CO-OPERATING TEACHERS' AND STUDENT TEACHERS' EXPECTATIONS ABOUT INSTRUMENTAL MUSIC STUDENT TEACHING IN AN ONTARIO PLACEMENT

By

Mary Bernadette Berthelotte

A DISSERTATION

Submitted to
Michigan State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

MUSIC EDUCATION

2007

ABSTRACT

CO-OPERATING TEACHERS' AND STUDENT TEACHERS' EXPECTATIONS ABOUT INSTRUMENTAL MUSIC STUDENT TEACHING IN AN ONTARIO PLACEMENT

By

Mary Bernadette Berthelotte

The purpose of this study was to investigate the similarities and differences between the expectations of selected pairs of co-operating teachers and their student teachers regarding instrumental music student teaching. Four co-operating music teachers and four instrumental music student teachers participated in this study. Instrumental music student teachers and co-operating music teachers experienced two three week teaching blocks at either a secondary or elementary level. During this time period, data were collected through one-on-one interviews; two focus group interviews and journaling while student teaching.

Six themes emerged: (1) Building a school community; (2) The blame game; (3) It's overwhelming; (4) Do as I do, not as I say; (5) Assessing versus assisting; and (6) The co-operating teacher as the sage. Building a school community involved student teachers and co-operating teachers wanting to be immersed in the school community, despite co-operating teachers not feeling that they were ready. The Blame game involved both the student teachers and the co-operating teachers putting the onus of responsibility on the other party rather than engaging in critical self-reflection. Fears, concerns and many questions were central to the theme "It's overwhelming." Student teachers displayed fears regarding a multitude of issues including classroom management, fear of their own shortcomings as a music teacher in front of their students and their co-operating

teacher and getting everything done. Co-operating teachers were concerned with getting the student teachers to understand their role as music educators, maintaining the pace of the curriculum, not wanting their classroom students to get behind, and having time for their student teachers. "Do as I do, not as I say," was a result of mixed messages for the student teachers from the co-operating teachers. Student teachers conformed to the styles of teaching of their co-operating teachers as a survival technique to get them through their placements. Student teachers were frustrated that they were not encouraged to develop their own styles as teachers of music. Co-operating teachers, on the other hand, identified a lack of time and unknown teaching methods as a restraint on their being willing to let the student be creative in the classroom. Assisting versus assessing described the conflict that co-operating teachers faced when evaluating their student teachers. Co-operating teachers needed to grade and evaluate their student teachers using generic evaluation sheets provided by the Faculty of Education, while at the same time assisting the student teachers in becoming better music teachers. Co-operating teachers who were "sages" thought of themselves as learners. Some co-operating teachers described as sages by their student teachers saw their co-operating role as a shared experience between themselves and the student teacher. Implications for practice include more knowledge and training for co-operating teachers, longer placements for student teachers, selected instrumental music programs in which to place student teachers, selection of co-operating teachers who are reflective practitioners who can promote critical thinking and reflection in their student teachers and collaborative decision making between the co-operating teachers and student teachers regarding the amount of teaching to be done during block teaching placements.

Dedicated to the Ewing Women.

Catherine Theresa Ewing (my Grandmother, 1910-1976)

Catherine Morley Ewing (my incredible mother)

Ann Gertrude Ewing (my Aunt and editor)

Grace Elizabeth Ewing (my Aunt, 1947-2002)

The integrity, grace and courage with which they have conducted their lives, has provided encouragement and purpose as to how I conduct mine.

I am grateful.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Throughout this journey there are many people to thank for their support, encouragement and teaching. To my advisor Dr. Cynthia Taggart who changed the way I teach and think about teaching. You have been a profound role model throughout this degree. To Dr. Mitchell Robinson who directed my paper on numerous occasions, offering great insight and encouragement to persevere. To Professor Janine Gaboury who reminded me of the role that French horn plays in my life, and how much I need to play it. The participants of this study, you have contributed to necessary research that will change things for the better.

Thank you to my friends. My best friend Corey Fitzpatrick, whose encouragement, support and belief in me has never faltered. To my great friend Dr. Victoria Oglan, peer reviewer, personal director, partnership in this journey. The phone calls meant everything to me, and always came at the right time. Maureen Harris, the visits to the library to make sure I got it done, especially when I did not want to go. To my life partner Bob Soulliere. You have been along for the ride for all these years, and I want to thank you for never getting off. I am very grateful to you for your love and support.

Finally, to the three most important people in my life, my children; Michelle, Daniel and Gerry. I've been doing this since you were six, seven and nine years old. You have reminded me that learning is life long and your humour, curiosity and thoughtfulness when it was difficult, are the things about all of you that I am the most proud of.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

Rude Awakening

Early on a Monday morning in October 1984, I reported to the secondary school for my first instrumental music student teaching placement. I would be there for 3 weeks. My co-operating teacher, whom I had never met, arrived 5 minutes before the bell for first period. He introduced himself to me, showed me the music office, gave me a copy of his schedule with his attendance lists for his classes, and informed me that he was taking his concert choir to sing at a Mass. He asked me to meet him the next morning at 8:15 a.m., and he left me to teach the rest of his classes alone.

Period one was a grade ten instrumental music class of about 25 students. Because I had no opportunity to observe first, I had no knowledge of his classroom routine, no knowledge of where any equipment or music was, and no idea what this particular class was studying. Most important, because I did not know that I would be teaching the class, I was not prepared to teach.

I did the logical things. I took attendance, I wrote my name on the board, I did not tell them that I was a student teacher, and I began to warm them up. There were two profound realizations that morning. The first was that 75 minutes is a long time when you are not prepared. The second I must preface with what I believed I felt when I was a grade ten student in high school. Music for me was what I looked forward to the most each school day. All the way through high school, music was my favourite class. I "hung out" with band kids, and a lot of our conversations surrounded band issues, such as the particular pieces we were playing, the ones we liked and did not like, and so forth. I do

not recall spending time with students in high school who did not feel the same way about music. With that and only that perspective, I was haunted when I stepped up to the podium for this grade ten class. It was immediately apparent to me that these students did not feel the same way about music that I had felt in grade ten. This revelation was stunning, and an immediate feeling of failure set in. I had no idea that this attitude toward music class could happen.

There's No Place Like Home

In my second student teaching placement in November, 1984, I was assigned to an itinerant music teacher who covered ten grade schools. I would be with her for the next three weeks. Her enrolment in music classes varied from one student to as many as 35. She covered grades seven and eight music classes in each of her ten schools and saw just under 400 students per week. Her music rooms varied, depending on the school. She taught in the library, the gym, a custodial supply room, the staff room, and, in one school, the hallway at the back of the school. The environment did not allow for posters, charts, or anything that signified the viability of music as a subject in a school setting.

The itinerant teacher virtually carried her office in the trunk of her car. Upon arrival at each school, she unloaded a box of wire stands, a box of reeds, mouthpiece sanitizer, tool box, and a box of music scores that the particular group was learning. Her travel time between schools was her lunchtime, and she usually arrived just in time to set up her equipment in order for class to begin. There was no time for her to really act as a co-operating teacher. There was no time for an orientation with her. Feedback consisted of a conversation about what we would do in the afternoon schools. The feedback lasted a short time, as we were traveling to different schools and we traveled in separate cars.

This type of job did not allow for extra-musical activities. The majority of the students were bussed between school and home. Because my co-operating teacher had no home school to speak of, she did not know many of the staff or administrators of the schools at which she taught. She did not really "belong" anywhere.

Music participation was voluntary, and students who forgot their instruments at home on instrumental music day simply sat in music class, during which they were often disruptive. Further, students who were enrolled in music at these schools were taken out of their regular classroom for 60 minutes per week to attend music class. Those students had to make up the work that was missed. In one particular school in which music took place in the gym, there was an assembly each of the three weeks I was there. Although music was scheduled as part of the school activities, it was also cancelled because of the school activities, usually with no prior notice to the teacher. The biggest "light-bulb" moments I had during this practice teaching block were that the administration did not value music in their schools and that the job of an itinerant music teacher was almost impossible to do well. The co-operating teacher did not like her job. She was surviving until she was able to secure a position at a "real" school. I began to believe that it would be nearly impossible to experience success under these circumstances. Again, I felt as if I had failed.

The Competitor

My final placement for the year at Teachers' College took place in a secondary school. It was in an affluent area of town. I met my co-operating teacher the week before I was to begin my student teaching. He showed me around the school, introduced me to administration and other staff in our wing of the school, and supplied me with a schedule

of classes as well as scores and information on other things they were doing. From my first official day, I was expected to teach 100% of the teaching load, conduct extra curricular rehearsals, teach theory, and help prepare for both the year-end concert and the musical "Fiddler on the Roof."

Although I was not particularly excited about teaching, I was elated that, after this experience, I would have completed my year as a student teacher. I was, however, hoping for a good student teaching experience and was eager to work with this organized co-operating teacher.

Upon arrival the first day of this placement, I began the class with what I had prepared, a warm-up targeting certain portions of pieces on which the students were working. The behaviour of this grade 11 music class was appalling. I knew it would be hard to replace the regular teacher, but I was shocked that the level of maturity of these students would be so low, given the grade that they were in. I tried to accelerate the pace of the lesson, kept all sections involved, limited sectional work to a minute, started and stopped with a purpose when conducting, and followed my lesson plan. What I came to realize was that the students did not know what the co-operating teacher told me they knew. I felt as if I had been set up to fail. Further, for the entire first day and subsequent days, my co-operating teacher was never in the room when I taught, so I never received meaningful feedback on how to improve.

For the next three weeks, I began to re-teach the music in the students' folders. I addressed fundamentals, such as rhythms, phrasing, dynamics, intonation, posture, and fingerings with the students. They began to respond to me. They played better, and they looked forward to playing. They began to use appropriate musical terminology, and I had

some fun. But, I was exhausted and frustrated. I felt completely alone, and the stress of constantly taking risks with lessons made me feel inadequate. With no appropriate feedback from the co-operating teacher, I never knew what I should do next. I would simply take chances and try something. Sometimes it worked, and sometimes it did not.

The end of each school day was the only time I spoke with my co-operating teacher. He would present me with a piece of paper that had two columns. One column used the heading "strengths" and the other "weaknesses." The weaknesses column was always full, and the strengths had little or nothing in it. I could not understand how he was identifying my weaknesses without having seen me teach. I felt angry and defeated. I felt as if I had to work harder for two reasons. First, I was the only female secondary instrumental music major enrolled at the Teacher's College that year. All of my professors of music education courses as well as my co-operating teachers in secondary practicums had been male up to this point, and, while part of it may have been that I had something to prove as a female, I also felt taken advantage of as a student teacher. There were no female secondary instrumental music teachers in the school board in which I was assigned to teach. The second reason was that these students deserved to learn to play correctly. I believed that, when taught well, they could respond more positively. These students were responding to me as a result of re-teaching things I believed they already knew initially. They were feeling better about themselves as musicians. My co-operating teacher appeared to be upset by the fact that students were responding and were performing better than before I had arrived. He seemed jealous. The co-operating teacher spent a great deal of time telling me about his accomplishments. He knew that I had a Master's degree in French horn performance and that I was a professional performer in

the symphony and free-lanced.

At the end of this practice teaching block, my co-operating teacher and I sat down to discuss my final evaluation. I was puzzled at how he would arrive at a grade for me. He had not seen me teach once in my four weeks in this setting. He never saw me pick myself up and brush myself off when a lesson plan failed. As an evaluation tool, my co-operating teacher asked what grade I thought I deserved. I told him that I deserved an A+ because he had no reason, without seeing me teach or directing me in any way, to give me anything else. My co-operating teacher then told me that he used his students to evaluate me, because he believed that their response to a teacher was indicative of the success of that teacher. My sense was that he was unaware of his role as a co-operating teacher; I was a convenience for him, allowing him to take a break. He was not taking responsibility for helping me develop as a future music educator. I knew that I would not get a meaningful evaluation from him, but I did get an A+. For what? I will never know.

Statement of the Problem

Before and as I began my year as a student teacher at Teachers' College, I had many expectations. Most of these expectations were beliefs and perspectives that I had formed through my experiences as a high school band student. I recalled the power that music had on my life during those years, and I believed, to some extent, that I could re-create that power for my own students. I believed that, at Teacher's College, I would be shown how to do that and offered opportunities that would provide me with positive teaching experiences. I expected that my co-operating teacher would be impressed by my musicianship, and I, in turn, would be in awe of his expertise as a classroom teacher. These expectations were shattered by the experience in the "real world" of the classroom.

On the other hand, and without completely blaming the co-operating teacher, I had no expectations for myself. I did not know how to take ownership of the experience I was about to have and subsequently experienced. I believe now that, had I been more aware of my own expectations and had the ability to voice those to my co-operating teachers, the experiences may have been different. Rather, I gave all the power to my co-operating teachers without realizing that they, too, did not know what to expect from the experiences.

Even though student teaching is often seen by students as being the most valuable part of their preservice education (Blakey, Everett-Turner, Massing, & Scott, 1988; Fallin, J. & Royse, D. 2000;), literature suggests that not only are the results of this experience questionable in terms of effectiveness in preparing teachers, but some of the experiences are less than positive and can be misleading (Holt-Reynolds, 1992; Schmidt & Kennedy, 1990). According to Schmidt & Kennedy (1990), students enter teacher training with well-developed beliefs and preconceptions about teaching that are based primarily on their experiences as students themselves. As a result they often have unrealistic views about their teaching abilities, their need for teacher education, and their own abilities as future teachers (Richards & Killen, 1993).

The dilemmas and difficulties that I experienced during my student teaching were unanticipated and left me feeling a like a failure, as well as unprepared to teach music. While at the time I believed that the role of the co-operating teacher had not been fulfilled appropriately, I now realize that my attitude regarding classroom teaching, my lack of preparation in methods courses, my lack of classroom management skills, the lack of a realistic philosophy of music education, and a flawed desire to teach also contributed to

my feeling like a failure. However, my co-operating teachers also were partly responsible because they were not aware of their roles and did not understand what was expected of me. The lack of feedback, poor supervision, difficult working relationships, and my fear of approaching the co-operating teachers were indicative of their inability to act as co-operating teachers because, I believe, they did not know how to do so. The short vignettes at the beginning of this chapter are representative of memories that remain the most vivid of my student teaching experiences. These experiences have led to the current research study as well as to my belief in the importance of a quality student teaching experience and co-operating teaching experience.

Much has been written about the triangle of participants involved in the success or failure of student teaching (Griffin, 1989; Kagan, 1987; Richards & Killen, 1994; Richardson-Koehler, 1988;). However, literature regarding the expectations of co-operating teachers and the expectations of student teachers during their placements in general, and in instrumental music teaching in particular, is limited. The ability to identify these expectations from the perspective of both the co-operating teachers and the student teachers could improve the overall quality of the field experience for both parties, resulting in a richer, more meaningful learning experience.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to investigate the similarities and differences between the expectations of selected pairs of co-operating teachers and their student teachers regarding the student teaching experience during instrumental music teaching blocks. The specific research questions are as follows:

- How do co-operating teachers and student teachers describe their

expectations of the other in an instrumental music placement?

- How do co-operating teachers and student teachers describe the role of the other?
- What kind of relationships do the co-operating teachers and student teachers expect to have with the other?
- What factors cause stress for co-operating teachers and student teachers when working with one another?

Gaining an understanding of these expectations and their diversity could result in a more productive learning experience for co-operating teachers and student teachers.

Expectations of the co-operating teacher and student teacher in terms of their roles are often misunderstood by both the co-operating teachers themselves as well as the student teachers assigned to them, and are in need of clarification (Berthelotte, 2000). Issues, such as providing and receiving feedback, developing a relationship between a student teacher and co-operating teacher, evaluation strategies for the student teacher, reflective practice, role modeling, amount of time co-operating teachers and student teachers should expect to have with each other, and expectations regarding a music teacher's role need to be addressed.

The expectations of the student teacher also need to be addressed. From a student teacher's perspective, student teaching contains many inconsistencies. Issues such as (a) evaluation, (b) expectations of the co-operating teacher, (c) type of feedback received from the co-operating teacher, and (d) the amount of time a co-operating teacher is willing to provide the student are inconsistent from co-operating teacher to co-operating teacher and leave student teachers feeling isolated and stressed (Berthelotte, 2000;

McDonald, 1993). In a pilot project conducted at the University of Windsor, Berthelotte (2000) found that student teachers and co-operating teachers have many inconsistent expectations of each other from one practice teaching placement to the next.

Framing the Problem

Research concerning the student teaching experience has led researchers to believe that the triad of the co-operating teacher, the student teacher, and the university supervisor is directly involved in either the success or failure of a student teacher's experiences (Brand, 1985; McDonald, 1993;). All roles in this triangle are crucial to the successful outcomes of student teaching. However, for the purposes of this research study, only issues pertaining to the co-operating teacher and the student teacher will be the primary focus.

The Co-operating Teacher

Researchers have found that co-operating teachers play a critical role in the professional growth and socialization of student teachers (Boydell, 1986; Griffin, 1989; Miklos & Green, 1987). Theoretically, a co-operating teacher accepts the responsibility for the field supervision of a student teacher. In practice, however, the role of the co-operating teacher is ambiguous. Some researchers suggest that co-operating teachers are oriented to the more practical aspects of teacher training and are generally unprepared for the task of adequate student teacher supervision (Griffin, 1989; Grimmet & Ratzlaff, 1986; Richardson-Koehler, 1988; Shavelson & Stern, 1981). Gillis (1987) sees the co-operating teacher as a way to bridge the gap between theory and practice. Griffin (1989) suggests that co-operating teachers orient their supervisory role to either that of facilitator or an apprenticeship model, in which students are expected to emulate their teachers.

According to Kahn (1999), current research on student teaching and the student teacher experience has often neglected the point of view of the co-operating teachers. Through interviews with 20 co-operating teachers, Kahn obtained data on how co-operating teachers identified a successful student teaching experience and what they believed could enhance their success as student mentors. Results from interviews confirmed certain trends in these perceptions, including the importance of a "mutual learning relationship" between student and co-operating teacher. Co-operating teachers also requested greater support and collaboration from the university community, as defined by (a) improved communication about university expectations, (b) more in-service courses for co-operating teachers, (c) more input from co-operating teachers on the content and delivery of methods courses, and (d) more input from co-operating teachers in the development of teacher education programs.

The traditional role of the co-operating teacher as the direct supervisor of student teachers continues to be important because the student teaching experience represents the student teacher's "real life" entrance into the profession of teaching. However, it is clear that the scope of this task is being broadened, as co-operating teachers desire to play a greater role in the overall training of student teachers, including identifying criteria for selecting student teachers, helping design professional development programs for individual and school improvement, and participating in research endeavours intended to broaden the teacher preparation knowledge base (Association of Teacher Educators, 1991).

MacDonald (1993) found that co-operating teachers are unsure of their roles and could benefit from having them more clearly defined. According to MacDonald, co-

operating teachers describe having a student teacher in their classroom as having both good and bad outcomes. The outcomes often depend on the relationships that the co-operating teachers have with their student teachers. When co-operating teachers perceive that the relationships between themselves and the student teachers are good, there are more good outcomes and fewer bad ones. Researchers for the past 40 years have consistently found that it is the co-operating teachers who play the most significant role in helping the student teachers direct themselves in the many decision-making aspects that go along with successful teaching (Boydell, 1986; Conant, 1963; Griffin, 1989; Karmos & Jacko, 1977; Manning, 1977; Miklos & Greene, 1987). The majority of student teachers view their co-operating teachers as being more influential than their university supervisors during their student teaching experiences (Boydell, 1986; Griffin, 1989). A study conducted by Calderhead (1987) suggests that, in many situations, student teachers reject feedback from university staff, as it is perceived to differ from the feedback given by their co-operating teachers. Student teachers feel that it is the co-operating teacher who holds the more expert opinion. In addition, Calderhead's study revealed that student teachers' lesson planning and teaching were influenced by differences in opinions between the co-operating teachers and their university supervisors. In those instances, co-operating teachers were regarded as the most reliable source of knowledge about real teaching.

Woolley (1997) conducted a study of student teachers' perceptions of their supervision by their co-operating teachers. An open-ended survey was used to gather the opinions of 469 student teachers. Common themes involved important skills and characteristics of successful co-operating teachers. These themes included type of

guide/mentor, understanding expectations, feedback, evaluation/grades, expert, style, power, availability, and support. Results revealed that, while student teachers were pleased with their supervision for the most part, they identified a lack of communication in expectations, feedback, and guidance through their student teaching experience as areas needing improvement. Woolley suggested that offering more workshops for co-operating teachers on providing feedback, clarifying expectations, and giving guidance could result in a more successful experience for both the student teacher and the co-operating teacher.

The Student Teacher

By the time student teachers are ready for the experience of teaching in a classroom setting, they have successfully completed their methods courses. Student teaching provides the preservice teacher an opportunity to practice these methodologies. However, the transfer of methodological theories to student teaching practices may not occur (Gallant, 1992). While student teaching is an important facet of becoming a teacher, according to Gallant, student teaching is different from inservice teaching, and lessons learned in undergraduate study may not transfer to the student teaching experience.

Student teachers themselves have complained that their university teacher training provides inadequate preparation for dealing with some specific issues, such as discipline, and is too theoretical, with insufficient practical application (Pataniczek & Isaacson, 1989). The university has a responsibility to provide the student teacher with a combination of music methodology and other course work that can be applied to classroom teaching, as well as to prepare musicians to further develop their skills in order

to be excellent in a music-teacher role. Towards these ends, the university is expected to offer appropriate courses and experiences that will result in such achievement. These classes usually include instrumental techniques, voice, keyboard, conducting, ear training, sight singing, music history, music theory, child development and educational psychology, which are presented in a sequential order meant to aid in the development of the music education student. Further, the university must provide structured observations at elementary, middle school, or secondary levels to prepare the student to function well in the classroom.

Kelly (2000) suggests that the university should ensure that students of music education develop sufficient subject-matter expertise, appropriate instructional techniques, and adequate classroom management skills to progress through student teaching and into the beginning years of inservice teaching. Although the university is attempting to teach the novice to be a thoughtful, imaginative, empathic, creative teacher, the outcome of the student teaching experience often has been a new teacher who is dogmatic and authoritarian (Zeichner & Tabachnick, 1981). Further, a study by Howey (1983) revealed that the impact of university-based knowledge is often substantially diluted or abandoned during the student teaching experience by students who see what they do at the university as not being relevant or important in the real world of teaching.

Student teachers have an opportunity to face their fears during their student teaching experience. Fears about discipline and classroom management, failure (not being cut out for teaching), not being competent, and not meeting expectations are examples of such fears (Schmidt, 1994). However, according to Kelly (2000), if pre-internship fears are not successfully resolved during preservice training and student

teaching experiences, these fears may continue during the initial years of inservice teaching and, if left unresolved, may negatively affect an individual's success as a teacher.

MacDonald (1992) found that, although student teachers consider student teaching a valuable experience, they also view student teaching as the most stressful part of their teacher education program. MacDonald (1993) conducted a study with 11 student teachers to investigate the strategies student teachers developed to cope with stress. Factors such as role clarification, expectations, conformity, time management, pacing, evaluation, assignments, peer discussions, and feedback were all sources of stress for these student teachers. Berthelotte's (2000) pilot study concerning expectations of student teachers by their co-operating teacher supported MacDonald's findings.

The University Supervisor.

Even though the roles of the co-operating teacher and the student teacher are the foci of discussion for this study, it is important to briefly discuss the role of the university supervisor, as the university supervisor can have either a positive or negative effect on the student teaching experience (Slick, 1998). University supervisors' roles are varied. The supervisor ensures that all requirements are completed during the student teaching experience. They are facilitators of relationships among students, teachers, and school administrators. They also serve as a personal confidante of the other two members of the triad (Griffin et al., 1983; Koeheler, 1984; Zimpler, DeVoss, & Nott, 1980). Further, according to O'Neal (1983), the university supervisor can help to raise the level of discourse during feedback sessions between the co-operating teacher and the student teacher.

Some advocate the elimination of this supervisory position, while still others advocate a clearer definition of its role and role expectations (Emans, 1983; Zeichner & Teitlebaum, 1982). Richardson-Koehler (1988) drew three conclusions from a study investigating barriers to the effective supervision of student teaching by the university supervisor. The first conclusion was that there is a lack of time, both in the supervisor's observation of the student teacher and in the feedback sessions between the university supervisor and the student teacher. The second conclusion involved the sense that both the co-operating teacher and student teacher were being evaluated. In three-way assessments, problems concerning the co-operating teacher and student teacher were not discussed, whereas one-on-one conversations with the university supervisor and the student teacher resulted in significant time being spent discussing such problems. The third conclusion described the co-operating teachers' perceptions of the university supervisors. Several co-operating teachers suggested that there existed a university perspective rather than a classroom perspective in the interactions of the university supervisor. The supervisors did not take the time to learn about the school setting in which they were evaluating student teachers, which, in turn, would allow university supervisors an opportunity to make student teachers more aware of expectations.

This particular study centers on investigating and comparing the expectations between the co-operating teacher and the student teacher in instrumental music settings. The university supervisor is important in the context of understanding the triangle; however, that part of the triangle is not a primary focus of this investigation.

Summary

The focus of this study is the nature and extent of both the co-operating teacher

and the student teacher during instrumental music teaching blocks. Although ambiguous, the role of the co-operating teacher is integral to the nature and quality of the student teaching experience. In practice, the co-operating teachers' expectations of student teachers manifest themselves in a variety of ways, and these expectations affect the relationship between the co-operating teacher and the student teacher, which is a key factor in the quality of the student teacher and co-operating teacher experience.

Student teachers consider student teaching to be a valuable experience. However, many student teachers feel inadequately prepared to translate theory into practice. Their undergraduate experiences often do not prepare them to implement effective methodologies, nor do they feel prepared for the "real world" classroom experiences. Student teaching is an opportunity to confront the variety of fears associated with practical classroom experiences. Therefore, student teachers should be aware of co-operating teachers' expectations and of exactly how these individuals view a student teacher's role as a second source of knowledge and authority in the classroom in order to be as successful as possible.

Definition of Terms

Defining terms within the confines of a study allows the reader to better understand the intent of the author. Terms for this particular study are based on terminology used at the University of Windsor by Faculty of Education professors and are familiar to both the student teachers and their co-operating teachers.

Inservice teacher: A teacher qualified by the Ministry of Education in the province of Ontario who is on a paid contract at either an elementary or secondary school level.

Co-operating teacher: A teacher with a minimum of five years teaching experience who supervises the student teacher during a three-week teaching block in the same area of expertise in which the student teacher is applying to be provincially qualified.

Teaching block: Student teaching in a classroom for three consecutive weeks in either an elementary or secondary school setting.

Student teaching: The placement of student teachers in classrooms in which they teach under the supervision of their co-operating teachers. These placements will occur in both elementary and secondary school settings.

CHAPTER TWO

Review of Related Literature

Student teaching is an important aspect of most teacher education programs. According to Conant (1963), student teaching remains the one indisputably essential element in professional education. For many prospective teachers, it is their first prolonged experience in the role of music teacher. In Ontario, student teaching experiences usually begin at the end of a completed four-year degree in a chosen subject area. Student teachers attend a Faculty of Education for 26 weeks, totalling two semesters. During this time student teachers are required to teach for 64 days, supervised by a co-operating teacher, and spend the rest of this time attending related education methodology courses. For many students, the student teaching experience includes a sudden confrontation with numerous unforeseen situations, expectations, and demands, some of which may clash with previously held ideals. Pritchard (1974) refers to this year at Teachers' College as the shortest apprenticeship period of any profession in which the purpose is "to transform a novice into an initiate" (p.1).

Cole & Knowles (1993) discuss "shattered images" held by student teachers in their introduction to the real world of teaching. Through reflective practice, such as journals, audio-taping, and interviews, they gathered information to study the perceived discrepancies between preservice teachers' expectations and their actual experiences of learning to teach. They found that preservice teachers select attributes and practices of their former teachers and synthesize them into an idealized image or model of the kind of teacher they want to become. Additionally, disillusionment comes about as student teachers become more cognizant of what teaching and being a teacher really is (Cole,

1985). According to Cole & Knowles (1993), student teachers are often surprised by the role of the teacher and the reality of the workload they carry. The authors discussed the inappropriate or unrealistic expectations that student teachers have about the students they are to teach, due in part to the commonly held perception that the classroom students that student teachers encounter will be like them when they themselves were students (Hollingsworth, 1989; Knowles & Holt-Reynolds, 1991).

Student Teacher and Co-operating Teacher Experiences

General Education

Historically, research investigating the expectations of the student teacher and co-operating teacher during student teaching is limited. Horowitz (1968) investigated the relationship between student teachers and their co-operating teachers, on the assumption that conflict between these individuals affects the success of the student-teaching experience. He approached his study using the conceptualization model developed by Getzel (1960), in which there are two main components within social systems. One component is institutional, and the other individual. "Human behavior, resulting from expectations and need-dispositions, can be a function of both personality and role" (p. 318). Getzel's model draws attention to the individual and institutional dimensions of behaviour and suggests patterns of behaviour along the continuum, from exclusive concern with personal needs to exclusive concern with the expectations held by others. Horowitz's model had three specific purposes: (1) To determine the effect of the initial student-teaching experience on student teachers' expectations and perceptions, regardless of the co-operating teachers to whom the students are assigned, (2) to determine the extent to which the expectations of co-operating teachers influence the expectations and

perceptions of their student teachers, and (3) to determine the extent of agreement between student teachers' expectations and co-operating teachers' expectations.

Using the Teacher Role Description (TRD) instrument developed by Guba-Bidwell (1957) to measure role expectations and role perceptions, Horowitz (1968) found that:

- Student teachers and co-operating teachers differ in their expectations of the role of co-operating teacher, and this difference is perceived by the student teachers before and after student-teaching experiences;
- Student teachers changed in their attitudes toward teaching, even if the student teaching period was short;
- Student teachers were more concerned with personal needs and less concerned with the expectations of others than were co-operating teachers;
- Student teachers and co-operating teachers differed in their expectations of the role of co-operating teacher. Student teachers perceived co-operating teachers as being more extreme in their expectations than co-operating teachers saw themselves;
- Co-operating teachers claimed to have achieved a much better balance between concern with self and concern with the expectations of others than student teachers were willing to ascribe to them; and
- Student teachers' expectations differed from co-operating teachers' expectations, student teachers' perceptions of co-operating teachers' expectations differed from co-operating teachers' self-expressed expectations, and student teachers' perceptions of co-operating teachers'

expectations differed from student teachers' self-expressed expectations (p. 139).

In a survey of 300 student teachers, Farbstein (1965) categorized over 700 expectations of co-operating teachers. In addition to expectations, such as flexibility, providing personal support, and assisting with classroom management and discipline problems, student teachers expected that co-operating teachers would do the following:

- Allow them to sit in on parent/teacher interviews.
- Possess an adequate to superior knowledge of subject material.
- Be aware of student teachers' needs.
- Be pleasant.
- Control their tempers.
- Trust the student teachers as equals.
- Show an interest in the student teachers as human beings.

Tabachnick et al. (1982) found that the perspectives of student teachers were dominated by utilitarian concerns, such as maintaining quiet and order throughout a lesson, fulfilling the expectations of others, seeing techniques as ends in themselves, and surviving student teaching. Tabachnick found that, while teachers conformed to organizational demands, their basic teaching styles were likely to remain unchanged. The study explored the socializing effects of the student teaching experience on the perspectives on teaching of thirteen student teachers. Before the start of their student teaching, the subjects responded to the Teacher Belief Inventory (TBI). The TBI was developed to assess teacher beliefs related to six specific categories: (1) teacher role: passive-active, (2) teacher-pupil relationship: custodial-humanistic, (3) knowledge and

curriculum: strong frame-weak frame, (4) student diversity: negative-positive, (5) the role of the community in school affairs: passive-active, and (6) the role of the school in society: reproductive-transformative. Responses in each of these areas provided a profile of teacher beliefs that comprised the individual's perspectives on teaching. In addition to completing the TBI, each student teacher was interviewed at least five times and observed while teaching at least three times. Interviews were also held with pupils, co-operating teachers, and supervisors to discover developments of perspectives of the student teachers, any observed changes, and influences that might induce change. Resulting data indicated that student teaching did not result in a homogenization of student teacher perspectives. Students came into the experience with different perspectives on teaching, and significant differences among them remained at the end of the semester. Little evidence was found of passive response to institutional forces. It should be noted, however, that the subjects of this study selected the schools in which they did their student teaching and, in this selection, naturally chose positions in schools most reflecting their own perspectives.

Tardif (1985) conducted a study that focused on the process of becoming a teacher. Operating from the theoretical orientation of symbolic interaction, the researcher sought to interpret the meaning that student teachers attach to their student teaching experiences. Four exploratory questions guided the study:

- What aspects of the practicum experience take on meaning for the student teacher?
- Is the meaning transformed as the student teacher progressively moves through the various phases of the practicum?

- How is the meaning handled and modified by the student teacher in dealing with significant others in the student teaching setting (teachers, students, university supervisors)?
- Is the meaning transferred into practice? (p. 26)

Four student teachers became key informants over an 18-month period, representing the different phases of the student teaching experience. An important criterion in the selection of the student teachers was the willingness of these individuals to relate and share their feelings and experiences with the researcher. Data collection included classroom observation, informant interviewing, document analysis, stimulated recall interview sessions, and video recording. Themes such as "self as teacher," "taking the class through the lesson," "finding a happy medium," "taking the path of least resistance," "securing control," and "justifying behavior" emerged as common to all four study participants. Becoming a teacher was a process of ". . . adopting classroom teacher behavior as legitimated by the social reality of the classroom world. It involved learning how to interpret the patterns of behavior of the students, the co-operating teacher and the wider school community, of knowing their expectations and adjusting one's behavior accordingly" (p.146).

McDonald (1993) explored the causes of stress that student teachers experienced during student teaching and investigated strategies student teachers implemented to cope with this stress. A lack of clear expectations from the co-operating teacher was among the most salient factors causing stress. Student teachers reported that not knowing the expectations of co-operating teachers regarding discipline, lesson plans, daily routines, amount of teaching, roles, and evaluations were sources of stress for them. Further,

MacDonald reported that addressing their concerns with co-operating teachers did not always alleviate their stress. Student teachers in their focus groups resolved that improved communication would be a good coping strategy and would help to alleviate this specific stress.

The majority of literature supports the belief that co-operating teachers play a critical role in the professional growth and successful process of student teachers (Boydell, 1986; Griffin, 1989; Miklos & Greene, 1987; Vogt, 1988). However, Vogt (1988) determined, in a review of research on the role of the co-operating teacher, that, although a variety of tasks are expected of the co-operating teacher, there is disagreement as to how the role of the co-operating teacher should be delineated. On one hand, a co-operating teacher is seen as the best way to bridge the gap between theory and practice (Gillis, 1987). On the other hand, research suggests that co-operating teachers are oriented toward the practical application aspects of student teacher training and are unprepared for the task of student teaching supervision (Griffin, 1989; Richardson-Koehler, 1988).

Co-operating teachers appear to be the most influential people in the student teaching experience (Friebus, 1977; Seperson & Joyce, 1973; Yee, 1969). Yet, O'Neal (1983) determined, in a study of co-operating teachers, that the practical and particular methods already established by the co-operating teacher do not necessarily allow student teachers to learn how to adjust to various classroom situations and demands. For example, practical classroom management strategies used by the co-operating teacher may work in one situation but not necessarily in another.

Grimmet and Ratzlaff (1986), in a groundbreaking and frequently cited study,

explored "the expectations that teachers held for their work as co-operating teachers" (p. 42). Using a closed-response survey instrument, the teachers indicated four key expectations they regarded as central to assisting beginning teachers in learning to teach: providing student-teachers with an orientation to the school, supporting and modelling instructional planning, conducting and sharing formative and summative evaluations, and involving the student teachers in the life of the school (for example, professional development and extra-curricular opportunities). Projecting beyond what co-operating teachers currently do, the co-operating teachers indicated the need "to play a more active role in the professional development of would-be teachers" (p. 48).

Zimpher and Sherrill's (1996) study concurred with these results and noted that co-operating teachers felt overall, "that they were well prepared for their work with student-teachers" (p. 292). Other studies show that co-operating teachers appreciate the opportunity to contribute to the profession through their work with student teachers (Korinek, 1989; Zimpher & Sherrill, 1996), in part because of reciprocal professional development benefits that occur. Book (1996) notes that "supervisors have begun to realize that their role in supervising student-teachers has enabled them to learn more about teaching [because] in helping novices improve, they articulate more explicitly what they know and believe about teaching" (p. 202). Other researchers, such as Neufeld and Freeman (1993), suggest similar outcomes.

Richardson-Koehler (1988) determined that co-operating teachers themselves felt that they had to learn much on their own during their student teaching days and that their student teachers would have to do the same. Feedback following a teaching experience centred more on what activities would take place the next day than on how to improve.

Also, Richardson-Koehler found a lack of openness on the part of co-operating teachers. Of the fourteen co-operating teachers in this study, only one determined that it would be valuable for the student teacher to observe other classroom practices. Koehler determined that the co-operating teachers' lack of ability or unwillingness to engage in reflection of their own or their student teachers' classroom practices contributed to the poor quality of feedback received by the student teachers. The amount of reflection necessary to facilitate a successful field experience for both the student teacher and the co-operating teacher was not an expectation of the co-operating teacher. The students, on the other hand, expected more feedback than was received.

Stout (1982) surveyed 40 secondary school teachers to ascertain what co-operating teachers look for and expect from a student teacher. The sample for this study included teachers of diverse subject matter. Of the responding teachers surveyed, 37 percent had worked with more than ten student teachers, 58 percent had worked with between five and ten and the remaining five percent had worked with four or fewer. In this survey, teachers were asked to share their views concerning five items relating to the classroom teacher and their expectations of a student teacher. Each survey item required the teachers to list what they thought would describe their expectations of student teachers.

Results revealed that co-operating teachers felt that overseeing student teachers was a way of fulfilling a professional obligation, having a positive influence on a student teacher, having an opportunity to learn new methodologies from student teachers, and forcing themselves to re-examine and re-evaluate their own teaching strategies. The researcher concluded that 72 percent of co-operating teachers expected that student

teachers would have a firm grasp of subject matter and be willing to seek out resources to implement knowledge in subject areas other than their own. Additionally, 78 percent of co-operating teachers expected that student teachers would possess enthusiasm for the subject matter that they were teaching as well as for how it was taught. Also, 38 percent of co-operating teachers determined that student teachers' taking initiative, being creative, and trying out methods used in undergraduate work was an expectation. Finally, 13 percent identified a sense of humour as strength of successful student teachers. Macdonald, Baker & Steward (1995) investigated co-operating teachers' perspectives on having a student teacher in the classroom. This study involved collaboration between two classroom teachers and an education faculty member as researchers. Five co-operating teachers, including two of the researchers, were participants in this study. The assumption underlying the study was that what was missing from the knowledge of the teaching practicum were the voices of the co-operating teachers. The objective of the researchers was to determine the benefits and drawbacks of having a student teacher in the classroom, to identify what co-operating teachers perceived to be stressful about student teaching, and to identify the coping strategies that they used or recommended for dealing with this stress. Focus group interviews, journaling, individual interviews, and observation were used to collect data.

The researchers determined that there were both benefits and drawbacks to having a student teacher in the classroom. Further, these benefits and drawbacks were often dependent upon the relationship that the student teacher had with the co-operating teacher. Benefits included positive experiences in watching the personal growth of the student teacher, enthusiasm displayed by the student teacher, and new methods and ideas

brought to their classroom by the student teachers. Also, the opportunity to observe the student teacher provided an opportunity for the co-operating teacher to observe classroom students. Drawbacks included the amount of time co-operating teachers felt that student teachers demanded of them, the disruption of giving up power in their classrooms to allow the student teacher an opportunity to experiment freely, time required for evaluation, change of routine, and conflict caused by different personalities. Personality conflicts posed a substantial stress for co-operating teachers. The co-operating teachers preferred to have student teachers whose approach to students was similar to their own. Co-operating teachers worried that opposite personalities and approaches of student teachers would affect the way in which they worked with the student teacher as well as the way that they evaluated them. Further, co-operating teachers reported that, when co-operating teacher expectations for the student teachers were different than what the student teacher expected for themselves, the result was often a stressful experience. As well as causing stress, the co-operating teachers felt that a disparity in expectations also affected their relationships with their student teachers.

Richardson & Killen (1994) determined, in a study involving co-operating teachers' and student teachers' and their practicum experiences, that shadowing co-operating teachers for a period of time prior to teaching would allow student teachers to experience the multi-faceted task of teaching, including becoming involved in student welfare activities, being involved in all extra curricular music and playground supervision, and in the overall day-to-day dealings of teachers. In other words, they found that co-operating teachers should allow student teachers to immediately be immersed in the school community. Allowing student teachers to immediately be immersed in the

school community could address the frustrations voiced by both the co-operating teachers and the student teachers in this study. The idea of shadowing could alleviate many of the frustrations of both the student teachers and the co-operating teachers. Unfortunately, the student teachers in this study had one day of observation prior to beginning their student teaching block with their co-operating teachers. This observation allowed the student teachers to watch the co-operating teachers in action, but did not leave adequate time for questions, preparation for classes, and other issues that should have been addressed beforehand. Richard & Killen (1994) found that the co-operating teachers' felt that the student teaching experience was more profitable for the student teachers when shadowing had occurred and they, as co-operating teachers, felt it easier to offer guidance to the student teacher under these conditions. Shadowing enabled student teachers and co-operating teachers to sit down, communicate, and learn from each other

Co-operating teachers uncovered a multitude of expectations for the student teacher that were revealed in a study conducted by Woods & Weasmer (2003). This study included expectations of student teachers outside the traditional classroom practices, such as participating in extra-curricular activities, attending faculty meetings, and volunteering on various committees while practice teaching in their assigned school. Participants of this study were 28 (5 male and 23 female) public school teachers, who had served the previous semester as co-operating teachers. Included in this study were co-operating teachers representing ten elementary schools, seven middle schools and 11 secondary school settings. Among the subject matters taught by these co-operating teachers were math, English, science, special education, and music.

Two primary sources provided data for this study. A demographic survey was

completed, followed by interviews with each of the co-operating teachers at the completion of the student teaching experience. The interviews were conducted using an interview guide for consistency. The 20-30-minute interviews were tape recorded and later transcribed for analysis.

Results revealed that, according to the co-operating teachers, expectations of student teachers during student teaching were clearly identified by the university supervisor, but misunderstood and confusing to the co-operating teacher and the student teacher. Issues, such as extra-curricular assignments, attending faculty meetings, and performing all tasks expected of the co-operating teacher were an expectation of the co-operating teacher but not necessarily the student teacher, who was already overwhelmed by classroom expectations. Co-operating teachers agreed that the primary focus of the student teacher was to gain teaching experience: however, there were multifarious expectations of teachers beyond the classroom. In order to have a "complete student-teaching experience," student teachers should be engaged in all facets expected of the co-operating teacher. If the belief is that co-operating teachers are there to provide the "real-world" experience for student teachers, it then stands to reason the student teacher should be involved in all activities outside of the classroom. Some of experiences that co-operating teachers wanted their student teachers to experience included:

- Serving as a role model,
- Understanding and caring about students,
- Developing a love of teaching,
- Establishing a positive rapport with parents,
- Demonstrating professionalism,

- Becoming adaptable.

Several studies have reported problems encountered by both student teachers and co-operating teachers, and most of these studies point to differences in expectations as a source of the problem. According to Applegate & Lasley (1982), co-operating teachers want student teachers who come to them committed to teaching, rather than wondering if the career will be the right one for them. Many co-operating teachers want partnerships with the student teachers and do not want to be totally responsible for evaluation. They want enthusiastic, well-organized, professional and knowledgeable individuals as student teachers. Many co-operating teachers believe that the university teaches and encourages skill development and practice, rather than emphasizing skill proficiency. In other words, co-operating teachers often feel that student teachers come to their classrooms with a lot of book knowledge about skills, but lack the practical skills to implement that book knowledge.

Co-operating teachers identified that an important coping strategy, when having student teachers in their classroom, was the establishment of communication strategies that enabled the student teachers to understand better the specific expectations of the co-operating teacher (MacDonald, 1995). Co-operating teachers felt that it was the job of the university faculty to inform student teachers of the expectations of student teachers, and that this communication would facilitate the development of a better relationship between student teacher and co-operating teacher. Further, this communication would result in a better student teaching experience for all involved (Applegate & Lasley, 1982).

Music Education

Having knowledge concerning expectations of both the co-operating teacher and

the student teacher can change the ideal into the real and vice versa, the real into the ideal. Thus far, the literature on expectations of student teachers and co-operating teachers is broad in terms of subject matter and individual concerns. Research has made it clear that co-operating teachers and student teachers have expectations. Studies of those expectations are in the voices of either the student teachers or the co-operating teachers, but not of both within the same study. There are studies that have identified those specific areas of concern for both the co-operating teachers and the student teachers such as classroom management, rehearsal techniques, discipline, specific fears of the practicum, and so forth.

Investigating the needs for both student teachers and co-operating teachers in music education has the potential to change the outcome of these experiences positively. Walker (1998) states that future music educators must "be prepared both mentally and academically for the administrative challenges that will confront them the very first day they walk into music classrooms and rehearsals" (p 5). The College music teacher education programs strive to prepare the music student teachers musically and academically for the challenge of teaching music. However, many teacher-preparation programs focus primarily on the theory behind the practice of teaching music. When the student teacher enters the placement with the co-operating teacher, the student has the opportunity to convert theory into practice with the guidance of the co-operating teacher as an additional resource. Ideally, the co-operating teacher addresses the mental challenges that come into play in the music room as well as illustrating how to put theory into practice. The student teacher then is exposed to ideas that the co-operating teacher has found useful and successful for him or her, such as teaching strategies, classroom

management skills, paperwork, school responsibilities, and administrative tasks. This collaboration is the beginning of the co-operating teacher enhancing the preparation that the student music teacher received in college, since these very issues may not have been addressed in methods classes.

Taylor (1970) investigated music teachers' opinions of their preparation on both graduate and undergraduate levels in light of their teaching experience. In response to "effectiveness of student teaching," 99 percent of teachers responded, with 62 percent reporting an effective outcome. However, 37 percent voiced concerns about lack of time, poor school situation, poor supervision, an inadequate co-operating teacher, unclear expectations, unrealistic or regimented situation, and poor scheduling.

Exploring the fears of undergraduate music education students prior to their student teaching experiences has identified that the lack of knowledge of expectations held by their co-operating teacher was a primary fear, along with classroom management and discipline issues that could arise (Kelly, 2000; Madsen & Kaiser, 1999). Kelly suggests that this kind of fear could be related to the effectiveness of student teaching and could continue into the teaching career. The purpose of Kelly's study was to identify, classify and compare preservice undergraduates' fears or concerns regarding the student teaching placement and their first years of teaching. Prior to their internship, 62 music education majors were surveyed regarding fears or concerns they had about their student teaching and initial inservice teaching experiences. Results indicated that preservice teachers were generally secure about their student teaching and initial inservice year of teaching except in the areas of handling discipline problems, working with their co-operating teachers, and dealing with non-teaching duties and responsibilities. They were

unaware of what was expected of them, which heightened their fears even more.

Brand (1982) acknowledged that student teaching experiences are important, but questioned whether the experiences are designed to be optimally effective for the student teacher. In his study, Brand explored the following research questions: (1) Does the music student teaching experience affect student teachers' classroom management beliefs and skills and; (2) As a result of student teaching, do student teachers classroom management beliefs and skills become more like those of their co-operating teachers? Brand selected the area of classroom and rehearsal management because it is an essential competency for music student teachers, and co-operating music teachers are expected to provide primary leadership in this area. The study involved 40 music student teachers and their co-operating teachers. The "Beliefs on Discipline Inventory" and the "Behavior Management Inventory" were the two instruments used as pre and post-tests to determine music student teachers' and co-operating teachers' classroom management beliefs and skills. To determine if their classroom management beliefs and skills became more like their co-operating teachers, differences between the student teachers and the co-operating teachers were compared. The results showed that there were no statistical differences between the student teachers in respect to their beliefs and skills before and after the student teaching experience. Similarly, the study also showed that there were no significant differences between the student and co-operating teachers in classroom management beliefs and skills.

While the results of the study were surprising, Brand (1982) surmised that perhaps the stress of new state testing requirements and the influx of new programs to meet more individual student needs, as well as the public reports of ongoing discipline

issues within the schools, have resulted in providing more realistic experiences, such as the use of videotapes and case studies to prepare student teachers to deal with discipline issues that are likely to arise. These experiences may have opened the eyes of idealistic music education majors. As a result, student music teachers were entering the student teaching experience with more realistic views of music teaching in schools, and, therefore, their beliefs and expectations concerning classroom management and music teacher issues paralleled those of their co-operating teachers.

Brand (1985) also determined that, while the initial unchanged beliefs and skills were due to a "reality check" on the part of the student teachers prior to entering the classroom, perhaps the co-operating teachers did not possess superior classroom skills themselves and that student teachers did not change their beliefs because co-operating teachers were not effective in assisting them in these areas. Student teachers expected that co-operating teachers would be better equipped with specific ideas in classroom management and discipline that would allow them to view their co-operating teacher as superior. Brand suggests the need for proper training and selection of co-operating teachers so as to allow them to work with student music teachers more effectively and efficiently.

Krueger (1987) investigated the extent to which music student teachers' perspectives toward their role as teachers were altered or maintained during the process of student teaching in public schools. Using two choral music students as her sample, Krueger devised four questions to guide her research. One of these questions was: "What is the implied or hidden curriculum and pedagogy of student teaching in public school music and what are the implicit expectations of experienced educational personnel who

interact with the student teachers?" (p. 40) Krueger found that student teacher perspectives toward their role as teachers were highly influenced by the existing structural organization of the school setting. Student teachers perceived the continuation of the curriculum in place to be an expectation of their co-operating teacher, and they rarely attempted to venture into new content materials of their own or of students' special interest. The co-operating teachers of these students expected individual planning and teaching to be done using existing school schedules and organized activities. While student teachers viewed this as a constraint, as time went on, they found it less problematic, became more accepting, and, as a result, began to practice methods that they viewed as survival tactics and as necessary for successful teaching.

Gordon (2000) identified and explicated factors that induced stress for new public school music teachers. Four practising music educators served as case study participants and were interviewed on three consecutive occasions over a period of 6 months. Results of the study found three categories of stress factors. One of these stress factors was inadequate preservice preparation for music teaching. These inadequacies included lack of planning skills that resulted in unsuccessful lesson presentations, lack of knowledge and skill in curriculum design, inadequate or incomplete pedagogical and methodological preparation, absence of skill and knowledge in classroom management and discipline, and insufficient knowledge of literature and particular instruments. Recommendations for alleviating this stress included placements with a co-operating teacher who could be a guide for the student teacher and offer more expertise to the student music teacher.

Teacher as Expert

Teacher expertise refers to a specific type of knowledge or skill. In an educational

context, expertise includes the emergence of the public perception that such knowledge is the exclusive domain of specially trained and qualified practising teachers. According to Welker (1991) expertise requires more than intellectual capacity. Expertise provides for occupational distinctions drawn along formalized lines, and in turn fosters an increasing reliance on institutions and organizations as mediators to service. Experts require not only specialized training to set them apart from their colleagues, but also special places in which to practice as experts.

Research studies investigating how one becomes an expert in teaching have focused on identifying those influences that aid in the student teacher's growth during the student teaching experience. Much discussion has centered on the learning institution or the background and personality of the student teacher. However, some researchers have been less interested with the socialization process of the student teacher and more concerned with the cognitive aspects of their learning. For example, researchers have been inquiring into the nature of the differences in pedagogical expertise between the novice and the experienced teacher. Methods, such as laboratory simulations, naturalistic observations, and stimulated recall, have been used to investigate this area of teaching. Findings suggest that expert teachers draw on "...richly elaborated and well-organized stores of procedural and declarative knowledge (schemata) about classrooms, students, and teaching" (Livingston, 1990, p. 254).

What makes a teacher an expert is an ongoing area of research. There are some models that attempt to describe the characteristics of expert teachers focusing on teacher styles, teacher interaction and teacher characteristics, while other models of expert teachers focus on products such as student outcomes and teacher effects (Borko &

Livingston, 1987; Saber, Cushing & Berliner, 1991). According to Sternberg & Horvath (1995), a master teacher is knowledgeable in subject matter content and pedagogical considerations. Master teachers use knowledge to make sound, quick, and efficient decisions about problematic situations within their teaching setting, often using insight and novel approaches to do so.

Sternberg and Horvath (1995) believed that there does not exist a well-defined standard that all experts meet and that no non-experts meet. Rather, experts bear a family resemblance to one another, and it is that resemblance to one another that structures the category "expert." In this study, the resemblances centered on the co-operating teachers' willingness to be open-minded, collaborative, flexible, willing to share their expertise, and a genuine excitement at the prospect of providing their student teachers with a positive classroom experience as music student teachers. Sternberg and Horvath (1995) proposed that teaching expertise should be viewed as a similarity-based category, with something like a prototype as its summary representation. This prototype view could contribute in important ways to the dialogue on expert in teaching. According to the researchers, the adoption of a prototype could allow for a fuller, more inclusive understanding of teaching expertise; second, a prototype view could provide a basis for understanding apparent "general factors" in teaching expertise. The prototype view provides a basis for understanding and anticipating in social judgments about teaching expertise.

Using the results of psychological research on the development of experts, Sternberg and Horvath (1995) identified expertise related to family resemblance through prototyping. The results included the notion that the prototype expert is knowledgeable.

He or she has extensive, accessible knowledge that is organized for use in teaching. In addition, the prototype expert has knowledge of the organizational context in which teaching occurs and is able to adapt to practical constraints within the field of teaching. Because his or her teaching is extensive, the prototype expert is able to perform many of the constituent activities of teaching rapidly and with little or no cognitive effort. This skill enables the prototypical expert to "reinvest" cognitive resources in problem reformulation and problem solving within the domain of teaching. The prototypical expert plans and is self aware in approaching problems. Finally, the prototypical expert is able to encode, combine, and compare information selectively to arrive at insightful solutions to problems in teaching.

In the 1980's, psychologists and scholars in education produced a set of assertions about the characteristics of expert teachers that were linked to the general psychological research on expertise (Glaser, 1987, 1990). As differences in experts and novices began to become codified across fields, the idea of a theory of development emerged to describe the transition from novice to expert.

According to Berliner (1994a, 1994b, 2001), there are propositions about expertise that describe expert teachers. These include:

- Expert teachers often develop automaticity and routinization for the repetitive operations needed to accomplish their goals;
- Expert teachers are more sensitive to the task demands and social situations when solving pedagogical problems;
- Expert teachers are more opportunistic and flexible in their teachings;
- Expert teachers represent problems in qualitatively different ways;

- Expert teachers have fast and accurate pattern-recognition capabilities;
- Expert teachers perceive meaningful patterns in the domain in which they are experienced;

Expert teachers, although slower at beginning to problem solve, bring richer and more personal sources of information to bear on the problem that they are trying to solve.

Berliner (1988) has suggested a five-stage model for the development of pedagogical expertise based on a general model presented by Dreyfus and Dreyfus (1986) in their book *Mind Over Machine*. Berliner describes these stages as:

- Novice – tends to comply to whatever rules and procedures they are told to follow, behaviour is inflexible, experience must be gained;
- Advanced beginner – melds book knowledge with on the job experience, still not very flexible;
- Competent performer – has sensible goals, choose flexible means for reaching goals and can determine what is and what is not important, flexible, can articulate goals;
- Proficient performer - recognizes similarities between quite different situations, holistic understanding of processes involved, is intuitive and;
- Experts – respond effortlessly to the demands of the situation they are confronted with, when things go well experts seldom appear to be reflective about their teaching. (p. 8-12)

Sabers, Cushing, & Berliner, D. (1991) studied the differences in the monitoring of classroom events between the novice, advanced beginner, and expert teachers. The novice teachers chosen were prospective teachers going through alternative certification

and had no pedagogical training. Advanced beginners were chosen from student teachers or first-year teachers. Expert teachers were identified as experts on the basis of observation by two different observers who had at least 5 years of teaching experience. Advance beginners and novices were interviewed to determine their suitability for the study. A total of seven experts, four advanced beginners and five novices were selected from each of their respective pools. The expert and advanced beginners all taught secondary science. Novices worked in areas in which scientific knowledge was required, but had not training or experience in teaching in the public schools.

The design of the study required one classroom period of a junior high science classroom to be videotaped for an entire week. One videotape was edited and made into three separate tapes in order to show different views of the classroom. Then each of the participants viewed all three television monitors simultaneously while taking notes on what they observed. It is important to note that the three monitors were not always on at the same time. The data were coded by two researchers, and both qualitative and quantitative methods were used to analyze the data.

A study by Sogin & Wang (2002) explored factors associated with expertise in music teaching. The study compared how music teachers enrolled in a summer professional development program perceived their teaching in terms of factors related to novice and expert teaching as represented by different models. Results revealed that, while the novice and expert teachers agreed on characteristics of successful teaching, 87% of group expert teachers, the group that had completed three or more specialized teacher-training courses, ranked flexibility as the most important characteristic for effective teaching..

Differences were found in how the participants perceived classroom events in relation to simultaneity, multidimensionality, and immediacy. The term simultaneity is used to describe how an expert can monitor many different events that occur at the same time in the classroom. Multidimensionality refers to the large number of responsibilities and events that happen in a classroom throughout the time, not necessarily at the same time, and immediacy refers to the rapid pace of classroom events. In scanning all three monitors, it appeared that experts were better able to: " a) monitor and comprehend the events presented, b) interpret the instructional strategies used, c) hypothesize reasons for behavior seen, and d) offer solution strategies for problems identified" (Sabers, Cushing, & Berliner, 1991, p. 84). Novices were found to be more dualistic thinkers. For example, they focused mostly on student behavior, especially when they believed the behaviour was inappropriate. Novices did not make an effort to understand the cause or offer solutions to address these behaviours. Advanced beginners tried to attach meaning and offer suggestions for improvement, but they were not as insightful as experts. For all of these reasons, the researchers, in this study, challenged the assumption that teaching requires only content knowledge.

Borko & Livingston (1989) studied the differences in mathematics instruction between three student teachers (two secondary and one elementary) with their co-operating teachers. The student teachers were selected because of the depth of their knowledge in mathematics and their high achievement in mathematics methods courses. Co-operating teachers were thought to be experts on the basis of interviews with building administrators. For one week, the elementary student teacher and co-operating teacher were observed teaching mathematics for approximately one hour on consecutive days.

Both the secondary student teachers and co-operating teachers were observed teaching two sections of the same course that had the same preparation. This was conducted in this way because, in an earlier study, it was found that teachers revised their teaching strategies between classes when teaching the same course. The student teachers were interviewed before teaching about their planning, and following each lesson about their thoughts after teaching. The "Ethnograph", an automated coding and retrieval system, was used to code and sort the data. Case descriptions of each participant's planning, teaching, and post-lesson reflections were prepared. The authors identified novices as: (1) being slower and less efficient planners; (2) encountering problems when attempts to respond to children led them away from the scripted lesson plans, and; (3) having less selective post-lesson reflections than experts. When interacting with students during a lesson, novices had difficulty improvising. Experts, on the other hand, were better able to predict where students might have problems. It seems that "experts" propositional structures for pedagogical content knowledge include stores of powerful explanations, demonstrations, and examples for representing subject matter to students.

A key element in determining success in student teaching is the relationship between the student teacher and the co-operating teacher. The student teacher works in an apprenticeship of observation (Lortie, 1975), becoming acculturated to the co-operating teacher's classroom. Co-operating teachers were once themselves student teachers and some are easily able to empathize with the student teacher's anxieties during evaluation-laden visits by the university supervisor. The definition of a teacher expert is still developing, and there is much research to be learned about its application for music teachers.

Bridging the Co-operating Teacher and Student Teacher Gap In the Music Classroom

While there are a number of studies that identify the expectations of co-operating teachers (Berliner, 2001; Brand, 1982; Castillo, 1971; Griffin, 1989; MacDonald, 1993) and the expectations of student teachers (Burnsed,1982; Cole, 1993; MacDonald, 1993) individually, there is little research that brings the expectations of both parties together to compare and identify those expectations within the boundaries of student teaching.

Schmidt (1994), as a non-participant observer in a qualitative study, explored the lessons learned by four instrumental music student teachers during their student teaching experiences. Through detailed observations, videotapes, journals, and interviews, Schmidt collected data concerning the thinking of these student teachers and the important influences in their development as teachers. The primary goals of the study were to identify the student teachers' perceptions and experience-based influences on those perceptions and to draw connections between each student teacher's perceptions and teaching practices in music classrooms. She compared differences and similarities in the content and processes of the learning acquired from student teaching and other learning experiences in teacher education. The three research questions were:

- What are music student teachers' perceptions of good and poor teaching, themselves as teachers, and their problems and successes in the classroom?
- What experiences shaped the music student teachers' perceptions?
- What connections exist among the music student teachers perceptions', their experiences, and their teaching practices? (p26).

While Schmidt does not make a comparison of similarities and differences between

student teachers' and co-operating teachers' perceptions, the study does recognize the direct influence that the co-operating teachers had on the student teachers' perceptions of their experiences, and the ways in which they would like to teach. The perceived quality of the relationship with their co-operating teachers affected what the students learned from them.

According to Schmidt (1994), these student teachers lacked a significant role model in music education; their personal experience came from poorly defined models that they either wanted to or did not want to emulate. The major theme of the four student teachers consistently emerged as "I want to be myself," a wish that student teachers did not communicate to their co-operating teachers. Self-image was an important factor in how they perceived themselves in the role of teacher. The student teachers also had little time to reflect on and learn from classroom experiences and expected that they would receive more adequate assistance in making sense of classroom events from their co-operating teacher than was actually the case. The co-operating teachers intended to help, but they lacked appropriate models of mentoring. The co-operating teachers shared their own learning experiences, but they talked more than they listened and failed to understand the student teachers' own perceptions of the situation. All four student teachers expected to please their co-operating teachers and fit into existing classroom procedures. This belief resulted in student teachers feeling restricted and not feeling free to be themselves.

Co-operating teachers expected that student teachers would follow and implement particular teaching practices and routines that were already in place in a classroom. Co-operating teachers determined by Krueger (2006) to be experts believed that the student

teaching experience was more successful when certain routines were promoted and practiced. The co-operating teachers modeled these routines for their student teachers and subsequently guided and encouraged them through the same practices. Among the most important of these practices was developing the skill of reflecting on the day's lessons. Guiding and aiding student teachers to develop these practices on their own, is an expectation of the co-operating teacher.

An analysis of papers and subsequent discussion led by Zeichner (2002) addressed many issues concerning student teacher learning. Papers representative of a variety of subjects; preservice programs at New York University (NYU), Mills College, Roosevelt University and the University of Haifa were used for the discussion forum. Additionally the papers also represented a variety of methodologies that have been used to address the question of what makes a good placement setting: surveys of student teachers, co-operating teachers, and university supervisors; interviews of preservice and inservice teachers; and analyses of student teacher journals. Summarized, Zeichner (2002) agreed with much of what was asserted in the papers:

- Student teaching is a critical aspect of preservice teacher education, and co-operating teachers are key participants in determining the quality of learning for student teachers.
- Being a good co-operating teacher is important to but is not synonymous with being a good teacher. Being a good co-operating teacher is more than providing access to a classroom or modeling a particular version of good practice. It involves active mentoring.
- The quality of human relationships is important to the making of a good

student teaching placement. Specifically, the importance of a safe and supportive environment in which student teachers feel able to take risks and explore options is stressed in the papers.

- It is important to consider the compatibility of the teaching enacted in the placement setting with that which is advocated in the rest of the teacher education curriculum. These papers also discussed the possibility of compatibility and familiarity acting as a barrier to teacher learning.

Zeichner (2002) emphasized the need to examine student teaching more systematically, stating that the results of student teaching research are often contradictory and ambiguous. These inconsistencies need to be addressed in instrumental music, and the perspectives of the student teacher and the co-operating teacher regarding expectations are crucial to completely understanding the issues. Little attention has been given to the co-operating teacher's expectations or to the expectations of the student teacher during the music student teaching placement.

Zeichner's (2002) findings are important in that they state what makes successful student teacher and co-operating teacher experiences. However, the problem is that, rather than aiding and guiding the student teacher to have these successful outcomes during the field experience, co-operating teachers expect that they will happen on their own. Co-operating teachers do not necessarily know how to facilitate these outcomes. Student teachers, on the other hand, do not know what to expect during the field experience. All that they know is that they want a positive outcome to occur. Providing both student teachers and co-operating teachers with the tools for success is dependent upon what each of their expectations are of each other.

Berthelotte (2000) investigated and compared the expectations of a current student teacher, a former student teacher and their co-operating teacher during one of their instrumental music student teaching placements. Qualitative data were collected using five open-ended questions that were administered in an e-mail interview format to the three participants. All three participants answered the questions during the instrumental music teaching block in which they were either the co-operating teacher or the student teacher.

Analysis revealed that co-operating teachers and student teachers do have expectations of one another. These expectations fell into the categories of feedback, observation, creativity, and relationship. Feedback was a primary concern for the student teachers, but not the co-operating teacher. The student teachers expected more feedback than was given; the co-operating teacher, however, found that the student teachers were not always open to feedback. The co-operating teacher was frustrated more by a lack of knowledge and specific music skills than by providing feedback to the student teachers (Berthelotte, 2000).

The second theme to emerge in Berthelotte's (2000) study was that of observation. The student teacher believed that an observation period should occur to enable student teachers to become familiar with classroom communication, teaching techniques, organization, scheduling, and the course outline for the music program in which they were placed. The student teachers expected that she would have a chance to observe how an experienced teacher handles issues and then begin to assume teaching responsibilities slowly with an assigned topic to teach. However, what actually occurred was a quick immersion into teaching with little observation time, leaving the student

teacher feeling unprepared to teach independently. Both the current student teacher and former student teachers felt that their first few days were spent trying to figure out the achievement level of the music class and that they could have saved time and frustration if their co-operating teacher had allowed for more observation time. The co-operating teacher expected that the students should observe the established class routines but did not believe that extensive observation was needed.

Creativity was the third theme to emerge. The co-operating teacher expected her student teachers to use her own strategies in the music classroom and to create interest for the students. Also, the co-operating teacher expected that student teachers would show initiative, do research, and be creative in the classroom. Both the current and former student teachers felt that they were encouraged to try new things, and, although frustrated initially, they appreciated this opportunity later on. The student teachers reported that the expectation to be creative was one of their most positive experiences during their student teaching experiences.

Relationships emerged as a fourth and final theme of this study. Results clearly revealed that developing and maintaining a positive relationship was an important expectation for both the co-operating teacher and the student teacher. The co-operating teacher determined that a good relationship existed when the student teacher established a good rapport with students and other teachers. Further, the co-operating teacher expected that her relationship would be non-threatening and team-like and that the student teacher should be approachable and compatible. When the student teacher displayed these characteristics, the co-operating teacher felt that a good relationship was in place. The student teacher expected the relationship with the co-operating teacher to be professional.

Student teachers believed that they could establish a positive relationship if the co-operating teacher was supportive, open to their ideas, and objective.

Summary

Co-operating teachers and student teachers have roles that are not clearly defined. These roles can be defined through communication between co-operating teachers and student teachers prior to the student teaching experience. A lack of congruence between expectations of these two parts of the student teaching triangle can result in conflict and tension.

One such expectation involves the relationship between the co-operating teacher and the student teacher during practica. According to MacDonald (1995), conflicts exist within the relationship between the co-operating teacher and the student teacher. Co-operating teachers believed that having student teachers in the classroom had benefits and drawbacks. These benefits and drawbacks were often dependent upon the relationship that the student teacher had with the co-operating teacher.

Student teachers often feel dominated by concerns such as classroom management, fulfilling the expectations of others when they are unclear as to what those expectations are, and simply surviving student teaching. However, student teachers develop strategies that allow them to cope. Among the most salient factors causing stress for the student teachers is the lack of clarity of the expectations of their co-operating teachers (Gordon, 2000).

According to Farbstein, (1965), student teachers need to know the expectations of their co-operating teachers and how to adjust their teaching behaviours accordingly. Expectations voiced by student teachers of their co-operating teachers revealed that part

of the process of becoming a teacher involved the ability to interpret the behaviour of the students, the co-operating teacher, and the wider school community.

The vast majority of literature supports the belief that co-operating teachers play a critical role in the professional growth and success of student teachers. Some studies suggest that co-operating teachers themselves believe that they had to learn on their own during their student teaching days and that their student teachers should do the same. Other studies cite co-operating teachers acknowledging ways in which they should be able to help the student teacher, but feel they lack the skills to do so. These strategies include issues such as providing feedback, allowing for more observation time, and feeling a willingness to engage in reflection with the student teacher.

Studies of co-operating teachers and student teachers that focus on instrumental music have investigated stress factors for the student teacher and co-operating teacher during student teaching. Co-operating teachers were already aware of the many issues that result in stress. However, student teachers did not expect that a lack of interest in music programs on behalf of students, parents, colleagues, and administrations would be one of those pronounced stresses.

Other researchers investigated the influence of co-operating teachers' on student teachers' beliefs about and skill development for becoming a music teacher and found no statistical differences between the student teachers' before-and-after student teaching beliefs and skills. Brand (1985) suggested that the lack of a co-operating teacher with superior classroom skills and unclear expectations could have contributed to this result. Student teachers believe that the process of becoming good music teachers depends upon a strong relationship with their co-operating teachers.

A number of studies (Zeichner, 2002; Krueger, 2006; MacDonald, 1993) have reported problems encountered by both student teachers and co-operating teachers, and most of these problems were a result of differences in expectations. Co-operating teachers identified the establishment of communication strategies that would enable the student teacher to understand the specific expectations of the co-operating teacher as an important coping strategy when having student teachers in their classroom.

Expectations of co-operating teachers and student teachers during student teaching in instrumental music warrant investigation. Studies discussed within the literature review shed light on the diversity of issues faced by both the co-operating teacher and student teacher in a variety of classroom settings and subject areas. The findings of these studies have implications for this study.

Determining and investigating the expectations of co-operating teachers and student teachers could potentially change the way the student teaching experience is approached by both the co-operating teacher and the student teacher. Developing a communication strategy for both the co-operating teacher and student teacher could result in the student teaching experience being individualized to the needs of the student teacher, rather than solely on the needs of the co-operating teacher. The role of the co-operating teacher could be enhanced when communication is open, because co-operating teachers could become comfortable and look forward to providing feedback, offering opportunities to the student teachers, and reflecting about their own roles as co-operating teachers, allowing them to search for new ways to improve in this role. Both parties could become better experienced in anticipating needs and developing plans better suited for success during student teaching. Further, due to the short teaching blocks assigned to

the student teachers and co-operating teachers in Ontario, finding ways that expectations become standard and are transferable rather than repetitive from placement to placement could potentially increase the skill development and lessen the stress factors experienced in the roles of both the co-operating teachers and the student teachers.

The expert-novice or student teacher studies provide a comparison of the thinking between student teachers and expert teachers. Researchers have concluded that student teachers seem to have a difficult time understanding the many things that occur in and around the classroom at any given time, and lack knowledge of what is "typical" in a classroom setting. Novices tend to have more difficulty "winging" it and have to pay attention to their prepared lesson plan more than expert teachers, who are able to anticipate difficulties and adjust methods accordingly.

As a co-operating teacher and a novice teacher, these experiences are familiar to me. Although novice teachers feel they have been prepared in music education through their undergraduate work at college, their ability to implement that work in a music classroom setting is not experienced until they are in a classroom. Lesson plans provide the novice teacher with a resource somewhat likened to a security blanket at this phase of their teaching experiences. Expert teachers, on the other hand, possess the ability to anticipate ways of student learning without a detailed lesson plan. Time experience and good mentorship in the classroom is the only method I have experienced that will allow novice teachers to develop into experts.

Chapter III

METHODOLOGY

Participants: Co-operating Teacher and Student Teacher Selection

The purpose of this study was to investigate and compare co-operating teachers' and student teachers' expectations about student teaching during instrumental music teaching blocks. This investigation involved four instrumental music teachers and four student teachers majoring in instrumental music education. Co-operating teachers and student teachers described their expectations of each other before, during, and after practice teaching blocks through data collection procedures including one-on-one interviews, focus group interviews, and journaling. Participants are identified by pseudonyms to protect their confidentiality.

This project benefited from the participation of four respected, experienced instrumental music educators as co-operating teachers: two were teaching instrumental music to students in grades 9-12, and two were teaching instrumental music to students in grades 5-8. Co-operating teacher selection was based on experience as co-operating teachers in the past, diversity of teaching situation (for example, the participants, one elementary teacher worked in an inner city school, and one in a more suburban area), professional reputation, and teacher willingness. In addition, I had previous professional associations with all four teachers.

"Tammy," who holds a Bachelor of Music Degree and a Bachelor of Education degree, has developed her school music program by increasing numbers of students and raising the quality of both performances of her ensemble and musical experiences. This has resulted in her establishing a positive reputation within the community and

administrative acknowledgement of the importance of music in her school over the past four years. Tammy has taught at the elementary school level for the last eight years. She is involved in her community as a musician and continues to perform in community-based ensembles. Tammy attends at least one music education conference a year to strengthen her teaching skills.

Tammy teaches instrumental music to students in grades 5 through 8. In addition, Tammy is also responsible for math and science on a rotating system for all grade 7 students. She runs lunchtime band rehearsals as well as band classes scheduled during the regular school day. She sees all of her instrumental students two times per week in their regular mandatory band class. Lunchtime rehearsals are voluntary. There are no before or after school rehearsals, because virtually all of the students are bussed to and from school. Her work with the grades five through eight music students is highly respected, and her students have won national music awards in competitions for the past two years. Tammy and I have collaborated through my university teaching. She often volunteers to host music education students who are completing observation portfolios as a project for music education classes that I teach.

"Yvonne," a second elementary teacher, holds a Bachelor of Music Degree and a Bachelor of Education degree from the University of Western Ontario. She has been teaching instrumental music at a variety of schools throughout the Province of Ontario for the past 21 years. She was a piano major who took many techniques classes while doing her undergraduate work. She has been at her current school for 13 years and has acted as a co-operating teacher fifteen times prior to this study.

Yvonne's school offers a tremendous number of challenges, and she has taught in

this same inner-city school for the past 13 years. This school is rich in cultural diversity, having students new to Canada, often unable to speak English. Many of her students are considered "at risk," and she uses music as a tool to teach self-respect, respect for others, and self-discipline. Additionally, this school is known as a compensatory school, meaning that it receives additional funding from the Government of Ontario to run breakfast and lunch programs, clothing programs for whole families, and various other social needs programs. More than 50 percent of the students in this school are ESL (English as a second language) students. A high percentage of the schools' families receive social assistance of some kind. It is not unusual for class rolls to change each week with new students arriving and others leaving, usually without notifying the teacher.

Yvonne teaches music to students from junior kindergarten (four years of age) to grade eight. The students from grades six to eight receive mandatory instrumental music classes. Yvonne runs lunchtime rehearsals for intermediate and senior choirs, as well as intermediate and senior bands. Her population of students causes her to choose choral music with words geared to developing motivation, courage, and self-respect. She offers many performing opportunities for her students in the community and at the local Kiwanis Music Festival each year. She is actively involved in her community as a musician. She continues to sing in a local choir and is the director and accompanist for her church. Yvonne has sat on many committees for designing new music curricula in the elementary system. She is passionate about the inclusion of at risk students in the music program, and she is highly respected in her field. I have collaborated with her on many occasions, sending her university music education students who can provide extra help with her

classes. Undergraduate music education majors have benefited profoundly from being involved with her and her school.

"Leo" is one of two secondary school teachers participating in this study. In terms of years of experience, Leo is the youngest of all four teachers, having taught at the high school level for the past 10. He has acted as a co-operating teacher on two prior occasions. Leo was apprehensive about acting as a co-operating teacher, explaining that his prior experiences with student teachers had not gone well.

Leo spent his first 5 years as a music educator developing a general music program in a secondary school for students with multiple learning disabilities. In his present school, Leo works with junior and senior concert bands. These ensembles are both for credit at his high school, so there are no extra-curricular music rehearsals. He is a highly respected music educator.

Recently, Leo completed a Masters of Education degree. In addition, Leo is actively involved in the community by volunteering to operate a marching band program made up of school music students from across the city and county, which he describes as his way of giving back to the community. He remains active in the community as a professional jazz saxophonist. I was Leo's supervising teacher during his year at Teacher's College.

"Brad" began teaching after a successful professional career as an orchestral trombone player in Vancouver, B.C. He has been employed in various secondary schools, one of which offered a general music program suited to the needs of the learning disabled. Brad is currently the Head of the Arts department at the local arts high school. This high school specializes in dance, drama, music, visual arts, and photography. He teaches

instrumental music to students in grades nine through 12, including guitar classes. Additionally, he runs the pit band for musicals and before school band rehearsals for credit. Brad has a Bachelor of Music and a Bachelor of Education degree from the University of Windsor. In addition, Brad continues to freelance heavily as a professional musician, both in Canada and the United States. Brad has acted as a co-operating teacher on seven occasions prior to this study. Brad and I attended university together and have worked together in various professional music venues prior to becoming teachers.

Because of my rapport with these teachers, I was comfortable in asking them to participate in this study. According to Patton, (1990) rapport means "...that I respect the people being interviewed, so what they say is important because of who is saying it. Rapport is built on the ability to convey empathy and understanding without judgment" (p. 317). All participating co-operating teachers were colleagues of mine working within the same city and surrounding county. We have shared educational ideas and strategies, relied on each other for various needs, and played in music ensembles together. Although I did not know all the student teachers, I have acted as both a student teacher and a co-operating teacher. As a result I was empathetic to the stress surrounding the student teaching experience for both parties. Additionally, I hoped that these co-operating teachers would be comfortable enough with me so that their teaching would not change, despite the fact that they knew there would be student teachers reporting to me about them. I also hoped that they would be able to reflect honestly about their student teachers and about themselves as co-operating teachers during the various data collection processes.

The four student teachers who participated in this study were in attendance at the University of Windsor's Faculty of Education, also known as Teachers' College. This is

an eight-month program. These particular student teachers have completed a Bachelor of Music from various universities around Canada or Europe and would qualify, upon completing their student teaching, to teach instrumental music as one of their subjects in the Province of Ontario.

Early in September 2004, I attended an Instrumental Methods class taught by a colleague at the University of Windsor's Teachers College to recruit participants for this study. Using handouts for students (Appendix A), I presented a summary of research findings regarding the co-operating teacher and student teacher experiences in both general education and music education. Additionally, this presentation outlined the purpose of the study, the specific research questions and the data collection procedures. Next, I explained the responsibilities of the student teachers who would choose to participate in this study (Appendix B).

There were 14 students in attendance in this class. The presentation lasted approximately 30 minutes. Upon completion of the presentation, I asked students interested in participating in the study to e-mail or call me. The only criterion for inclusion in the study was that the student teachers would be teaching instrumental music in elementary or secondary schools as a primary, not a secondary teachable, and that they would agree to the data collection procedure.

Within a week of the presentation, I was contacted via e-mail by three students. Two of them were qualifying for J/I (Junior/Intermediate, grades 4-10) and one for I/S (Intermediate/Senior, grades 6-12). The fourth student participant contacted me two weeks after the presentation. As each student e-mailed me, I called them by phone. In brief conversations, they assured me that they were willing to participate. I, in turn,

answered any final questions that they had regarding their responsibility as a participant in the study.

The first student teacher to respond to participate was "Mary." Mary completed a Bachelor of Music Degree. She was attending Teacher's College to qualify to teach instrumental music in junior grades. Mary's music background was not from school music programs but instead from being a member of the local military band as she was growing up. There was no high school music program at her school. Her band experience was limited to military band and military repertoire until she arrived at university. Mary was a trumpet major while at university. I have had no association with Mary before this study.

The second student teacher to respond as a participant was "Tom," who held a Bachelor of Musical Arts degree. He spent the last several years owning and running a restaurant as well as being a new father of two small children. Tom's major instrument was tuba. He spent his university years concentrating on course work that he knew would benefit him when he became a music educator. His high school music program had a profound impact on him as a student, and he believed he could have that effect on others. Although he no longer played in the community, he continued to sing in a choir. Tom was a past student of mine in a music education class that I taught at the university.

"Mike" was the third student teacher to respond. Mike holds a Bachelor of Music degree and was a trombone major. His interests as a university student were primarily in composition and history. His initial reason for attending Teachers' College was to gain some experience as a teacher of grade six and seven students. His plan was to continue to compose while teaching. I did not have any prior associations with Mike.

The last student teacher to respond was "Kate." Kate was from Romania and came to Canada with an already established performing and teaching portfolio. She was a professional violinist in her hometown of Cluj-Napoca, Romania. She held both a Bachelor of Music and a Bachelor of Education degree from Romanian schools and arrived in Canada in 1990. Kate taught instrumental music (band and strings) for a number of years at a private school in Toronto, Ontario. She had worked as a music teacher in her native country of Romania, but she had to qualify in Ontario in order to teach for publicly funded schools. The majority of her teaching experience was with students from grades five through eight. Kate was qualifying to teach intermediate and senior grades and work in a secondary school setting. Kate was multilingual, speaking four languages, and was an adult student in her 40's at Teacher's College, as well as a mother and wife. Kate moved to Windsor to complete her teaching qualifications. I had no association with Kate prior to this study.

I immediately felt comfortable with the students who had agreed to participate. Although Kate had expressed concerns about an already heavy workload and fear of not being able to complete the requirements of a participant, I thought her perspective as a foreign national and adult student would add an interesting dimension to this study. She contacted me a week after the others. Even though I was concerned, because of the limited response of willing students, I included Kate as a participant.

This study involved student teachers and co-operating teachers during instrumental music teaching placements at both the elementary and secondary levels. In Ontario, most elementary schools are configured as Junior Kindergarten to grade eight. Generally speaking, secondary schools consist of grades 9 through 12. The field

experience program at university Teachers Colleges in the Province of Ontario provides for a total of 64 days of classroom observation and teaching. At the University of Windsor, where this study took place, the student teaching schedule consists of four 3-week teaching blocks. These occur in October, November, February, and April.

The four co-operating teachers participating in this study worked with a student teacher for two 3-week blocks of instrumental music teaching at either the elementary or secondary level. The four student teachers had four blocks of student teaching practice, and at least two of those blocks were in instrumental music. The other two 3-week teaching blocks were reserved for "secondary teachable subjects." These subjects were dictated by the levels in which teacher candidates were qualifying to teach. For example, the student teachers involved in this study included two qualifying to teach at a Junior/Intermediate level. This means that in addition to qualifying to teach instrumental music, they also taught elementary classroom subjects during two of their student teaching blocks. Additionally, those music education majors qualifying to teach Intermediate/Senior level students, taught in their secondary teachable of one subject for two of the student teaching blocks. These two blocks of instrumental music student teaching occurred in November, 2004 and April, 2005. For the purpose of this study, I only collected data from student teachers during the instrumental-music student teaching blocks.

Methodology Frame

My goal as a researcher in this study was to listen to and interpret the expectations of both student teachers and co-operating teachers during instrumental music student teaching placements. This requires a flexible research design that was open and

emergent; it involved the researcher interpreting the meaning of events for the co-operating teacher and the student teacher; it involved people in familiar and unfamiliar settings, and representations and interpretations of multiple realities; it involved various contexts; and it involved the participation of an actively reflective researcher who was open to continual discovery. These factors contributed to what Lincoln and Guba (1985) describe as a constantly evolving design that allows research to "unfold, cascade, roll, and emerge" (p. 210).

In this study, I interviewed student teachers and co-operating teachers. I have served in both of those roles before. As a high school instrumental music teacher, a co-operating teacher, and a lecturer of undergraduate music education classes, I brought certain understandings to the study. My professional background and personal experience provided me with a strong theoretical sensitivity to this study. I tried to remain aware of this during data analysis, as this awareness was crucial to ensure that I was not making assumptions and overlooking important factors.

The focus of the study was on the lived experiences of the participants during student teaching, suggesting a phenomenological approach. Bogdan and Biklen (1998) discuss the importance of theoretical orientation as "a way of looking at the world, the assumption people have about what is important and what makes the world work" (p. 22). Merriam (1988) discusses the theoretical orientation of the researcher as an important element in qualitative research. According to Bogdan and Biklen (1998), the researcher should become aware of his or her theoretical orientation, because this awareness facilitates the collection and analysis of data. In spite of the considerable debate that exists around the word "theory" in research, Patton (1990) suggests that the idea of linking a

theory to a specific method of research means "...that how you study the world determines what you learn about the world" (p. 67).

Patton (1990) states that, "...phenomenological inquiry focuses on the question: What is the structure and essence of experience of this phenomenon for these people?" (p. 69) Phenomenological researchers attempt to understand the meaning of events and interactions of ordinary people in particular settings (Bogdan & Biklen, 1992). According to Bresler (1995), phenomenology is "...lived experience...it is human science which studies persons" (p. 8). As a researcher within this phenomenological frame, it was important for me to act as an observer to the extent that it was possible. While the inclusion of my own personal lived experiences and the beliefs I have contracted from them was important, it was also important for me to acknowledge my assumptions, attitudes, and views in order to see the experience more clearly. I believed that I could only begin to understand the expectations of both student teachers and co-operating teachers by giving them a voice with which to describe these expectations. According to Patton, "...there is no separate reality for people, there is only what they know their experience is and means" (p. 69).

Theoretical Framework

This is an instrumental multiple case study and I am studying the participants to find out more information about the expectations of the co-operating teachers and student teachers during instrumental music placements. Case study is an ideal methodology when a holistic, in-depth investigation is needed (Feagum, Orum & Sjoberg, 1991). Case studies have been used in varied investigations, particularly sociological studies, but also increasingly in instruction. According to Stake (1995), when the study is experimental or

quasi-experimental, the data collection and analysis methods are known to hide some details. Case studies, on the other hand, are designed to bring out the details from the viewpoint of the participants by using multiple sources of data. Stake's (1995) term "instrumental case study design" is used when the researcher wants to understand more than what is obvious to the observer. The method of phenomenology gave direction to becoming aware of, and understanding, the meaning of co-operating teacher and student-teacher experience. The goal of this study was to achieve what Merleau-Ponty (1956) saw as the purpose of the effort of phenomenology: "to describe experience as it is and to describe it directly, without considering the various causal explanations social scientists may give" (p. 59).

Turning to the nature of lived experience

The fundamental process of understanding demands a posture of thoughtful attending or orienting toward an abiding area of concern. Phenomenological research originates in a particular, real-life awareness that makes the researcher want to make sense of some aspect of human existence. This study was motivated by a desire to construct an interpretation of what the human experience of the student teacher and co-operating teacher is really like; specifically, what does it mean to be such a student or co-operating teacher?

Bracketing, or placing one's knowledge about a phenomenon outside of it, is essential. This is a conscious process of becoming aware of what is known and setting it aside, rather than trying to ignore or forget that the knowledge exists. Personal and professional understandings, beliefs, biases, assumptions, presuppositions, and theories about student and co-operating teacher information were made explicit and recalled

throughout the study. A primary concern was to be open to the experiences described by all participants.

In this study, explications of meaning of the student teacher and co-operating teacher experience provided a deeper understanding of the phenomenon. Phenomenology-guided description of the student teacher and co-operating teacher experience provided a structure for unfolding the phenomenon before the eyes and ears of the researcher. The process uncovered meaning in experience.

Role of the Researcher

My role as researcher was that of observer, and I was immersed in the experiences of the participants in this study as they were voiced during focus group interviews, one-on-one interviews, and as I read-through electronic journaling. Guba and Lincoln (1981) describe this research role as allowing the researcher to, "...emphasize, describe, compare, portray, evoke images and create, for the reader or listener, the sense of having been there" (p. 149). In order for participants to share openly their experiences during data collection, I had to negotiate the boundaries that separated me as observer. This allowed for a more meaningful construction of knowledge and understanding.

Having been a student teacher within this same structure of four three-week block teaching experiences, I was reminded of the concerns that I felt during my own student teaching. By the time that I had arrived at Teachers' College, I had a Master's Degree in French horn performance with a theory minor. I was making a living as a freelance musician and was auditioning around the country for a permanent orchestral job. I was going to Teachers College just in case I could not find a playing job.

Each block teaching experience was negative for me. This reaction was, in part,

because I was not open-minded about teaching, and, in part, because I felt a lack of direction in what was expected of me from the co-operating teacher during each student teaching experience. I was often left on my own, because my co-operating teachers felt I was technically skilled enough in the classroom to be trusted alone with students. I was often used to strengthen their brass section rather than to work as a teacher within a classroom. This made it difficult for them and for me to recognize the weaknesses that I displayed as a teacher of instrumental music. I was often unaware of what the students already knew, and, as a result, lesson planning often faltered. I felt as if I had failed. I received little meaningful feedback. There was never a time that the co-operating teacher and I just sat and talked about teaching instrumental music, what it did for students, what it did for the co-operating teacher, and what it could do for me as a teacher. There were no observation days. On the days that they were to occur, I was immediately immersed into actual teaching.

I was naive enough to believe that all students enrolled in music in high school were there because they wanted to be. Upon reflection, I blame this belief partially on a lack of exposure to a philosophy of music education. My own philosophy was built on my goals and not on goals of the students that I was teaching. I completed my year of Teachers' College feeling like a failure, yet grateful that I would have something to fall back on if playing did not work out.

After completing Teachers' College, I was hired for an instrumental music teaching position. This position was a dream for a brand new music teacher. The school had award winning, established musical ensembles. There was another full time music teacher on site who could mentor me daily. The program was popular, supported, and a

source of pride in the community and the high school. It was a wonderful opportunity through which to learn. While this ideal placement should have been something that I looked forward to and alleviated some concerns, it had the opposite effect. I did not ask questions. I did not regard the other teacher as my colleague or mentor, because I felt that I should already know the answers. I felt unprepared for the task of teaching and constantly believed that I was not good enough to be a successful teacher. I felt that my job was to create professional players, who should think about music the way I thought about it. I had a deeply held feeling that, because I felt so inadequate, I was unable to provide students with a meaningful music education. After two weeks of teaching, I quit. I returned to the auditioning circuit, won a full time orchestral position in another province, and pursued a playing career. It was fifteen years before I returned to the classroom. A clearer understanding of the role and expectations of the student teacher and the co-operating teacher might have changed my career path.

Winning an orchestral job in a new province was an opportunity to see and experience music education in a different way. Part of my job was teaching the local university French horn majors as well as French horn students enrolled at the conservatory of music. I ended up with a studio of 31 horn students, an unusually large number. French horn students would often talk of their school music programs, which were a primary reason why they were studying music privately. Many positive comments from my students made me wonder what it was about school music that had them so enthused. I began to go into the high schools to observe first-hand how music was being taught.

One of the first things I noticed was the camaraderie amongst the music educators themselves. There was collaboration between the elementary school music teachers and

teachers of the secondary schools that these students would eventually attend. Music education was viewed more as an education for students rather than a competition between schools. I was encouraged. A parental advocacy group for arts in schools was strong in this province, and the voices of these parents allowed music educators to provide students with a more comprehensive music education than what I had been accustomed to seeing. Music education in instrumental music was not just about playing, entertaining, and winning competitions. It centered on learning about music and creating an educated audience.

Constant encouragement and consistent contact amongst music educators and student teachers allowed for successful student teaching experiences to occur. Co-operating teachers viewed their role as crucial in continuing the level of music education that was occurring in schools by welcoming student teachers to work with them. This was the kind of experience that I had wanted for myself. In this school system, constant attention and direction from co-operating teachers provided student teachers with positive experiences. Approximately two years later, I took on a secondary school instrumental music job and began to develop my self concept as a music educator. What I learned at that time has carried directly into how I conduct myself now in my own job as a high school music educator and a university lecturer in music education courses.

As a co-operating teacher, I have seen first-hand the need for open communication with the student teachers that are assigned to me. We talk about how I will evaluate them while observing them. This talk about evaluation tends to open up the lines of communication between the student teacher and me. I welcome comments and questions from them while we speak. I take it upon myself to see that the student teachers are

videotaped so that they can see themselves as teachers, which I believe strengthens their attitudes and their own personal philosophies. Prior to beginning each student teaching experience, I spend time detailing the expectations I have of these student teachers, and I ask them to think about what they expect of me and to voice these expectations. My expectations not only concern rapport within the school and the classroom, but also their level of musical skill. I expect that, if my student teachers do not know how to correct things, they can acknowledge the problem and fix it with work and guidance. My primary concern, however, is that each student teacher leaves my classroom with a positive music teaching experience and a view of him or herself as a teacher of music. Student teachers must understand what they need to do to allow themselves to be more successful with each subsequent teaching experience. Through continuing my own education, I have begun to discover the needs of student teachers and co-operating teachers and to pay more attention to them. I regard student teaching as crucial to becoming a successful teacher. Current student teachers may become co-operating teachers in the future. Making student teachers aware of the importance of voicing their expectations in their own student teaching experience potentially could change the way in which they think about their roles as co-operating teachers later in their careers.

As a lecturer of music education classes for undergraduate students, I am aware of the need for students to take ownership for the type of experience that they have as student teachers. Collaboration with their co-operating teachers, expressing their needs as student teachers, and reflecting on their daily student teaching experiences are key contributors to successful outcomes.

Data Collection

Data collection techniques included an individual interview with each participant, two focus group interviews for both the student teachers and the co-operating teachers in separate groups, and electronic journaling by both student teachers and co-operating teachers during student teaching placements. Student teachers and co-operating teachers were sent a schedule of data collection dates and procedures via e-mail (see Appendix C). Times and dates for the individual interviews and both focus group interviews were scheduled via e-mail correspondence. The journals were forwarded via e-mail from study participants to the researcher at the end of each week throughout their teaching block experiences. These journals were printed and filed for consequent data analysis by the researcher.

Several types of data from eight study participants were collected over a period of eight months. A week prior to the first block teaching experience, scheduled for October 2004, each participant was interviewed individually. Questions for these one-on-one interviews (Appendix D for student teachers and Appendix E for co-operating teachers) were sent via email to participants one week before their scheduled interviews. The purpose of the initial interview was four-fold. First, it was an opportunity to confirm with all participants their responsibilities as participants in data collection, including the interview, two focus group interviews, and journaling. Second, each participant had a chance to read the letters granting permission for the study to be conducted from both the University of Windsor Ethics Board and Michigan State University Committee on Research Involving Human Subjects (UCRIHS). Third, participants signed their consent forms (Appendix L) and permission forms granting permission to audio-tape the

interviews (Appendix M). Fourth, it was the beginning of the data collection process.

In the one-on-one interviews, conducted in October 2004, I collected as much general data as I could with four open-ended questions for the student teachers (Appendix D). The answers to these questions helped to identify the expectations of student teachers and co-operating teachers during instrumental music placements. Additionally, co-operating teachers were asked five open-ended questions (Appendix E) in a parallel set of individual interviews.

After each block teaching experience, a focus group interview was held for the student teachers and another for the co-operating teachers. During these focus group interviews, student teachers were asked five open-ended questions (Appendix F) and co-operating teachers were also asked five parallel open-ended questions (Appendix G). Analysis of these interviews involved asking progressively more refined questions in addition to the five open-ended questions during the interview (Spradley, 1980; Spindler, 1982) that I believed would aid in answering the specific questions of the study. Finally, individual journaling, including scenarios or stories, was part of data collection process. Each student teacher (Appendix H) and co-operating teacher (Appendix I) was asked to focus on particular issues during practice teaching field experiences. These issues were specific to each week of practice teaching and were identified as a result of the analysis of the interview data. Thus, the process of collecting data, asking questions, and analyzing data were all concerned with finding relationships among the data (Burgess, 1985; Spradley, 1979; Strauss, 1987). I analyzed the data, coding according to patterns and categories, and developed themes that included and accounted for the data (Merriam, 1988; Spradley, 1980; Strauss, 1987).

Focus group interviews occurred in December 2004 and May 2005. Participants received their times and questions (Appendix F for student teachers and Appendix G for co-operating teachers) two weeks before each focus group interview via email. All interviews were audio-taped using two tape recorders and transcribed by a paid transcriber. Permission was granted from the Head of the School of Music, University of Windsor (Appendix O) for both individual interviews and focus group interviews to be conducted in a classroom at that site.

Journaling was the final source of data collection for this study. At the beginning of each block teaching experience, student teachers and co-operating teachers received an e-mail guiding them toward issues on which to focus during that particular week for their journal writings (Appendix H for student teachers and Appendix I for co-operating teachers). At the end of each week, journal entries were e-mailed to the researcher from the participants.

Trustworthiness

The issue of trustworthiness was addressed through a variety of triangulation methods. Data triangulation was achieved through the variety of data collection techniques, which included one-on-one interviews, focus group interviews, and journaling and through the multiple data sources, which included the four co-operating teachers and the four student teachers. Also, data analysis triangulation was achieved through peer review. An experienced qualitative researcher in education research at the University of South Carolina and colleague, Dr. Victoria Oglan, examined the raw data to confirm my codings.

Finally, member checks were used to further enhance trustworthiness. I sent all

transcripts from interviews to participating co-operating teachers and student teachers for comments. According to Lincoln & Guba (1985), the purpose of member checking is to test for factual and interpretive accuracy and also "...to provide evidence of credibility – the trustworthiness criterion analogous to internal validity in conventional studies" (p. 374). "Member checking is directed at a judgment of overall credibility, while triangulation is directed at the accuracy of specific data items" (p. 316). Both informal and formal member checks were carried out throughout the study. It was especially important to allow the participants to view my interpretation of their voices as what they intended to be heard. All participants agreed during the study that my interpretations were representative of their own thoughts and feelings and provided meaning for the experience. In addition, I was corrected by both Kate and Mary regarding their backgrounds prior to arriving at Teacher's College.

Chapter IV

VOICES OF THE PARTICIPANTS AND IDENTIFICATION OF THEMES

The goal of analysis in phenomenology is to gain "...insight into the essence of a phenomenon and it involves a process of reflectively appropriating, of clarifying, and of making explicit the structure of meaning of the lived experience" (van Manen, 1990, p. 77). In analyzing the data, I interpreted structures of meaning or themes about the lived experience from the transcribed interviews and journals with student teachers and co-operating teachers. Creating themes "...is largely an intuitive process but it is also systematic and informed by the study's purpose and the investigator's orientation and knowledge" (Merriam, 1988, p. 133). Interview transcripts, focus group interview transcripts and journal entries were analyzed according to the case study research analysis procedures outlined by Merriam (1988) and Yin (1994). Common elements were coded in the data, and themes were identified. The process of discovering phenomenological themes involved grasping and formulating an understanding of meaning structures of the student teachers and co-operating teachers.

Themes were formed and became interpretive products that evolved through a conscious, unbiased openness to all data in response to the question, "...what is the essence of the notion being expressed here" (Merleau-Ponty, 1962; VanManen, 1990). Coding strategies were used to categorize and manage concepts from statements and words abstracted from the data. Thus, I attempted to isolate the essence of meaning of the views of the student teachers and co-operating teachers.

The danger in a study using a variety of data collection techniques is that the researcher will collect "a large mass of data of dubious theoretical relevance" (Glasser &

Strauss, 1967, p. 72). To counteract this possibility, data analysis, which is "the process of making sense out of one's data" (Merriam, 1988, p. 127), began with the initial collection of data and continued throughout the duration of the study. I noted insights as they happened (Burgess, 1985; Erickson, 1986; Spradley, 1980). I included these insights in the analysis of data, making reference to such things as vocal expression, physical gestures while speaking, subjects who did not participate in certain portions of the focus group interviews, and so forth, when I felt it meaningful to the interpretation of the data.

Creating Codes and Themes

Immediately following all interviews, I taped my comments about the interview dynamics and environment to capture immediate insights and to help retain specific data about each student teacher and co-operating teacher. These taped comments were also considered to be data in my phenomenological reflection. There were 13 tapes in total. One tape was designated to each participant involved in the study for the individual interviews. Five other tapes were as follows:

- Co-operating teachers, focus group #1
- Student teachers, focus group #1
- Co-operating teachers, focus group #2
- Student teachers, focus group #2
- My taped comments

Tapes and journal writings were divided into two groups. One was student teachers' tapes and journals, and the other was co-operating teachers' tapes and journals. Both individual interviews and focus group interview tapes were included in each of these groups. After each taped interview was transcribed, I read through the transcript

while listening to the tape to be certain that it accurately reflected the content of the interview and to review and immerse myself in the content. Additionally, I read and re-read each journal entry, while I made notes simultaneously in the margins. As the data was gathered, I generated a list of words or phrases that seemed to capture thematic aspects of that interview and the subsequent journal. These words or phrases were written in the margins of the transcriptions and in the margins of the journals. Also, I evaluated the dynamics of the interviews for openness, objectivity, and use of interview techniques, so that necessary adjustments could be made for future interviews. This procedure was followed for each of the three interviews, including the one-on-one interviews that occurred in October 2004 and the focus group interviews that occurred in December 2004 and May 2005. Similar processes were followed with the journal entries that occurred in December 2004 and May 2005.

Copies of the original tapes were made, labelled, and placed in a locked cabinet, and the originals were taken to the transcriber. The names of the participants were not written anywhere on the tapes. On occasion, I addressed the participants by their first names, but their last names were not disclosed. These were subsequently changed to pseudonyms in the transcripts.

The need for strict confidentiality was discussed with the transcriber. She was alone when she transcribed at the computer, and she designated files for each participant and each interview separately on her computer. When she completed each tape, the transcriber returned the tape to me along with the transcriptions, and I placed them in a locked cabinet for subsequent analysis.

Data from interview transcripts and journals were read and re-read to get a sense

of meaning from the participants. It was important to divide the data according to groups and read data from both groups separately to get a sense of meaning from within each group. First, I read the data transcriptions from the co-operating teacher group several times. Each time I read the data from this group, I highlighted important words. I followed the same procedure for the student teacher group. After reading the data of each group several times, I re-read all data, intertwining both groups rather than reading separately to get a sense of group meaning as a whole. I highlighted any additional words that were important but had not yet been highlighted during these readings.

I then read the transcripts again while listening to the tapes, specifically listening to the inflections and emphasis given to words by the student teachers and co-operating teachers, as this was important for sensitive interpretation. This also confirmed my choice of significant words and statements.

Developing coding categories

Groups of descriptive data were created by separating certain words, phrases, patterns' of behaviour, subjects' ways of thinking, and events that were repetitive or stood out to me. This grouping strategy allowed me to sort the descriptive data within the individual groups so that certain preliminary codes would begin to emerge. I began to generate preliminary codes by using yellow Post-it notes® for co-operating teachers and purple Post-it® notes for student teachers. I wrote the highlighted words, statements, and words written in the margins taken from data transcripts on the Post-it notes® and taped them onto the floor separated by colour and group.

I then re-arranged the Post-it notes® taped on the floor by merging the student teachers' group and the co-operating teachers' group. Grouping was again a means of

organizing the preliminary codes into groups that demonstrated similar meanings, opposite meanings, events, patterns of behaviour, and subjects' ways of thinking. When I determined that words and statements were grouped appropriately, a one-or-two code word description representative of that group of words was written on a pink Post-it® note that was attached to the wall. Pink Post-it® notes were used to identify these codes. There were 68 codes on pink Post-it® notes resulting from the data from the two groups. I then shared these codes with my peer reviewer, Dr. Victoria Oglan, who confirmed my findings.

Often spending several days simply looking at the codes on the wall, I began to merge these emergent threads together into groups that eventually became categories. When I could not make sense of the categories, I would try a different grouping. It was difficult not to manipulate the categories into what I thought they should be, and I was conscientious about avoiding this and letting the themes emerge through the analysis of the data. Categories emerged that were representative of behaviours, events, perceptions, similar meanings, opposite meanings, and places. After several days of formulating meanings through various category groupings, the following themes emerged:

- Building a music learning community
- The blame game
- It's overwhelming!
- Do as I do, not as I say!
- Assessing versus. assisting
- The co-operating teacher as the sage.

The themes were reviewed by Dr. Victoria Oglan to confirm that the data within

each were consistent and that I had not unconsciously forced data into any pre-determined category. Then themes were analyzed for the purpose of possibly reducing them by combining those that were redundant or similar in meaning. Some preliminary codes were created during the various phases of the data collection process, but the major analysis occurred after all the data had been transcribed. Once I had established the themes, I e-mailed a copy of my results to my peer reviewer, Dr. Victoria Oglan, as well as to my dissertation co-chair, Dr. Mitchell Robinson, for validation.

Theme Results

The following reflections on each essential theme make the meaning of the human experience of student teacher and co-operating teacher more understandable. Selected quotes from interview transcripts and journals are included to allow the reader to know each participant and to grasp the message in the words of student teachers and co-operating teachers.

Building a Music Learning Community

Trying to define the word community is a difficult task, as it is a word used in various contexts. Researchers have described and defined communities as having mutually-shared values. (Grant, 1988; Hallinger & Murphy, 1986; Lightfoot, 1984; Sizer, 1984). A community can be defined as a group of people engaged in a common task. It can be a group in one specific location, such as a classroom, or a group of people separated by geographic space but linked through technology. Sharing common ideas and experiences, both good and bad, helps to shape a community. A music learning community can provide student teachers and co-operating teachers with a sense of belonging and may instil a willingness and desire in them to make the community better.

Included in the music learning community of this dissertation are students, student teachers, co-operating teachers, the school faculties, administrations and parents.

A school as community is not a new concept. Literature on "school as community" has begun to identify specific variables that contribute to a sense of community. Based on both empirical research (Battistich, Solomon, Kim, Watson & Schaps, 1995; Bryk & Driscoll, 1988) and a synthesis of existing research (Boyer, 1995; McMillan & Chavis, 1986; Meier, 1995; Sergiovanni, 1994), sharing values, teaching and learning from one another, being honest, developing communication strategies and creating bonding relationships emerged as critical elements of community-building in school settings.

In this study, co-operating teachers and student teachers described themselves as sharing some things and not others. The shared issues voiced by co-operating teachers and student teachers included such things as belonging to the school, being supportive of each other in teaching music, sharing views about music teaching and learning, developing a relationship that is professional and provides mentorship, and being responsible in their roles as student teachers and co-operating teachers for the teaching and learning that takes place within student teaching. Yet, some co-operating teachers felt that their student teacher would be inclined to learn more if they were involved with many aspects of the school. On the other hand, some co-operating teachers felt that their student teacher should only be with them, because they voiced concerns that the student teachers were not fully aware and prepared for the role of an instrumental music teacher. Student teachers feared leaving their co-operating teachers to take part in the larger music learning community.

Building a music learning community was a theme that emerged out of the data from both the co-operating teachers and the student teachers. Initially during the one-on-one interviews, each student teacher and co-operating teacher described themselves in roles that involved similar ways of thinking. Each co-operating teacher enjoyed a music program that was geared towards the types of learners they had in their school communities. These schools involved in this study were diverse in their demographics, socio-economic status, population numbers, and ethnicities, and each teacher, while following curricular guidelines, accomplished expectations within their school communities. Student teachers also described similar expectations for themselves as student teachers. During the one-on-one interviews, each student teacher had an idea of what he or she wanted to accomplish, but the student teachers were not sure of how they would fulfill these expectations as they worked with their co-operating teachers.

The theme of "Building a Music Learning Community" emerged from codes such as "belong," "faculty involvement," "parent-teacher interviews," "immersion," "experience," "acceptance," "collaborate with," and, "want to learn." Student teachers, in their focus group interviews and journaling, often described themselves as not fitting anywhere while student teaching. It was difficult for these student teachers to decide if they should immerse themselves in the school community or wait to be invited by their co-operating teacher. Co-operating teachers, on the other hand, expressed themselves as being separate from their student teacher except when they were in the classroom. It did not seem to occur to co-operating teachers that allowing their student teachers to become involved in all areas of the school community could potentially heighten the overall student teaching experience and allow the student teachers to be more successful as

community members.

Student teachers and co-operating teachers had different ideas concerning what was needed to create a positive, productive learning community. Student teachers, for the most part, believed that a sense of belonging and a sense of membership in the school community was a pre-requisite for the positive learning experience of a music student teacher. Student teachers felt from the beginning of each experience that two communities existed: one was the community of teachers and another of student teachers.

> One thing that was kind of weird is that in the middle of the staff room there was a huge table and all the teachers were at the table and we the student teachers have a small round table somewhere on the side of the room. We had our environment and they had their environment. Many, many times I had the feeling no one cares about us (Kate, focus group interview #1, December, 2004).

Co-operating teachers agreed that they wanted to provide a positive experience for their student teachers, but they felt a sense of frustration at the lack of understanding on the part of the student teachers of the multiple dimensions of the roles of music teachers and what the community entails. This sense of frustration took precedence over other areas of concern faced by the student teachers. Perhaps as a result, the idea of helping to create a sense of the student teachers belonging to the school community was not a consistently voiced concern of the co-operating teachers. Yet, co-operating teachers expressed early concerns about providing positive learning experiences for student teachers that would help provide a "sense of belonging," since they described their roles as much more complex than just teaching:

> Student teachers are there to experience all aspects of the teaching profession as it

> pertains to an instrumental music teacher, including such things as creating lesson plans, teaching the music curriculum, conducting ensembles and preparing for concerts, being involved in extra curricular music programs, fixing/maintaining instruments and all other aspects of school life (Leo, individual interview, October, 2004).

This sense of misunderstanding the role of the music educator in the classroom was of key concern to the co-operating teachers, and immediately stood in the way of their inviting student teachers into the larger community.

Immersion in the school community could allow both student teachers and co-operating teachers to understand each other's roles during student teaching experiences. That understanding could have allowed for the sharing of values, teaching and learning from one another, being honest, developing communication strategies, and bonding relationships to begin developing. Yet, while I read the data, it became clear to me that, although the co-operating teachers had similar ideas regarding the roles of student teachers, student teachers did not understand what their roles were, nor did the co-operating teachers delineate those roles for the student teachers. Co-operating teachers did not display a fundamental community value, "....the principle that people are as important as any information to be learned or techniques to be used. The fundamental values of community are those of open and honest communication, mutual vulnerability, significant commitment to each other, and collective responsibility for sustaining the community" p.5 (Larivee, 2000, p.5). During the initial few days of being with each other in the classroom, there did not appear to be a willingness to establish open and honest communication that could result in a positive outcome between the student

teachers and the co-operating teachers. As a result of this apparent lack of communication, the student teachers appeared more confused with where they fit, not just at the beginning of their student teaching experiences, but in subsequent experiences as well. As a result, they were alienated, rather than becoming essential members of the community.

In the first focus group interview with co-operating teachers conducted in December, 2004, co-operating teachers shared their collective frustration regarding the lack of preparation of the student teachers. This frustration occurred as a result of a variety of dimensions, such as inadequate student teaching time and a lack of exposure to the myriad of instrumental music teaching roles, including repairing instruments, arranging, analyzing scores, conducting, running extra-curricular rehearsals, programming and advocating, fundraising, purchasing, and presenting concerts. One co-operating teacher described the frustration in this way:

> I will have a student teacher who is required to teach 25% of my course load during their first practice teaching experience. However, being a music teacher requires many other things, not just course work. I don't think student teachers are really aware of their job roles and it's not their fault (Brad, focus group interview #1, experience. December 2004).

When student teachers appeared to lack the practical skills and knowledge needed to successfully fulfill music teacher roles, co-operating teachers became concerned with not being able to effectively guide the student teachers assigned to them. Just as co-operating teachers shared their desire for a positive learning experience for their student teachers, they also shared this frustration, which became apparent after the first student teaching

block. Co-operating teachers initially, but not intentionally, set themselves up to be frustrated with the student teachers. Rather than using a lack of student teacher knowledge as an opportunity to guide their student teachers and open up the lines of communication between the two parties, they allowed their frustrations to fester, creating rifts in the learning community.

On the other hand, student teachers also voiced concerns about their experiences with their co-operating teachers. Prior to the first student teaching experience, in individual interviews, student teachers expressed a desire to have a positive learning experience by participating in as many facets of the school community as possible. However, student teachers were unable to voice how this might occur. While student teachers defined their roles uniquely, each student teacher expressed their need to do and experience as much as possible. They understood that experiencing as much as possible meant that they had to be a part of the school as much as possible. For example, Tom felt that being involved with the school community was the first step to an effective learning experience in the classroom. He stated:

> Initially I thought that my role would be that of an observer, a visitor to the school. I think now that if I dive right in and become a member of the school society and be a part of the school as a teacher, not so much an observer, I will learn more (Tom, one-on-one interview, October 2004).

Kate, an older student teacher who was 40 years of age, was afraid that she would not be accepted as a student teacher within the community due to her age. In addition, she was a teacher with 10 years experience from another country. Consequently, Kate had expected that she would experience a positive outcome if she were able to immerse

herself immediately into the school community in the role of teacher, rather than have to conform to the designated percentage allotted to younger, less experienced teachers. The designated percentage of teaching time set by the Faculty of Education is 25% for the first teaching block. Faculty of Education restraints did not permit Kate to become a member of the school community as much as she desired. She reported:

> I don't know why I have to wait to teach. I want to get to know the staff and the school environment. I want to sit in with my teacher and experience parent-teacher interviews, staff meetings and other things. I want to get to know my musicians. This is frustrating. I'm losing valuable time in the classroom (Kate, individual interview, October, 2004).

Kate's beliefs about community were already somewhat established before she began her first student teaching block. She wanted to communicate and share information with her co-operating teacher. She was committed to learning from her co-operating teacher, a characteristic valued highly in belonging to a community.

Not all student teachers were able to discern the types of experiences they wanted to have. Mary initially began her student teaching with confusion regarding her role as a student teacher. She was unable to articulate what she wanted to experience and also lacked the ability to express her desire for guidance from her co-operating teacher. Mary's remarks, when she was asked to describe her role as a student teacher, reflected a lack of ability to communicate as well as an interest in learning how. She felt from the beginning that she was on her own and not a part of a school community. Mary expressed confusion regarding her role as a student teacher.

> I think that, in the role as a student teacher, it's really difficult in an instrumental

music placement because often times you're faced with numerous bands. My job is really to sort of observe and watch her for the first little bit and then do some teaching. I just want to be able to do it, and give it a go, and see how it happens (Mary, individual interview, October, 2004).

Without a plan upon which to rely for the initial student teaching experience, Mary had pre-determined that her success or failure during student teaching was entirely up to her. She was apprehensive and believed that teaching band was difficult. Whether the reason was that Mary lacked the skills or was nervous and fearful of the unknown was not clear.

Brad expected a positive learning experience. His difficulty, however, lay in the fact that he could not develop a sense of belonging that would allow for the experience to feel authentic. Brad determined that he did not want to develop himself as a teacher in someone else's classroom, but, rather, he wanted to emerge as a teacher in his own setting. Brad did not describe his need for guidance from a co-operating teacher, or his need to be a part of the school community in order for his positive experience to occur. Brad said, "The problem I had to deal with is that you always find yourself as a guest in that class" (Brad, focus group interview #1, December, 2004). If Brad had understood that the opportunity to be involved in someone else's class could provide a meaningful learning opportunity for him, he might have felt more like a community member and less like a guest. However, he was unable, initially, to determine the positive effect that this approach could have on his overall experience. On the other hand, Brad's attitudes could have been a result of the lack of open and honest communication with his co-operating teacher from the onset of student teaching. An honest conversation between the student

teacher and co-operating teacher at the beginning of the student teacher experience might have quelled this feeling for Brad, as well as made his co-operating teacher aware of the responsibility of alleviating Brad's feeling like a "guest."

Student teachers and co-operating teachers had different ideas about the positive learning outcomes of student teaching. Some student teachers believed that a sense of belonging and a sense of membership in the music learning community was a prerequisite to their positive learning experiences, and some determined that they could have achieved this sense of belonging by being immersed in the student teaching experience. Other student teachers thought that they were on their own, needing to observe more, as well as function in their own classroom in order to really experience the "teacher role."

The other "sense of belonging" identified by student teachers involved pupil-given recognition. In this study, the student teachers felt that they had to have continuous contact with classes in order to allow pupils to redefine them as teachers rather than student teachers. Being accepted by pupils as a teacher appeared to be an important indicator of being confirmed as a teacher. Achieving teacher status in the eyes of pupils conveyed a powerful message to students about both professional credibility and personal fulfillment. While not all students involved in this study had the opportunity to achieve this "sense of belonging" through their teaching experiences, it was significant that the student teachers sought out the "sense of belonging" on their own by forming relationships with teachers outside of their areas. This sense of belonging needing to be experienced by student teachers in this study is supported by McNally, Cole & Stronach (1994).

To develop the secondary sense of belonging Kate wanted to teach 100% of the teacher's load rather than the Faculty of Education's designated 25% for the first student teaching block. Also, Tom expressed his need to dive right into the experience of belonging to the school community, believing that this experience could provide him with a more holistic view of a teacher's role. The short allotment of time for the first block as a student teacher could be the cause of the student teacher's sense of lack of belonging. On the other hand, the immediate immersion into the role of a teacher could help to alleviate the frustration for the co-operating teacher regarding the misunderstanding of a music teacher's role, as well as provide the student teacher with a sense of belonging to the entire school and the students they are assigned to teach during student teaching.

Part of the definition of community used in this study involved the fundamental values of community as those of being open and honest in communication and of having a collective responsibility for sustaining the relationships and values of the community. Co-operating teachers all agreed that they wanted to provide positive experiences for the student teachers, but their sense of frustration at the lack of understanding on the part of the student teachers of the multiple dimensions of the roles of instrumental music teachers deterred them. Co-operating teachers wanted the student teachers to understand that, while teaching music is of paramount importance, the time allotted to it was small when compared with the preparation portion of the job. Co-operating teachers felt that student teachers did not have realistic views of their future roles as music teachers and that they were not equipped to show or explain to the student teachers what was entailed. This frustration on the part of the co-operating teachers deterred them from

communicating with the student teachers and from allowing the student teachers to see what music teachers do more fully. As a result, the student teachers did not ask questions regarding the role of teachers, which further reinforced the co-operating teachers' assumptions that student teachers should have come with this knowledge and did not need to be nurtured in this direction. Rather than using the student teachers' lack of understanding as an opportunity to teach them about the role of teachers, co-operating teachers felt insulted. As a result, the co-operating teachers held early concerns about providing positive learning experiences for student teachers, since they described their roles as more complex than the student teachers believed them to be.

Some research paints a bleak picture of co-operating teachers' understanding of their roles and responsibilities (Wideen, Mayer-Smith, & Moon, 1998). The Faculty of Education at the university in this study offers a voluntary two-hour orientation for co-operating teachers. In attendance at this orientation are usually those teachers who have volunteered to act as co-operating teachers for the first time. During this orientation, co-operating teachers learn about the use and submission of the evaluation sheets for the student teachers, how to contact the university supervisors when necessary, and what the designated teaching percentages are during each practice teaching block. Issues such as feedback, building a relationship, rapport with other faculty, and immersion into the community of the school are not the central focus of the orientation.

Feiman-Nemser (1996) has suggested that, if teacher educators want teacher candidates to learn new ways of thinking and acting, they must be placed with co-operating teachers who are already practising the kinds of reform teacher educators want to see or establish contexts in which collaborating teachers and teacher candidates

explore new strategies together. Teacher educators in some settings, has little control over the selection of co-operating teachers, and few co-operating teachers practise the kind of learner-centred teaching currently advocated by teacher education programs (Cochran-Smith, 1991; Cohen, McLaughlin, & Talbert, 1993; Feiman-Nemser, Parker, & Zeichner, 1993). The Faculty of Education involved in this study did not choose the co-operating teachers for their student teachers. Each school within the various boards of education for this area asks for one teacher volunteer who will co-ordinate the co-operating teacher placements within their school. These teachers often solicit co-operating teachers via email requests. Once the teacher co-ordinator has the list for the school, it is shown to the principal of the school. The principal approves the list, which then is forwarded to the co-ordinator at the Faculty of Education, who later assigns student teachers to the co-operating teachers on the list. The only criteria necessary to act as a co-operating teacher is a minimum of five years experience in a primary teachable for secondary school, and five years of classroom experience for elementary school.

Gallant (1994) suggested that viewing the role of a co-operating teacher as being more work than break can help ensure a better chance of success for the student teacher. In his study, Gallant implied that co-operating teachers have a responsibility to provide student teachers with many opportunities that will reflect the job description of a music educator. To do this, Gallant suggests that co-operating teachers should allow the student teachers to be involved in the community of the school by attending faculty meetings, department meetings, extra-curricular activities, and observing parent-teacher interviews. This might have alleviated the concerns voiced by both the student teachers and the co-operating teachers in this study. Co-operating teachers wanted student teachers to

experience the myriad of roles that define a music educator; yet, in some respects, their hands were tied. The Faculty of Education is quite strict in their allotment of time designated for each student teaching block. It is not until the final block of teaching that student teachers are expected to teach 100% of the time. However, it is typical practice that the fourth teaching block will be at a school that the student teachers have never been to before and with a new co-operating teacher. This makes immediate immersion difficult.

The Blame Game

"The Blame Game" emerged as a theme mostly out of codes found in journal writings. Codes such as "too busy," "feed," "feeling sorry," "figure it out," "it's not my fault," "hate," and "agree to disagree," defined this theme as putting the onus of responsibility on the other party. In other words, student teachers and co-operating teachers consistently blamed each other for why something did not work, rather than looking within (reflecting) to determine how something could have gone better.

During focus group interviews, participants listened and involved themselves in sharing information with their peers. It appeared to me that this information was shared cautiously by the participants to position themselves favourably in the eyes of their peers. Journal writings, on the other hand, were personal exchanges of information with the researcher. The purpose of the journal writings was to reflect on teaching experiences, including lesson planning, lesson delivery, student rapport, classroom management, behaviour management, relationship with co-operating teachers, handling day to day issues in a classroom and school, and seeing themselves as teachers of music. The tone in these personal writings was different than the tone in the focus group conversations.

Whereas the tone in the focus group interviews was reserved and generic, the tone of the journal writings was forthcoming and specific. The intent of the journal writing was to provide the participants with an opportunity to look inward and reflect on their journeys. However, what actually appeared in the journal was not introspective. Rather, participants used the journals as an opportunity to blame the other party rather than talking about and reflecting on themselves and their teaching.

Reflective practices appear to be lacking for both student teachers and co-operating teachers. While the student teaching experience is a powerful influence upon prospective teachers, these experiences might have more positive, lasting effects upon their views about teaching if reflectivity is stressed and modeled by expert in-service teachers. Hollingsworth (1989) found that preservice teachers modified prior beliefs and made conceptual changes, and that expert co-operating teachers encouraged them to confront their past perceptions.

It's the co-op's fault!

Student teachers blamed their co-operating teachers for providing too few positive learning experiences and for their feeling like "failures." This happened for a variety of reasons. Student teachers needed the co-operating teachers to validate the work that they were doing in the classroom by telling them what they wanted to hear, rather than the truth. When this did not happen, rather than questioning their co-operating teachers regarding specifics or reflecting themselves about their own work, they blamed their co-operating teachers. Mary wrote:

> I don't feel successful because I don't feel like she appreciates any of my efforts, or what I'm trying to do. I know how much work I'm doing and how much I'm

accomplishing. I can't even get positive feedback from her. It's very difficult to want to do better (Mary, journal writing, December, 2004).

The short placements also resulted in student teachers blaming their co-operating teachers for disappointing or unexpectedly negative experiences. Student teachers were aware from the beginning that there would be four placements of three weeks each. Rather than plan and learn from each experience, they used the short placement as an excuse to vent their frustration and blame their co-operating teachers. According to the student teachers, the multiple venues and co-operating teacher changes did not allow for the student teachers to experience continuity of teaching ideas from placement to placement. Student teachers expressed frustration at the multiple expectations of the Faculty of Education as well as the different expectations of each co-operating teacher. Kate discussed the mixed messages she received:

> My co-operating teacher says it's this way, this is what we need done, and this is how I would do it. And if I'm not doing it that way I almost feel like, okay I can't do this. When my university supervisor came to observe me, I was doing something that my co-operating teacher told me to do and my university supervisor made a comment about it being done wrong. I didn't know what to say. That moment made me feel like a complete failure (Kate, focus group interview #1, December, 2004).

An experience such as Kate's took place while I, too, was student teaching. The lack of time to develop comfort with both the students that a student teacher is teaching and to develop a relationship with the co-operating teacher was frustrating. Expectations change from co-operating teacher to co-operating teacher, and it perhaps is unrealistic for

student teachers to understand them quickly.

At times, however, co-operating teachers took responsibility and voiced concerns regarding their ability to provide feedback for their student teachers. All four co-operating teachers reflected openly on their processes of providing feedback during the second focus group interview. Many thoughts were expressed by the co-operating teachers when recounting their feedback experiences with their student teachers, ranging from having to be explicit when providing feedback to accepting the fact that they did not model reflection to their student teachers. These realizations seemed to profoundly affect the co-operating teacher group during the focus group interview.

> When I was talking with Kate regarding a lesson she had just completed, I didn't realize that what I was saying was too specific and too much for her to take in all at once. I thought that she was ignoring my advice (Leo, focus group interview #2, May, 2004).

Although feedback is an important part of the co-operating teachers' role, until they were given the opportunity to really think about the way in which they provided feedback, co-operating teachers did not regard it as an important part of their job. All co-operating teachers agreed that they needed to develop better feedback strategies with their student teachers.

<u>It's the student teachers fault!</u>

Co-operating teachers blamed their student teachers for having inadequate musical, practical, and classroom management strategies. While it was difficult, according to co-operating teachers, to provide feedback to their student teachers concerning these inadequacies, co-operating teachers voiced their concerns in their

journal entries. However, the co-operating teachers continued to blame the student teachers for their shortcomings rather than to examine and reflect on their own roles. Tammy said:

> I worry about my student doing well. She told me that she was worried about having a job like mine because "you just do so much." Instead of trying to get something out of the experience, she just complains about it (Tammy, journal entry, December, 2004).

Tammy's inability to help her student teacher understand the job of a music educator resulted in a negative experience for the student teacher and in less growth on the part of the co-operating teacher. Tammy could have questioned the student teacher about what she could do to prevent her student teacher from feeling this way. Rather, Tammy exhibited an inability to reflect on what her student teacher was experiencing. While co-operating teachers were concerned with the lack of understanding of the role of a music educator on the part of the student teachers, they appeared to be unable to understand that they have a responsibility to teach their student teachers about their roles.

A study conducted by Clarke (2006) represents one of the first attempts to systematically explore the nature and substance of co-operating teacher reflection in practicum settings. One purpose of the study was to move beyond brief observations, surveys, interviews, and self-report data of co-operating teachers to a more in-depth exploration of the nature and substance of co-operating teachers' work with beginning teachers. Results indicated that interaction between the co-operating teachers and their student teachers promoted co-operating teacher reflection. Further, reflection typically fell into two main categories: reflection on one's advisory practices or reflection on the

sense they made of the student-teachers' teaching practices. Both categories were important in that they enabled the co-operating teachers to bring new perspectives to bear on their work as school-based teacher educators. Additionally, this study supports the concern in my study regarding reflective practices among both co-operating teachers and student teachers and their communication issues. Following the suggestion of better communication between these two parties could also promote better reflection skills.

It's the university's fault!

Co-operating teachers also expressed frustration about the brief duration of the experience and blamed student teachers and the Faculty of Education. A study conducted by Ewart & Straw (2005) addressed and confirmed this frustration. During focus group interviews, co-operating teachers expressed their dissatisfaction with a program in which teacher candidates were split into short 3-week practicums. These co-operating teachers believed that, when the practicum was split into brief practicums, the teacher candidates never had the chance to develop their own teaching styles. Also, co-operating teachers agreed during focus group interviews that short student teaching experiences encouraged student teachers to copy the personality of the co-operating teachers in order to survive, whereas a longer practicum, with the same co-operating teacher, might have allowed teacher candidates' personalities to flourish:

> You can't hide and you can't become the other person either because eventually the students will get to know you or they will tell you (Mike, focus group interview #2).

Co-operating teachers felt that a longer practicum could provide more of a "real-life" experience. Their criticism of split block student teaching as too short gave no

doubt of their support for a structure that gave teacher candidates a longer period of time in individual classrooms, and this long time frame could be influential in helping student teachers see the "real picture" of a music teacher's role.

In addition to blaming one another in journal writings, both student teachers and co-operating teachers pointed a finger at the Faculty of Education during focus group interview #2, May, 2005. Co-operating teachers and student teachers consistently remarked during these focus group interviews that they felt that the Faculty of Education was remiss in preparing students for a positive practice teaching experience. One co-operating teacher posited:

> I think that the Faculty of Education, if they're going to train people to teach in public schools, should have something concrete in terms of appropriate courses coming in and insist that those people take those courses. I've had student teachers who have never played in a band, orchestra or wind ensemble before (Brad, focus group interview #2, May, 2005).

It is not unusual for vocal music candidates to be placed into instrumental music placements in which they feel inadequate because instrumental music is not their area of expertise, nor have they any experience in this area. Co-operating teachers, who are instrumental, not vocal, music specialists become frustrated with this. Both the student teachers and the co-operating teachers often feel inadequate in facilitating a successful student teaching experience under these circumstances. In her case, Tammy felt that the current procedure for selecting teacher candidates within the Faculty of Education hindered the way she acted as a co-operating teacher. While some faculties of education interview potential teacher candidates, the University of Windsor is among those who do

not. The faculty relies on transcripts to determine the qualifications of potential teacher candidates who apply to its program. While transcripts allow for a particular type of screening process to occur, successful entry is determined by cumulative averages rather than by which courses have been taken to develop the body of knowledge needed to be successful in the classroom. In other words, the overall grade point average is more important than the courses taken to achieve the overall average.

According to Byrnes, Kiger & Schechtman (2003) most teacher-education programs select students based on academic criteria, such as grade point average (GPA) and standardized test scores (Habermann & Post, 1998). While this may be common practice, research demonstrates that these academic criteria are generally poor predictors of who will be successful teachers (Baskin, Ross, & Smith, 1996). Much of the research on effective classroom teaching emphasizes the importance of verbal, interpersonal, and leadership skills (Dunkin & Barnes, 1986; Westbrook, 1998). Despite these findings, teachers colleges tend to ignore outstanding verbal, interpersonal, and leadership qualities in favour of easier-to-measure academic criteria.

Both the co-operating teachers and student teachers blamed the Faculty of Education for the three-week, split block scheduling. Teacher candidates are assigned to four different co-operating teachers for three week teaching blocks during their year at Teacher's College. Co-operating teachers also receive four different student teachers in a year. Because the teaching blocks are only three weeks long, it is difficult to establish working relationships between co-operating teachers and student teachers. These types of relationships are difficult to develop that quickly. Student teachers are expected to increase their teaching load by 25% each time they are practice teaching, and co-

operating teachers are expected to let that happen as part of the agreement between the Faculty of Education and the co-operating teachers. This scenario makes it difficult for both the co-operating teachers and student teachers. Tammy described the problem:

> I think the system that's in place does have an effect on how we are as co-operating music teachers. I've seen some places where it's four months straight. If I could get one student teacher for all that time, it could be more personal for me and them. I could try to mould and direct that person more, and I think the result would be better prepared music teachers (Tammy, focus group interview #2, May, 2005).

Student teachers must be well prepared in the areas of music theory, history, literature, performance practice, instrumental and choral techniques, and current theories of learning, including how to work with students with special needs, students from diverse backgrounds, and students who are at risk Like co-operating teachers, student teachers also experienced four different placements validating the need to be prepared musically. Often student teachers' decision making regarding teaching would need to be specific to each new placement. These multiple changes did not allow for the student teachers to experience continuity in teaching. Student teachers expressed frustration at the multiple expectations of the Faculty of Education, as well as the different expectations of each co-operating teacher.

<u>It's Overwhelming!</u>

"It's Overwhelming" surfaced as a theme for both the co-operating teachers and the student teachers. Codes such as, "I'm swamped," "I can't do this," "how can I learn this?," and "survival" helped to identify this theme. Fears, concerns and many questions,

particularly from the student teachers, were central to this theme. Student teachers felt overwhelmed with such things as developing a relationship with the co-operating teacher, communicating with their co-operating teachers, developing classroom management strategies, learning to undertake the multi-tasking role of the classroom music teacher, and developing assessment strategies as well as being assessed, all while trying to emerge as a teacher in their own right.

On the other hand, the theme of "it's overwhelming" emerged for one co-operating teacher who was concerned with staying on track curricularly, meeting the needs of the student teachers, maintaining performing skills of their own students, teaching new skills, working with the student teacher to understand the music teacher's role, and having enough time for their student teacher.

> Finding out what the job's really like. To be honest with you I had no idea what it was really like. I mean I loved the thought of it, worked my tush off, but realistically I had no idea of what the job was. I feel sorry for the student teachers, but my concern is they will never get it, or when they do, it will be too late. They will have already left this profession. I don't have time for all of this. How can I get them to understand better, what it is I do (Tammy, focus group interview #2, May, 2005)

Student teachers felt overwhelmed by the amount and variety of duties that they were expected to perform at school. Part of this problem was that, while student teaching provides plentiful opportunities for growth and for the development of teaching knowledge, it simultaneously exposes the student teacher to a minefield of possible disasters. Although the practical experience in schools is considered by many preservice

teachers to be the most significant part of their education program (Cole & Knowles, 1993; Griffin, 1989), it is fraught with risks. These risks include failure to learn the designated content, implied criticism of the co-operating teacher if her or his approach to teaching is not followed, danger of loss of control of the class while using an unfamiliar teaching approach, and risk of effects on the student teaching evaluation if things do not work properly.

As stated previously, the student teaching placements at the University of Windsor require that, during each teaching block of three weeks, student teachers will increase their teaching load by 25%. In other words, by the third teaching block, student teachers should be teaching 75% of the co-operating teachers' courses. While reading the data from this particular block, I identified many concerns of the student teachers, as well as a new found fear. While student teachers had already expressed their nervousness about student teaching, 75% of the course load suddenly seemed to be overwhelming. Mary expressed:

> I feel like I don't have time to do anything well. Lesson planning, teaching, instrument expertise, rehearsal, reflecting, communicating...anything. Student teaching doesn't allow for review on the specifics because I'm too busy trying to fit it all in (Mary, journal writing, December, 2004).

Part of the student teachers' concerns and fears were that they had a new co-operating teacher with new expectations, a new class with students who they did not yet know, new learning styles and needs, and a new portion of the curriculum being covered. These were concerns and fears not only for the student teachers but for the co-operating teachers as well. Covering the curriculum requirements can be a daunting task in and of

itself and co-operating teachers must ensure that, in spite of having a student teacher in the room, the curriculum has to continue to be taught. Student teachers have to follow the curriculum at a pace set by the co-operating teacher and, therefore, co-operating teachers feel that time cannot be wasted. As a student teacher explains:

> Student teaching should be a time of experimentation but I feel extremely restricted and restrained because of the structured timetable (Kate, journal writing December, 2004).

Student teachers were also aware of this, and they felt obligated to ensure that the pace of the curriculum delivery was maintained and did not slacken, while they were learning to teach simultaneously. Co-operating teachers often added to the stress of the student teachers, as they were concerned that, with the student teachers wanting to teach differently than they did and using new methodologies, the curricular pace may be slower. One of the outcomes of this concern was that student teachers tended to "play it safe" and conformed to the patterns of teaching that they observed in the classroom.

> I've found that this placement has been incredibly stressful. I don't want to do the job the way she does it, and I have to because I feel that that's the way she's looking for me to do it and there's no time to do it any other way (Mary, focus group interview #1, December, 2004).

Concerns and fears for both student teachers and co-operating teachers ranged from actual implementation of lessons and learning outcomes to classroom management. Mike's concerns and fears focused on students who he did not yet know:

> What will their attitudes be like while I'm teaching? Will it be different for me than their teacher? Will they welcome me or will they resist me? Will my co-operating teacher like the way I try new things or would they rather have things stay their way? The problem for is that I will lose credibility with these new students and my co-operating teacher if the way I want to do things does not accomplish what my co-operating teachers wants them to know (Mike, journal entry, May, 2005).

During their student teaching experiences, student teachers taught at the same time they became acquainted with the classroom environment, and attempted to meet learning expectations of the co-operating teachers. This contributed to that sense of being overwhelmed. Student teachers consistently voiced in their journal writings and in focus group interviews a myriad of fears regarding the multi-dimensional role of the music teacher. Tom expressed:

> I can't believe how much I had to change my expectations of where I thought my grade school students should be instrumentally. My expectations were of what my grade six band was doing when I was in it, or at least what I thought they were doing. I had to change my expectations of the program and what I had to do to succeed. My biggest fear is that I won't do better than this (Tom, journal entry #1, December, 2004).

Another set of concerns and fears voiced by the student teachers was being overwhelmed by the issues of classroom management. This fear consistently surfaced both at focus group interviews and in journal writings for the duration of the study. I

expected that student teachers would gain more confidence in their abilities to maintain classroom order with each teaching block; however, this fear continued to surface in each new setting, and particularly among those student teachers in secondary school settings.

> Classroom management was rarely mentioned in the music education courses I took during my four years prior to Teachers College. In the music classroom especially, my professor referred to it as "positive chaos." During teachers college the professor would spend at the most, one class period on what classroom management means, and how to manage bad behaviour (Leo, focus group interview, May, 2005).

As numerous studies have documented (Brophy & Everston, 1976; Doyle, 1986; Latz, 1992; Veenman, 1984), student teachers entering their teaching experiences frequently report feeling inadequately prepared to effectively manage a classroom. The common complaint among student teachers is the lack of preparation they received during their undergraduate methods classes that ascribe to "real classroom" management situations (Siebert, 2005).

Both the student teachers and co-operating teachers felt overwhelmed, but their fears were communicated differently. Student teachers displayed fears regarding a multitude of issues, including classroom management, application of university methods classes and new theory, fear of their own shortcomings as a music teacher in front of their students and their co-operating teacher, and getting it all done. Co-operating teachers were concerned with getting the student teachers to act as music educators, maintaining the pace of the curriculum, and having adequate time for their student teachers. Co-

operating teachers seemed torn between concerns regarding their classroom students getting behind and providing their student teachers with enough direction to allow them to be successful.

A final contributing factor to the feeling of being overwhelmed was that co-operating teachers held different views than their student teachers regarding the same teaching events during practice teaching. Although there was not necessarily a single correct view, student teachers felt that they should interpret situations in the same way as their co-operating teachers. Unfortunately, co-operating teachers tended to voice their views in a manner that made the student teachers feel that their own views were wrong rather than different. This inhibited effective communication between the two parties.

During the second focus group interview for student teachers, Kate told a story to the student teachers group. The same story was recounted by Leo in the co-operating teacher's group. While the details regarding the incident were similar when told by the student teacher and the co-operating teacher, their interpretations of the event were substantially different. The student teacher and co-operating teacher interpreted it differently.

In this incident, Kate was introducing composition to grade nine instrumental music students during her second practice teaching experience. The co-operating teacher assigned partners for this activity rather than having students pick their own. There was a detailed list of criteria involved in creating the composition that students had to follow, and, upon completion, they checked off the box that indicated that they were done. The students were allotted 20 minutes during each class to work on their compositions for a five-day period.

The student teacher narrated in her focus group interview that, during the first two days, students seemed to be hard at work accomplishing the task, as well as enjoying the task during their allotted times. The partnerships seemed to be working well, except for a few groups. These particular groups had pairs that were directly opposite of one another. Students who had behavioural issues as well as learning issues were paired with the students who excelled in the class. The co-operating teacher believed that this would help the weaker student be more successful. For the next two days, the students who excelled in music seemed to be the only ones working, and their partners ceased to contribute to the assignment and began to talk with classmates, causing disruption to other groups. Despite efforts on the part of the student teacher to get those students back on task, they did not respond. The student teacher made a decision that she would mark those individuals separately rather than as a group situation to make it fair.

While recollecting the story, both the student teacher and the co-operating teacher, identified issues of organization and management of students as central. They differed, however, in how they talked about the issues. The student teacher disagreed with the manner in which groups were chosen by the co-operating teacher. The student teacher felt that it was unfair for the academically strong students to have to ensure that the students with behavioural or learning issues were successful in their compositions. The student teacher believed that the primary reason for the academically strong students doing the work was that they were concerned about their own marks. As a result their partners did not contribute. The student teacher believed that:

> "...the achieving student was too responsible for their partner", and that "... collaboration and exchanges of ideas had not worked in these cases" (Kate, focus

group interview #2, May, 2005).

In contrast, the co-operating teacher pointed to the organizational properties of the work students were given to accomplish the composition. The co-operating teacher noted that the student teacher.

> "...failed to focus on the disruptive student in the partnership and concentrated too much on the achieving student to get the assignment done," and "...what could you have done to include the struggling student more in the activity" (Leo, focus group interview #2, May, 2005)?

When the co-operating teacher and student teacher discussed the event with each other, the co-operating teacher talked more about pacing, timing, student ability, involvement, and achievement. Additionally, the co-operating teacher displayed his expertise as a classroom teacher by speaking in terms of diagnosing the classroom problems quickly, as well as offering solutions to those problems. On the other hand, the student teacher gave detailed accounts of the events but did not focus on the work students were accomplishing or the interactions of students and the curriculum within the classroom environment. The student teacher seemed to be more concerned with the particulars of the events and how these particulars affected them personally. Although there were other instances involving stories from the classroom that both the co-operating teachers and student teachers told during focus group interviews, this story particularly seemed to be important to both the co-operating teacher and the student teacher who were involved.

This difference in interpretation ultimately caused a problem in communication between the student teacher and the co-operating teacher. In this case, the co-operating teacher discussed the issue with such confidence that it made the student teacher feel that her interpretation was wrong. The outcome perhaps should have involved the co-operating teacher acknowledging the interpretation of the student teacher, but then included pointing out the concerns regarding managing such a partnership and working with students in this collaborative method. Kate found herself feeling confused and "wrong"; instead of asking the co-operating teacher questions regarding her own interpretation, she let herself feel unsuccessful in this activity.

This misinterpretation of events is supported by Gonzalez & Carter (1990). While both Kate and Leo recognized the events as salient in a student teacher's experience, the student teacher and the co-operating teacher interpreted them in different ways. In this study the differences that were found between co-operating teachers and student teachers in teaching played themselves out in the core student teaching relationship. This incident demonstrated that co-operating teachers and student teachers did not share interpretive practices. As a result, communication was likely to be demanding, frustrating and perplexing for both parties, causing the co-operating teacher and the student teachers to feel overwhelmed.

Student teachers expressed a variety of concerns about their teaching in the classroom, and researchers have investigated many of these concerns. For example Fuller and Brown (1975) identified three stages of concern in student teacher development: 1) survival concerns, 2) subject matter concerns, and 3) pupil concerns. During the first

phase of student teaching, the student teachers are concerned with surviving student teaching and must overcome any doubts that they have concerning their presence in the classroom. During the second stage, the student teacher is concerned about classroom management strategies. It is not until the third stage that the student teacher is concerned with student understanding and that they use assessment strategies to determine that understanding. Fuller and Brown found that, when student teachers are in the survival stage, it is difficult for them to reflect on their teaching. The short three-week block of student teaching does not allow the student teachers in this study to get past the survival. Further, even by the time student teachers were involved in their fourth practice teaching experience, surviving the experienced was a primary goal.

Likewise, Borko & Livingston (1980) also found that student teachers move through different stages of concern during their student teaching experience. Initially, they focus on personal concerns and must overcome self-doubts. In the second stage, they are concerned with organizing and managing subject matter; it is not until the third stage that student teachers begin to focus on the learner.

During student teaching, student teachers can put into practice all that they have learned about teaching. However, student teachers must go beyond subject matter knowledge to actually learn how to teach their students. One aspect of this transition from knowledge to application of knowledge involves "pedagogical content knowledge." Pedagogical content knowledge is needed in order to present the material so that learning will occur. Shulman (1987) believes:

> ...it identifies the distinctive bodies of knowledge for teaching. It represents the blending of content and pedagogy into an understanding of how particular topics,

problems, or issues are organized, represented, and adapted to the diverse interests and abilities of learners, and presented for instruction. (p.8)

Student teachers do not enter student teaching knowing nothing. Before they enter student teaching, they possess their own set of beliefs and ideas about teaching, which are a result of many different influences:

> I knew by the middle of high school that this was what I wanted to do. Teach band and orchestra. I had so much fun. We played so many great pieces and went on a lot of trips. My best friends were in music. My teacher let me conduct the class and work with students who were having trouble playing. I thought this would be great experience for me. Little did I know that my high school teacher is not the same as these teachers (Mike, Journal, May, 2005).

Learning to teach the subject matter learned in methods courses was a source of concern for both the student teachers and the co-operating teachers. This study found that co-operating teachers felt that the student teachers did not possess the skills necessary to pace instruction at an appropriate level for learning when teaching instrumental music classes. Co-operating teachers voiced concerns that their students were getting behind in the curriculum and that student teachers were not skilled enough to run rehearsals, prepare scores for rehearsing, manage classroom issues as well as conduct. Student teachers, on the other hand, felt that they had the knowledge, but practice teaching was their opportunity to put knowledge into practice and at times they felt that too much was expected of them too soon. Student teachers' other concern was that developmental methods courses did not prepare them adequately for transitions to different placements in which skill levels among students had to be determined quickly in order to prepare to

teach. This lack of preparation caused student teachers to imitate their co-operating teachers rather than attempt to find themselves as teachers, which is what they wanted to do:

It is so hard to figure out what new students can and can't do. As soon as I got comfortable with my students in one placement, my placement was over and the next placement was so different. I thought I knew and understood my methods and had the skills to teach music. What I don't know is how to anticipate learning so that I can be comfortable quicker. I end up feeling good about what I just did, and then feel like a failure because I can't do it again (Kate, focus group interview #1, December 2004).

Gohlke (1994) studied a sophomore level music methods class as a source of learning to teach. Four questions guided the study:

1) How do preservice music education students, who are collegiate students of music education, learn to make pedagogical and curricular decisions?

2) What is the source of this knowledge?

3) What effect does a methods course and previous experience in music, teaching and observing of instruction have on these decisions?

4) How is this knowledge organized and utilized by preservice teachers? (p.9)

Even though her dissertation was concerned with the methods class, it does have some findings related to student teaching. The most frequently mentioned sources of music teachers' pedagogical knowledge were (1) apprenticeship of observation, primarily received through their experience in music learning situations that are performance-based, and (2) their observations of other teachers through field experiences.

Student teachers in this study voiced concerns at the lack of observation time with

their co-operating teachers that they felt would prepare them for that particular placement. Some of the student teachers wanted to have the opportunity to observe more lesson presentations, get a sense of learning from students in the classroom and reflect on what they saw. Some of the co-operating teachers on the other hand felt that there was not enough time for more observation days and that more observation would encourage the student teachers to teach like them rather than develop themselves:

> I want my student teacher to be better. I want her to understand time management and pacing. I need her to move faster so I feel that my students are not getting behind or bored. I also need to step back and stop wishing that she would do things the way I do them. I have to be careful not to put that pressure on her (Leo, focus group #2, May, 2005).

Classroom management issues were a primary concern of the student teachers involved in this study, and the student teachers commented that little was taught regarding classroom management and discipline techniques in instrumental methods classes. Schmidt (2006) illuminated a variety of influences on six instrumental music teachers' understanding of classroom management as developed during their student teaching semester. The study was part of a larger study (Schmidt, 2005) that examined whether six student teachers in instrumental music incorporated learning from a year long junior year practice teaching course in their student teaching experience. The larger study found that, although these student teachers said they learned effective methods of lesson planning in the practicum course, they did not learn about classroom management. They claimed instead to have only learned of classroom management as student teachers, despite claims of the professors that they had taught both.

Instrumental music classes at times can easily be referred to as "positive chaos," and the key to managing them is organization and routine within the classes. Student teachers often felt limited as to what they could try that was different from what was being done due to short student teaching placements, and an already established routine. However, in instrumental music classes that did not seem to be organized or have a routine set up, student teachers could see where mayhem would occur. These placements resulted in the most fear for them. Mary said:

> We spoke very little of classroom discipline in our methods courses at the Faculty. But I had two placements that were very different. One was organized and chaotic, and the other was disorganized and a zoo. I saw first hand the importance of establishing a routine, and I saw what that routine was for an instrumental music class. When I went to my second placement I was shocked at the disrespect of the subject itself. Trying to put a routine into my second placement was pointless. I didn't have any support from the co-operating teacher, and I only got attitude from the students. Although I knew it was important, it was very intimidating trying to do it. That placement made me think twice about being a teacher (Mary, focus group #2, May 2005).

Madsen & Kaiser (1999) found that, when ranking fears of student teachers, even those student teachers deemed to have "outstanding" potential as future music educators cited fear of inadequacy in the area of discipline and classroom management at twice the rate of their next ranking fear of being a "failure". Lacking classroom management skills can be an overwhelming concern for student teachers. While most of the student teachers felt that their co-operating teachers had great control over their classes so that learning

would occur, some student teachers were placed in a situation in which discipline was so difficult it caused them to wonder if their choice of career was right. Student teachers voiced concerns regarding anxiety over the risk of loss of control of their groups.

Do As I Do, Not As I Say!

"Do as I do, not as I say!" surfaced as a theme for the student teachers and co-operating teachers in both journal writings and focus group interviews. Co-operating teachers have a profound impact on student teaching, for they can influence the experiences that the student teachers will have during student teaching. For example, co-operating teachers as they can influence their work socialization, feelings of career satisfaction, perceptions of the professional role, philosophies of teaching, instructional practices, and whether to continue working in the educational field is the right decision (Achinstein & Barrett, 2004; Britzman, 2003; Brouwer & Korthagen, 2005; Goodfellow & Sumsion, 2000; Kelchtermans & Ballet, 2002; Seperson, & Joyce, 1973). The operational word within this statement is "influence." However, codes such as "demand," "model," "it's this way," "you can't do it like that," "controlling," and "there's not enough time for that," defined the type of influence some co-operating teachers had on the student teachers in this study and resulted in this theme.

The issue of being creative as a student teacher was discussed by both the co-operating teachers and the student teachers in journals and focus group interviews. The group of student teachers expected to be able to try new things in the classroom, to learn on their own to become a teacher, to be immersed in the learning process, and to share their recent learning from the Faculty of Education with their co-operating teachers. Co-operating teachers also expected that student teachers would be willing to take risks,

demonstrate and share new methodologies, and demonstrate adequate, if not efficient classroom management and discipline skills. Brad said:

> I find I am trying to give the student teacher more space to develop a rapport with the students. I would like to see more risk taking on the student teacher's part. Much can be learned from the students themselves if the student teachers would allow themselves to do that. I would like to see them initiate this risk taking rather than constantly telling them what to do. Risk taking includes initiative on the part of the student teacher (Brad, focus group interview #2, May, 2005).

Mary was eager to have the opportunity to be creative and found this opportunity when her co-operating teacher was away. Mary said:

> During the week my co-operating teacher was away and I was left with the supply to teach the classes. I was so excited to teach music, finally. The students had been playing all the time so I decided to try something a little different. I had the students listen to three different works that had different tempos and moods. I asked the grade 8 class to write a story following the mood changes in the music. The activity went well and the students enjoyed it. It was great to hear some of the creative ideas the students had. I left these for my co-op proudly on her desk, and I was very pleased with myself. When she returned I told her about the activity and showed her the stories. She picked them up and threw them in the recycling bin without looking at them. I thought it was a great activity to help those students who aren't great at playing to perhaps shine at listening. If a teacher I am supposed to be working with can't see the value in an activity that I think was excellent, then there is something wrong with what I value. Or am I being

unrealistic (Mary, Journal week one, December, 2004)?

Although co-operating teachers claimed to want their student teachers to be creative in the classroom and take risks, student teachers told a different story. By the time the final student teaching placement had arrived, Tom expressed that he was excited to teach 100% of the time and have the opportunity to experience and use all of the information he had gained throughout his student teaching year. However, despite the fact that Tom was given free reign by his co-operating teacher, he was surprised to find that his co-operating teacher found fault in anything he did that was different:

> I always thought that I would be alright. I like trying new things and I thought I had a lot of great ideas. I'm relying on their expertise to let me know if I'm on the right track. Instead of letting me find out things on my own, they were constantly telling me how it should be (Tom, focus group interview #2, May, 2005).

This perception surprised Tom, and his student teaching experience left him feeling as if he did not have the opportunity to try anything new. Tom felt that his co-operating teacher did not let him be creative:

> I was given free reign when it came to designing the bulletin boards in the classroom or creating fun games that could go along with the music concepts being taught at the time, but when I was told that the unit I would be teaching was on rhythms, rather than letting me research it on my own or use my own ideas, my co-operating teacher insisted that I only use the materials that she gave me (Tom, focus group interview #2, May, 2004).

Co-operating teachers voiced during focus group interviews, in one-on one interviews, and in journals that they wished for their student teachers to be more creative

in the classroom. However, they provided their student teachers with conflicting information. Tammy wrote:

> I don't know why I take time with her to discuss things. She's just going through the motions and she doesn't really care about what will happen. I still offer suggestions to be more creative, try things that are different. But I found that at some points a lot of what she does mimics me and I tell her she should be doing things on her own, in her own way. She should find her own niche. It bugs me when I take time to offer suggestions and they choose not to use them (Tammy, journal writing #1, December, 2004).

Although Tammy wrote that she offered suggestions to be more creative, she also voiced the following in a focus group interview:

> My students are not good at change when a student teacher gets up in front of the class. They are used to things my way and that's how I know they learn. There's not enough time for her to try things her way. It will take me twice as long to bring my student's back to the way I do things (Tammy, focus group interview #2, May, 2004).

Co-operating teachers seem to mislead their student teachers during placements. Student teachers wanted to be creative in the classrooms, and co-operating teachers appeared to want that as well. However, the fear of the classroom students getting behind in the curriculum, lesson plans failing on the part of the student teachers, not enough time during the placements for student teachers to teach differently, and not knowing how to offer feedback may be some of the issues that prevent the co-operating teacher from really endorsing the use of creative ideas in their classrooms. Co-operating teachers may

have said that they wanted the opportunity to learn new methodologies demonstrated by their student teachers, as well as have their student teachers take more risks in the classroom. However, the co-operating teachers appeared to be unwilling to take risks by allowing student teachers to try something different. The mixed message the student teachers received resulted in them doing as their co-operating teacher did rather than trying out new teaching ideas.

Student teachers determined during observation days some of the things that they would like to try differently when they had the opportunity to teach the classes that they were observing, and they did not ask permission to implement some of these ideas. However, their trying new things were sometimes hampered by their co-operating teachers who had clearly established routines: "I would be willing to let them experiment with the routine as long as they told me ahead of time" (Yvonne, focus group interview #1, December 2004).

Yvonne, as evidenced in this comment, does not allow the student teacher to take a risk unless she asks permission first. Although co-operating teachers expressed a desire for student teachers to become their own teachers, the co-operating teachers felt that they were not as open and willing to allow risk taking as the student teachers would have liked:

> Different student teachers need and want different things. Student teachers can try to achieve these in different ways. The whole interaction between the student teacher and the class that I've been teaching all year involves a myriad of variables. I have a hard time to allow the student teachers to be as creative as they would like to because I haven't tried these things and I can't predict how my

students will react. There is no time to allow for my students to get behind because a student teacher wants to be creative (Brad, focus group interview #2, May, 2005).

Although the co-operating teachers said that they wanted their student teachers to fulfill the multi-faceted role of teachers, their actions toward their student teachers sometimes were in conflict with this articulated desire. Co-operating teachers can influence student teachers in their work socialization. For university students about to begin student teaching, the socialization to teaching can be daunting. Faculty advisors expect them to behave as professionals and to consider student teaching as their "....first job in their new profession" (Knowles & Cole, 1994, p.38). However, when student teachers enter the public school system to begin their student teaching, co-operating teachers sometimes send a different message: "...the title of teacher comes after you complete your student teaching efficiently and effectively" (Yvonne, one-on-one interview, October, 2004).

Realistically, student teachers are situated in two worlds. As the name implies, on the one hand they are still students, while on the other hand they are teachers. Student teachers face the dual struggle of not only educating others, but continuing to be educated themselves. These two worlds often times wreak havoc with student teachers. The student teachers feel that they have to adjust to that of their co-operating teachers. Despite the times that their co-operating teachers expressed they wanted student teachers to do things their own way, student teachers felt that this would hurt, more than help, them. Doing what the co-operating teachers do, rather than what they are told to do became a survival tactic for the student teachers.

Socialization for student teachers tended to be focused on learning to "play the game." The "game" was doing things the way co-operating teachers did them in order to survive, get approval, and receive effective evaluations. While student teachers may not have liked this outcome, conforming to the way in which co-operating teachers did things appeared to be better than not conforming:

> I spent each placement doing what my co-operating teacher does. Running rehearsals the same way, interpreting a piece of music their way, not mine, all because you really have to conform to them and their way of doing things. I don't know if I'll be ready for my own classroom because I don't know if my own true self has come out yet in a classroom situation (Mike, focus group interview #2, May, 2005).

In addition to this, student teachers were aware that success in student teaching might result in employment. Student teachers hoped that the connections of their co-operating teachers would be helpful in procuring a job. As a result they conformed to the routines, methods, and techniques of their co-operating teachers. However, conforming to the way their co-operating teachers did things was frustrating and, in the process of doing this, they failed to learn about themselves as teachers:

> In this last placement I was going to teach my lesson the way she wanted me to teach it. Her evaluation of me is important for my future. I don't feel like my lessons are anywhere near as exciting as they could be. How do you teach music-of all subjects-someone else's way (Mary, focus group interview #2, May, 2005)?

The constant presence of the co-operating teacher in the room seemed to be another way in which student teachers felt their creativity was hindered. During focus

group interviews, co-operating teachers identified their sense of responsibility as the reason why they remained in the classroom at all times. Outside of the legalities involved in leaving student teachers alone in the classroom, there were other reasons co-operating teachers felt it was important to be present:

> I want to see where my student teacher is making mistakes so that I can help them and I can't do that if I'm not in the room. You have two teachers in the classroom and you want to take advantage of having a student teacher. I thought the students could get more individual attention with both of us in the room (Brad, focus group interview #1, December, 2004).

In this case, Brad wanted the opportunity to provide feedback about his student teacher's lesson later on. Additionally Brad wanted to take advantage of having another teacher in the room. Student teachers felt at times that the constant presence of the teacher impeded their abilities to be creative when teaching lessons. When co-operating teachers really took advantage of having two specialists in the room, they were also involved with the students, and student teachers felt more at ease while teaching. However, when the co-operating teacher was simply watching the student teacher teach and took notes, student teachers felt that creativity was impeded:

> I can see my co-operating teacher at the back of the room shifting and looking at me and the students in the classroom. She lets me know when students are off task with hand gestures which distract me from what I'm supposed to be doing (Mary, focus group #2, May, 2005).

These last two comments suggested that the manner in which the co-operating teacher's presence was in the room was displayed, influenced the way in which the student teacher

responded. Often times, student teachers referred to comments made by their co-operating teachers regarding the methods and manners that they not only used to teach, but also to maintain classroom management. While at the beginning of their placement with these particular co-operating teachers they were encouraged to "do their own thing," student teachers found that most feedback suggested trying things the way the co-operating teacher did them, rather than complimenting them on skills that went well but were different from those of the co-operating teacher. Student teachers regarded gestures from the co-operating teachers while they were teaching as silent feedback that reminded them that they were not doing things right or overlooking things that the co-operating teacher would never miss. Student teachers revealed that co-operating teachers who strictly observed and took notes while they were teaching made them feel nervous, whereas co-operating teachers who were also involved in teaching with them made them feel more trusted and calm.

Classroom management and discipline were areas about which both the co-operating teachers and student teachers voiced concern. Co-operating teachers felt that changing the way in which their class was managed could result in chaos. On the other hand, student teachers wanted the opportunity to apply creative discipline and classroom management strategies that they may want to use in their own classrooms when they become teachers. Co-operating teachers interceded to discipline their own students while the student teacher was teaching the class. This intrusion made student teachers feel that they could not develop creative discipline strategies and that they were not trusted. It also had an effect on their sense of themselves as the teacher in charge. When the co-operating teacher was a constant management presence in the classroom, student teachers did not

get the opportunity to practice classroom management.

> My co-operating teacher felt free to constantly interrupt my teaching when a child misbehaved instead of letting me handle it. She would also do this if she felt the whole class needed reprimanding. Her perception and my perception of students misbehaving was different. I began to discipline like her, and I didn't like that (Mike, focus group interview #1, December, 2004).

After each lesson was over, student teachers received either verbal or written feedback from their co-operating teachers. However, this feedback focused more on what the student teacher did not do or should have done differently:

> I didn't really get a lot of guidance from my co-operating teacher. I kind of discussed things with her on the two days of observation and I understood where her classes were in terms of practical and theory work. During the first lesson's feedback, I was stunned to hear mostly about the things I should have done. How could I have done them, if she didn't tell me to do them? The rest of the placement was spent wondering what I was going to do wrong, before I did it. It was disappointing (Kate, focus group interview #1, December, 2004).

While feedback is a large part of the student teaching process, co-operating teachers sent mixed messages to student teachers. While co-operating teachers expressed concern at the lack of risk taking on the part of the student teachers, they also expressed comfort when student teachers emulated them when teaching. Student teachers on the other hand were left feeling restricted in their efforts to develop themselves as teachers, as the co-operating teachers either directly or indirectly implied that the student teachers should "do as I do" during the student teaching experiences.

Assessing vs. Assisting

Assessing or evaluating is often an activity to be endured both by the evaluator and the recipient of the evaluation (Danielson, 1991). Although assessing student teachers frequently is required during the student teaching experience, most student teachers and co-operating teachers alike are uncomfortable during the evaluation process. Dye (1994) asserts that all student teacher supervision contains a somewhat strained relationship between the co-operating teacher and the student teacher. Despite this tension, student teachers expect support and help within their student teaching placements. Co-operating teachers feel that they are less effective assisting their student teachers because the student teachers are so conscious that they are being assessed by the co-operating teachers, and that they may depend upon this assessment in their search for employment.

Assessment refers to the process of gathering, analysing, interpreting and using information about student's responses to an educational task (Harlen, 2005; Sadler, 1989). Two key purposes for assessment are identified in the literature: assessment for formative purposes and assessment for summative purposes (Angelo & Cross, 1998;Harlen, 2005). The former is concerned with improving the quality of student learning (Angelo & Cross, 1993), and the latter with summarizing and communicating achievement in relation to a specified end point for the purposes of reporting, accountability and/or certification (Sadler, 1989; Torrance & Pryor, 1998). Assisting, on the other hand, centers on guiding student teachers effectively so that a co-operating teacher's guidance will carry on when they are on their own.

Co-operating teachers are expected to serve multiple roles, and sometimes these roles conflict. In this study, one such point of conflict centered on the issue of assessment versus assistance. Co-operating teachers needed to grade and evaluate (assess) their student teachers using guidelines provided by the Faculty of Education. At the same time, they needed to assist their student teachers in becoming better music teachers. This conflict is difficult for the co-operating teachers:

> One of the goals of co-operating teachers is to support student teacher learning. I want to be there to help direct my student teacher to become better at what he is trying to do. I want to let him know ahead of time and afterwards of the "successful" and "need improvement" categories. I want him to evaluate himself by how his students learned (Leo, one-on-one interview, October, 2004).

Co-operating teachers can assess student teachers in the same way that they assess their classroom students. In order for student teachers to develop into effective teachers, co-operating teachers must accomplish two things with them: (1) assess the student teachers' progress, where they were, where they are, and where they need to go, and (2) guide the student teacher to assess their own teaching through reflective inquiry. In this study however, assessment was used by the co-operating teacher for at least one more reason. Evaluating student teachers was necessary in order to provide them with a grade that allowed them to complete the requirements to be certified as a teacher.

Co-operating teachers in this study assisted their student teachers in many ways. One type of assistance was the sharing of information regarding practical knowledge. This was often done by the co-operating teacher through professional dialogue. One co-operating teacher said: "....I want them to ask me what it is they need and I want to

provide them with information about their teaching" (Mike, individual interview, October, 2004).

Another type of assistance provided by the co-operating teacher was that of moral support. Offering moral support to the student teacher during practice teaching is critical in developing a strong co-operating teacher, student teacher relationship (Crow & Mathews, 1998; Daloz, 1999). The experience of student teaching can be highly stressful. This was particularly true when the expectations of the placement were not met for the student teacher or the co-operating teacher. In addition, student teachers in this study found that, although they might have felt successful in one placement, they did not for all placements. The student teachers believed that the Faculty of Education set up the placement schedules in a manner that lacked continuity. In addition to practice teaching in their area of expertise, student teachers were placed outside of their area of expertise with populations of students that were difficult as well as with grade levels with which they were unfamiliar. This was frustrating for both the student teachers and the co-operating teachers. As one co-operating teacher said:

> ".....almost all student teachers will go through a period of self-questioning, especially in music. Understanding how to deal with these situations is crucial for me as a co-operating teacher. Sometimes it is important for me to just act as their sounding board, and let them unload (Yvonne, focus group interview #2, May, 2005).

Co-operating teachers also assisted student teachers by sharing some of their own stumbling blocks when they were student teachers. This practice provided encouragement for the student teachers when their lessons were not going the way that they had planned.

Often times student teachers wanted to hear about successes as well as difficulties from their co-operating teachers. Positive responses helped student teachers feel that the good things they were doing were not going unnoticed, while, at the same time put their work in perspective:

> My student teacher spent a lot of time making very detailed lesson plans for rehearsals. These lesson plans were dynamic and reached the students. However, my student teacher had to realize that these were grade seven students... It's all about helping my student teachers to keep it all in perspective (Leo, focus group #1, December, 2005).

One powerful type of assistance was for the co-operating teacher to allow and encourage student teachers to become their own teacher, although this did not occur consistently or in all settings. All co-operating teachers had felt at times that they wanted to take over rather than observe what the student teacher was doing. However, some of the co-operating teachers learned to understand that student teachers needed time to work things out in practice, they needed their concerns addressed, and they needed assistance in building their confidence while becoming new music teachers. Brad described:

> I don't want to mould my student teachers. I want to assist them in realizing what their own teaching styles are and help them build on their strengths as new music teachers. I want them to feel self-sufficient in the classroom (Brad, focus group #1, December, 2004).

During both focus group interviews with the co-operating teachers and the student teachers, one of the most talked about issues in this theme of assisting versus assessing was the use of the generic evaluation sheets used to grade the student teachers

supplied by the Faculty of Education. Student teachers were graded each time they taught, using these sheets as guidelines. These generic sheets required both formative and summative assessments to be determined by the co-operating teacher alone both during and at the end of each practicum. As stated earlier, summative evaluations are used in this context to make decisions regarding grades, overall performance evaluations, and to provide a pass or fail grade that will determine the acquisition of a teaching certificate. Formative evaluations on the other hand, are designed to improve student performance or improve the outcomes on which student teachers are working. In a formative evaluation, teachers do not issue overall judgments about the quality of a performance but instead point out particular strengths and/or weaknesses, suggest how those weaknesses might be addressed, and encourage reflection. Neither the formative evaluation nor summative evaluations appeared to be easy. The use of the evaluation sheets seemed to create an almost unavoidable conflict of interest when co-operating teachers made summative and formative evaluations of the performance of their student teachers. The conflict lay in the fact that student teachers were being evaluated on characteristics that even their co-operating teachers did not model. This was frustrating to the student teachers, whose view of these generic evaluations was negative because of their beliefs that they did not indicate a fair assessment of their work:

> I have been teaching for a number of years in Canada and Romania already. That evaluation sheet is not helpful to me or my co-operating teacher when telling me the things that I really have to pay more attention to. It's not the evaluation itself or the fact that I have to succeed; it's what's written there. The sheet doesn't allow my co-operating teacher to talk about me as a music teacher. Some of the

> things written in my first evaluation, for instance, were about getting to know teachers. The evaluation said to continue to get to know them better. But my co-operating teacher doesn't even lunch with any other teacher. She eats off by herself with just a few others. She's never seen me with other teachers because she separates herself from that. How can she evaluate me on my relationship with other teachers when she hadn't actually seen it? That really frustrated me. I'm talking about an unfair evaluation because there's no reference point (Kate, focus group interview #2, May 2004).

Kate's co-operating teacher may have been encouraging her to get to know other members of the staff so that she could learn from other members of the school community during her student teaching experience. Instead of taking advantage of becoming a part of the faculty community understanding the suggestion as an opportunity to enhance her student teaching experience, Kate displayed frustration regarding the grade and comment. Also, Kate did not take the time to ask the co-operating teacher to elaborate on her comments. Perhaps by doing so, Kate's experience could have been enriched by the many facets of teaching styles and years of experience belonging to her co-operating teachers and their colleagues.

Co-operating teachers expressed their own concerns about these sheets. The third practicum occurred in February, 2005, and Leo's student teacher displayed what he determined to be "very weak musical skills" while teaching his grade ten instrumental music class. Leo was surprised that she had been allowed to student teach, as he could not believe that she would have been successful in previous instrumental classroom placements. According to this student teacher, her summative evaluations had been good

from prior student teaching experiences. Leo was concerned about his evaluation of this student:

> I did not give her a good evaluation, but it was better than it should have been. I was suddenly aware that two things could have happened with this student teacher that would have put me in a bad position. She could have come to me and said "why tell me so late in this placement? Why not let me know earlier?" and second, "...at the beginning of this placement, I told you about my concerns in the very areas you now cite as weaknesses, so you are repeating the weaknesses I identified earlier without helping me with them. Why should I be punished because of your ineptness as a co-operating teacher" (Leo, focus group interview, December, 2005)?

Co-operating teachers, who by the nature of their responsibilities are acting both in an assisting and assessing role, are open to conflicts that could arise with not only their student teachers but also with the Faculty of Education. The assessment aspect of a co-operating teacher's role is important and difficult. The University of Windsor Faculty of Education student evaluation sheets describe the knowledge and skills that every beginning education professional should possess. These evaluation sheets include categories of knowledge, disposition, and performance with statements in each of these categories representing levels of understanding and performance (See Appendix J.). The same evaluation sheet is used for both the summative and formative evaluations. These evaluation sheets are not subject specific, but generic in nature.

Co-operating teachers are asked to provide a formative evaluation at the end of the first week of student teaching and a summative evaluation at the end of each three-

week block. Co-operating teachers keep a copy, student teachers keep a copy, and a copy is sent to the Faculty of Education. Each criterion provides for four levels, ranging from poor to excellent. These sheets are used as general guidelines to provide both the student teacher and the university supervisor with an opportunity to determine strengths and weaknesses of the student teacher during each teaching block.

During the focus group interviews, co-operating teachers and student teachers both commented on the evaluation process. It became clear that the evaluation process had multiple meanings. For example, in some instances evaluation referred solely to the grades student teachers received from their co-operating teachers. Student teachers were constantly aware during teaching that they were being evaluated. The grade was first and foremost on their minds.

> The one thing I've noticed when having a student teacher is that when you get one of those informative evaluations, they read every bloody word of those because it could be the meaning of a job or not. They also try to put a grade to the comments. I realize that I'm writing a letter of recommendation on those forms. But, when things are not going well, I still have to think, what can I write on those forms that will make them have a positive experience? In addition to this, those forms don't really tell anyone about how well they did teaching music. All they tell them is the generic things, teaching things that are crossovers to other subjects, to all subjects. If I was hiring for music, I want to know things about music. Can they rehearse, do they have good ears, can they analyze scores, will they have appropriate expectations, can they conduct for crying out loud (Brad, focus group interview #1, December 2004)?

Co-operating teachers felt, in addition to the completion of these evaluation sheets as part of their roles, their comments on evaluation sheets would also serve as letters of reference. This position poses a potential difficulty for the co-operating teacher on a number of levels. While co-operating teachers have a responsibility to assist their student teachers, it does not necessarily mean that, although growth is occurring, that they are comfortable in recommending these student teachers for future employment. At times, conflicts existed for the co-operating teachers and the student teachers. Co-operating teachers viewed student teachers as students of teaching and learning. Major dissonance occurred when the co-operating teachers were faced with the knowledge that their student teachers really could not or would not learn what was necessary to teach successfully:

> Everything I knew about my student teacher indicated that she would be successful. She was extremely successful academically, and based on the limited knowledge I had about her past teaching experiences as a private teacher, I thought she would learn to teach a class well. She was extremely responsible, and she spent a great deal of time on her lesson planning and grading papers. The problems she had with teaching were all based on her inability to interact positively with students. Her expectations for their behaviour were so far from reality that she had a difficult time planning appropriate lessons. The atmosphere in the room during her teaching was often uncomfortable for everyone. She didn't know or understand the students well enough to predict or anticipate their reactions. Students perceived her as "stuck-up" to use their terminology. Unfortunately, the students tested her often, as they usually do with student teachers. Since she was unable to convey a sense of humour or an interest in

them, they rebelled more than usual. I felt she sent students a strong message indicating that she really didn't like interacting with them. I also felt that she considered herself "above" them, possibly too good to teach "average high school students." I even felt that she looked down on me for actually choosing this job (Leo, focus group #2, May, 2005).

Co-operating teachers sometimes struggled to help student teachers overcome problems that they, themselves, did not struggle with in their own journeys towards becoming teachers. Leo's comment was a reflection of the fact that he went into teaching liking his students and was able to develop productive relationships with his students, thus making it difficult for him to understand his student teacher's dislike of and inability to interact with students. Diagnosing what constitutes stumbling blocks for a student teacher becomes confounding when the stumbling blocks are aspects or dimensions of teaching that co-operating teachers were "always able to do," or "learned to do easily." Although Leo expressed his concerns to his student teacher, she did not exhibit enough growth in her teaching so that he was able to recommend her for a job.

Another conflict was the tension that co-operating teachers sometimes felt between encouraging and critiquing their student teachers. Co-operating teachers felt that they constantly walked a narrow line between teaching or assisting the student teacher and assessing the student teacher. On the one hand, co-operating teachers had to adhere to the evaluation sheets established as benchmarks of performance. At the end of the student teaching blocks, co-operating teachers were responsible for determining whether they could say with some assurance, "Yes, this student teacher is ready to assume a place in a classroom of his or her own." On the other hand, co-operating teachers recognized that

learning to teach was a life-long process. Finding a balance between these conditions became especially problematic in the case of struggling or failing student teachers. When to prompt student teachers and let them find their own way and when to confront student teachers with their lack of success in meeting program standards became a monumental decision for co-operating teachers working with struggling student teachers.

Aligned with this tension was the conflict that occurred between wanting to do what needs to be done to foster the growth of student teachers and co-operating teachers' responsibilities to their own students. Teachers invest a great deal of time and energy in creating learning opportunities that will enable their students to be successful. This is, after all, their ultimate professional responsibility. However, co-operating teachers in this study also believed that they had invested a great deal of time and energy in helping student teachers learn to teach.

Student teachers rarely commented on the results of their teaching, in terms of student learning. Student teachers did not appear to be aware of how their student teaching grade and student learning were related to one another. Instead, student teachers spoke solely about the grade and separated their teaching from it. In other words, student teachers would teach to the grade rather than teach to learn to be better teachers:

> I don't understand how my co-op can give me all these nice comments and then a satisfactory level? What does that mean? Who is going to hire me with satisfactory? I have to have excellent in all my evaluations, otherwise what's the point? (Mary, journaling, May, 2005).

Most of the student teachers commented on the evaluation form, which is generic to teaching and does not address concerns specific to instrumental music. Student

teachers, also, referred to some of the criteria on the form as too general. Some co-operating teachers did not make any comments under some of the rating categories on the evaluation. For example, the co-operating teacher would circle the basic rating, and the student teachers did not understand what specific behaviours of theirs led to that that rating. Other student teachers talked of the different philosophies with which co-operating teachers approached the evaluation sheets. Kate commented that her first co-operating teacher assigned formative ratings at a satisfactory level so that the summative evaluation would demonstrate improvements. Her second co-operating teacher assigned good and excellent as the formative ratings and then all excellent for the summative ratings. Kate said:

> After seeing the two different placements that I had and how they each rated me, it's relative to their scale and how they grade individually. My first co-op gave me satisfactory levels, but commented on virtually every one so that progress shown for the summative was apparent. I know how I got better because I was made aware of what needed to be done. My second co-op gave me all good and excellent on the formative and all excellent on the summative, with no comments. I have no idea how I got there. The second co-op told me to ask questions if I had any questions about the evaluation, whereas the first co-op talked at great length about both the formative and summative evaluations (Kate, focus group interview #1, December, 2004).

In these instances, evaluation took the form of feedback offered by the co-operating teachers in conversation with the student teachers about lessons taught from day to day. Feedback was sometimes written and other times oral. Co-operating teachers

often commented on the feedback process:

> I used feedback, or so I thought, as a motivation tool. I wanted to let them know how well they were doing. I always told them the good things first and followed it up with how I thought they could do something better. I have to admit though, if I had a student teacher who gave me an attitude of knowing it all already, I wouldn't bother to take the time to do it. I really believe it would be a waste of my time (Yvonne, focus group interview #1, December, 2004).

Some co-operating teachers used feedback as a motivating tool for their student teachers. However, they were uncomfortable delivering critical comments that they felt would hurt their relationships or make their student teachers feel unsuccessful about what they were doing. Because student teachers could not differentiate between the grade that they would receive and the kind of music teacher that they would become, giving feedback was a difficult task for the co-operating teachers.

Student teachers worried about their relationships with their co-operating teachers and used this as an excuse to accept without question whatever feedback they received from their co-operating teachers. Student teachers did not ask co-operating teachers to expand on their comments, nor did they feel free to disagree with what their co-operating teachers said. Whether student teachers valued the input from their co-operating teachers was not clear. However, resentments due to perceptions of a poor relationship with the co-operating teacher and feedback were articulated by both the co-operating teachers and the student teachers:

> I thought that my role as a student teacher was to learn from the person I was working with and to continue the education of the students I was teaching. I had

> hoped that I wouldn't be searching for the approval of somebody else in order to get a good grade. My co-operating teacher had high demands on me, or at least that's what I felt. So the entire time, I'm aware that not only am I teaching students, but I'm being graded by this person so I have to please them. My co-operating teacher and the Faculty of Education have told me a hundred times that they wouldn't expect us to do things the way that they do them, but when in Rome sort of thing. I'm finding that I've been in Rome a lot (Mary, journal entries, May 2005).

Mary had determined throughout her fourth teaching block that her relationship with her co-operating teacher made her feel unsuccessful. While this was the final block of student teaching, Mary had not yet become comfortable as a teacher in her own right. She was unwilling to ask questions and become more involved in her growth as a teacher. It was easier, more comfortable, or safer to conform to the expectations of the co-operating teacher.

Mike's experience with evaluation and his relationship with his co-operating teacher during his second teaching block were positive. It occurred to Mike during this block that, while his relationship was positive and he learned a lot from his co-operating teacher, he felt he was not being evaluated as a student teacher as much as the co-operating teacher was evaluating his own work as the co-operating teacher:

> Mine was a teacher who did not forget what the experience of being a student teacher was really like and was constantly reminding me that he could remember what this experience was like. It wasn't do this and don't do that but rather "I would have second thoughts about teaching this because..." This manner is very

> good for a relationship with student teachers and co-operating teachers as well. It's very important. So my co-operating teacher ends up evaluating someone else, not me. He would evaluate actually his own personality because that's what he would like to see happening in the classroom. He evaluates himself, not me (Mike, focus group interview #1, December, 2004).

Another issue within the theme of assisting versus assessing involved co-operating teachers and university supervisors. Co-operating teachers discussed that university supervisors are unwilling to acknowledge the differences from classroom to classroom. University supervisors assess the student teachers according to what they are being taught in their methodology classes at the Faculty of Education, rather than what they are doing in the co-operating teacher's classroom. What co-operating teachers deemed to be successful by the student teachers was not always seen that way by the university supervisor when observation occurred:

> I find the university to be far too invasive in my classroom. They are not around enough to gauge progress or lack thereof of the student teachers. I don't like it when university supervisors expect the student teacher to change my classroom in order to experience what they're being taught at the university (Yvonne, focus group interview, May, 2005).

Little contact with the university supervisor, as well as infrequent observation/evaluation of the student teacher by the university supervisor caused concern for the co-operating teachers. Also, some of the co-operating teachers found it difficult to meet with the university supervisors and did not have regular contact with them.

Although co-operating teachers play a profound role in student teachers'

experiences, they have little interaction with the Faculty of Education. Co-operating teachers have full-time teaching jobs in the public school system and, according to the co-operating teachers themselves, have not received adequate coaching to enable them to fully understand the goals, expectations, or conceptual frameworks of the teacher education program in which their student teachers are enrolled. At the University of Windsor, co-operating teachers are invited to an after school hours orientation workshop that is not mandatory. They also received a student-teaching handbook, but they admitted during the first focus interview that they did not read it from cover to cover.

University supervisors, on the other hand, are often full-time or part-time faculty members and are required to observe student teachers on two occasions during the teacher's college year. They spend much of their time observing student teachers during student teaching placements and, on occasion, help to solve critical problems that may arise during student teaching. They do not appear, however, to be available for the co-operating teachers. One co-operating teacher said:

> It's frustrating that they hire you as a co-operating teacher with your five dollar a day fee, but they don't put faith in what it is you have to say. I had a student teacher practice teaching with me who was terrible. We had lots of meetings with principals and advisors. This girl can't do this job. She got a job the next year (Tammy, focus group interview #1, December, 2004).

Even student teachers expressed frustration with their university supervisors. Tom felt that, because his co-operating teacher and he worked together each day, she was far more qualified to assess and evaluate his entire practicum than was the university supervisor. He was frustrated that the university supervisor would observe him for one

class and determine strengths and weaknesses as well as a grade based upon that single observation. Tom felt it would be more effective if the university supervisor was involved in a follow-up after student teaching:

> If we are supposed to be student teachers, we should be given all the opportunities to practice and should be evaluated in our own environments. I think once you get into your own school, your own class, my supervisor can come back and evaluate me. And then at least I will know myself better and I would be able to demonstrate more aspects of the music teachers' role than what I get to do as a student teacher (Tom, focus group interview #2, May 2005).

During the second focus group interview with the co-operating teachers, they seemed to realize the importance of their role in the supervision, teaching, and mentoring of student teachers. It is not often that music teachers get to dialogue with each other, because they are often the only music teachers in their schools. Until they really began talking about evaluating, they, like the student teachers, had not made the connection between assessing and student teacher learning. They also expressed that, in addition to guiding and grading the student teacher, they had a responsibility to the profession itself. They looked forward to acting in the capacity of a co-operating teacher again, and determined that they needed to become better at this particular role:

> As I've gotten more experience as a teacher, I've realized as a co-operating teacher you really have to be in a position where you're willing to fail someone. You have to be willing to say the hard things which, in my first couple of years, I couldn't do, nor did I know how to do. Being a co-operating teacher is a huge responsibility that we have. I think we take that for granted, and then kids slip by

that maybe shouldn't have and end up getting a job for thirty years. That's a scary point so in terms of my role, I've got to be willing to be, on some level obviously collaborating with this person, be able to adjust that level from collaborator to co-teacher (Yvonne, focus group interview #1, December, 2004).

A co-operating teacher's evaluation should be an important index of a student teacher's competence. It should indicate the judgment of an experienced professional educator about the fitness of a student teacher about to enter the profession. Unfortunately, some researchers have found the ratings made by co-operating teachers to be invalid. For example, Phelps, Schmitz, and Boatright (1986); Phelps, Schmitz, and Wade (1986); and Wheeler and Knoop (1982) all found rater errors of leniency and the halo effect in co-operating teachers' evaluations. Likewise, Chang and Ferre (1988) reported that, in 135 evaluations by co-operating teachers, there were virtually no below-average grades.

In this study, co-operating teachers did not fail any of the student teachers. They commented that the generic evaluation sheets should acknowledge improvement in the grading and comment portion, but student teachers should not receive an "excellent" rating their first time out, fearing that their next grade from a different co-operating teacher would be lower. Co-operating teachers felt that grades should improve with placement, but starting them too high could pose a problem for the student teacher. Another problem for both co-operating teachers and student teachers was the inconsistency of the practice teaching schedule. Student teachers were graded each time they were at a placement. The problem is that they never had the same co-operating

teacher or the same placement twice. Co-operating teachers were forced on some level to anticipate the grade based on what number the practice teaching block was. Co-operating teachers felt that, during the third and fourth block, student teachers should be doing certain things. However, they may not have been expected to do those things at all by their last co-operating teacher. In addition, student teachers were concerned about receiving a grade when placed outside of their areas of expertise. Student teachers believed this to be unfair and worried about using their sheets when applying for employment. Co-operating teachers seemed to understand their concern and perhaps awarded a grade slightly higher than it should have been to compensate.

Feedback functions as motivation, reinforcement, and information, and therefore, may be necessary for behaviour change or intervention. It may be especially beneficial to student teachers who are still learning to teach (Bunting, 1988). However, results of research reveal that the co-operating teachers provide limited quality and quantity of feedback (McIntyre & Killian, 1987; Richardson-Koehler, 1988; Veal & Rikard, 1998; Wilkins-Canter, 1997). Yet, when feedback is provided, the co-operating teachers' feedback has a greater impact on student teachers' than that of the university supervisor (Richardson-Koehler, 1988; Zahorik, 1988). A study conducted by Richardson-Koehler (1988) revealed that 80% of student teachers believed their teaching knowledge and practices were attributable to their co-operating teachers. Jones (1992) found that co-operating teachers' positive feedback helped student teachers confirm their career choice.

In light of the critical importance of feedback during the student teaching experience, the co-operating teacher has an important and influential role in the development of the student teacher. This belief was articulated by both the student

teachers and the co-operating teachers in this study. Performance feedback that is accurate, consistent, multimodal, timely, relevant, and objective has been identified as a key component of supervision programs designed to improve teachers' instructional skills (Metzler, 1990; Pelletier, 2000).

Co-operating Teacher as The Sage

"Sage" is a term used as far back as Socrates and Plato to describe a person with perfect knowledge and the ability to transfer that knowledge according to the needs of others (Johnson, 2006). Kerferd (1978), in his well known essay "What does the wise man know?" discusses the content of a sage's knowledge and concluded that a sage knows what to do in various circumstances and how to do it. Kerferd describes the sage as being nurturing, caring of others, and willing to promote the good in others:

> "...the sage is not only concerned with the good of the whole or the good of others, the sage's knowledge and role as a craftsperson of virtuous activity means that she has the capacity to attend to individuals and their particular needs and circumstances" (p. 128).

Using Kerferd's description of a sage and transferring it to the world of education, a sage, then, might take the form of a master teacher who is not only knowledgeable of his or her craft, but has the ability to transfer knowledge to others according to their needs.

The "Sage" surfaced in this study in two different ways. The first was described on a variety of occasions by the student teachers during focus group interviews and in journals. When a co-operating teacher served as a sage, he or she provided opportunities for student teachers to find out for themselves what would or would not work in a music classroom. These sages created positive learning environments, selected appropriate

instructional goals, used appropriate assessments, used the curriculum to guide decision making, and employed a variety of teaching methodologies to assist in the learning process for all students:

> She let's you go with whatever you want to try and she doesn't fault you for failing and I need something like that. I need to be able to try anything, and if I screw up she's not going to hold it over my head. I don't need to be coddled at this age. I don't need to be told what's right and wrong. I just need to be allowed to try (Mike, focus group interview #1, December, 2004).

The second way in which the sage emerged was described by the co-operating teachers. Co-operating teacher participants considered to be sages by student teachers generally gave much of the credit of a successful experience to the student teacher. Student teachers allowed for these co-operating teachers to feel free to share the qualities that made them sages in the first place. These qualities included flexibility, positive communication skills, and the ability to establish a good working rapport or relationship with their student teachers:

> It's funny how my opinion has changed over time because I really like both of the student teachers that I have right now. They're wonderful. I thought that from the very beginning. I thought this will be a piece of cake because they both seem to know what they're doing musically. They're really ambitious and eager to dive in and take over. Actually, it's taken a whole lot more energy because I want so much to help these two. It takes so much energy because I want so much to give them every bit of feedback I can possibly give. I want them to excel, so it's draining (Yvonne, focus group interview #1, December, 2004).

In both focus groups interviews, the student teachers discussed qualities that their co-operating teachers had and the skills that co-operating teachers used when teaching. Student teachers believed that these qualities carried over into how these teachers worked with them as student teachers. Two of those qualities were trustworthiness and collaboration.

> My co-operating teacher is able to collaborate with me like I'm a new teacher. I feel I can confide in him and that I'm not a topic in the lunchroom with other teachers. I can tell that one of their goals is for me to be better for me, not so they can say they did a good job, but because that's what they really want for me (Kate, focus group interview #1, December 2004).

Additionally, being a life long learner was a characteristic of a sage. Sages always wanted to improve their skills. This was regarded with respect by student teachers:

> My co-operating teacher is always going to conferences and taking courses. He recommended to me that I do the same when I'm out there. The last time he went, he brought back so much material, and gave me some of it to give me an idea of how much there really is to learn. He didn't make me feel overwhelmed with it, just more interested (Mike, focus group #1, December 2004).

Another characteristic spoken of students was flexibility. Planning was essential to cover material, but the planning needed to be flexible so that it could be adjusted to the realities of the actual classroom. Sages as co-operating teachers were not only flexible in the classroom with their own students they were also flexible with their student teachers as well:

> Yvonne is very flexible and open-minded and she encouraged us to be open-

> minded about the way that we approach all of our classes and the way we approach new pieces. She feels good about what she is doing, she feels good at the end of the day, she doesn't feel run down or anything like that and she wants the students to feel good about what they're doing, and she wants to see some sort of level of accomplishment at the end of each of her classes from day to day. It's a really basic set of guidelines but it's really obvious that that's what she needs to do and she wants us to do the same thing. But the way in which we achieve it is totally up to us (Mike, focus group #1, December, 2004).

During the teaching blocks for all student teachers, lesson planning needed to include predictions of the way in which a class would respond to the lesson rather than just the content of what would be taught. Student teachers were asked to consider alternative pathways in the lesson if their predictions did not match actual student response:

> It took many tries and sometimes great frustration, but I realized that flexibility involved the ability to cover the lesson and reflect about the lesson, not just predict the flow of the lesson (Kate, journaling, May, 2005).

Watching this particular enlightenment allowed co-operating teachers to see flexibility and understand what it means to include this characteristic when having student teachers:

> What I saw, particularly toward the end of her teacher's college year, was that she was so intuitive and natural, she did start thinking about her lessons differently; "You know I could be stronger here, or do this here next time." Watching that happen was very powerful for me (Brad, focus group interview #2, May, 2005).

Tammy's experience was similar:

> I think he really had it. After watching him go it alone for awhile, he learned to go with the flow and he started to ask me the right questions. He forced me to look a lot harder at answers so I was better prepared to help him. He was good for me. I think when they get to this stage that it's easier for them to relax, and they don't look at me as much like an evaluator, but rather a colleague (Tammy, focus group interview #2, May, 2004).

Student teachers deemed rapport and personality to be an important attribute of a sage. The co-operating teachers who displayed the willingness to establish a teaching/learning relationship allowed the student teachers to feel comfortable and willing to experience anything. Student teachers feared that, if their relationships with their co-operating teacher were negative, their destiny to experience something negative was pre-determined. Co-operating teachers who acted as "sages" understood that the development of rapport and a relationship with their student teacher was important to the student teacher, but also required time. However, student teachers really did not focus on the word "develop" at all. Student teachers wanted the relationship to be immediate, rather than developed.

> What if my co-op doesn't like me? What if I don't like them? I just don't feel that I will be in a situation where my relationship with her won't reflect the way I'm evaluated by her, or the way she behaves as my co-operating teacher. This is very stressful for me (Mike, one-on-one interview, October, 2004).

When student teachers were asked what they believed were good qualities of a co-operating teacher, the ability to develop a relationship was not their first answer. Rather, personality emerged as a characteristic reflective of a sage. Over and over again, student

teachers directly related the personality of the co-operating teacher to the success or failure of a placement:

> If your co-operating teacher has a good personality and a very good shaped character then you will feel much on ground and in a position to start your teaching. You will feel like, I can do this on my own terms and I can show actually that what I do and the way that I can do it without thinking that much about pleasing the teacher (Tom, focus group interview #2, May 2005).

Also, student teachers identified sage-like characteristics that the co-operating teachers should possess before they take on a student teacher. Among them was their willingness to develop collaborative relationships with the student teachers:

> I don't feel that we're treated like students at all. We have never gotten to the point that there's conflict because I can easily talk to her. Our personalities match. I've come to the conclusion that before a co-operating teacher takes on a student teacher, they should look at themselves and ask whether or not they are the type of person who is receptive to others and works well with others instead of just teaches or talks to others? My co-operating teacher helped to mould me. She not only taught me, she also learned from me. That's an expert (Tom, focus group interview #2, May 2005).

Co-operating teachers discussed how their own ideas of acting as co-operating teachers had changed since being involved with this study, and these changes allowed them to function more as a sage. Credit for this change was given to their student teachers and to participating in this study:

> My idea of being a co-operating teacher has changed as a result of being involved

in this study. I know that it's important for me to be a positive role model with high moral standards for my student teacher; I think that it's more important for me to communicate my love for teaching music to children and the teaching profession itself (Leo, focus group interview #2, May 2005).

Further, some co-operating teachers talked about sharing their positive experiences with their student teachers as having changed the way in which they saw themselves as co-operating teachers:

> I don't want to make my student teachers feel inferior because they can't do this job the way I do. I need to learn from her as much as she needs to learn from me. Being the co-operating teacher doesn't mean I'm "in charge," it's a negotiated idea. Both the student teacher and I have to be clear on what we both expect from the experience (Tammy, focus group interview #2, May, 2005).

In the last focus group interview, Yvonne seemed particularly affected by her participation in this study. Out of all the co-operating teachers involved in this study, Yvonne felt most that using her role as a co-operating teacher was one of the most effective ways of learning. Again, she credited her student teachers with her development as a "sage":

> I find acting as a co-operating teacher to be a gratifying experience. Yes, it is extra work. Yes, it can be a struggle at times. Yes, the monetary compensation is little. But the rewards are worth the effort. I find myself being enriched as a teacher as a result of my experiences with my student teachers. Any time educators collaborate, the exchange of ideas is likely to be creative. Student teachers challenge me, even after all these years, to reflect on my own methods

> and practices. I strongly believe that the experienced teacher has much to offer to the novice teacher. Sometimes we may fail to realize just how much expertise we possess until we see ourselves in the eyes of a student teacher (Yvonne, focus group interview #2, May, 2005).

Yvonne's willingness to reflect in this manner epitomizes the sage.

"Sages" functioning as co-operating teachers is a relatively new area of research. Kahn's (2001) results supports this study regarding attributes of a "sage" as described by student teachers. Kahn's study involving the success of the student teaching experience listed specific attributes of the co-operating teacher as contributing factors to a successful student teaching experience. These attributes included flexibility, positive communication skills, the ability to establish a good working relationship, and crediting the student teacher for supporting co-operating teachers' learning. Kahn's study, like this study, also determined that the ability of the co-operating teacher and student teacher to learn from one another was an attribute that contributed to expert teachers.

The student teachers in this study, when describing experts or sages, did not refer to the amount of teaching experience of the co-operating teachers. Instead they described characteristics of teaching and teachers that they felt allowed them to have positive experiences as well as facilitated their development as a music teacher. Looking back at the co-operating teachers chosen for this study, the amount of time taught varies. All of the co-operating teachers had taught music for more than five years, something the Faculty of Education requires in order to act in the capacity of a co-operating teacher. However, each of the co-operating teachers possessed the characteristics of a sage despite the differences in the amount of time each of them have spent in the classroom.

During focus group interviews, all of the co-operating teachers believed that part of their role was to learn from their student teachers, and they voiced this belief. Additionally, they welcomed this learning. However, a difference between the sage and non-sage co-operating teacher appeared to lie within the definition of their roles. Although all voiced this belief, only two consistently demonstrated this belief, particularly in the areas of risk taking, flexibility and learning from their student teachers. Co-operating teachers who were sages thought of themselves as learners and thought of themselves as mentors for the student teachers, rather than leading the student teachers. Some co-operating teachers described as sages by their student teachers saw their co-operating role as a shared experience between themselves and the student teacher.

> I provided feedback to my student teacher after each lesson. Why? Because I needed it!... After what I thought was initially going to be a break watching my student teacher, I found that I was re-charged. I began to become restless waiting to get back in there. The student teacher was doing an excellent job...but I couldn't wait....I realized how much I missed it. This time of the year teachers are beginning to sense the end is near, but I felt as if it was the beginning again... I was excited. I think a lot of this feeling came from my student teacher. He's young, fresh, does all these activities that I've not seen...shows lots of variety...and I just felt like it was a reflection opportunity for me on what I'm doing, what I could do better. I was excited to try new things that I watched him do. Just by observing him, I was able to reflect on my own approach. It was such a great learning experience (Leo, focus group interview #2, May, 2005).

The most effective co-operating teachers are those that are willing and look

forward to learning from their student teachers; not just learning more about their student teachers, but also learn about themselves through the process of serving as co-operating teachers. The co-operating teachers identified as sages by the student teachers were the ones who felt that, at some times, they were students themselves. These teachers were eager to learn from their student teachers. All of these findings support those discovered by Kahn (2001).

All participants spoke positively about the learning that resulted from speaking with each other about their experiences as both co-operating teachers and student teachers. A strong desire to continue to learn was demonstrated by both groups, particularly towards the third block, when focus group interviews and journaling provided opportunities to think about what they were doing as well as dialogue with each other. Co-operating teachers, as a group, consistently credited the student teachers with wanting to learn more about their co-operating teachers as teachers of music and as co-operating teachers.

While wishing that all student teachers could be paired up with "sages," the reality was that only some of the paired co-operating teachers and student teachers "hit it off" and formed mutually satisfying relationships during the student teaching experience. The other instrumental music student teachers struggled under the supervision of "good" teachers who believed that there was only one way to do things... their way. Still other student teachers found themselves in mismatched situations with congenial, but uncommunicative co-operating teachers whose pedagogical and philosophical orientations were different from their own. These unvoiced differences of style and opinion at times caused confusion and stress.

Summary

Both co-operating teachers and student teachers had mixed views regarding the expectations of each other during the student teaching experiences. While student teachers made it clear that they needed to feel a sense of belonging to the school while they were student teaching, co-operating teachers were frustrated that the student teaching experience was not a real reflection of the role of a music educator. However, they did not know how to address that with the student teachers. During focus group interviews, co-operating teachers could not agree upon a common definition of their roles; rather, they found a common frustration. They focused on their roles as music educators, describing the expectations of their jobs rather than the expectations of themselves as co-operating teachers. This lack of focus on their role as co-operating teachers made it difficult for the co-operating teachers to meet the needs of student teachers, as well as to guide them effectively through the experience of being contributing members to the music learning community.

A music learning community provides student teachers and co-operating teachers with a sense of belonging and a willingness to want to participate in making the community better. Included in the community for this study are students, student teachers, co-operating teachers, parents, and administrators. Results indicated that student teachers and co-operating teachers had different ideas concerning what is needed to create positive, learning outcomes during the student teaching experience and to become effective members of the community. Co-operating teachers held early concerns about providing productive learning practice teaching experiences for student teachers, since they described their roles as being much more complex than just teaching.

Understanding, defining, and clearly articulating the expectations of the student teachers and co-operating teachers before student teaching may create a more effective music learning community within which co-operating teachers and student teachers would have a better, more productive student teaching experience.

If student teachers and co-operating teachers were able to sit down, talk more and learn from each other, more community might be created. Dialogue and commitment to learning were two fundamental parts of the descriptions of community. Both co-operating teachers and student teachers needed to belong to a greater extent to the community as learners and teachers.

Student teachers blamed their co-operating teachers for a lack of positive learning experiences, a lack of feedback and for their feeling like "failures" more than they blamed themselves for a variety of reasons. According to the student teachers, the multiple venues and co-operating teacher changes did not allow for the student teachers to experience continuity of teaching ideas from placement to placement. Student teachers expressed frustration at the multiple expectations of the Faculty of Education, as well as at the different expectations of each co-operating teacher. Expectations changed from co-operating teacher to co-operating teacher, and it was unrealistic to assume that student teachers would be able to understand new sets of expectations in a three-week time frame.

Co-operating teachers blamed their student teachers for having inadequate musical, practical and classroom management strategies. While it was difficult, according to co-operating teachers, to provide feedback to their student teachers concerning these inadequacies, co-operating teachers did voice their concerns in their journal entries. **Co-**

operating teachers voiced concerns regarding their lack of ability to provide appropriate feedback to their student teachers. All of the co-operating teachers agreed that they needed to develop better feedback strategies.

Co-operating teachers also blamed the Faculty of Education for the three-week teaching block schedule. Co-operating teachers agreed that splitting the student teaching experience into four blocks encouraged student teachers to copy the personality of the co-operating teacher in order to survive, whereas a longer student teaching placement with the same co-operating teacher might allow teacher candidates' personalities to flourish. Also, the short blocks made it difficult to establish working relationships between co-operating teachers and student teachers, which was difficult for co-operating teachers and student teachers alike. Co-operating teachers also blamed the Faculty of Education for a lack of preparation of student teachers and the lack of consistency between the co-operating teacher and the university supervisor. All of these factors contributed to a somewhat negative co-operating teacher experience.

Blaming others impeded the growth of both the student teachers and the co-operating teachers, as neither the co-operating teachers nor the student teachers were able to reflect critically on their own practice. It also appears that neither the co-operating teachers nor the student teachers were aware of their inability to self reflect.

"It's overwhelming!" surfaced as a theme for both the co-operating teachers and the student teachers. By the third teaching block, when student teachers were teaching 75% of the co-operating teacher's courses, student teachers felt overwhelmed by such things as developing relationships with the co-operating teachers, communicating ideas with their co-operating teachers, developing classroom management strategies, learning

to undertake the multi-tasking role of the classroom music teacher, and developing assessment strategies as well as being assessed, all while trying to emerge as a teacher in their own right.

Concerns and fears for both student teachers and co-operating teachers ranged from actual implementation of lessons and learning outcomes to classroom management. Student teachers consistently voiced in their journal writings and in focus group interviews a myriad of fears regarding their being able to succeed in the multi-dimensional role of the music teacher. This fear was voiced more often among those student teachers in secondary school settings.

The idea of being overwhelmed was exhibited by both the student teachers and co-operating teachers. Student teachers displayed fears regarding a multitude of issues, including classroom management, application of university methods classes and new theory, fear of their own shortcomings as a music teacher in front of their students and their co-operating teacher, and getting everything done. Co-operating teachers were concerned with getting the student teachers to understand their role as music educators, maintaining the pace of the curriculum, not wanting their classroom students to get behind, and having time for their student teachers.

Co-operating teachers and student teachers shared the same experiences while working together in a classroom; however, the interpretations regarding those experiences were often not the same. This result contributed to the feeling of being overwhelmed, because student teachers did not feel like they knew what to do differently if a similar situation occurred again. The fact that their co-operating teachers analyzed

things so differently made the student teachers feel inadequate as teachers rather than informed about other possibilities. Ideally, student teachers have the opportunity to put into practice all that they have learned about teaching. However, for this to be successful, student teachers must go beyond subject matter knowledge and immerse themselves in practice to actually learn how to teach their subject.

Clearly the theme "Do as I do, not as I say," was a result of mixed messages for the student teachers from the co-operating teachers. The reality is that student teachers conformed to the styles of teaching of their co-operating teacher as a survival technique to get them through their placements. Student teachers were frustrated that they were not encouraged to develop their own styles as teachers of music. Co-operating teachers, on the other hand, identified a lack of time and unknown teaching methods as a restraint on their being willing to let the student be creative in the classroom.

As a result of the "Do as I say, not as I do" theme, there were many lessons that the student teachers felt they could not learn on their own. They believed that they were unsuccessful in trying to "read" their students, because they were too consumed with "reading" their co-operating teachers. They were not given the opportunity to make any major decisions during the practice teaching sessions and, as a result, they never faced any consequences from those decisions. There was little opportunity to be innovative and apply new teaching ideas, because materials and methods were dictated to them by their co-operating teachers. Because the co-operating teachers intervened, they were never really "tested" by the students, so they never really learned whether they could manage a class on their own. They never really learned to set their own pace, because they were too busy "marching to the beat" of the co-operating teacher.

Although co-operating teachers voiced, during focus group interviews, that they wished for their student teachers to be more creative in the classroom, in their journal writings they wrote that their student teachers would be most successful if they were emulating their teaching styles in the classroom. Student teachers, however, saw things completely differently from their co-operating teachers. Student teachers expressed many areas in which they would have liked to try to be more creative and discover themselves as teachers.

In the theme assessing versus assisting, co-operating teachers faced a conflict when evaluating their student teachers. Co-operating teachers needed to grade and evaluate their student teachers using guidelines suggested or provided by the Faculty of Education, while at the same time assisting the student teachers in becoming better music teachers. This conflict was difficult for both the co-operating teachers and the student teachers.

During the focus group interviews, co-operating teachers and student teachers both commented on evaluation. Student teachers were constantly aware during teaching that they were being evaluated. It was rare that student teachers commented on their teaching results and whether their students learned from them. Rather, student teachers focused on their grades. However, some co-operating teachers used feedback as a motivating tool for their student teachers. Because student teachers could not differentiate between the grade they would receive and the kind of music teacher they would become, giving feedback was difficult for the co-operating teachers.

Student teachers worried about their relationship with their co-operating teachers and used this as an excuse to accept, without questioning, whatever feedback they

received from their co-operating teachers. Student teachers did not ask co-operating teachers to expand on their comments, nor did they feel free to disagree with what they said. Whether student teachers valued the input from their co-operating teachers was not clear. However, resentments due to perceptions of a poor relationship with the co-operating teacher and feedback did appear for both the co-operating teachers and the student teachers.

Student teachers were graded each time they practice taught using the same generic rubric as the guideline for both formative and summative assessments. There exists within these evaluation sheets an almost unavoidable conflict of interest when co-operating teachers make summative evaluations of the performance of their student teachers. The conflict revolves around the fact that, although student teachers may have improved during the practice teaching experience, it may not be enough improvement to provide a grade that would be considered for an employment reference. One reason was that these generic rather than subject-specific sheets did not allow co-operating teachers and student teachers to discuss the strengths and weaknesses of the student teacher from a musical standpoint. Co-operating teachers expressed their own concerns about the shortcomings of the rubric provided and required by the Faculty of Education.

An additional issue relating to assisting versus assessing involved the interactions between and roles of co-operating teachers and university supervisors. Although co-operating teachers play a profound role in student teachers' experiences during the teacher's college year, they have little interaction with the Faculty of Education. This lack of communication contributes to issues that concern both co-operating teachers and student teachers. For example, the expectations of what should be happening in the

classroom on the part of the university supervisor and the co-operating teacher are often different. This difference in opinion affects the experience for the music student teacher, who at times becomes confused regarding those expectations. Communication between these two parties, during student teaching blocks particularly, needs to be addressed.

A co-operating teacher's evaluation should be an important index of a student teacher's competence. Most research, including this study, provides evidence that this is not the case. In light of the critical importance of feedback during the student teaching experience, the co-operating teacher has an important and influential role in the development of the student teacher. For co-operating teachers, however, assisting student teachers was important to them, and often these two roles were at odds.

All of the co-operating teacher participants could be considered to be sages in once capacity or another. These co-operating teachers generally gave much of the credit of a successful experience to the student teacher. On the other hand, student teachers believed that co-operating teachers were sages for a variety of reasons. In both focus groups in December, 2004 and May, 2005 student teachers identified qualities that described their co-operating teachers who they considered to be sages.

Flexibility was a major characteristic spoken of by student teachers, who, according to their co-operating teachers, finally understood that a music teacher must be flexible on many levels, including when acting in the capacity of a co-operating teacher. Sages as co-operating teachers were flexible as classroom teachers as well as with their student teachers.

Results from this study supported Kahn's (2001) study, which listed specific attributes of the co-operating teacher as contributing factors to a successful student teaching experience. Attributes associated with "sages" as co-operating teachers in this study included flexibility, positive communication skills, the ability to establish a good working relationship, and crediting the student teacher for co-operating teacher learning. In addition this study also determined that the ability for the co-operating teacher and student teacher to learn from one another was an attribute contributed to teachers as "sages."

A key element in determining success in student teaching is the relationship between the student teacher and the co-operating teacher. The student teacher works in an apprenticeship of observation (Lortie, 1975), becoming acculturated to the co-operating teacher's classroom. Co-operating teachers agreed that observing their student teachers allowed them to see themselves and reflect on what they were doing as a teacher. It also provided the co-operating teachers with the opportunity to watch new approaches in action and decide whether these approaches would be something that they should consider doing. The relationship between the co-operating teacher and the student teacher was positive throughout the experience for some student teachers and co-operating teachers, but not for all, and not for all the practice teaching blocks. The co-operating teachers who provided the respectful, open-minded, flexible, approachable, and personable environments in which their student teachers would be set up for success had student teachers who reacted positively to any circumstance while student teaching and developed good relationships with their co-operating teachers.

Co-operating teachers who were "sages" believed that part of their role was to learn from their student teachers, and they welcomed this learning. The most effective co-operating teachers thought of themselves as learners. Some co-operating teachers described as sages by their student teachers saw their co-operating role as a shared experience between themselves and the student teacher.

Chapter V

CONCLUSIONS AND SUGGESTIONS FOR THE PROFESSION:

Conclusions

The theme, "Building a music learning community" included many things. Student teachers and co-operating teachers demonstrated difficulty defining their roles within the community. While co-operating teachers as a group were able to agree on a description of the role of student teachers, their major concern was in their own inability to convey to student teachers the many components of the role of a music teacher in the community involved. Co-operating teachers expected that student teachers would be involved in all areas of music education, both inside and outside of the classroom. However, the student teachers were not able to initiate and engage in, in their view, those things that are involved in being a music teacher, such as extra-curricular activities, photo-copying, lesson planning, instrument repair, and fundraising. This frustrated the co-operating teachers.

Student teachers, on the other hand, expected to be immersed in the experiences of the music teacher. Perhaps they had not reflected on the role of a music teacher, because they did not seem to know what "behind the scenes" activities were involved. However, student teachers wanted to be involved holistically in the school community and belong to it. More than one student teacher voiced that being immersed in the school community would be beneficial, because he could learn so many things, not just the one subject area. Yet, the co-operating teachers did not feel that the student teachers were ready to be immersed in the entire school community. That student teachers seemed to be unable to understand the role of a music teacher resulted in the co-operating teachers not

offering many of the experiences that should have been offered to the student teachers. Immersion into the school community, although it may have seemed overwhelming at the time, could have encouraged the understanding of the complexity of the role of music teachers for student teachers and could have alleviated some of the frustration of the co-operating teachers.

Co-operating teachers have the opportunity to directly shape and mould the ideas of incoming novice music teachers. Co-operating teachers must help the student teachers achieve that "sense of belonging" they desire, while also helping them to understanding that the role of a music teacher is much more involved than teaching students in the classroom. The results of this study support that co-operating teachers need to help students teachers discover and identify with the rich role of a teacher of music and all that this role entails.

The desire to view themselves and be viewed by others as music teachers in the community was voiced by the student teachers during both of their focus group interviews. Student teachers experienced this when they had taught good lessons and when the students treated them as their teacher. This "pupil given sense of belonging" (McNally et al., 1994) demonstrated that the student teachers had established rapport with the students, as well as had begun to identify themselves in the role of music teacher, thus allowing them to feel more like a part of the school community.

Student teachers also wanted to develop a rapport with their co-operating teachers as well as the other teachers within the school community. They wanted to feel relaxed with the teachers, which would allow for the conversations about teaching and help them to think of themselves as teachers. Co-operating teachers could help students teachers

accomplish this by allowing student teachers to observe more than just their own classrooms and by ensuring that they have been introduced to other members of the music department and other colleagues in the building. They could also introduce student teachers in a manner that allows them to feel like a teacher (Krueger, 2006).

Most of the student teachers were plunged into the role of teaching music classes, but, in general, they were grateful for this experience. If anything, student teachers were disappointed at the limited teaching experiences during their first teaching block. Student teachers wanted to take charge of the classes they were assigned to teach, because they believed that this would allow them to gauge for themselves their ability to handle classroom reality and, as a result, help them develop their sense of themselves as a teacher. Giving student teachers sustained teaching responsibilities, however, demanded the trust of the co-operating teachers. If the student teachers were allowed to take charge, it was a sign of their being accepted as a colleague rather than a student.

One of the most persistent issues from the theme of "musical learning community" was that the co-operating teachers could not let go of the belief that student teachers did not understand their jobs. Co-operating teachers believed that students were set up for failure by the Faculty of Education, because, when they started student teaching, they did not clearly understand the many facets of the role of a music educator. Yet, the co-operating teachers in this study did not have conversations with the student teachers about their philosophies of music education that would allow them to either enhance their philosophies or begin to understand their roles. That the co-operating teachers viewed their own roles as co-operating teachers so narrowly was indicative of their lack of knowledge of this role, and served as evidence that they misunderstood the

expectations of the student teachers assigned to them.

While some co-operating teachers suggested that this lack of awareness was not the fault of the student, they also indicated in their focus group interviews that this had been frustrating each time they worked with a student teacher. Co-operating teachers, when they became aware of this continual frustration, should have made more of an effort to ensure that, at the very least, the student teachers learned the "behind the scenes" components of the job, even though they felt that the Faculty of Education needed to provide more opportunity for student teachers to experience the "real, all encompassing job" of the music educator.

Prior to the first practice teaching experience, in individual interviews, student teachers expressed a desire to have a positive learning experience. Student teachers defined their roles uniquely; each student teacher had a different interpretation of what their role as a student teacher should be, even though the four student teachers had taken the same courses together at the Faculty of Education.

The student teachers and co-operating teachers differed in their ideas about the desired learning outcomes of the student teaching experience. A study conducted by McNally, Cole & Stronach (1994) looked at what and how student teachers learned or failed to learn during extended periods of the student teaching experience through the perspectives of the student teachers themselves. This "teacher-given sense" of belonging (McNally et al, 1994) was stated explicitly. In this study, there was no prolonged opportunity to teach. Three-week blocks do not appear to be enough time for the student teachers to grasp as many concepts as necessary to understand the role of the music teacher..

Focus group conversations among student teachers made me realize that it was difficult for student teachers to share their experiences. Student teachers' definitions of themselves within this role were complex and divided, and these conversations resulted more in introducing individual experiences than in allowing them to feel that they were experiencing student teaching together. Expectations were different for each individual. Although student teachers had individual needs as future music educators, all of them were experiencing practice teaching for the first time. Some felt that belonging to the community of the school and feeling a sense of membership with the faculty of the school from the beginning would have enhanced their experience. They felt that waiting to teach deterred them from "diving right into" the community of the students and the school. Other student teachers felt completely removed from the teaching faculty in the classroom and in the staffroom. To these student teachers, there was no apparent student teaching community.

One of the only commonalities that existed among both the student teachers and co-operating teachers in terms of their expectations was the desire for a positive, learning experience. A clearer definition of co-operating teacher and student teacher roles before student teaching occurs could benefit both parties.

The "The blame game" theme heightened my awareness of the need for the development of reflective strategies for both the co-operating teachers and student teachers. Reflecting, for student teachers and co-operating teachers, should be seen as an opportunity for growth rather than for assigning blame. As this study unfolded, I felt that student teachers and co-operating teachers would have benefited from sharing their reflections on the student teaching experience on a regular basis. Sharing the content of

some of the journal entries with the other parties would have been beneficial. Mixed messages were sent by both the co-operating teachers and the student teachers to one another, and the opportunity for shared reflection did not occur.

Attitudes shape expectations, and it is important for both the co-operating teachers and the student teachers to learn reflection strategies that will promote growth rather than instil resentments. Student teachers and co-operating teachers have an opportunity to learn about themselves as teachers while teaching each other as well as their students.

Student teachers expressed a desire to be involved in the evaluation process. Student teachers felt that this involvement would open up communication between the co-operating teachers and the student teachers and provide them with specific areas of improvement to be addressed. In addition, this involvement would promote growth in self-assessment and encourage ownership of their teaching experiences. Being involved in evaluation would help promote self-reflection, a characteristic that was only weakly and occasionally exhibited by the student teachers and co-operating teachers. Learning to self-assess (reflect) could turn student teachers into active participants in their own development. On the other hand, co-operating teachers must provide feedback to aid in the reflection process of the student teachers and should critically reflect on their own practices as co-operating teachers.

Lack of feedback allowed student teachers to blame their co-operating teachers for not reinforcing and encouraging them when teaching. Student teachers seemed to need to rely on their co-operating teachers to confirm or deny that what they are doing was "good" and were hoping to accomplish this through feedback sessions with the co-operating teachers. When co-operating teachers did not respond to this need, student

teachers felt inadequate, alone, or like a "failure." Even when student teachers hinted at their need for feedback, co-operating teachers did not always respond. Often when they did, it was at the end of the day, or too far away from the experience as it had happened. This was frustrating for the student teachers, because they could not always remember to what the co-operating teachers were referring.

On the other hand, co-operating teachers expressed concern regarding providing feedback to their student teachers. Most co-operating teachers agreed that they were not comfortable and did not know how to do it appropriately. Co-operating teachers blamed student teachers for their inadequate knowledge and skills. Perhaps co-operating teachers needed to be more aware of what to expect from student teachers. With beginning instrumentalists, co-operating teachers know what to expect, and they know how to gauge the students' progress. However, they may be unaware of the learning process for student teachers during the student teaching experience. Results of this study indicated that co-operating teachers continually compared their student teachers to what they believed they were able to do when they themselves were student teachers. A clearer understanding of the expectations within student teaching practices in instrumental music may allow co-operating teachers to be more accepting of student teachers' weaknesses and help them learn to work with their student teachers rather than against them.

Finally, the Faculty of Education was blamed by the co-operating teachers and the student teachers for placing students in music programs for which they were not qualified, which set the student teachers up for failure and frustrated the co-operating teachers. Co-operating teachers voiced concerns regarding those students who had no background performing in bands or orchestras; they felt that those student teachers did

not have the skills to work with such an ensemble effectively. Although all the student teachers in this study had an instrumental music background, not all of them had performed in school music groups, which are different from community groups or performing alone. The co-operating teachers believed that teacher education programs should require that potential music teacher candidates have the appropriate courses on their transcripts, such as conducting, instrumental techniques, methods classes, and performing classes including choirs, orchestras and bands, before admitting them. While it is difficult to believe that those entering the profession of music education would not have taken these courses as part of their undergraduate work, it did occur. Those wishing to teach music should not be admitted to the Teacher's College on the basis of grades alone, and co-operating teachers should not be expected to remediate during student teaching.

The "I'm Overwhelmed!" theme involved the fears, concerns, and questions of student teachers in particular. Student teachers feared being unable to do the job of music teacher and all that it involves. They found their placements stressful, and also felt that asking questions was viewed as a weakness rather than a strength. They felt that they were not encouraged to be creative and try new things with the students in their charge. Student teachers also voiced concerns that they may not be good enough to be a successful music teacher.

Student teachers believed that their co-operating teachers had higher expectations of them than was reasonable at this stage of their development. One student teacher felt dismissed when he asked questions that resulted in his feeling he was failing. As a result, this particular student teacher ceased to ask questions of the co-operating teacher and

survived the practice teaching placement, but experienced much stress while doing so.

Co-operating teachers could not accept the fact that student teachers did not understand the breadth of their jobs. This realization should have provided the co-operating teachers an opportunity to educate the student teachers. However, what the co-operating teachers interpreted as a lack of understanding on the student teachers' parts could have been the student teachers' lack of knowledge'. Co-operating teachers missed the opportunity to educate the student teachers as to what their future as music teachers would include. This resulted in student teachers feeling inadequate.

It appears to be crucial to teach instrumental music student teachers that calling on resources for help and asking questions can support their learning. This could prevent them from feeling overwhelmed. Further, co-operating teachers should encourage student teachers to ask questions and express their needs during practice teaching. This could help to lessen the overwhelming sense of "too much to do and learn" experienced by student teachers in an instrumental music setting. Co-operating teachers should be offered training or orientation that includes information regarding effective supervision and provides an opportunity to have conversations with each other within this role.

The theme of "Do as I do, not as I say" focused on the mixed messages that were being sent to student teachers. On the one hand, the Faculty of Education offered courses that ostensibly prepared student teachers for their student teaching experiences. These courses involved learning to write effective lesson plans, engaging in mock teaching experiences, learning classroom management strategies, teaching to specific ways of student learning, and reviewing instrumental techniques that are necessary for success in the music classroom. On the other hand, co-operating teachers felt that student teachers

came to the student teaching experience unprepared. While student teachers looked forward to developing their own style of teaching and being creative in the classroom, co-operating teachers consistently encouraged them to continue doing things the way that they were already being done in their classrooms. Student teachers ended up conforming to the styles of the co-operating teachers in order to survive the student teaching experience, rather than learning about themselves and developing themselves as teachers.

Even though co-operating teachers told the student teachers that they wanted them to be creative, they worried that a new style of teaching within their classrooms would be too disruptive to students and their learning. Their claim of "too little time" to allow the student teacher to "try new things" was as frustrating for the co-operating teachers as it was for the student teachers. New creative methods of teaching that could potentially have reached students who were experiencing difficulty as well as the opportunity to teach the co-operating teacher new methodologies of music teaching were lost because of time constraints in respect to the student teaching block and the co-operating teachers' unwillingness to try.

The Assessing versus assisting theme perhaps was among the most widely discussed themes during focus group interviews and in journal writings. The interpretations of both the student teachers and the co-operating teachers concerning the evaluation process were complex. Both the co-operating teachers and the student teachers agreed that the evaluation form required by the Faculty of Education was inadequate, as it did not allow for subject-specific evaluation. Student teachers and co-operating teachers alike expressed a desire to be able to evaluate as well as be evaluated in musical rather than generic terms. Co-operating teachers and student teachers agreed that the required

evaluation form did not allow for growth and progress to be appropriately documented. Musical items, such as rehearsal skills, knowledge of instruments, conducting and so forth, are areas critical to the assessment of a future music educator. These areas are in need of individual evaluation in addition to the generic issues that are transferable to all subjects.

Co-operating teachers' evaluations of student teachers' abilities to perform in context should be a fundamental component of assessment. The ability to perform in context combines content (knowledge) with process (pedagogy) and provides an opportunity to evaluate effective student music teaching. Collaboration between co-operating teachers and student teachers must occur during this process in order for evaluation to be effective, which did not occur regularly with the student teacher/co-operating teacher dyads in this study.

All of the co-operating teachers expressed concern about the process of evaluating or assessing their student teachers. Some co-operating teachers were reluctant to say "bad things" about the student teacher or point out weaknesses, as they did not want to be responsible for preventing these student teachers from getting a job or for keeping them out of the profession. They also did not want to damage their relationships with the student teachers, which would make them less able to assist them in their growth as teachers. On the other hand, one teacher voiced that when she had experienced an inept student teacher, and her concerns went unnoticed, even when confronting the university supervisor. The teacher felt frustrated when this student was employed as a music teacher the next year.

A music-specific evaluation sheet could open up communication between the co-

operating teacher and the student teacher. Identifying specific areas for improvement followed by suggestions on how to improve from the co-operating teacher could improve the way feedback is initiated and conducted. Also, subject-specific evaluation sheets could serve as guidelines for both the co-operating teacher and the student teacher during student teaching and could, in turn, allow for a more positive, productive learning experience for both the co-operating teacher and the student teacher and for shared expectations.

The second concern of the co-operating teachers was the grading process itself. They believed that student teachers were unable to recognize the developmental nature of learning to teach. Co-operating teachers agreed that some of the teachers expected to be rated excellent on each placement in all areas. One co-operating teacher worried that providing her student teacher with the evaluation sheet threatened their relationship if it was not as strong as the student had expected. Co-operating teachers suggested that student teachers needed to show progress in terms of grades from the outset of the placements. Some co-operating teachers felt that the student teachers expected or were used to being rated higher than they deserved to be. Further, co-operating teachers found that, when they assisted their student teachers with advice concerning delivery, methods, and other issues, student teachers did improve their skills. However, two co-operating teachers felt that, despite the fact that their student teachers improved, they could not provide them with high ratings on the final evaluation form. In these cases, the co-operating teachers provided appropriate comments for the student teachers that spoke to their positive response to feedback and hoped that these comments would warrant more strength than the actual rating.

The third concern focused on the student teachers. Student teachers voiced concerns that they were being evaluated based on personality matching with their co-operating teachers and that the expectations of the co-operating teachers were not clear. Common or similar methods of evaluation and assessment among co-operating teachers, except for the generic evaluation sheets, were virtually non-existent.

The final theme that emerged from the data was "The co-operating teacher as the sage." Co-operating teachers deemed to be sages were described by their student teachers as teachers who possessed the will and passion in their own teaching styles that was not only that of an expert musician, but was that of a teacher who wanted his or her own student teachers to feel good about teaching music. Co-operating teachers who were willing to mould student teachers by allowing them the opportunities for trial and error, while acknowledging weaknesses and strengths, built confidence in their student teachers.

Most important however, co-operating teachers described as "Sages" were also willing to admit that they were learners. Co-operating teachers learned, partly through this study, that acting in this capacity allowed them to re-examine themselves as teachers in a new light. What some may have thought would be a "break" actually rejuvenated them. They gained new energy and learned new techniques and ideas from their student teachers. Talking with other co-operating teachers in focus groups also played a role in allowing co-operating teachers to see themselves in a different way. Co-operating teachers began to realize the importance of issues like feedback, and that it was up to them to improve this skill. Their taking responsibility for improving the experience of student teaching for the student teachers also improved it for themselves. Characteristics

defining the Sage included being approachable, being respectful to the student teachers, being flexible, being open-minded and, being considered expert teachers by the student teachers. Student teachers believed that sages knew why they were acting in the capacity of a co-operating teacher and whether they had the characteristics that would allow for a positive experience to occur for the student teacher.

Creating "sages" is important to the success of student teaching. I believe that this process begins with the willingness to act as a co-operating teacher and to view training for that role as an important part of the process. The Faculty of Education should provide both the co-operating teachers with specifics of the teacher preparation program with which they will be involved. This information should include three areas: the goals and expectations of the teacher education program, the roles and responsibilities of both the co-operating teacher and the student teacher, and critical aspects of the supervision process including conferencing or consistent contact, observation strategies, and guidelines for providing effective feedback. Some of this information, such as the roles and responsibilities of the co-operating teacher and the student teacher, should be given to the student teachers as well.

In a study conducted by Richardson-Koehler (1988), both the co-operating teachers and student teachers ranked the quality of their relationship at or near the top of factors contributing to student teacher success. Explicit conversations about respective roles and expectations would assist in clearing up existing misconceptions and open the door for effective mentoring to occur. If, as Richardson-Koehler suggests, the co-operating teacher is the most influential player in the co-operating teacher, student teacher, and university teacher educator triangle, then teacher educators must take

seriously the particular and unique role of co-operating teachers as they contribute to student teachers' successes or failures.

Providing opportunities for participants to be well informed about the goals and expectations, the roles and responsibilities, and the supervision processes used during practicum experiences produces effective relationships between co-operating teachers and student teachers, regardless of personality styles (Giebelhaus, 1997). Student teachers need a guide, teacher, and mentor to help them as they struggle to navigate the often frightening-distance between their university preparation and the beginnings of their teaching career. Co-operating teachers also need a guide as they navigate the waters of providing effective supervision. The support for and modeling of effective supervision and co-operating practices by the teacher instils confidence in the outcomes of the student teaching experiences and builds partnerships and excellence in the process of preparing tomorrow's music teachers.

Recommendations for Practice

This study identified a number of areas in which the student teaching experience and the co-operating teacher experience in instrumental music education may be improved. Co-operating teachers and student teachers need to realize that, for some co-operating teachers and student teachers, the field experience will substantially alter their actions, intentions, beliefs of teaching and expectations.

1) The results of my study indicate that co-operating teachers discovered through taking part in this study that they wanted more knowledge and preparation for being co-operating teachers. Universities could provide this education by sharing research findings on student teaching and practical course work. Rather than having the Faculty of

Education dictate the allotment of time that a student teacher is allowed to teach, the co-operating teacher and the student teacher should be allowed to collaborate on what structure is best suited for the student teacher to learn the most in instrumental music classes during each student teaching block. Longer field experiences, more time built into daily schedules to spend reflecting as a co-operating teacher/student teacher team as well as time to share experiences with colleagues are some suggestions that would entail shifting priorities and would demand a re-organization in the current practices of the Faculty of Education that might be helpful in better preparing co-operating teachers for their roles.

2) Schools and universities should work collaboratively to identify music programs in which student teachers can be placed that can give the student teacher a successful experience. Additionally, co-operating teachers should be chosen by the standards of their work in instrumental music programs, rather than by their willingness to volunteer to act as co-operating teachers. Research involving the selection of co-operating teachers in instrumental music, based on a specific selection criteria, could result in enhanced student teaching/co-operating teaching experiences. The Faculty of Education would benefit from the identification of exemplary or "sage" teachers based on the past experiences of student teachers and recommendations from their colleagues in the schools. This selection committee of sages could include in-service teachers who have recently graduated from Teacher's College and can provide first-hand insight into the needs they felt when practice teaching. Even though this practice could result in situations in which colleagues are forced to confront the shortcomings of fellow music educators, it could also result in student teachers with strong placements with co-

operating teachers who are both qualified and successful as music teachers. There is no simple solution to the screening process; however, it is something that must be considered. Collaboration at all levels of education could benefit all parties involved.

3) Student teachers in this study identified "sages" as co-operating teachers who were flexible in allowing the student teacher to try new things in the classroom, who provided resources, who established a good rapport with the student teacher, who provided the student teacher with numerous opportunities for teaching in various instrumental music settings, and who learned from their student teacher. These characteristics should be part of co-operating teacher orientation when learning to work with student teachers.

4) Time or lack thereof, was a recurring theme. Participants in this study collectively agreed that more time in the practice teaching experience would improve the experience overall. More time should include one-on-one reflection time between co-operating teachers and student teachers, more time to reflect with other instrumental music co-operating teachers, and a longer time for the student teaching experiences as a whole. Time is a limited resource and will always be identified as a limitation; however, the length of the experience currently offered through this Faculty of Education is not enough. The elimination of the block system of student teaching and replacing it with either one 12-week experience or two six-week experiences could potentially establish better instrumental music teachers who would get to know the methods of their co-operating teachers, as well as establish their own teaching styles more effectively.

5) Results revealed that reflection strategies were considerably lacking among co-operating teachers and student teachers. Promoting critical thinking and reflection among

student teachers and co-operating teachers could enhance the success of the experience for both the student teachers and co-operating teachers. Using co-operating teachers who practice reflection on an ongoing basis in instrumental music could result in student teachers becoming reflective practitioners and might change the outcome of the student teaching experience and ultimately the co-operating teacher experience.

6) Results of this study revealed that neither the co-operating teacher nor the student teacher credited the university with the success of the student teaching experience. The university supervisor's role is unclear, but it could have a positive impact on the practice teaching experience if the supervisors were more aware of the curriculum of the co-operating teacher's classroom, rather than expecting the co-operating teacher to be aware of the curriculum of the Faculty of Education classroom. The university supervisor must serve as a bridge between the teacher education program at the university and the practices of the co-operating teacher in order to end the mixed messages that were received by both the student teacher and the co-operating teacher from the university supervisors in this study.

7) A need exists to prepare co-operating teachers to supervise student teachers. Preparation will help co-operating teachers provide specific and objective feedback and can prevent them from having unrealistic expectations of their student teachers. Informal meetings or conversations with university supervisors and clinical faculty training are both methods of co-operating teacher preparation. When the four co-operating teachers in this study were asked if they had participated in any of this preparation, they all responded no. However, they all felt the need for some kind of preparation for serving as a co-operating teacher.

8) Co-operating teachers should be trained professionals who are able to model clinical competence, build a supportive and nurturing environment, and demonstrate professional qualities. Future instrumental music teachers must be provided the support necessary to encourage them to continue to be life-long learners.

Recommendations for Future Research

My study shares the perspectives of the co-operating teachers and student teachers investigating the expectations of one another during instrumental music student teaching placements. Findings from this study are not intended to represent the beliefs and practices of all student teachers and co-operating teachers, but they do add to the body of knowledge regarding the expectations of student teachers and co-operating teachers in a specific setting. There is still much to be studied, as there remain many unanswered questions concerning this topic. Some of these might include the following:

1) Establishing a concurrent music education program modelled after the concurrent science program at the University of Windsor should be considered. The concurrent program would offer student music teachers an opportunity to be in school placements earlier in their undergraduate degrees as well as experiencing longer placement internships upon completion of that degree. Rather than participating in block placements during one year of teacher's college, they could participate in block placements throughout their degree, including during their year at teacher's college. A future investigation of the differences between the two types of teaching internships and the benefits of instrumental music student teaching experiences is warranted.

2) Despite the inconsistencies reported as to the positive or negative experiences that occurred during this study, one can conclude that co-operating teachers and student

teachers have expectations of each other, although these expectations differ between the co-operating teachers and the students teachers. Further research needs to be done to continue that documentation of such expectations of the student teachers and co-operating teachers during instrumental music placements.

3) A follow up study of the participants in this investigation, would be useful to determine whether expectations of the co-operating teachers and student teachers have changed because of their involvement in this study or, for the student teachers, as a result of their experience as in-service teachers.

4) Student teachers should be taught to effectively reflect or evaluate themselves daily on a formative basis. This particular practice is viewed as critical to all teachers and should be an ongoing process throughout every teacher's career. It was not only important that student teacher's determine their own strengths and weaknesses, but that they also identify specific behaviour changes to improve their teaching. Student teachers should then be expected to implement those changes. Further research involving reflective practices, how to improve and deepen these practices, and their effects on teaching is warranted during the student teaching experience in instrumental music.

5) The University of Windsor's Faculty of Education handbook (2004) suggests a percentage of the co-operating teachers teaching load as a guideline for student teachers. However, it appears that some student teachers are eager to begin teaching and welcome more than one class to teach at the beginning of the student teaching experience. Other student teachers may indicate that a small number of classes to begin their experiences is more appropriate. Since co-operating teachers do not have a sense of the student teacher's comfort level with class assignments, it is difficult to determine what workload is

efficient as a start. Student teachers not only mentioned needing a comfort level with classes assigned, but also expected that the co-operating teacher would orient the student teacher to the school procedures, facilities, students and educational community. There is a need for the Faculty of Education to develop more specific guidelines for a progressive student teaching workload. Future research is necessary to determine differences in readiness levels of the student teachers and what these levels should mean for the induction process into student teaching.

6) The current non-subject specific formative and summative evaluation forms were repeatedly criticized by both the co-operating teachers and student teachers. There is a need for further studies to explore more in-depth assessment outcomes using a subject-specific evaluation form and how such a form can be used most effectively to promote student teacher learning.

7) Some of the student teachers experienced differences in expectations from one co-operating teacher to another. From the student teachers' descriptions during focus group interviews and journaling, some of those differences affected the outcome of their experience and other differences the student teachers adapted to the differences. Some co-operating teachers had higher performance expectations than did other co-operating teachers. Some co-operating teachers had different assessment expectations than did other co-operating teachers. Future research should be conducted into the effects of maintaining the same co-operating teacher for more than one teaching block to see if this builds a better relationship and results in more consistent assessments of student teachers.

8) On a professional level, during this study, the co-operating teachers had the opportunity to share their ideas and techniques about working with student teachers with

one another in a relatively constructive and positive environment. Despite the number of years that these co-operating teachers had acted in this capacity, all agreed that part of why they did this was to give back to the music education community, build confidence among student music teachers and update, and improve upon their own teaching techniques. Researchers should investigate whether regularly participating in a discussion group with other co-operating teachers enriches the student teaching experience of the co-operating teacher and, consequently, the student teacher.

> "...I owe it to myself and to the profession of music teachers to take student teachers. I think part of me blamed them for their inadequacies and I used that as my excuse not to be bothered. But now I know they were my inadequacies too. I didn't think I could do a good job for them. It's my responsibility. Now I feel as if I can, and more importantly, I should" (Leo, focus group interview #2, May, 2005).

The four co-operating teachers in this study found humour and education when sharing their experiences with each other. All commented on the fact that no-one had ever asked about their experiences in a manner that caused them to really think about the answer. All agreed that participating in this study was cause to reflect on how they would act as co-operating teachers in the future, because focus groups allowed them to reflect on, and verbalize those things that contributed to their strengths as well as their weaknesses as music teachers.

Co-operating teachers also agreed that they came to recognize the contribution that their student teachers made to their understandings of their own roles. This observation is important for two reasons. The first is that co-operating music teachers

rarely get to speak with each other about their reflections regarding the role of co-operating teachers, and this reflection is a wonderful mechanism that should be used for improvement. The second is that co-operating music teachers have a lot to share as professionals with one another and with teacher education as a whole. The voices of the co-operating teachers and student teachers contributed profoundly to this study in developing a more accurate picture of the student teaching experience in instrumental music specifically, and of the foundations of successful music teaching experiences in general. These voices must continue to be heard and taken seriously if music teacher education is to move forward.

Appendix A
PRESENTATION

COOPERATING TEACHERS' AND STUDENT TEACHERS' EXPECTATIONS

ABOUT INSTRUMENTAL MUSIC STUDENT TEACHING

M. Bernadette Berthelotte, M.M., M.Ed.

1. INTRODUCTION: WHY I'M HERE

2. PRACTICE TEACHING EXPERIENCES: GENERAL EDUCATION

- People often perceive the expectations of their jobs based on what others communicate to them
- These are the expectations that people within organizational systems communicate to each other about the definition of jobs and roles.
- The cooperating teacher and the student teacher each have roles that are not clearly defined.
- A lack of congruence between expectations can create conflict and tension
- Cooperating teachers determined that having student teachers in the classroom could have benefits and drawbacks. These benefits and drawbacks were often dependent upon the relationship that the student teacher had with the cooperating teacher.
- A study by Farbstein (1965) listed 700 expectations voiced by student teachers of their cooperating teachers.
- The process of becoming a teacher involved the ability to interpret the behaviour of the students, the cooperating teacher and the wider school community.
- Student teachers needed to know the expectations of the cooperating teacher and

adjust their teaching behaviour accordingly.

- Student teachers feel dominated by concerns such as classroom management, fulfilling the expectations of others and simply surviving the student teaching experience.
- Among the most salient factors causing stress was the lack of clarity of expectations from cooperating teachers.
- The vast majority of literature supports the belief that cooperating teachers play a critical role in the professional growth and successful process of student teachers.
- Some studies suggested that cooperating teachers themselves felt that they have to learn much on their own during their student teaching days and that the student teachers they were in charge of would have to do the same. Issues such as providing feedback, a lack of observation time, and a lack of willingness to engage in reflection with the student teacher were all issues researchers suggested cooperating teachers would face.
- A number of studies have reported problems encountered by both student teachers and cooperating teachers, and most of these problems were a result of differences in expectations as a source of the problem.
- Cooperating teachers identified that an important coping strategy when having student teachers in their classroom was the establishment of communication strategies that would enable the student teacher to understand the specific expectations of the student teaching experience.

3. PRACTICE TEACHING EXPERIENCES: MUSIC EDUCATION

- Studies on cooperating teachers and student teachers focusing on instrumental

music subjects investigated areas such as stress factors for the student teacher/cooperating teacher during the student teaching experience. A lack of interest in music programs on behalf of students, parents, colleagues and administrations was amongst the salient factors.

- The influence of the cooperating teacher o student teachers' beliefs about and skill development for becoming a music teacher was investigated (Gordon, 2000). There were no statistical differences between the student teachers' before and after student teaching beliefs and skills. Brand (1985) suggested that the lack of a cooperating teacher with superior classroom skills and unclear expectations could have contributed to this result.
- The study of relationships within music classrooms has also been investigated. Student teachers determined that their relationship with their cooperating teacher was shaped by the perception that their relationship with their cooperating teacher was strong.
- Relationship is an important issue for both the cooperating teacher and the student teacher.
- Expectations of cooperating teachers and student teachers during instrumental music student teaching experiences warrant investigation. Studies discussed within the literature review shed light on the diversity of issues faced by both the cooperating teacher and student teacher in a variety of classroom settings and subject areas. The findings of these studies have implications for this study.

4. THE PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

- The purpose of this study is to investigate and compare co-operating teachers' and

student teachers' expectations about instrumental music student teaching during instrumental music teaching blocks.

5 THE SPECIFIC RESEARCH QUESTIONS.

- How do co-operating teachers and student teachers describe their expectations of the other in an instrumental music placement?
- How do co-operating teachers and student teachers describe the role of the other?
- What kind of relationships do the co-operating teachers and student teachers expect to have with the other?
- What factors cause stress for co-operating teachers and student teachers when working with one another?

6. DATA COLLECTION PROCEDURES.

1. One-on-One interviews.
2. Two Focus Group interviews.
3. Journaling

Appendix B

RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE PARTICIPANTS

- Agree to sign the consent forms to participate in this research.
- Agree to sign the consent form giving permission to audio-tape both the one-on-one interviews and both focus group interviews.
- To journal as close to the experience as possible in order for the reflection to be honest and real.
- A commitment to the study that will allow you to participate within the focus group interviews, one-on-one interviews and journaling, honestly, reflectively and open to learning.
- A willingness to look at or learn to look at the practice teaching experience not as a conclusion to your education, but rather a beginning to your teaching career.

Appendix C

Data Collection Calendar

The calendar below lists the times that data collection for the purposes of this study will occur. Times and dates within the designated months are subject to both individual and group availability.

Data Collection	October, 2004	November, 2004	December, 2004	April, 2005	May, 2005
Student Teaching Blocks		1st Student teaching block for instrumental music		2nd student teaching block for instrumental music	
One-on-One Interviews	Distribute one-on-one interview questionnaires to study participants/conduct one-on-one interview with each study participant				
Focus Group Interviews		Distribute focus group interview questions	Conduct focus group interview with student teachers/co-operating teachers		Conduct focus group interview with student teachers/cooperating teachers
Journaling		Email journal entries, one time per week during block placement.		Email journal entries, one time per week during block placement.	

Appendix D

One-on-one Interview Questions for the Student Teachers

- How do you define your role as a student teacher in an instrumental music placement?
- What characteristics and responsibilities do you think a cooperating teacher should have?
- What factors do you think will cause you the most stress during the student teaching experience?
- Describe the music program you would like to have when you become a music teacher?

Appendix E

One-on-one Interview Questions for Cooperating Teachers

- How often have you acted in the role of cooperating teacher in an instrumental music capacity?
- How do you define the role of a student teacher in an instrumental music placement?
- Describe your previous experiences as a cooperating teacher. Please discuss both positive and negative experiences.
- Why did you agree to take a student teacher?
- What factors cause you to feel the most stress when you act as a cooperating teacher?

Appendix F

Focus Group Interview Questions for Student Teachers

- How does the personality of the cooperating teacher affect your perception of this block field experience?
- In the one-on-one interview, you were asked to define your role as a student music teacher. How has your perception of that role changed during this block teaching experience?
- A student teacher causes an additional workload for the cooperating teacher in any subject matter. Can the same be said about a cooperating teacher causing an additional workload for the student teacher? How?
- Describe the expectations you had of your cooperating teacher specific to your instrumental music experience. How were these expectations met during this placement?

Appendix G

Focus Group Interview Questions for the Co-operating Teachers

- How does the personality of the student teacher affect your perception of this instrumental music student teaching experience?
- In the one-on-one interview, you were asked to define your role as a co-operating music teacher. Could you elaborate on this as it pertains to your last experience as a cooperating teacher?
- A student teacher causes an additional workload for a co-operating teacher. What does this statement mean for instrumental music student teaching?
- Describe the expectations you had of your student teacher in your music program.
- Describe one thing you feel you did well, one thing you feel you need to continue working on, and one thing you would like to change in your role as cooperating teacher during this last experience.

Appendix H

Student Teaching Journaling

- Week #1: Reflect on the type of feedback you are receiving, how you respond to it and how it is delivered to you. This reflection can be as short or as long as you like.
- Week #2: Reflect on the developing relationship you are having with your co-operating teacher and how it is affecting your thoughts about yourself as a future music educator.
- Week #3: Reflect on the rapport you have developed with your students as well as the school community. How does this affect the way you practice teach?
- Week #4: Reflect on the improvements or lack of, that you feel you have made as a student teacher. In your mind do you think you have accomplished any major improvements, progressed beyond your wildest dreams, still have a ways to go or any other comments you may have. Have you developed a teaching style of your own?

Appendix I

Co-operating Teachers Journaling

- Week #1: Journal about the type of feedback you are providing your student teachers. How is this feedback delivered? How are student teachers responding to this feedback?
- Week #2: Reflect on the developing relationship you are having with your student teacher and how it I affecting your thoughts about them a future music educators.
- Week #3: Reflect on the rapport you have observed that the student teacher has developed with both the students they are teaching, as well as the staff/community in the school they are placed.
- Week #4: Reflect on the improvement or lack of, that your student teacher has made. Have they accomplished any major improvements, progressed beyond your wildest dreams or still have a way to go? Have they developed a teaching style of their own?

Appendix J

Student Evaluation Form, Faculty of Education, University of Windsor

UNIVERSITY OF WINDSOR

FACULTY OF EDUCATION

STUDENT TEACHING PROGRESS REPORT

STUDENT TEACHER_____ **ASSOCIATE TEACHER**_____

SCHOOL_____ **GRADE(S)**_____ **DATES OF EVALUATION**_____

INSTRUCTIONAL AREAS AND STRATEGIES_____

KEY: C=Consistently U= Usually S=Sometimes R=Rarely N=Not Applicable

PREPARATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL PLANNING: The student teacher	C	U	S	R	N
was knowledgeable of content.					
was aware of pupil needs, abilities, and previous learning.					
showed initiative.					
set appropriate and clear instructional objectives.					
planned motivation, development, and appropriate activities.					
planned evaluation strategies.					
had instructional materials prepared and organized.					

PROFESSIONAL AND PERSONAL FACTORS: The student teacher	C	U	S	R	N
was professional in appearance and behaviour.					
demonstrated effective self-evaluation.					
was receptive to counselling.					
worked cooperatively with colleagues.					
used good judgement.					
demonstrated an understanding of sound pedagogical principles.					

IMPLEMENTATION: The student teacher	C	U	S	R	N
followed established routines.					
adapted instructional plans as necessary.					
promoted appropriate pupil behaviour.					
had rapport with and respect for pupils.					
engaged pupils in the learning process.					
used language effectively.					
asked a variety of questions.					
received and answered questions appropriately.					
made good use of appropriate instructional strategies and aids.					
taught enthusiastically.					
taught accurate content.					
gave clear, well paced instructions.					
provided for individual differences.					
developed new learning sequentially.					
had pupils apply new learning.					
monitored and/or assessed pupil progress.					
achieved instructional objectives.					

SPECIFIC COMMENTS: (Give specific attention to strengths and weaknesses)

page 1 of __ (1 of 2)

EVALUATION (Associates use Summative at end of placement)

__FORMATIVE ___SUMMATIVE

___Extremely effective
___Strong in most areas and progressing in others
___Progressing in most areas and improvement required in some
___Improvement required in many areas
___Unsuccessful in most areas

DATES OF ABSENCE

Signature of Associate Teacher/Advisor (Circle)

Signature of Student: Indicates only that the student has received this report and does not in any way indicate agreement with the content of this assessment.

White-Student Copy • Pink-Associate Copy • Yellow-Faculty Copy

Appendix K

Consent Form

CONSENT TO PARTICIPATE IN RESEARCH

Title of Study: Co-operating Teachers' and Student Teachers' Expectations About Instrumental Music Student Teaching in an Ontario Placement.

You are asked to participate in a research study conducted by Mary Bernadette Berthelotte (student), and Dr. Cynthia Taggart (advisor) from Michigan State University at the University of Windsor. All data collected from this study is part of the requirements for a dissertation project in completion of a Dr. of Philosophy Degree in Music Education. If you have any questions or concerns about the research, please feel free to contact Dr. Cynthia Taggart, School of Music, Michigan State University, East Lansing, Michigan 48824. Dr. Taggart can be reached at (517)355-7555. Her email address is: taggart@msu.edu

The purpose of this study is to investigate the similarities and differences between selected co-operating teachers and their student teachers regarding the participants' expectations of the student teaching experience during instrumental music teaching blocks. The specific research questions are:

1.. How do co-operating teachers and student teachers describe their expectations of the other in an instrumental music placement?
2. How do co-operating teachers and student teachers describe the role of the other?
3. What kind of relationships do the co-operating teachers and student teachers expect to have with the other?
4. What factors cause stress for co-operating teachers and student teachers when working with one another?

This qualitative study involves eight participants. It is a descriptive case study. There will be four co-operating teachers and four student teachers of instrumental music. Co-operating teachers and student teachers will describe their expectation of each other before, during, and after teaching blocks on two separate occasions.

If you volunteer to participate in this study, we would ask you to do the following things. You will be asked to participate in one, one-on-one interview with the researcher where the following questions will be asked.

1. How do you define your role as a student teacher in an instrumental music placement?
2. What characteristics and responsibilities do you think a co-operating teacher should have?

3. What factors do you think will cause you the most stress during the student teaching experience?
4. Describe the music program you would like to build when you become a music teacher?

The following are one-on-one interview questions for the co-operating teachers:

1. How often have you acted in the role of co-operating teacher in an instrumental music capacity?
2. How do you define the role of a student teacher in an instrumental music placement specifically?
3. Describe your previous experiences as a co-operating teacher. Please discuss both positive and negative experiences.
4. Why did you agree to take a student teacher?
5. What factors cause you to feel the most stress when you act as a co-operating teacher?

The interview will be audio-taped for all participants and transcribed by the researcher for data collection.

Additionally, you will be asked to participate in two focus group interviews at the end of each instrumental teaching block. The co-operating teachers and the student teachers will meet separately in groups. During these focus group interviews the following five open-ended questions will be asked of the students teachers.

1. How does the personality of the co-operating teacher affect your perception of this block field experience?
2. In the one-on-one interview, you were asked to define your role as a student music teacher. How has your perception of that role changed during this block teaching experience?
3. A student teacher causes an additional workload for a co-operating teacher in any subject matter. Can the same be said about a co-operating teacher causing an additional workload for the student teacher? How?
4. Describe the expectations you have of your co-operating specific to your instrumental music-experience. How were these expectations met during this placement?
5. Describe one thing you feel you did well, one thing you feel you need to continue working on, and one thing that you would like to change in your role as student teacher during this last experience?

The following five open-ended questions developed by the researcher will be asked of co-operating teachers during focus group interviews at the end of each instrumental music block teaching experience:

1. How does the personality of the student teacher affect your perception of this instrumental music teaching block?
2. In the one-on-one interview, you were asked to define your role as a co-operating music teacher. Could you elaborate on this as it pertains to your last experience?
3. A student teacher causes an additional workload for a co-operating teacher. What does this statement mean for instrumental music teaching blocks?
4. Describe the expectations you had of your student teacher in your music program. How were these expectations met during this placement?
5. Describe the one thing you feel you did well, one thing you feel you need to continue working on, and one thing you would like to change in your role as co-operating teacher during this last experience?

These focus group interviews will be audio-taped and transcribed by the researcher for data collection.

Finally, each participant of the study will be asked to journal during their instrumental music teaching experiences only. These unstructured journals will be analysed by the researcher for data .Both the one-on-one interviews and focus group interviews will be conducted in a classroom at the University of Windsor's school of music. Journals will be collected by the researcher at the end of each instrumental music teaching experience, and returned to the participants before the next teaching experience will occur.

I am unable at this point to foresee any circumstances that would cause any of the participants discomfort during the course of this study. There are however direct benefits to this study. The direct benefits to the student teachers and the co-operating are of a collaborative nature. Student teacher participants have the opportunity to learn the art of reflection during their practice teaching experiences, and voice these reflections with their peers in a focus group interview setting. In addition, it is crucial to note that these student teachers of instrumental music may one day act as co-operating teachers of instrumental music student teachers. This experience can provide them with an opportunity to better learn and understand the role of a co-operating teacher, discussion of the role of the co-operating teacher, the expectations and so forth can only lead to better educated co-operating teaches for future music education student teachers. Both current co-operating teachers and student teachers could change the way they approach co-operating teacher roles based on this experience. No participants of this study will receive any kind of compensation.

Any information that is obtained in connection with this study and that can be identified with you will remain confidential and will be disclosed only with your permission. Confidentiality will be ensured through the following procedures. All participants in this study will be consistently referred to by pseudonym during the transcription of their interviews, and any references to their journal entries. During data collection all data will be contained in a locked container. Only the researcher and her advisors will have access to this data. At the end of this study all data collected through audio-taping, transcriptions of audio-tapes and journals will be destroyed.

Participants of this study will be involved in data analysis through member checks. This will ensure that what the researcher has derived from interviews and journal writings, are interpreted by the researcher as the participant meant them to be.

You can choose whether to be in this study or not. If you volunteer to be in this study, you may withdraw at any time without consequences of any kind. You may also refuse to answer any questions you do not want to answer and still remain in the study. The investigator may withdraw you from this research if circumstances arise which warrant doing so. If for some reason, you choose to remove yourself from the study, you will have the option of allowing the researcher to use data collected thus far, or taking your data out of the study.

All of the participants of the study will each receive a copy of the results upon its full completion. These results will be distributed to the co-operating teachers and student teacher participants accordingly, and distribution type decided upon where they are residing at the time.

Based on the results of this qualitative study, further research regarding expectation of co-operating teachers and student teachers may be warranted. I agree that this data can be used in subsequent studies.

You may withdraw your consent at any time and discontinue participation without penalty. This study, Co-operating teachers' and student teachers' expectations about instrumental music in an Ontario placement has been reviewed and received ethics clearance through the University of Windsor Research Ethics Board. If you have questions regarding your rights as a research subject, contact:

Research Ehthics Coordinator
University of Windsor
Windsor, Ontario
N9B 3P4

Telephone: 519-253-3000, ext. 3916
E-mail: lbunn@uwindsor.ca

I understand the information provided for this study as described herein. My questions have been answered to my satisfaction, and I agree to participate in this study. I have been given a copy of this form.

_____

Name of Subject

_____ _____

Signature of Subject Date

These are the terms under which I will conduct research.

_____ _____

Signature of Investigator Date

Appendix L

Permission to Audio-tape

CONSENT FOR AUDIO/VIDEO TAPING

Research Subjects' Name:

Title of Project: Co-operating Teachers' and Student Teachers' Expectations About Instrumental Music Student Teaching in an Ontario Placement

ID# Number:

Birth date:

I consent to the audio/video-taping of interviews, procedures, or treatment of _____.

I understand these are voluntary procedures and that I am free to withdraw at any time by requesting that either the taping be stopped or the viewing be discontinued. I also understand that my name will not be revealed to anyone and that taping and viewing will be kept confidential. Tapes are filed by number only and store in a locked cabinet.

I understand that confidentiality will be respected and the viewing of materials will be for professional use only.

_____

(Signature of Parent or Guardian) (Date)

Or

_____

(Signature of Participant) (Date)

References

Achinstein, B., & Barrett, A. (2004). (Re) framing classroom contexts: How new teachers and mentors view diverse learners and challenges of practice. *Teachers College Record, 106,* 716-746.

Adler, S. (1994). Reflective practice and teacher education. In E. Wayne Ross (Ed.), *Reflective practice in social studies.* (pp. 51-58). Washington, DC: NCSS.

Angelo, T. A., & Cross, K. P. (1993). *Classroom assessment techniques. A handbook for college teachers.* Jossey Bass: San Francisco, CA.

Appelgate, J. H., & Lasley, T. J. (1982). Cooperating teachers' problems with preservice field experience. *Journal of Teacher Education, 33*(2), 15-18.

Appelgate, J. H., & Lasley, T. J. (1984). What cooperating teachers' expect from preservice field experience students. *Teacher Education, 24,* 70-82.

Association of Teacher Educators. (1991). Restructuring the education of teachers: Report of the commission on the education into the 21st century. Reston, VA: Author.

Baskin, M. K., Ross, S. M., & Smith, D. L. (1996). Selecting successful teachers: The predictive validity of the urban teacher selection interview. *The Teacher Educator, 32,* 1-21.

Batten, M., Griffen, M., & Ainley, J. (1991). Recently recruited teachers: Their views and experiences of preservice education, professional development and teaching. *Department of Employment, Education and Training, Canberra, AGPS.*

Battistich, V., Solomon, D., Kim, D., Watson, M., & Schaps, E (1995). Schools as communities, poverty levels of student populations, and students' attitudes, motives and performance: A multi-level analysis. *American Educational Research Journal, 32,* 627-658.

Berliner, D. C. (1987). *In pursuit of the expert pedagogue.* Educational Researcher, 15, 5-13.

Berliner, D. C. (1994a). Expertise: The wonders of exemplary performance. In J.N. Mangieri & C.C. Block (Eds.) *Creating powerful thinking in teachers and students* (pp. 141-186). New York: Holt, Reinhart & Winston.

Berliner, D. C. (1994b). Teacher expertise. In T. Husea & T. Neville Postlethwaithe (Eds.). *The International encyclopedia of education* (2nd ed., Vol. 10, pp. 6020-6026). Elmsford NY: Pergamon.

Berliner, D. C. (2001). Learning about and learning from expert teachers. *International Journal of Educational Research, 35*, 463-482.

Berthelotte, M. B. (2000). Expectations of cooperating teachers and student teachers. Unpublished manuscript, Michigan State University at Lansing.

Blakey, J., Everett-Turner, L., Massing, C., & Scott, N. (1988). The many faces of beginning teachers. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Canadian Society for the Study of Education, Windsor, Ontario.

Bogdan, R., & Biklen, S. (1998) Qualitative research for education: An introduction to theory and methods (3rd ed.) Boston, Mass.: Allyn and Bacon.

Bolin, F. S. (1988). Helping student teachers think about teaching: Field setting. *Journal of Teacher Education, 24*(3), 48-56.

Bond, L., Smith, T., Baker, W.K., & Hattie, J.A. (2000). *The certification system of The National Board for Professional Teaching Standards. A construct and consequential validity study.* Greensboro: Center for Educational Research and Evaluation, University of North Carolina at Greensboro.

Book, C. L. (1996) Professional Development Schools. In Sikula, J. (Ed.), *Handbook of research on teacher education.* (2nd ed., p.ix). New York: MacMillan.

Borko, H., & Livingston, C. (1989) Cognition and improvisation: Differences in mathematics instruction by expert and novice teachers. *American Education Research Journal, 26*(4), 473-498.

Boyd, C. O. (1993). Philosophic foundation of qualitative research. In P.L. Munhall.

Boyd, C.O. (1992.) *Nursing research: A qualitative perspective.* New York: National League for Nursing Press.

Boydell, D. (1986). Issues in teaching practice supervision research: A review of the literature. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 2*(2), 115-125.

Boyer, E. (1995). *The basicsSchool: A community for learning*. Princeton NJ: The Carnegie Foundation.

Brand, M. (1982). Effects of student teaching on the classroom management beliefs and skills of music student teachers. *Journal of Research in Music Education, 30*, Winter, 255-265.

Brand, M. (1981). The challenge of the first year. *Music Educators Journal, 54*(4), 5-37.

Chaliès, S., & Durand, M. (2000) L'utilité discutée du tutorat en formation initiale des enseignants (The discussed usefulness of mentoring during teachers' training), *Recherche et Formation 35* (2000),145–180.

Chang, M. K., & Ferre, V. (1988). An analysis of student teaching evaluations by college supervisors and cooperating teachers. *Education, 108,* 493-496.

Cheyne, M. (2002) Why we accept the challenge. *The Science Teacher, 69*(7), 6-10.

Clarke, A. (2006). The nature and substance of cooperating teacher reflection. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 22*(3), 910-921.

Cochran-Smith, M. (1991a). Learning to teach against the grain. *Harvard Educational Review, 61*, 279-319.

Cochran-Smith, M. (1991b). Reinventing student teaching. *Journal of Teacher Education, 42*(2), 104-118.

Cohen, M. Z. (1987). *A historical overview of the phenomenologic movement.* Mage, 19(1), 31-34.

Cole, A. L., & Knowles, J. G. (1993). Shattered images: Understanding expectations and realities of field experiences. *Teaching & Teacher Education, 9*(5/6), (pp.457-471).

Cole, M. (1985). "The tender trap?" Commitment and consciousness in entrants to teaching. In S. J. Ball & I. F. Goodson (Eds), *Teachers' lives and careers* (pp. 89-104). London: Palmer Press.

Conant, J. (1963). *The education of American teachers.* New York: McGraw-Hill.

Conway, C. M. (1997). The development of a casebook for use in instrumental music education methods courses. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Columbia University, New York.

Crow, G. M., & Mathews, L. J. (1998). *Finding one's way – How mentoring can lead to dynamic leadership.* Corwin Press: Thousand Oaks, CA.

Daloz, L. A., (1999). *Mentor – guiding the journey of adult learners.* Jossey-Bass: San Francisco.

Danielson, C. (2001). New trends in teacher evaluation. *Educational Leadership, 58*(5), 12.

Darling-Hammond, L., (2000). Reforming teacher preparation and licensing: debating the evidence. *Teachers College Record, 102*(1), 28-56.

Davies, M., Brady, M., Rodger, E., & Wall, P. (1999) Mentors and school-based partnership: Ingredients for professional growth. *Action In Teacher Education, 21*(1), 85-96.

Dewey, J. (1933). How we think: A restatement of the relation of reflective thinking to the educative process (rev. Ed.). Boston: Heath. (Original work published 1909).

Dinkelman, T. (2000). An inquiry into the development of critical reflection in secondary student teachers. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 16*(2), 195-222.

Doyle, W. (1986). Classroom organization and management. In M.C. Wittrock (Ed.), *Handbook of Research on Teaching (3rd ed.,* pp. 392-431). New York: MacMillan.

Dreyfus, H. L., & Dreyfus, S. E. (1986). *Mind over machine.* New York: Free Press.

Dunkin, M. J., & Barnes, J. (1986). Research on teaching in higher education. In M.C. Wittrock (Ed.), *Handbook of Research on Teaching (3rd ed.*, pp. 754-777). New York: Macmillan.

Dye, A. (1994). *The suepervisory relationship.* (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED372343).

Edwards, A., & Ogden, L. (1999). Learning to see in classrooms: Developing an understanding of the complexity of teaching and learning during initial teacher education. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the *American Educational Research Association*, Montreal.

Eisenhart, M. A., & Howe, K. R. (1992). Validity in education research. In M.D. LeCompte, W. L. Millroy, J. (Eds.), *The Handbook of Qualitative Research in Education* (pp. 643-680). San Diego: Academic Press, Inc.

Emans, R. (1983). Implementing the knowledge base: Redesigning the function of the cooperating teacher and the college supervisor. *Journal of Teacher Education, 32*(3), 14-18.

Erickson, F. (1986). Qualitative methods in research on teaching. In M. C. Wittrock (Ed.) *Handbook of research on teaching* (3rd ed). (pp. 119-161). New York: Macmillan Publishing Co.

Ewart, G., & Straw, S. B. (2005). A seven-month practicum: Collaborating teacher's response. *Canadian Journal of Education, 28*(1), 185-205.

Fairbanks, C. M., Freedman, D., & Kahn (2000) The role of effective mentors in learning to teach. *Journal of Teacher Education* **51** (2000), pp. 102–112.

Fallin, J. & Royse, D. (2000). Student teaching: The keystone experience. *Music Educators Journal 87*(3), 19-22.

Farbstein, M. (1965). Critical requirements for cooperating teachers: a study of cooperating teachers as perceived by student teachers in the state of New Jersey. Dissertation Abstracts International, 25, 3991.

Feagin, J., Orum, A., & Sjoberg, G. (Eds). (1991). *A case for case study.* Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press.

Feiman-Nemser, S. (1996). Teacher mentoring: A critical review. *ERIC Digest, 95.* Washington: ERIC Clearinghouse on Teaching and Teacher Education.

Feiman-Nemser, S., Parker, M. B. & Zeichner, K. (1993). Are mentor teachers teacher educators? In D. Mclntyre, H. Hagger, & M. Wilkin (Eds.), *Mentoring: Perspectives on school-based teacher education* (pp. 147-165). London, UK: Kogan Paul.

Friebus, R. (1977). Agents of socialization in student teaching. *Journal of Educational Research,* 7, 263-268.

Fuller, F. F., & Brown, O. H. (1975). Becoming a teacher. In K. Ryan (Ed.), *Teacher Education: The 74th yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Part II* (p.25-52). Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Gallant, M. W. (1992). An overview of issues in music student teaching, related research, and a sample study of the effects of classroom characteristics on evaluation of student teaching. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The Ohio State University, Columbus.

Ganser, T. (1993) The benefits of mentoring as perceived by beginning teachers and mentors. *Forward, 17*(2), 61-68.

Garner, A. (1971). The cooperating teacher and human relations. *Education, 92*(2), 99-106.

Getzels, J. W., & Thelon, H. A. (1960). The classroom as a unique social system. The Dynamics of Instructional Groups. Fifty-ninth yearbook, Part II, *National Society for the Study of Education.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press. 53-82.

Giebelhaus, C. (1997) Mentoring: Help or hindrance? Research alive. *Mid-Western Educational Researcher, 10*(4), 20-23.

Gillis, G. L. (1987). The preservice program and schools: Will research in teaching close the gap between theory and practice? In L. J. Newton, M. Fullan, & J. W. MacDonald (Eds.), Rethinking teacher education: Exploring the link between research practice and policy. (pp 53-66). Toronto: O.I.S.E. Joint Council on Education.

Glasser, B., & Strauss, A. (1967*). The discovery of grounded theory: Strategies for qualitative researchers.* New York: Chicago, Aldine de Gruyter.

Gomez, A. P. (1997). Professional socialization of student teachers. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the *American Educational Research Association* Chicago Ill.

Gonzalez, L. E., & Carter, K. (1996). Correspondence in cooperating teachers' and student teachers' interpretations of classroom events. *Teacher and Teacher Education, 12*(1), 39-47.

Goodfellow, J., & Sumsion, J. (2000, April). Field-based teacher educators' perception of their contribution to preservice teachers' personal-professional development. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA.

Goodman, J. L. (1986). Perceived music and music-teaching competencies of classroom teachers in the state of Ohio (Doctoral dissertation, The Ohio State University, 1985). Dissertation Abstracts International, 463642A.

Goolsby, T. (1996). Time use in instrumental rehearsals: A comparison of experienced, novice and student teachers. *Journal of Research in Music Education, 44,* 286-303.

Goolsby, T. (1999). A comparison of expert and novice music teachers' preparing identical band compositions: An operational replication. *Journal of Research in Music Education, 47*, 174-87.

Graham, P. (1997) Tensions in the mentor teacher-student teacher relationship creating productive sites for learning within a high school English teacher education program. *Teaching and Teacher Education* **13** (1997), pp. 513–527.

Grant, G. (1988). *The World We Created at Hamilton High*. Cambridge: University Press.

Griffin, G. A. (1989). A descriptive study of student teaching. *The Elementary School*

Journal, 89(3), 343-364.

Griffin, G. A. et al, (1983). Student teaching: a review of University of Texas at Austin. Research and development center for Teacher Education.

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

Grossman, P. L. (1990). *The making of a teacher: Teacher knowledge and teacher education.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Guba, E. G., & Lincoln, Y. (1981). Effective evaluation: Improving the usefulness of evaluation results through responsive and naturalistic approaches. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Guba, E. G. & Bidwell, C. E. (1957). *Administrative relationships.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Haberman, M., & Post, L. (1987). Recruiting and selecting teachers for urban schools. Reston VA: Association of Teacher Educators.

Hallinger, P., & Murphy, J. (1986). The social context of effective schools. *American Journal of Education, 94*, 328-355.

Hanley, B. (1997). Critical and reflective thinking in music teacher education: A foundations approach. *Canadian Music Educator, 38*(2), 7-10.

Hargreaves, A., & Dawe, R. (1990). Paths of professional development contrived collegiality, collaborative culture and the case of peer coaching, *Teaching and Teacher Education* **6** (1990), 227–241.

Harlen, W. (2005). Teacher's summative practices and assessment for learning – tensions and synergies. *The Curriculum Journal, 16*(2), 207-223.

Hawkey, K. (1996). Image and the pressure to conform in learning to teach. *Teacher and Teacher Education, 12*, 99-108.

Hawkey, K. (1997) Roles, responsibilities, and relationships in mentoring a literature review and agenda for research. *Journal of Teacher Education,* 48, 325–335.

Head, F., Reiman, A., & Thies-Sprinthall, L. (1992). The reality of mentoring: Complexity in its process and functioning. In T. Bey & C.T. Holmes (Eds.), *Mentoring Contemporary principles and issues* (pp. 5-24). Reston, VA: Association of Teacher Educators.

Hirsch, E. D., Jr. (1996). *The schools we need: And why we don't have them.* New York: Doubleday.

Hollingsworth, S. (1989). Prior beliefs and cognitive change in learning to teach. *American Educational Research Journal, 26,* 160-189.

Holt-Reynolds, D. (1992). Personal history-based beliefs as relevant prior knowledge in coursework. *American Educational Research Journal, 29*(2), 325-349.

Horowitz, M. (1968). Student-teaching experiences and attitudes of student teachers. The *Journal of Teacher Educator, 19*(3), 317-324.

Howey, K. (1983). Teacher education: An overview. In K. R. Howey & W. E. Gardner (Eds.), *The education of teachers* (pp. 66-37). New York: Longman.

Husserl, E. (1970). Logical investigations (J. N. Findlay, Trans.). New York: Humanities Press.

Johnson, K. A. (2003). Every experience is a moving force: Identity and growth through mentoring. *Teaching and Teacher Education Volume 19*(8), 787-800.

Johnston, J. S., et. al., (2006). The use of Socrates: Earl Shorris and the quest for political emancipation through the humanities. *Educational Studies (American Educational Studies Association), 39*(1), (February 2006) p. 26-41.

Jones, R. (1992). Student teachers: Incidents that lead them to confirm or question their career choice. *The Physical Educator, 49*, 205-212.

Kagan, D. M. (1987). Cognitive level of student teachers and their perceptions of cooperating teachers. *Alberta Journal of Educational Research, 33*(3), 180-190.

Kagan, D. M. (1992). Implications of research on teacher belief. *Educational Psychologist, 27,* 65-69.

Kahn, B. (2001). Portrait of success: Cooperating teachers and the student teaching experience. *Action in Teacher Education, 22*(4), 48-58.

Karmos, A. H., & Jacko, C. M. (1977). The role of significant others during the student teaching experience. *Journal of Teacher Education, 26*(3), 51-55.

Katz, L. G., & Raths, J. (1992). Six dilemmas in teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education, 43*(5), 376-385.

Kelly, S. N. (2000). Preservice music education student fears of the internship and initial inservice teaching experience. *Contributions to Music Education, 27*(1), 41-50.

Knowles, J. G. (1992). Addressing "failure" in student teaching: Some practical and ethical issues. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Research Association, 20-24, April 1992. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 353-238)

Knowles, J. G., & Coles, A. (1994). Through preservice teachers' eyes: Exploring field experiences through narrative and inquiry. New York: MacMillan College Publishing Co.

Knowles, J. G., & Holt-Reynolds, D. (1991). Shaping pedagogies against personal histories in preservice teacher education. *Teachers College Record, 93,* 87-113.

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

Kelchtermans, G., & Ballet, K. (2002). The micropolitics of teacher induction: A narrative-biographical study on teacher socialization. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 18,* 105-120.

Koerner, M., Rust, F., & Baumgartner, F. (2002). Exploring roles in student teaching placements. *Teacher Education Quarterly, 29*(2), 35-58.

Korinek, L. A. (1989). Teacher preferences for training and compensation for field supervision. *Journal of Teacher Education, 40*(6), 46-51.

Krueger, P. J. (1987). The hidden curriculum of music student teaching: An ethnography. *Dialogue in Instrumental Music Education, 18*(1), 37-54.

Krueger, P. J. (2006). Empowering music students through inquiry: Cooperating teacher views. *Music Educators Journal, 92*(3), 56-61.

Kyriacou, C., & Stephens, P. (1999). Student teachers' concerns during teaching practice. *Evaluation and Research in Education, 13*(1), 18-31.

Latz, M. (1992). Preservice teachers' perceptions and concerns about classroom management and discipline: A qualitative investigation. *Journal of Science Teacher Education. 3*(1), 1-4.

Legette, R. M. (1997). Enhancing the music student-teaching experience: A research review. *Update, 16*(1), 25-28.

Lemma, P. (1993) The cooperating teacher as a supervisor. *Journal of Curriculum and Supervision* 8 (1993), pp. 329–342.

Lightfoot, S. (1984). *The Good High School.* New York: Basic Books

Lincoln,Y., & Guba, E. (1985). *Naturalistic Inquiry.* Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.

Livingston, C. (1990). Student teacher thinking and the student teacher curriculum. *Dissertation Abstracts International, 51*(08A), 2713. (University Microfilms No. AAG9030941).

Lortie, D.C. (1975). *Schoolteacher: A sociological study.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Lynch, R. (2000). *New directions for high school career and technical education in the 21st century,* ERIC Clearinghouse on Adult, Career and Vocational Education, Columbus OH.

MacDonald, C. J. (1992). The multiplicity of factors creating stress during the teaching practicum: The student teachers' perspective. *Education, 30*(10), 1-11.

MacDonald, C. J. (1993). Coping with stress during the teaching practicum: The student teachers' perspective. *The Alberta Journal of Educational Research, 34*(4), 407-418.

MacDonald, C. J., Baker, D., & Steward, S. R. (1995). Student teachers in the classroom: Associate teacher's perspectives. *McGill Journal of Education, 30*(1), 73-94.

MacKinnon, J. D. (1989). Living with conformity in student teaching. *Alberta Journal of Educational Research, 35*(2), 2-19.

Madsen, C. K., & Geringer, J. M. (1989). The relationship of teacher "on task" to intensity and effective teaching. *Canadian Music Educator, 30*(2), 87-94.

Madsen, C. K., & Kaiser, K. A. (1999). Pre-internship fears of student teaching. *Update, Spring/Summer,* 27-32.

Madsen, C. H., & Madsen, D. K. (1983). Teaching/discipline: A positive approach for educational development (3rd ed.). Raleigh, NC: Contemporary Publishing.

Madsen, C. K., Standley, J. M., & Cassidy, J. W. (1989). Demonstration and recognition of high low contrasts in teacher intensity. *Journal of Research in Music Education, 37*(2), 85-92.

Manning, D. T. (1977). The influence of key individuals on student teachers in urban and suburban settings. *Teacher Educator, 12*(3), 2-8.

McIntyre, B., & Killian, J. (1987). The influence of supervisory training for cooperating teachers on preservice teachers' development during early field experiences. *Journal of Educational Research, 80*(5), 277-282.

McMillan, D., & Chavis, D. (1986). Sense of community: A definition and theory. *Journal of Community Psychology, 14,* 6-23.

McNally, P., Cope, B., Inglis, B., & Stronach, I. (1997) The student teacher in school conditions for development. *Teaching and Teacher Education* 13, pp. 485–498.

McNally, J., Cope, P. & Stronach, I. (1994). Current realities in the student teaching experience: A preliminary inquiry. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 10*(2), 219-230.

Meir, D. (1995). *The Power of Their Ideas.* Boston, MA: Beacon Press.

Merleau-Ponty, M. (1956). What is phenomenology? *Cross Currents, 6,* 59-70.

Merleau-Ponty, M. (1962). *Phenomenology of Perception.* New York: The Humanities Press.

Merriam, S. G. (1988). *Case study research in education: A qualitative approach.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc.

Merriam, S. B. (1998). *Qualitative Research and Case Study: Applications in Education.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Metzler, M.W. (1990). *Supervision for physical education.* Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.

Miklos, E., & Green, M. L. (1987). Assessments by teachers of their preservice preparation programs. *The Alberta Journal of Educational Research, 33*(3), 191-205.

Natanson, M. (1973). Edmund Husserl–Philosopher of infinite tasks. Evanston: Northwestern University Press.

National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education. (1997). Draft standards for identifying and supporting quality professional development schools. Retrieved August 1, 2006 from Standards, procedures, and policies for the accreditation of professional education Washington, DC, http://www.org/ncate

Neufeld, J., & Freeman, D. (1993). *Teachers as teacher educators within a professional development school context.* San Diego: Paper presented at the annual meeting of American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education.

Omery, A. (1983). Phenomenology: A method for nursing research. *Advances In Nursing Science, 5*(2), 49-63.

O'Neal, S. (1983). *Supervision of student teachers: Feedback and evaluation.* Austin: University of Texas Research and Development Center for Teacher Education.

O'Neal, S. (1988). An analysis of student teacher/cooperating teacher conferences as related to self concept, flexibility and teaching concerns of each participant. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Montreal, Canada.

Pataniczek, D. & Isaacson, N. (1989). The relationship of socialization and concerns of beginning secondary teachers. *Journal of Teacher Education, 32*(3), 14-17.

Patton, M. Q. (1990). Qualitative evaluation and research method (2nd ed.). Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Pelletier, C. M. (2000). *A handbook of techniques and strategies for coaching student teachers* (2nd ed.). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Phelps, L., Schmitz, C.D., & Boatright, B. (1986). The effects of halo and leniency on cooperating teacher reports using Likert-type rating scales. *Journal of Educational Research, 79*(3), 151-154.

Phelps, L., Schmitz, C.D., & Wade, D.L. (1986). A performance-based cooperating teacher report. *Journal of Teacher Education, 37*(5), 32-35.

Price, H., & Harding, L. (1988, April). Elementary school teachers comparative use of time: Teacher who are versus those who are not Orff Schulwerk certified. Paper presented at the 1988 national convention of the Music Educators National Conference, Indianapolis, IN.

Pritchard, E. F. (1974). Matching student teachers with cooperating teachers: A review of the literature. East Lansing, MI: National Center for Research on Teacher Learning. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 087759)

Randall, L.E. (1992). *Systematic supervision for physical education.* Champaign, EL: Human Kinetics.

Ray, M. A. (1994). The richness of phenomenology: Philosophic, theoretic, and methodologic concerns. *In Critical issues in qualitative research methods* (J. M. Moree, Ed.). Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

Reeder, F. (1987). The phenomenologic movement. *Image, 19,* 150-152.

Richards, C., & Killen, R. (1993). Problems of beginning teachers: perceptions of preservice music teachers. *Research Studies in Music Education, 1*(1), 40-51.

Richards, C. & Killen, R. (1994, July). Collaborative solutions to key problems in the practicum. Paper presented at the 24th annual conference of the Australian Teacher Education Association, Brisbane.

Richardson-Koehler, V. (1988). Barriers to the effective supervision of student teaching: A field study. *Journal of Teacher Education, 39*(2), 28-35.

Saber, D. S., Cushing, K. S., & Berliner, D. (1991). Differences among teachers in a task characterized by simultaneity, multidimensionality, and immediacy. *American American Educational Journal, 26, 63-88.*

Sadler, R.D. (1989). Formative assessment and the design of instructional systems. *Instructional Science*, 18(1), 119-144.

Saunders, T. C. & Baker, D. S. (1991). Inservice classroom teachers' perceptions useful music skills and understandings. *Journal of Research in Music Education, 39*(3), 248-261.

Schmidt, M. (1994). Learning from experience: Influences on music student teachers. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Michigan, 1994.

Schmidt, M. (2005). *Experience meets experience: Preservice music teachers' course-based learning.* Paper presented at the meeting of the Asia-Pacific Society for Music Education Research, Seattle, July 14-16.

Schmidt, M. (2006). *"It's just a false sense of reality:" Student teacher's latent learning about classroom management.* Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, CA, April.

Schmidt, W. & Kennedy, M. (1990, February). Teachers and teacher candidates beliefs about subject matter and about teaching. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED320902).

Schon, D. (1987). Educating the reflective practitioner. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Seperson, M. A., & Joyce, B. (1973). *Teaching styles and student teachers as related to those of their cooperating teachers.* Educational Leadership Research Supplement, 146-151.

Sergiovanni, T. (1994). *Building community in schools*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Shavelson, R. J., & Stern, P. (1981). Research on teachers' pedagogical thoughts,

judgements, decisions and behavior. *Review of Educational Research, 51*, 455-498.

Shulman, L. S. (1987). Paradigms and research programs in the study of teaching: A contemporary perspective. In M.C. Wittrock (Ed.), *Handbook of research of teaching* (3rd. ed., pp. 3-36), New York: Macmillan.

Siebert, C. (2005). Promoting preservice teachers' success in classroom management by leveraging a local union's resources: A professional development school initiative. *Education, 125*(3), 385-392.

Sizer, T. (1984). *Horace's compromise*. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin.

Slick, S. K. (1998). A university supervisor negotiates territory and status. *Journal of Teacher Education, 49*(4), 306-315.

Soltis, J. F. (Ed.) (1987). Reforming teacher education: The impact of the Holmes Group report. New York: Columbia University.

Spiegelberg, H. (1975). *Doing phenomenology: Essays on and in phenomenology*. The Hague: Nijhoff.

Speigelberg, H. (1982). *The phenomenological movement: A historical introduction* (3rd ed.) The Hague: Nijhoff.

Spindler, G. (Ed.) (1982). *Doing the ethnography of schooling*. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

Spradley, J. P. (1979). *The ethnographic interview*. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

Stake, R. E. (1995). *The art of case study research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Standley, J. M., & Madsen, C. K. (1991). An observation procedure to differentiate teaching experience and expertise in music education. *Journal of Research in Music Education, 39*(1), 5-11.

Sternberg, R. J., and Horvath, J. A. (1995). A prototype view of expert teaching. *Educational Researcher, 24*(6), 9-17.

Steward, D. M., & Shamdasani, P. N. (1990). *Focus groups: theory and practice*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Stout, C. (1982). Why cooperating teachers accept student teachers. *Journal of Teacher*

Education, 4(6), 22-27.

Stuber, S. (1997). Teaching behavior viewed as a function of learning style and personality type: A comparison of experienced and novice instrumental music teaching. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Washington, Seattle.

Su, J. (1992). Sources of influence in preservice teacher socialization. *Journal of Education for Teaching, 18*(3), 239-258.

Sykes, G. (1983). Public policy and the problem of teacher quality: The need for screens and magnets. In L.S. Schultzman, & G. Sykes (Eds.), *Handbook of teaching and policy* (pp. 41-25). New York: Longman.

Tabachnick, B. R., Zeichner, K., Densmore, K., Adler, S., & Egan, K. (1982). The impact of the student teaching experience on the development of teacher perspectives. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Education Resource Association, New York.

Taebel, D. K. (1980). School music teachers' perceptions of the effect of certain competencies on pupil learning. *Journal of Research in Music Education, 28*(3), 185-197.

Tardif, C. (1985). On becoming a teacher: The student teachers' perspective. *The Alberta Journal of Educational Research, 31*(2), 139-148.

Taylor, C. H. (1970). Opinions of music teachers regarding professional preparation in music education. *Journal of Research in Music Education, 18*(4), 330-339.

Teachout, D. J. (1997). Preservice and experienced teachers' opinions of skills and behaviours important to successful music teaching. *Journal of Research in Music Education, 45,* 41-50.

Thompson, C. (1985). Origination and communication: Experience and reflection in the education of art teachers. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Iowa.

Tochon, F.V., & Gwyn-Paquette, C. (2003). Pre-service teachers' reflections on risk taking: the dynamics of practice and experience while experimenting with innovation during student teaching. *Alberta Journal of Educational Research, 49*(2), 2-22.

Torrance, H. & Pryor, J. (1998). *Investigating formative assessment: teaching, learning and assessment in the classroom.* Open University Press: Buckingham.

Brophy, J., & Everston, C. (1976) *Learning fromtTeaching: A developmental perspective* Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Bresler, L. (1995). Ethnography, phenomenology and action research in music education. *The Quarterly Journal of Music Teaching and Learning, VI* (3), 4-16.

Britzman, D. P. (2003). *Practice makes practice: A critical study of learning to teach* (Revised ed.). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Brouwer, N., & Korthagen, F.(2005). Can teacher education make a difference? *American Educational Research Journal, 42*, 153-224.

Brucklacher, B. (1998) Cooperating teachers' evaluations of student teachers all "A's"? *Journal of Instructional Psychology 25* (1998), pp. 67–72.

Brown, A., & Alley, J. M. (1983). Multivariate analysis on degree persistence of undergraduate music education majors. *Journal of Research in Music Education, 31*(4), 271-281.

Bryk, A., & Driscoll, M. (1988). *Reclaiming educational administration as a caring profession.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Bunting, C. (1988). Cooperating teachers and the changing views of teacher candidates. *Journal of Teacher Education, 39*(2), 42-46.

Burgess, R. G., (Ed.). (1985) Strategies of educational research: Qualitative methods. London: The Palmer Press.

Burnsed, V. (1982). Student teachers on their own. *Music Educators Journal, 68*(9), 45-47.

Buttram, J. B., (1994). Outcomes Assessment: A process for improving music teacher education. *The Quarterly Journal of Music Teaching and Learning, IV*(1), 52-58.

Byrnes, D. A., Kiger, G., & Shechtman, Z. (2003). Evaluating the use of group interviews to select students into teacher-education programs. *Journal of Teacher Education, 54*(2), 163-172.

Campbell, L. P., & Williamson, J. A. (1973). Practical problems of the student teacher/co-operating teacher relationships. *Education, 94*(2), 169-189.

Castillo, J. B. (1971). The role of expectations of cooperating teachers as viewed by student teachers, college supervisors and cooperating teachers. Dissertation Abstracts International, 32, 1374.

Turner, D. S. (1995) *Identifying exemplary secondary school teachers: The influence of career cycles and school environments on the defined roles of teachers perceived as exemplary*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Macquarie University, Sydney, Australia.

Van Manen, M. M. (1990). Researching lived experience: Human science for an action sensitive pedagogy. New York: State University of New York Press.

Veal, M. L., & Rikard, G. L. (1998). Cooperating teachers' perspectives on the student teaching triad. *Journal of Teacher Education, 49*, 108-119.

Veenman, S. (1984). Perceived problems of beginning teachers. *Review of Educational Research. 54*(2), 143-178.

Vogt, M. E. (1988, May). The preservice teacher-cooperating teacher relationship: a historical perspective. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the International Reading Association, Toronto, Canada.

Walker, D. E. (1998). Teaching Music: Managing the successful music program. (3rd. ed.). New York: Schirmer Books.

Wang, C., & Sogin, D. (1997). A comparative study of self-reported versus observed classroom activities in elementary general *music. Journal of Research in Music Education, 45,* 444-56.

Waxman, H. C., & Walber, H. J. (1986). Effects of early field experiences. In J. D. Raths & L.G. Katz. (Eds.). Advances in teacher education: Volume 2 (pp. 165-184). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Weasner, J., & Woods, A. M. (2003). Reaping new harvests: Collaboration and communication through field experience. *Action in Teacher Education, 20*(3), 50-61.

Westbrook, A. B. (1998). Teacher selection practices in effective elementary schools which differ by community type and socioeconomic status context. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge.

Wheeler, A. E., & Knoop, H. R. (1982). Self, teacher and faculty assessments of student teaching performance. *Journal of Educational Research, 75*(3), 178-181.

Wideen, M., Mayer-Smith, A., & Moon, B. (1998) A critical analysis of the research on learning to teach: Making the case of an ecological perspective on inquiry. *Review of Educational Research, 68*(1), 130-178.

Wilkins-Canter, E. A. (1997). The nature and effectiveness of feedback given by cooperating teachers to student teachers. *Teacher Educator, 32*, 235-250.

Wilson, S., & Cameron, R. (1996). Student teachers perceptions of effective teaching: A developmental model. *Journal of Education for Teaching, 22*, 181-195.

Woods, A. M., & Weasmer, J. (2003). Great expectations for student teachers: Explicit and impled. *Education, 123*(4), 681-688.

Woolley, S. L. (1997). What student teachers tell us. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Association of Teacher Educators, Washington, DC.

Yee, A. (1969). Do cooperating teachers influence the attitudes of student teachers? *Journal of Educational Psychology, 60*(4), 327-332.

Yin, R. (1989). Case study research: Design and methods. Newbury Park, CA: Sage. Publications.

Zahorik, J. A. (1988). The observing-conferencing role of university supervisors. *Journal of Teacher Education, 39(*2), 9-16.

Zeichner, K. (2002). Beyond tradition structures of student teaching. *Teacher Education Quarterly, 29*(2), 59-64.

Zeichner, K., & Tabachnick, B. (1981). Are the effects of university teacher education "washed out" by school experiences? *Journal of Teacher Education, 32*(3), 7-11.

Zeichner, K. M., & Teitlebaum, K. (1982). Personalized and inquiry-oriented teacher education: An analysis of two approaches to the development of curriculum for field-based experiences. *Journal of Education and Teaching, 8*(2), 95-177.

Zimpher, N. L., DeVoss, G. G., & Nott, D. L. (1980). A closer look at university student teacher supervision. *Journal of Teacher Education, 31*(4), 11-15.

Zimpher, N. L., & Sherill, J. A. (1996). Professors, teachers and leaders in the SCEDs. In J. Sikula (Ed.), *Handbook of research on teacher education* (2nd ed) (pp. 279-305). New York: MacMillan.