperating teachers who were mentors of the participant student teachers.

For the condition that they were more accessible to the researchers, those four particular universities were selected for the purposes of the study.

Data Collection

Data were collected during the second and third months of the “Practice Teaching” course, which is March and April, in the senior year.

After the schools and the university departments accepted to participate in the study, the maximum number of accessible participants for each institution was determined, and sets of questionnaires were distributed.

Except for some of the cooperating schools out of İstanbul where data were gathered by the help of the university supervisors, all the schools and the foreign language education departments of the participating universities were visited by one of the researchers.

Instrument

Origins of the instrument are questionnaires used by Shippy (1989), who also used Kaplan (1967) on the role of the university supervisors and Castillo (1971) on the role of the cooperating teachers. In the original instrument, the participants stated their expectations on a four-point scale. For the purposes of the study, the original questionnaires were adapted to be used in the Turkish EFL context as indicated below.

Adaptation of the instrument

The criteria of CHE (Koç et al., 1998) was taken as reference for the adaptation of the instrument. All the constructs and items in Shippy’s (1989) questionnaires were thoroughly

examined in terms of the roles of the university supervisors and cooperating teachers defined in the handbook prepared by CHE. The constructs and items that would not contradict with what CHE required of the participants were retained and reworded if necessary; the items that the researcher thought would not be applicable for the Turkish context were omitted. Some new items or constructs were added to the questionnaires because some of CHE's requirements were not found within the original questionnaires.

Once the instrument was thoroughly reconstructed, it was sent to expert opinion of 11 judges from ELT departments. They were mainly asked if any item should be omitted, retained, reworded, or its category should be changed. 9 out of 11 agreements were taken as a basis to finalize the instrument before data collection.

The instrument consisted of a questionnaire about the background information of the related triad member, a questionnaire investigating the expectations of the triad members for the roles of the university supervisors, a questionnaire investigating the expectations of the triad members for the roles of the cooperating teachers.

The questionnaires investigating the roles of the university supervisors and the cooperating teachers required participants to state their opinion as an expectational mode with varying degrees of strength on a four-point Likert scale (1 = Absolutely must, 2 = Preferably should, 3 = Preferably should not, 4 = Absolutely must not).

In order to explore the validity of the instruments, responses to each questionnaire were subjected to an exploratory factor analysis. Thus, factor analysis was conducted to identify the constructs the questionnaires measured.

The final version of the questionnaire for the university supervisors consisted of ten constructs after factor analysis with a total of 39 items: (See Appendix I)

- Support role
- Supervision in lesson planning and practice teaching
- Liaison role for the student teacher and the cooperating teacher
- Evaluation of the student teacher with the cooperating teacher
- Facilitating reflection
- Working with the cooperating teacher
- Selecting cooperating teachers
- Guidance and evaluation of the cooperating teachers
- Liaison-role for the university-school partnership
- Evaluation role as a supervisor

The final version of the questionnaire for the cooperating teachers consisted of nine constructs after factor analysis with a total 36 items: (See Appendix II)

- Orientation to physical set up and equipment

- Sharing the knowledge of teaching
- Observing and supervising student teaching
- Guidance in lesson planning
- Support role
- Preparing for having a student teacher
- Orientation to the school/classroom atmosphere
- Evaluation
- Facilitating student teacher autonomy

Therefore, the validity of the instruments was established through opinions of the experts in the field of English Language Teaching and factor analysis of each instrument.

In order to explore the reliability of the instrument, internal consistency coefficients were obtained for each factor and for each questionnaire as a whole. Findings of reliability analysis indicated that both questionnaires achieved high reliability coefficients: questionnaire investigating the roles of the university supervisors ($r = .89$); questionnaire investigating the roles of the cooperating teachers ($r = .93$).

Data Analysis

For the statistical analysis, SPSS 11.0 version was used. Descriptive statistics and frequency analysis were run. In order to investigate differences among the triad members regarding their expectations for the roles of the university supervisors and cooperating teachers, research questions 1 and 4 were analyzed by One-way ANOVA using the General Linear Model. The procedure was as follows: when one of the groups' mean on a factor ranges in between "absolutely must" (exact point mean is 1.00) and "preferably should" points (exact point mean is 2.00) and the other group's mean ranges between "preferably should not" (exact point mean is 3.00) and "absolutely must not" points (exact point mean is 4.00), that means there is a directional difference between the two groups.

If one of the groups' mean is around "absolutely must" point (1.00) and the other group's mean is around "preferably should" point (2.00) that implies a difference in terms of strength of expectations between the groups.

If the group's mean is approaching the point 2.50 which is in between "preferably should" and "preferably should not" options, that means the group is not clear about their expectations related to that particular factor.

To investigate the similarities concerning the groups' expectations for the roles and responsibilities (research questions 2 and 5), the percentage of responses were calculated and the mode of response for each item was taken as a basis to identify the areas of similarities. The mode response also determined the levels of consensus, i.e. the nature of similarities (100%-66.7% as high consensus, 66.6%-33.4% as moderate consensus, 33.3%-0% as low consensus) for each item. The levels of consensus in the original questionnaires were also taken as a basis for the instrument of this study.

Then, within-group results of each triad member were compared to see whether there were similar expectations among the members of the triad concerning the roles of the university supervisors and cooperating teachers (see research questions 3 and 6).

Regarding the research questions 7 and 8, Kruskal-Wallis One-way ANOVA was used to examine the differences among the university supervisor groups, and F-tests were run using One-way ANOVA using the General Linear Model to compare the expectations of the student teachers in different universities.

Findings

In relation to research question 1, whether there were differences among the triad members concerning the expectations for the roles of the university supervisors, findings indicated that members of the triad had different expectations for the university supervisors' role in the areas of (see Appendix III):

- Selecting cooperating teachers (Factor 7)
- Guidance and evaluation of the cooperating teachers (Factor 8)

When raw means of each group on factors 7 and 8 were examined, it was observed that the differences among the triad members concerning the roles of the university supervisors were in terms of strength of expectations rather than direction of expectation. In other words, the student teacher group ($M = 1.61$) expected the university supervisor to select the cooperating teachers prior to student teaching.

Cooperating teachers ($M = 2.07$), being close to “preferably should” option, had milder expectations in relation to the role of the university supervisors selecting cooperating teachers prior to student teaching. Cooperating teachers ($M = 2.34$) were even close to the undecided position regarding the role of the university supervisors as guiding and evaluating cooperating teachers during the practicum. Hence, cooperating teachers did not have a clear idea of the guidance and evaluative role of the university supervisors for cooperating teachers; they may even have felt uneasiness about being guided and evaluated by the university supervisors.

On the other hand, university supervisors ($M = 1.61$) and student teachers ($M = 1.67$) expected the university supervisor to provide guidance and to evaluate cooperating teachers during the practicum.

Regarding the second research question, whether there were similar expectations within each of the triad members concerning the role of the university supervisors, results revealed that in general, university supervisors reached moderate levels of consensus regarding their own role in 25 of the 39 items (64%). 12 of those 25 items were on “absolutely must” and 13 were on “preferably should.” The university supervisors reached high levels of consensus on 14 of the 39 items (36%) of the questionnaire investigating the role of the university supervisors. 11 of those 14 items were on “absolutely must” and 3 were on “preferably should” (see Appendix IV). University supervisors expected with high consensus that they “absolutely must” do the following (see Appendix IV):

Factor 2: Supervision in lesson planning and practice teaching

- check the student teacher's lesson plans for practice teaching
- give written and oral feedback to the student teacher about his/her lesson plans
- guide the student teacher in lesson planning, observation and classroom management observe the student teacher for at least two full lessons during the semester.

Factor 3: Liaison role for student teacher and cooperating teacher

- inform the cooperating teacher about his/her responsibilities towards the student teacher and the university faculty
- inform the student teacher about his/her responsibilities towards the cooperating teacher and the cooperating school
- inform the student teacher about the practice teaching program, cooperating school, guidelines to follow and evaluation

Factor 5: Facilitating reflection

- guide the student teacher toward the goal of self-evaluation
- give written and oral feedback to the student teacher about his/her teaching performance
- help the student teacher put theory into practice

Factor 9: Liaison role for the university-school partnership

- inform the cooperating school coordinator about the expectations/requirements of the university faculty

Achieving high levels of consensus, university supervisors also thought that they “preferably should” perform the following duties:

Factor 1: Support role

- participate as a trainer in in-service training programs for cooperating teachers

Factor 7: Selecting cooperating teachers

- observe the cooperating teacher prior to the placement of the student teacher for the purpose of selecting cooperating teachers
- talk with the cooperating teacher prior to the placement of the student teacher in order to see his/her ideas and attitudes towards teaching and teaching practice

These findings imply that university supervisors are aware of their liaison roles between the members and institutions of the practicum which was mentioned by Bourke (2001), Burton (1998), Sienty (1997), Sinclair (1997), Slick (1997), Slick (1998a), Slick (1998b) and Zimpher et al. (1980); their roles in relation to the student teachers as providing supervision to

student teachers (Bourke, 2001; Burton, 1998; Koç et al., 1998; Sienty, 1997); and their roles as facilitating reflection of the student teachers (Koç et al., 1998).

On the other hand, university supervisors could not agree on the areas of sharing the evaluation role which was indicated as necessary by Sienty (1997) and Koç et al. (1998), working with the cooperating teachers as indicated by Burton (1998), Borko and Mayfield (1995) and Koç et al. (1998), and guiding and evaluating the cooperating teachers (Burton, 1998).

Regarding the roles of the university supervisors, the consensual tendency of the cooperating teacher group was moderate. They reached moderate levels of consensus on 31 of the 39 items. The mode of responses in general was “preferably should” with 20 items out of 31. The remaining eleven items received moderate consensus on “absolutely must” (see Appendix IV).

Cooperating teachers agreed with high consensus on 6 of the 39 items of the questionnaire investigating the role of the university supervisors. Five were on “absolutely must” and one was on “preferably should.” Cooperating teachers thought that the university supervisors “absolutely must” do the following duties (see Appendix IV):

Factor 2: Supervision in lesson planning and practice teaching

- check the student teacher’s lesson plans for practice teaching
- give written and oral feedback to the student teacher about his/her lesson plans
- guide the student teacher in lesson planning, observation and classroom management

Factor 3: Liaison role for student teacher and cooperating teacher

- inform the student teacher about his/her responsibilities towards the cooperating teacher and the cooperating school
- inform the student teacher about the practice teaching program, cooperating school, guidelines to follow and evaluation

Cooperating teachers also expected with high consensus that university supervisors “preferably should” meet the following expectations:

Factor 10: Evaluation role as a supervisor

- follow evaluation guidelines adopted by the university faculty

As for the expectations of the student teachers for the roles of the university supervisors, although most of the student teachers’ responses in the questionnaire investigating the role of the university supervisors were “absolutely must,” the level of consensus they reached was moderate. Student teachers achieved high consensus on “absolutely must” on 4 of the 39 items regarding the role of the university supervisors (see Appendix IV).

They expected that the university supervisors “absolutely must” perform the following roles (see Appendix IV):

Factor 2: Supervision in lesson planning and practice teaching

- give written and oral feedback to the student teacher about his/her lesson plans
- guide the student teacher in lesson planning, observation and classroom management

Factor 5: Facilitating reflection

- give written and oral feedback to the student teacher about his/her teaching performance
- help the student teacher put theory into practice

Concerning the third research question, findings of agreement within each of the triad member groups indicate that university supervisors, cooperating teachers and student teachers could reach consensus on one of the roles of the university supervisors:

- supervision of the student teachers in lesson planning and practice teaching (Factor 2) (see Appendix IV)

This indicates that university supervisors' role is considered in limited terms by the triad members, especially by the student teachers and the cooperating teachers. This finding concurs with the findings of the studies conducted previously (Ryan, 1989; Shippy, 1989).

Regarding the expectations of the triad members for the roles of the cooperating teacher (see research question 4), findings have indicated that there are differences among the triad members in terms of the following roles of the cooperating teachers (see Appendix V):

- Orientation of the student teacher to the physical set up and equipment (Factor 1)
- Support role (Factor 5)
- Preparing for having a student teacher (Factor 6)
- Orientation of the student teacher to the school/classroom atmosphere (Factor 7)

The central tendency of the cooperating teacher group ($M = 2.02$) considering the role of the cooperating teachers as orienting the student teachers to the physical set up and equipment was that they “preferably should” enact this role as cooperating teachers. On the other hand, compared to the cooperating teacher group, the university supervisors ($M = 1.48$) and student teachers ($M = 1.78$) were somewhere in between “absolutely must” and “preferably should” options.

Regarding the “Support role”, the tendency of the cooperating teacher group ($M = 2.25$) approached the neutral point between “preferably should” and “preferably should not” implying an undecided position. Student teacher group ($M = 1.95$) was very close to the point of “preferably should,” whereas university supervisors ($M = 1.76$) were again in between “absolutely must” and “preferably should” options concerning the “Support role” of the cooperating teachers.

When we look at the role “Preparing for having a student teacher,” we can see that cooperating teachers ($M = 2.02$) thought that they preferably should prepare for having a

student teacher while university supervisors ($M = 1.68$) and student teachers ($M = 1.67$) were in between “absolutely must” and “preferably should” on the scale.

Concerning the “Orientation (of the student teacher) to the school/classroom atmosphere” university supervisors ($M = 1.61$) were closer to “absolutely must” option. This time cooperating teachers ($M = 1.75$) and student teachers ($M = 1.68$) were in between absolutely must and “preferably should” options; they were even closer to the point of “preferably should” while university supervisors thought that cooperating teachers “absolutely must” give orientation for the school and classroom atmosphere in practice teaching. This finding contradicts the findings of a previous study (Shippy, 1989).

As can be seen, although the groups do not differ from each other in terms of the direction of expectations, they differ in terms of strength of expectations.

As mentioned earlier although not as severe as directional differences, these differences in strength of expectations also imply discrepancy and lack of clarity in terms of certain roles of cooperating teachers among the practicum members. So, as the strength of expectation decreases the initiative to perform the expected role is weakened.

Among the triad members, university supervisors have reached the highest amount of agreement within themselves concerning the roles of the cooperating teachers (research question 5).

Results showed that, concerning the role of the cooperating teachers, university supervisors from all universities showed high levels of consensus on 20 of the 36 items, which constitute 56% of the total number of items in the questionnaire. Fifteen of these 20 items were on “absolutely must” option whereas five were on “preferably should” (see Appendix VI). University supervisors reached high consensus on the following items expecting that the cooperating teachers “absolutely must” do the following (see Appendix VI):

Factor 1: Orientation to the physical set up and equipment

- introduce the student teacher to administrators, staff, co-teachers and other school employees
- demonstrate operation and use of audio-visual equipment and office machines
- supply the student teacher with copies of teacher’s guides, manuals and aids

Factor 3: Observing and supervising student teaching

- observe the student teacher’s lessons
- fill in an observation/evaluation form for each practice teaching of the student teacher
- keep a file of observation and evaluation forms of the activities and progress of the student teacher
- make the completed observation/evaluation forms available to the student teacher

Factor 4: Guidance in lesson planning

- give oral and written feedback to the student teacher about his/her lesson plans

Factor 5: Support role

- make his/her evaluation of the student teacher available to the university supervisor

Factor 7: Orientation to the school/classroom atmosphere

- introduce the student teacher to the pupils in the class
- share with the student teacher information about the interests and abilities of the pupils in the class
- explain all school rules, routines and policies

Factor 8: Evaluation

- share the responsibility of evaluation of the student teacher with the university supervisor
- follow evaluation guidelines adopted by the university faculty

Factor 9: Facilitating student teacher autonomy

- give full charge of the class to the student teacher during practice teaching

University supervisors also expected that the cooperating teachers “preferably should” enact the following role definitions with high levels of consensus.

Factor 1: Orientation to the physical set up and equipment

- supply reference books and professional magazines to be used by the student teacher
- provide the student teacher with a place for personal materials

Factor 2: Sharing the knowledge of teaching

- demonstrate for the student teacher different methods or techniques of teaching
- explain the principles underlying certain teaching techniques

Factor 5: Support role

- invite the student teacher to extra-curricular activities in the cooperating school

As the above-mentioned results indicate, university supervisors have highly consensual expectations from the cooperating teachers’ role. Many of these expectations are strongly normative (absolutely must), that is, the university supervisor requires the cooperating teacher to perform each role definition during the interaction of the triad members in the practice teaching period, and some of them are mildly normative (preferably should), that is, the university supervisor expects the cooperating teacher to better perform the expected role. High levels of consensus related to role expectations on 56% of the items tell us that

university supervisors know what to expect and how to expect from the cooperating teachers' roles.

Cooperating teachers agree with high consensus on only four of their own role definitions. They thought with high levels of consensus that they “absolutely must” (see Appendix VI):

Factor 3: Observing and supervising student teaching

- observe the student teacher's lessons

Factor 7: Orientation to the school/classroom atmosphere

- introduce the student teacher to the pupils in the class

Cooperating teachers also think with high levels of consensus that they “preferably should” perform the following duties (see Appendix VI):

Factor 1: Orientation to the physical set up and equipment

- show the student teacher the physical set up of the classroom, building and grounds

Factor 8: Evaluation

- evaluate the activities and progress of the student teacher with the university supervisor periodically

Student teachers could not reach high consensus on any of the role definitions in relation to the cooperating teachers' role.

Concerning the research question 6, which investigates the areas of similarities among the triad members regarding the role of the cooperating teachers, no areas of similarities among the triad members with high levels of consensus was observed. In other words, university supervisors, cooperating teachers and student teachers do not share any similar expectations with high levels of consensus in relation to the cooperating teachers' role.

The triad members could only reach moderate levels of consensus on very few of the items (4 of the 36 items) (see Appendix VI). One of them was on “absolutely must.” That item was included in:

Factor 4: Guidance in lesson planning

- check the student teacher's lesson plans for practice teaching

The other three items which received moderate consensus from all the members of the triad were on “preferably should.” Those three items were:

Factor 5: Support role

- inform the student teacher about the important decisions taken in the staff meetings and other organizational meetings in the cooperating school
- arrange for the student teacher to observe other teachers' classrooms

Factor 6: preparing for having a student teacher

- work with the university supervisor to prepare a set of observation guidelines for the student teacher

These results contradict what have been found in relation to the shared expectations of the triad members for the cooperating teachers' role (Ryan, 1989; Shippy, 1989).

In the literature it has been claimed that as a liaison person between the cooperating teacher and the student teacher, it is the university supervisor's role to inform and clarify the nature and scope of the roles of the cooperating teachers in the practicum (Bourke, 2001; Zimpher et al., 1980). The results of this study indicated that university supervisors were very much aware of what constituted the cooperating teachers' role and what to expect from them (high levels of consensus on 56% of the items concerning the role of the cooperating teachers).

However, the lack of agreement within the cooperating teacher and student teacher groups concerning the role of the cooperating teachers implies that the roles and responsibilities of the cooperating teachers and what the student teachers should expect from the cooperating teachers might not have been communicated well to the cooperating teachers and the student teachers by the university supervisors.

Another explanation to the lack of consensus within the cooperating teacher group in relation to their own role could be their lack of orientation for their role in student teaching as they reported. Among the respondents, only 13.5% of the cooperating teachers said that they had received orientation for the cooperating teacher role; the rest reported that they did not receive any orientation to prepare for their role.

Findings in relation to the institutional differences among each of university supervisor and student teacher groups indicate that, concerning the role of the university supervisors (research question 7), the university supervisors in different universities do not differ from each other.

On the other hand, findings show that there are differences among the student teachers of these universities in terms of the supervision role of the university supervisors in lesson planning and practice teaching, liaison role for the student teacher and the cooperating teacher, and for the university-school partnership (see Appendix VII).

As in the case of previous findings in this study, although the observed differences do not reflect a directional difference, student teachers in different universities hold expectations of different strength. Some of this may be due to the fact that student teachers in these universities are not given sufficient orientation about the roles of the triad members.

Concerning the last research question (question 8), university supervisors in different universities do not differ from each other regarding their expectations for the role of the cooperating teachers. It could be implied that working for different universities does not seem to have any relationship with the university supervisors' awareness of the cooperating teachers' roles.

However, student teachers differ in terms of the guidance role of the cooperating teacher in lesson planning, orientation of the student teacher to the school/classroom atmosphere, and

evaluation of the student teacher (see Appendix VIII). Student teachers, especially of two universities (Universities A and D), differ in their awareness of the roles of the university supervisors and cooperating teachers. This may be due to the fact that in one of these universities, student teachers are not informed about the university supervisor, cooperating teacher and student teacher role relationships.

Conclusion

This study investigated the expectations of the triad members for the roles of the university supervisors and cooperating teachers. It can be concluded that, triad members do not hold very clear expectations for the roles of the university supervisors and cooperating teachers. Within the triad, it is the university supervisors who are relatively more aware of their own and cooperating teachers' roles. Nevertheless, as mentioned earlier it seems that university supervisors are not much effective in explaining these roles to their partners in the practicum as liaison persons.

Implications

The findings of the study have some implications for the role of the preservice EFL teacher education programs in strengthening university-school cooperation. First, if supervisors have a clearer understanding of their own roles, they can more effectively work with the cooperating teachers and student teachers, and help them understand their roles in the practicum. Among these opportunities could be organizing meetings for university supervisors to get together and review their responsibilities for the practicum component of their teacher education programs.

Second, orientation sessions for the cooperating teachers and student teachers could be conducted by the ELT departments to clarify and raise awareness of the participants regarding their roles and responsibilities in practice teaching and to share expectations of each other's roles among themselves.

Third, especially, among the triad members, the need of cooperating teachers for appropriate orientation seems to be neglected by the university faculties, which implies that university-school collaboration is not that strong. As another means of strengthening the relationship between university faculties and cooperating schools and to enhance collaboration, university faculties can provide the cooperating teachers with the opportunities of regular orientation sessions and meetings regarding the responsibilities of the triad members, and the cooperating teachers should be encouraged by their school administrations to participate in those sessions.

University supervisors and cooperating teachers do not have enough time to devote to their students' practice teaching due to their other responsibilities. Therefore, cooperating teachers could be given low teaching load by the administrators. If possible university supervisors should not be assigned to supervise large numbers of students.

Limitations of the study

The results of this study should be interpreted in light of the following limitations:

1. An investigation of the expectations of the triad members for the roles of the student teachers could not be conducted within the scope of this study because including an investigation of the student teacher's role would lengthen the instrument to more than 100 items. This could reduce the response rate to less than 50% (Grimmet & Ratzlaff, 1986; Ryan, 1989) and lead to a sampling error. However, such an investigation of the student teachers' role together with the university supervisors' and cooperating teachers' roles could help the researcher draw a better picture of the role relationships and reciprocal role expectations of the triad members.

2. A comprehensive qualitative investigation of the results of the quantitative analysis could not be conducted due to time constraints and unavailability of some of the triad members, especially student teachers, after the practice teaching period. Interviews conducted with the triad members could have been helpful in providing explanations for the observed differences and the areas of ambiguity among and within the triad members.

3. The university supervisor sample was quite small; a total of 17 university supervisors responded from four universities. If the number of respondent university supervisors had been higher, different results could have been obtained.

4. Due to the limited number of university supervisors participated in the study and the convenience sampling procedure used, the results can only be generalized to the sample in this study.

5. The members of the triad who were available and wanted to participate constituted the sample in the study. While interpreting the results it should be taken into consideration that random sampling could have led to different results.

Suggestions for further research

Further research on the roles of the triad members could focus on the following aspects:

- Expectations of the triad members for the roles of the student teachers in the practicum,
- A qualitative analysis of role expectations of the triad members using interviews, observation and journals,
- Changes in expectations of the triad members from the beginning to the end of the practice teaching experience,
- To what extent the participants in practice teaching perform the expected roles,
- The effects of orientation sessions and professional development activities on the role performance of the triad members.

References

- Aubusson, P. & Schuck, S. (2013). Teacher education, future's, today's trends, tomorrow's expectations. *Teacher Development*, 17(3), 322-333.
- Bain, C. E. (1991). *Student teaching triads: Perceptions of participant roles*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The University of North Dakota, USA.
- Beck, C., & Kosnik, C. (2000). Associate teachers in pre-service education: Clarifying and enhancing their role. *Journal of Education for Teaching*, 26, 207-224.
- Biddle, B. J. (1979). *Role theory: Expectation, identities and behaviors*. New York: Academic Press.
- Biddle, B. J. (1986). Recent development in role theory. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 12, 67-92.
- Borko, H., & Mayfield, V. (1995). The roles of the cooperating teacher and university supervisor in learning to teach. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 11, 501-518.
- Bourke, J. M. (2001). The role of the TP TESL supervisor. *Journal of Education for Teaching*, 27(1), 63-73.
- Burton, D. (1998). The changing role of the university tutor within school-based initial teacher education: Issues of role contingency and complementarity within a secondary partnership scheme. *Journal of Education for Teaching*, 24(2), 124-146.
- Castillo, J. B. (1971). The role expectations of cooperating teachers as viewed by student teachers, college supervisors, and cooperating teachers [Abstract]. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 32, 1374.
- Demirkol, I. (2004). *Expectations for the roles of cooperating teachers and university supervisors during the practice teaching period as perceived by university supervisors, cooperating teachers and student teachers*. Unpublished master's thesis, Boğaziçi University, Istanbul.
- Duquette, C. (1996). Partnerships in pre-service education: Perceptions of associate teachers and student teachers. *McGill Journal of Education*, 31, 69-81.
- 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.
- Fairbanks, C. M., Freedman, D., & Kahn, C. (2000). The role of effective mentors in learning to teach. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 51(2), 102-112.
- Garland, C. B. (1964). An exploration of role expectations for student teachers: Views of prospective student teachers, cooperating teachers, and college supervisors. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 26, 1497-1498.
- Grimmett, P. P., & Ratzlaff, H. C. (1986). Expectations for the cooperating teacher role. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 37(6), 41-50.

- Kane, R. G., & Francis, A. (2013). Preparing teachers for Professional learning: is there a future for teacher education in new teacher induction? *Teacher Development*, 17(3), 362-379.
- Kaplan, L. (1967). An investigation of the role expectations for college supervisors of student teaching as viewed by student teachers, supervising teachers, and college supervisors. *Dissertation abstracts International*, 28, 517.
- Koç, S., Ergezen, S., Ayas, A., Baki, A., Çepni, S., & Kincal, R. (1998). Fakülte-okul işbirliği. YÖK/Dünya Bankası Milli Eğitimi Geliştirme Projesi, Hizmet Öncesi Öğretmen Eğitimi. Ankara.
- Koskela, R., & Ganser, T. (1998). The cooperating teacher role and career development. *Education*, 119(1), 106-114.
- Kyle, D. W., Moore, G. H., & Sanders, J. L. (1999). The role of the mentor teacher: Insights, challenges and implications. *Peabody Journal of Education*, 74(3-4), 190-122.
- McNamara, D. (1995). The influence of student teachers' tutors and mentors upon their classroom practice: An exploratory study. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 17, 51-61.
- Paker, T. (2000). Teaching practice from student teachers' perspective. *Journal of Social Sciences, Çukurova University Institute of Social Sciences*, 6(6), 111-118.
- Paker, T., & Sendan F. C. (1997, November). *Öğretmen yetiştirmede sorunlar ve farklı yaklaşımların önemi*. Panel discussion at Uluslararası Öğretmen Yetiştirme Sempozyumu I, Çanakkale.
- Ryan, M. W. J. (1989). *An investigation of the role expectations held among and within the groups representing each of the three members of the student teaching triad*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The University of British Columbia, Canada.
- Sarbin, T. R., & Allen, V. L. (1968). Role theory. In G. Lindzey & E. Aronson (Eds.), *The handbook of social psychology* (pp. 488-567). Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, Inc.
- Shippy, V. S. (1989). *An investigation of role expectations in the student teaching triad as viewed by student teachers, cooperating teachers and college supervisors*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, State University of New York, Albany.
- Sienty, S. F. (1997). The changing roles of student teacher supervisors. *Education*, 117, 506-510.
- Sinclair, C. (1997). Redefining the role of the university lecturer in school-based teacher education. *Asia - Pacific Journal of Teacher Education*, 25, 309-324.
- Slick, S. (1997). Assessing versus assisting: The supervisors' roles in the complex Dynamics of the student teaching triad. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 13, 713-726.
- Slick, S. (1998a). The university supervisor: A disfranchised outsider. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 14, 821-834.

- Slick, S. (1998b). A university supervisor negotiates territory and status. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 49, 306-315.
- Tercanlioğlu, L. (2000). The implementation of school-based mentoring in the training of student-teachers of English. *Journal of Practice in Education for Development*, 5(2), 17-22.
- Trent, J. (2012). Teacher professional development through a school-university partnership: What role does teacher identity play? *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, 37(7), 449-470.
- Yee, A. H. (1968). Interpersonal relationships in the student-teaching triad. *The Journal of Teacher Education*, 19(1), 95-112.
- Zimpher, N. L., deVoss, G. G., & Nott, D. (1980). A closer look at university student teacher supervision. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 31(4), 11-15.

Appendix I

Questionnaire Investigating the Role of the University Supervisor

* Please read each statement carefully and circle the number that best fits your expectation related to the university supervisor role:

- 1 = Absolutely must
- 2 = Preferably should
- 3 = Preferably should not
- 4 = Absolutely must not

UNIVERSITY SUPERVISOR

Category 1. Support role

University supervisor:

	Absolutely must	Preferably should	Preferably should not	Absolutely must not
	1	2	3	4
1. serve as a resource consultant for all teachers in the cooperating school	1	2	3	4
2. participate as a trainer in in-service training programs for cooperating teachers	1	2	3	4
3. contribute to the improvement of the language teaching program of the cooperating school	1	2	3	4
4. plan the practice teaching schedule with the student teacher and the cooperating teacher	1	2	3	4
5. serve as a research consultant for the cooperating teacher	1	2	3	4
6. work with the university department staff in developing a teacher training program for cooperating schools	1	2	3	4

Category 2. Supervision in lesson planning and practice teaching

University supervisor:

	1	2	3	4
7. check the student teacher's lesson plans for practice teaching	1	2	3	4
8. give written and oral feedback to the student teacher about his/her lesson plans	1	2	3	4
9. guide the student teacher in lesson planning, observation and classroom management	1	2	3	4
10. assist the student teacher in preparing lesson plans for practice teaching	1	2	3	4
11. observe the student teacher for at least two full lessons during the semester	1	2	3	4

Category 3. Liaison role for student teacher and cooperating teacher

University supervisor:

	Absolutely must	Preferably should	Preferably should not	Absolutely must not
12. introduce the student teacher to the school coordinator and the cooperating teacher				
13. inform the cooperating teacher about his/her responsibilities towards the student teacher and the university faculty	1	2	3	4
14. inform the student teacher about his/her responsibilities towards the cooperating teacher and the cooperating school	1	2	3	4
15. inform the student teacher about the practice teaching program, cooperating school, guidelines to follow and evaluation	1	2	3	4
	1	2	3	4

Category 4. Evaluation of the student teacher with the cooperating teacher

University supervisor:

16. make his/her evaluation of the student teacher available to the cooperating teacher				
17. share the responsibility of evaluation of the student teacher with the cooperating teacher	1	2	3	4
18. evaluate the activities and progress of the student teacher with the cooperating teacher periodically	1	2	3	4
19. decide on the final grade of the student teacher in collaboration with the cooperating teacher	1	2	3	4
	1	2	3	4

Category 5. Facilitating reflection

University supervisor:

20. guide the student teacher toward the goal of self-evaluation				
21. give written and oral feedback to the student teacher about his/her teaching performance				
22. help the student teacher put theory into practice	1	2	3	4
23. hold weekly conferences with the student teachers to discuss their experience at the cooperating school	1	2	3	4
	1	2	3	4
	1	2	3	4

Category 6. Working with the cooperating teacher***University supervisor:***

- | | Absolutely must | Preferably should | Preferably should not | Absolutely must not |
|---|-----------------|-------------------|-----------------------|---------------------|
| 24. conduct in-service sessions with the cooperating teachers to guide them in their partnership with the university faculty | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 25. work with the cooperating teacher in planning the student teacher's schedule | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 26. work with the cooperating teacher in developing a well-balanced program of student teaching activities and skills at different levels for the student teacher | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |

Category 7. Selecting cooperating teachers***University supervisor:***

- | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 27. assist the department head of the cooperating school in selecting cooperating teachers | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 28. observe the cooperating teacher prior to the placement of the student teacher for the purpose of selecting cooperating teachers | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 29. talk with the cooperating teacher prior to the placement of the student teacher in order to see his/her ideas and attitudes towards teaching and teaching practice | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 30. examine the lesson plans, materials, worksheets and exam sheets of the cooperating teacher in order to get some ideas about his/her approach in teaching and assessment | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |

Category 8. Guidance and evaluation of the cooperating teachers***University supervisor:***

- | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 31. evaluate the effectiveness and appropriateness of the cooperating teacher as a mentor during the period of practice teaching for the purpose of selecting/keeping the same teacher in the following semesters | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 32. use the student teacher's feedback about the cooperating teacher after the period of student teaching for the purpose of selecting/keeping the same teacher in the following semesters | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 33. conduct in-service sessions with the cooperating teachers to guide them in their partnership with the university faculty | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |

Category 9. Liaison role for the university-school partnership***University supervisor:***

	Absolutely must	Preferably should	Preferably should not	Absolutely must not
34. inform the cooperating school coordinator about the expectations/requirements of the university faculty				
35. inform the university faculty coordinator about the expectations/requirements of the cooperating school	1	2	3	4
36. keep in touch with the university and school coordinators and cooperating teachers of practice teaching for ongoing cooperation	1	2	3	4
	1	2	3	4

Category 10. Evaluation role as a supervisor***University supervisor:***

37. assume total responsibility for deciding on the final grade of the student teacher				
38. follow evaluation guidelines adopted by the university faculty	1	2	3	4
39. check whether the student teacher acts in accordance with the regulations of the Ministry of Education	1	2	3	4
	1	2	3	4

Appendix II

Questionnaire Investigating the Role of the Cooperating Teacher

* Please read each statement carefully and circle the number that best fits your expectation related to the cooperating teacher role:

1 = Absolutely must

2 = Preferably should

3 = Preferably should not

4 = Absolutely must not

COOPERATING TEACHER

Category 1. Orientation to the physical setup and equipment

Cooperating teacher:

	Absolutely must	Preferably should	Preferably should not	Absolutely must not
1. introduce the student teacher to administrators, staff, co-teachers and other school employees	1	2	3	4
2. show the student teacher the physical set up of the classroom, building and grounds	1	2	3	4
3. demonstrate operation and use of audio-visual equipment and office machines	1	2	3	4
4. supply the student teacher with copies of teacher's guides, manuals and aids	1	2	3	4
5. supply reference books and professional magazines to be used by the student teacher	1	2	3	4
6. provide the student teacher with a place for personal materials	1	2	3	4

Category 2. Sharing the knowledge of teaching

Cooperating teacher:

7. explain the procedures of study for each unit	1	2	3	4
8. demonstrate for the student teacher different methods or techniques of teaching	1	2	3	4
9. explain the principles underlying certain teaching techniques	1	2	3	4
10. guide the student teacher in reflecting on the preparation of lesson plans, selection of teaching materials and methods, delivery of lesson and evaluation of the teaching performance	1	2	3	4

Category 3. Observing and supervising student teaching

Cooperating teacher:

	Absolutely must	Preferably should	Preferably should not	Absolutely must not
11. observe the student teacher's lessons	1	2	3	4
12. fill in an observation/evaluation form for each practice teaching of the student teacher	1	2	3	4
13. keep a file of observation and evaluation forms of the activities and progress of the student teacher	1	2	3	4
14. make the completed observation/evaluation forms available to the student teacher	1	2	3	4

Category 4. Guidance in lesson planning

Cooperating teacher:

15. assist the student teacher in preparing lesson plans for practice teaching	1	2	3	4
16. check the student teacher's lesson plans for practice teaching	1	2	3	4
17. give oral and written feedback to the student teacher about his/her lesson plans	1	2	3	4

Category 5. Support role

Cooperating teacher:

18. invite the student teacher to participate in the staff meetings of the cooperating school	1	2	3	4
19. invite the student teacher to extra-curricular activities in the cooperating school	1	2	3	4
20. inform the student teacher about the important decisions taken in the staff meetings and other organizational meetings in the cooperating school	1	2	3	4
21. arrange for the student teacher to observe other teachers' classrooms	1	2	3	4
22. make his/her evaluation of the student teacher available to the university supervisor	1	2	3	4

	Absolutely must	Preferably should	Preferably should not	Absolutely must not
Category 6. Preparing for having a student teacher				
<i>Cooperating teacher:</i>				
23.				
24. work with the university supervisor in planning the student teacher's schedule	1	2	3	4
25. work with the university supervisor in developing a well-balanced program of student teaching activities and skills at different levels for the student teacher	1	2	3	4
26. plan the practice teaching schedule with the student teacher and the university supervisor	1	2	3	4
27. work with the university supervisor to prepare a set of observation guidelines for the student teacher	1	2	3	4

Category 7. Orientation to the school/classroom

atmosphere

Cooperating teacher:

27. introduce the student teacher to the pupils in the class	1	2	3	4
28. share with the student teacher information about the interests and abilities of the pupils in the class	1	2	3	4
29. explain all school rules, routines and policies	1	2	3	4

Category 8. Evaluation

Cooperating teacher:

30. share the responsibility of evaluation of the student teacher with the university supervisor	1	2	3	4
31. evaluate the activities and progress of the student teacher with the university supervisor periodically	1	2	3	4
32. decide on the final grade of the student teacher in collaboration with the university supervisor	1	2	3	4
33. follow evaluation guidelines adopted by the university faculty	1	2	3	4

Category 9. Facilitating student teacher autonomy				
<i>Cooperating teacher:</i>	Absolutely must	Preferably should	Preferably should not	Absolutely must not
34. give full charge of the class to the student teacher during practice teaching	1	2	3	4
35. leave the classroom to the student teacher for practice teaching from time to time	1	2	3	4
36. be easily accessible to the student teacher when he/she (cooperating teacher) leaves the classroom	1	2	3	4

Appendix III

ANOVA Summary Table for the Expectations of the Triad members for the Roles of the University Supervisors

<i>Source</i>		<i>df</i>	<i>SS</i>	<i>MS</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>	η^2
Factor 1	Between groups	2	9,991	4,996	5,107	,006	,027
	Within groups	368	360,009	,978			
	Total	371	370,000				
Factor 2	Between groups	2	1,482	,741	,740	,478	,004
	Within groups	368	368,518	1,001			
	Total	371	370,000				
Factor 3	Between groups	2	7,358	3,679	3,734	,025	,020
	Within groups	368	362,642	,985			
	Total	371	370,000				
Factor 4	Between groups	2	4,713	2,356	2,374	,095	,013
	Within groups	368	365,287	,993			
	Total	371	370,000				
Factor 5	Between groups	2	8,613	4,307	4,385	,013	,023
	Within groups	368	361,387	,982			
	Total	371	370,000				
Factor 6	Between groups	2	3,161	1,580	1,585	,206	,009
	Within groups	368	366,839	,997			
	Total	371	370,000				
Factor 7	Between groups	2	34,956	17,478	19,197	,000	,094
	Within groups	368	335,044	,910			
	Total	371	370,000				
Factor 8	Between groups	2	54,817	27,408	32,001	,000	,148
	Within groups	368	315,183	,856			
	Total	371	370,000				
Factor 9	Between groups	2	6,325	3,162	3,200	,042	,017
	Within groups	368	363,675	,988			
	Total	371	370,000				
Factor 10	Between groups	2	2,566	1,283	1,285	,278	,007
	Within groups	368	367,434	,998			
	Total	371	370,000				

Appendix IV

Expectations for the Role of the University Supervisors: High and Moderate Consensus within Triad Members

Questionnaire on the Role of the University Supervisors		University supervisor		Cooperating teacher		Student teacher	
		absolutely must	preferably should	absolutely must	preferably should	absolutely must	preferably should
Factor 1	25 serve as a resource consultant for all teachers in the cooperating school		MC*		MC		MC
	26 participate as a trainer in in-service training programs for cooperating teachers		HC**		MC		MC
	27 contribute to the improvement of the language teaching program of the cooperating school		MC		MC		MC
	33 plan the practice teaching schedule with the student teacher and the cooperating teacher		MC		MC		
	34 serve as a research consultant for the cooperating teacher		MC		MC		MC
	35 work with the university department staff in developing a teacher training program for cooperating schools		MC		MC		MC
Factor 2	12 check the student teacher's lesson plans for practice teaching	HC		HC		MC	
	13 give written and oral feedback to the student teacher about his/her lesson plans	HC		HC		HC	

* MC = Moderate consensus

** HC = High consensus

	14 guide the student teacher in lesson planning, observation and classroom management	HC	HC	HC	
	15 assist the student teacher in preparing lesson plans for practice teaching	MC	MC	MC	MC
	16 observe the student teacher for at least two full lessons during the semester	HC	MC		MC
	28 introduce the student teacher to the school coordinator and the cooperating teacher	MC	MC		MC
Factor 3	29 inform the cooperating teacher about his/her responsibilities towards the student teacher and the university faculty	HC			MC
	30 inform the student teacher about his/her responsibilities towards the cooperating teacher and the cooperating school	HC	HC		MC
	31 inform the student teacher about the practice teaching program, cooperating school, guidelines to follow and evaluation	HC	HC		MC
	38 make his/her evaluation of the student teacher available to the cooperating teacher	MC		MC	MC
Factor 4	39 share the responsibility of evaluation of the student teacher with the cooperating teacher	MC	MC		MC
	40 evaluate the activities and progress of the student teacher with the cooperating teacher periodically	MC		MC	MC

	41 decide on the final grade of the student teacher in collaboration with the cooperating teacher	MC		MC		MC
Factor 5	17 guide the student teacher toward the goal of self evaluation	HC		MC		MC
	18 give written and oral feedback to the student teacher about his/her teaching performance	HC		MC		HC
	19 help the student teacher put theory into practice	HC		MC		HC
	20 hold weekly conferences with the student teachers to discuss their experience at the cooperating school	MC	MC		MC	MC
Factor 6	8 conduct in-service sessions with the cooperating teachers to guide them in their partnership with the university faculty		MC		MC	MC
	9 work with the cooperating teacher in planning the student teacher's schedule		MC		MC	MC
	10 work with the cooperating teacher in developing a well-balanced program of student teaching activities and skills at different levels for the student teacher		MC		MC	MC
Factor 7	1 assist the department head of the cooperating school in selecting cooperating teachers		MC	MC		MC
	2 observe the cooperating teacher prior to the placement of the student teacher for the purpose of selecting cooperating teachers		HC		MC	MC

	3 talk with the cooperating teacher prior to the placement of the student teacher in order to see his/her ideas and attitudes towards teaching and teaching practice	HC	MC	MC
	4 examine the lesson plans, materials, worksheets and exam sheets of the cooperating teacher in order to get some ideas about his/her approach in teaching and assessment	MC	MC	MC
	5 evaluate the effectiveness and appropriateness of the cooperating teacher as a mentor during the period of practice teaching for the purpose of selecting/keeping the same teacher in the following semesters	MC	MC	MC
Factor 8	6 use the student teacher's feedback about the cooperating teacher after the period of student teaching for the purpose of selecting/keeping the same teacher in the following semesters	MC	MC	MC
	7 conduct in-service sessions with the cooperating teachers to guide them in their partnership with the university faculty	MC	MC	MC
	22 inform the cooperating school coordinator about the expectations/requirements of the university faculty	HC	MC	MC
Factor 9	23 inform the university faculty coordinator about the expectations/requirements of the cooperating school	MC	MC	MC
	24 keep in touch with the university and school coordinators and cooperating teachers of practice teaching for ongoing cooperation	MC		MC

	42 assume total responsibility for deciding on the final grade of the student teacher			MC
Factor 10	43 follow evaluation guidelines adopted by the university faculty	MC	HC	MC
	44 check whether the student teacher acts in accordance with the regulations of the Ministry of Education	MC	MC	MC

Appendix V

ANOVA Summary Table for the Expectations of the Triad members for the Roles of the Cooperating Teachers

<i>Source</i>		<i>df</i>	<i>SS</i>	<i>MS</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>	η^2
Factor 1	Between groups	2	27,784	13,892	14,939	,000	,075
	Within groups	368	342,216	,930			
	Total	371	370,000				
Factor 2	Between groups	2	6,504	3,252	3,292	,038	,018
	Within groups	368	363,496	,988			
	Total	371	370,000				
Factor 3	Between groups	2	8,209	4,104	4,175	,016	,022
	Within groups	368	361,791	,983			
	Total	371	370,000				
Factor 4	Between groups	2	1,316	,658	,657	,519	,004
	Within groups	368	368,684	1,002			
	Total	371	370,000				
Factor 5	Between groups	2	22,835	11,418	12,103	,000	,062
	Within groups	368	347,165	,943			
	Total	371	370,000				
Factor 6	Between groups	2	33,362	16,681	18,235	,000	,090
	Within groups	368	336,638	,915			
	Total	371	370,000				
Factor 7	Between groups	2	14,458	7,229	7,482	,001	,039
	Within groups	368	355,542	,966			
	Total	371	370,000				
Factor 8	Between groups	2	6,266	3,133	3,170	,043	,017
	Within groups	368	363,734	,988			
	Total	371	370,000				
Factor 9	Between groups	2	,447	,224	,223	,800	,001
	Within groups	368	369,553	1,004			
	Total	371	370,000				

Appendix VI

Expectations for the Role of the Cooperating Teachers: High and Moderate Consensus within Triad Members

Questionnaire on the Role of the Cooperating Teachers		University supervisor		Cooperating teacher		Student teacher	
		absolutely must	preferably should	absolutely must	preferably should	absolutely must	preferably should
Factor 1	5 introduce the student teacher to administrators, staff, co-teachers and other school employees	HC		MC		MC	MC
	6 show the student teacher the physical set up of the classroom, building and grounds	MC			HC		MC
	7 demonstrate operation and use of audio-visual equipment and office machines	HC			MC	MC	
	8 supply the student teacher with copies of teacher’s guides, manuals and aids	HC			MC	MC	
	9 supply reference books and professional magazines to be used by the student teacher		HC		MC	MC	
	10 provide the student teacher with a place for personal materials		HC		MC		MC
Factor 2	15 explain the procedures of study for each unit	MC	MC		MC	MC	
	16 demonstrate for the student teacher different methods or techniques of teaching		HC		MC	MC	
	17 explain the principles underlying certain teaching techniques		HC		MC		MC
	35 guide the student teacher in reflecting on the preparation of lesson plans, selection of teaching materials and methods, delivery of lesson and evaluation of the teaching performance	MC			MC	MC	

Factor 3	29 observe the student teacher's lessons	HC		HC		MC
	30 fill in an observation/evaluation form for each lesson presentation of the student teacher	HC		MC	MC	MC
	31 keep a file of observation and evaluation forms of the activities and progress of the student teacher	HC			MC	MC
	32 make the completed observation/evaluation forms available to the student teacher	HC			MC	MC
Factor 4	26 assist the student teacher in preparing lesson plans for presentations	MC			MC	MC
	27 check the student teacher's lesson plans for presentations	MC	MC	MC		MC
	28 give oral and written feedback to the student teacher about his/her lesson plans	HC		MC		MC
Factor 5	14 invite the student teacher to participate in the staff meetings of the cooperating school		MC			MC
	40 invite the student teacher to extra-curricular activities in the cooperating school		HC		MC	MC
	41 inform the student teacher about the important decisions taken in the staff meetings and other organizational meetings in the cooperating school		MC		MC	MC
	42 arrange for the student teacher to observe other teachers' classrooms		MC		MC	MC
	43 make his/her evaluation of the student teacher available to the university supervisor	HC			MC	MC

Fcator 6	2 work with the university supervisor in planning the student teacher's schedule	MC		MC	MC
	3 work with the university supervisor in developing a well-balanced program of student teaching activities and skills at different levels for the student teacher		MC	MC	MC
	24 plan the practice teaching schedule with the student teacher and the university supervisor	MC		MC	MC
	25 work with the university supervisor to prepare a set of observation guidelines for the student teacher		MC	MC	MC
Fcator 7	11 introduce the student teacher to the pupils in the class	HC	HC		MC
	12 share with the student teacher information about the interests and abilities of the pupils in the class	HC	MC		MC
	13 explain all school rules, routines and policies	HC	MC		MC
Fcator 8	36 share the responsibility of evaluation of the student teacher with the university supervisor	HC		MC	MC
	37 evaluate the activities and progress of the student teacher with the university supervisor periodically	MC		HC	MC
	38 decide on the final grade of the student teacher in collaboration with the university supervisor	MC		MC	MC
	39 follow evaluation guidelines adopted by the university faculty	HC		MC	MC
Fcator 44	44 give full charge of the class to the student teacher for lesson presentations	HC	MC		MC

45 leave the classroom to the student teacher for practice teaching from time to time	MC	MC	MC
46 be easily accessible to the student teacher when he/she leaves the classroom		MC	MC

Appendix VII

ANOVA Summary Table for the Expectations of the Student Teachers in Different Universities for the Roles of the University Supervisors

<i>Source</i>		<i>df</i>	<i>SS</i>	<i>MS</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>	η^2
Factor 1	Between groups	3	2,944	,981	1,012	,388	,013
	Within groups	234	226,844	,969			
	Total	238	233,147				
Factor 2	Between groups	3	14,987	4,996	4,531	,004	,055
	Within groups	234	258,012	1,103			
	Total	238	273,530				
Factor 3	Between groups	3	20,105	6,702	6,468	,000	,077
	Within groups	234	242,464	1,036			
	Total	238	263,121				
Factor 4	Between groups	3	6,674	2,225	1,997	,115	,025
	Within groups	234	260,719	1,114			
	Total	238	268,688				
Factor 5	Between groups	3	9,661	3,220	2,774	,042	,034
	Within groups	234	271,664	1,161			
	Total	238	283,512				
Factor 6	Between groups	3	7,874	2,625	2,480	,062	,031
	Within groups	234	247,695	1,059			
	Total	238	255,624				
Factor 7	Between groups	3	6,743	2,248	3,549	,015	,044
	Within groups	234	148,184	,633			
	Total	238	167,134				
Factor 8	Between groups	3	1,858	,619	,879	,452	,011
	Within groups	234	164,864	,705			
	Total	238	182,283				
Factor 9	Between groups	3	13,762	4,587	4,589	,004	,056
	Within groups	234	233,916	1,000			
	Total	238	249,945				
Factor 10	Between groups	3	5,163	1,721	1,443	,231	,018
	Within groups	234	279,126	1,193			
	Total	238	284,935				

Appendix VIII

ANOVA Summary Table for the Expectations of the Student Teachers in Different Universities for the Roles of the Cooperating Teachers

<i>Source</i>		<i>df</i>	<i>SS</i>	<i>MS</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>	η^2
Factor 1	Between groups	3	3,270	1,090	1,131	,337	,014
	Within groups	234	225,586	,964			
	Total	238	236,979				
Factor 2	Between groups	3	11,296	3,765	3,858	,010	,047
	Within groups	234	228,385	,976			
	Total	238	241,672				
Factor 3	Between groups	3	8,319	2,773	2,621	,051	,033
	Within groups	234	247,584	1,058			
	Total	238	256,308				
Factor 4	Between groups	3	21,290	7,097	6,777	,000	,080
	Within groups	234	245,027	1,047			
	Total	238	266,773				
Factor 5	Between groups	3	9,372	3,124	3,018	,031	,037
	Within groups	234	242,217	1,035			
	Total	238	256,006				
Factor 6	Between groups	3	5,760	1,920	2,596	,053	,032
	Within groups	234	173,067	,740			
	Total	238	188,630				
Factor 7	Between groups	3	18,053	6,018	5,906	,001	,070
	Within groups	234	238,405	1,019			
	Total	238	259,699				
Factor 8	Between groups	3	16,602	5,534	5,393	,001	,065
	Within groups	234	240,146	1,026			
	Total	238	257,550				
Factor 9	Between groups	3	3,421	1,140	1,021	,384	,013
	Within groups	234	261,340	1,117			
	Total	238	264,761				