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ABSTRACT

TRANSFER OF CONTROL IN INSTRUCTION AND CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT FROM THE COOPERATING TEACHER TO THE STUDENT TEACHER: THE DEGREES OF FREEDOM IN DECISION-MAKING INVOLVED IN THE PRESERVICE CLINICAL EXPERIENCE

FEBRUARY, 1993

PATRICK J. DALY. B.S., STATE COLLEGE at BOSTON
M.A.T., BOSTON COLLEGE
M.Ed. in ADMINISTRATION and SUPERVISION, SUFFOLK UNIVERSITY
M.Ed. in ELEMENTARY EDUCATION, BOSTON STATE COLLEGE
Ed.D., UNIVERSITY OF MASSACHUSETTS
Directed by: Professor R. Mason Bunker

Within the period of each student teaching experience a series of transfers takes place in which responsibility for decision-making in instruction and classroom management is shifted from the cooperating teacher to the student teacher and culminates with the assumption of the role of teacher by the student teacher. The purpose of this study was to investigate the transfer of instruction and classroom control and the degrees of freedom allowing the student teacher to make decisions during the preservice clinical experience.

Six categories were used as a framework to discipline the collection of the data: Time Sequence, Readiness, Formal Communication - Conferences, Informal Communication - Cues and Signs, Degrees of Freedom and Proximity, and Legal and Moral Responsibilities. The methodology involved three phases of investigation: oral interviews, classroom
observations, and questionnaires. The population in Phases 1 and 2 consisted of ten matched pairs of cooperating teachers and student teachers who were interviewed and observed. In Phase 3 nine cooperating teachers and eight student teachers comprised a different, non-matched population who responded to two types of questionnaires. All participants were from elementary preservice clinical experiences in western Massachusetts. Collected data from the three phases were qualitatively analyzed to identify significant factors relative to the transfer of control.

Cooperating teachers and student teachers had no personal explicit time sequence to grant or receive the transfer of control but believed an implicit pattern existed. Student teachers had no personal criteria for readiness to assume control but determined it by personal successes in classroom management, lesson ownership, and pupil respect. Cooperating teachers had an implicit pattern for determining readiness based on these factors.

Conferencing varied in length and content: reflective thinking and philosophical discussion were not major components. Cues and signs were important indicators of the progress of the transfer of control. Student teachers needed to experience degrees of freedom to make decisions as they assumed control. They believed the cooperating teacher's proximity affected the mode of instruction and limited the degrees of freedom in their instructional and management styles. Legal questions limited the latitude of
the student teacher's risk-taking and decision-making potential.
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Question: "What do you feel or believe happens as the transfer of control is nearing completion? Do you notice anything happening with the student teacher?"

Response: "I always get excited about [the transfer of control] because . . . It's . . . like watching a flower bloom. It's like the petals are opening up . . . They're really coming into their own. . . . It's just wonderful to watch. . . . They walk different, they talk different . . . they just do a lot of things different. . . . They come in to me like a bud. All of a sudden I've got a petal or two, or three, or four . . . and it's just a wonderful thing to watch."

(Janice, 216-225)
1.1 Introduction

Within the period of each student teaching experience a series of transfers takes place in which responsibility for instruction and classroom management is shifted from the cooperating teacher (CT) to the student teacher (ST). These experiences eventually culminate in a transfer of control from the resident CT to the visiting ST. The level of control actually assumed by the ST and the extent to which responsibility is transferred, however, are open to question. Eddy (1969) found that

During this transition period . . . lesson planning, practice teaching, classroom management, and other tasks teachers perform are assigned to them in varying degrees. . . . The circumstances under which student teaching eases the transition from the role of student to that of teacher, and the extent to which it does so, are not empirically known. Yet it seems clear that important learnings about the role of teacher do occur during student teaching. (p. 14)

This shifting of control during transition becomes an important variable in the interrelationship between the CT and the ST. An understanding begins to take shape that the process of transfer of control is underway. This understanding by the CT and the ST may be a crucial aspect of the student teaching experience. The degrees of freedom that are allowed the ST during this transition period often determine the CT's actual commitment to the transfer of control. The eventual relationship between the CT and the
ST, as well as the positive outcome of the practicum experience, may hinge on the "feelings of freedom" relative to control that the participants believe have been achieved. Britzman (1985) reported that the practicum, by its nature, is complex and limiting.

The role of student teacher is both constricting and conflicting. Part student, part teacher, the experience of student teaching is also an exercise in role marginality, social dependency, and an initiation into the cultural tensions of the profession. (p. 6)

Campbell and Williamson (1973) described this difficult transition period as follows:

The constant worry about the rubrics of the classroom and the school culture at-large play on the thoughts of and interfere with the actions of the student teacher. They are distracted by anxiety about appropriate socialization factors in the classroom, cafeteria and teachers' lounge. Often this frustration is caused by the cooperating teachers' reluctance to allow them sufficient autonomy. (p. 169)

In a study on decision-making in student teaching, several questions were asked by Mistretta (1988), such as: Do STs have autonomy?; Do STs consider autonomy important?; and Do STs feel at-risk? The results of Mistretta's research showed that STs believed in autonomy but failed to promote their own.

My research involved a descriptive, qualitative study which investigated the role of the CT and the ST in the elementary classroom setting and the manner in which they adjusted to each other during the transitional period of the transfer of control. The type of control transferred by the CT to the ST may dictate imitation or encourage risk-taking situations on the part of the ST relative to content.
instruction and classroom management. Regardless of the limitations of the transferred control, the ST will generally seize this opportunity to assume the role of teacher. Etheridge (1989) referred to this as "strategic adjustment" wherein the ST consciously selects those practices which modify or replace initially desired practices. This allows the ST to perceive what he/she is doing as acceptable even though it is not part of his/her own beliefs (p. 32). Shipman (1967) referred to this ability to manipulate values according to the ST's situation as impression management. This behavior seems to be a subconscious attempt by the ST to meet the requirements of a given predicament in which he/she is involved.

There is a series of supplementary actions to the social contract being formed during the transfer that brings into question the degrees of freedom and proximity allowed the ST by the CT. In relation to instruction, does freedom mean to design one's own lessons or to model those of the CT? In classroom management, how much freedom to express authority is really transferred and with what restrictions? The proximity of the CT may, in fact, dictate modes of instruction or classroom management contrary to the ST's beliefs and styles. Are the transferred control and degrees of freedom to make decisions allowed within that control merely an illusion which deceives neither the participants in the exchange nor the pupils in the classroom or is it actual, genuine, and true?
One would think there is a series of intermediate steps between partial and complete freedom of action. Control of small groups to large group, from lesson to unit, from one-on-one discipline to classroom management seem to be some of the pathways to autonomy. An aspect of the exchange must also involve directionality. Is there a smooth passing of the baton of authority or is it a tug-of-war? Are the transitional degrees of freedom involved provisional and restricted? Are the freedoms involved always contingent on factors beyond the ST's control? Are there concurrent and observable behavior changes in the ST and the CT?

My research sought to answer these questions: To what degree does the transfer of control occur? and How complete is the freedom to make all classroom decisions in evidence by master week, the traditional week in charge? CTs who know when and how to yield control may hold the blueprints to an exciting and empowering preservice experience and the keys to what ultimately makes an excellent teacher. The interplay between the CT and the ST as they develop personal interrelationships of a social and professional nature bears investigation because those relationships will be the means through which the transfer of control will occur. It is my opinion that as the CT actively transfers the control, the ST must willingly be prepared to accept it. The eventual outcome may be the acceptance of the ST in the role of the teacher by both participants.
1.2 Rationale

Student teaching in the preservice practicum is traditionally the culmination phase in teacher training where learned theory is applied to on-site situations over a set period of time. Many aspects of this internship are significant. This current research analyzed several variables of the field experience relative to the interaction between the CT and the ST. In particular the central focus was on the transfer of control from the CT to the ST. The literature merely glanced at the primary focus of this study. Primary focus was fixed on the amount of latitude allowed by the CT to the ST relative to the degrees of freedom to make decisions. The degrees of freedom in teaching style and classroom management techniques permitted by the CT were investigated because they may indicate the extent of the transfer of control allowed to the ST. In addition, the manner in which the CT guides the ST is of major importance to the role of teacher as eventually conceptualized by the ST. This implies the need for CT mentor teachers as facilitators who actually teach pedagogical skills to STs rather than focusing on a process of imitation. The future teacher efficacy of the ST may be determined by the presence or absence of an effective CT who nurtures the ST's progress.

Criticism of research on teacher education (Haberman, 1983) and problems related to the study of student teaching and the school-based site (Lortie, 1975; Richardson-Koehler.
1988: Zeichner, 1980) have led to renewed interest in reexamining programs involving the certification of future teachers. The extensive reforms presented in the Holmes Group Report (1986) and the Carnegie Forum Report (1986) are under investigation by educational institutions throughout the country. In fact, many changes have already been implemented. Some states are revising and upgrading their certification standards and developing mentor-teacher programs. Although these are excellent advances, we must consider the entire ecology of the site as described by Zeichner (1983) in order to fully understand the complexities of the student teaching field experience.

Goodlad (1990a) stated

Placement of a neophyte in a single classroom with a single cooperating teacher . . . is a seriously flawed approach. It does not prepare future teachers to be stewards of entire schools. . . . Rather than focusing only on the classroom, we must expand our thinking to embrace whole schools. . . . (p. 281)

This approach involves the Professional Development Schools described in the Holmes Group Report (1986). However, although the study of the entire school is important, I believe a major variable would still remain the interactions between the CT and the ST.

This current research examined the ST in action during the full-time, semester-long preservice practicum with primary attention to the processes which mediate the transfer of instructional control and authority. Lortie (1975) has written that the success or failure of this series of events depends on the changing perceptions of the
ST as he/she becomes socialized and develops professionally. Ultimately, one must ask, does the transfer of authority and responsibility from the CT to the ST lend dignity and legitimacy to the practicum experience and does it imply that the ST will be provided with the skills necessary to assume the role of teacher?

1.3 Purpose

The purpose of the research was to examine how the transfer of control from the CT to the ST occurs and what important variations in that transition appear to be common. The first objective was to provide a rich description of the events that may pertain to the transfer of instructional control and authority - expressed in the words of the participants in the interview data (Phase 1) and the classroom observational data (Phase 2). The second objective was to examine and compare the accounts of the perceptions of the transfer process as reported by the ST and the CT (Phase 3). The third phase of the research drew more extensively on questionnaire data to augment the content of interview transcripts and classroom observations. Particular attention was paid to the congruence between ST and CT perceptions, the internal consistency of their perceptions, and the temporal shifts in perceptions which occur across the course of the practicum.

The specific questions that guided the research consisted of the following:
1. What are the significant factors affecting the transfer of control in instruction and classroom management involving the CT and the ST during the preservice clinical experience?

2. Who makes the decisions about the transfer of control, the ST or the CT?

3. How are these decisions made within the framework of the transfer of control?

4. Does a pattern appear during the transfer, either implicit or explicit, by which the CT determines the ST's readiness to assume the role of teacher?

5. What appears to influence the CT's and the ST's decision about the timing of the process of the transfer of control?

6. What is the significance of the degrees of freedom in decision-making as experienced by the ST to the rate of progress of the transfer of control and overall mastery of the preservice clinical experience?

Investigation of these questions provided parameters for the research methodology and maintained a focused direction throughout the research.

1.4 Research Methodology

The research methodology employed a process which allowed for triangulation through the use of three data sources: interviews (McCracken, 1988; Spradley, 1979); classroom observations (Good and Brophy, 1984; Metzler, 1981; Siedentop, 1976); and questionnaires, both an objective check-off type (Cussen, 1974; Wolfson and Nash, 1965) and a subjective paragraph completion type (Hunt, Butler, Noy and Rosser, 1978; Ingersoll, 1984; Nisbet, 1990).
From the initial stages of the collection of data and an in-depth review of the literature a construct of six categories was developed. These categories included Time Sequence, Readiness, Formal Communication - Conferences, Informal Communication - Cues and Signs, Degrees of Freedom and Proximity, and Legal and Moral Responsibilities. (APPENDIX B). These were utilized as a framework to guide and discipline the research.

The research process involved three phases. In Phase 1 ten sets of CTs and their STs were individually interviewed on audio-tape cassettes. All participants were asked to respond to a set of questions (APPENDIX D - STs and APPENDIX E - CTs) as asked orally by the researcher. Both the CTs and the STs were given a list of terms and their definitions utilized in the research. These terms were Teacher Authority, Teacher Control, Transfer of Control, Degrees of Freedom, Proximity, Tug-of-War, Master Week, and Perception (APPENDIX A). These terms were discussed with all participants to make it clearly understood that these terms were defined specifically as stated. This was to ensure a uniformity of interpretation relative to these terms.

In Phase 2 the researcher made a series of classroom observations of the same participant population as interviewed in Phase 1. Guided by Good and Brophy (1984), Metzler (1981), and Siedentop (1976) the researcher collected data in the two specific areas of formal and
Informal conferencing and CT/ST proximity and their impact on ST development.

Phase 3 required the distribution, collection, and analysis of two types of questionnaires. The "Who Decides?" Questionnaire (APPENDIX H) and The Paragraph Response Questionnaire (APPENDIX J). The population surveyed in this phase was not the population interviewed and observed in Phases 1 and 2. The STs participating in Phases 1 and 2 had completed their practicum. It was desirable for this research to have STs currently serving in the field as participants in Phase 3.

All data were collected and analyzed from the three phases of the research. Presentation was processed in the format of quotes and interpretation from the data of the interviews, classroom observations, and questionnaire instruments by interweaving pertinent areas of congruence or contrast throughout each facet of the focus of the research.

1.5 Significance

The data from the research will be useful to managers of teacher education programs, principals, university supervisors (SVs), CTs, and STs. Professional educators involved in reform movements and teacher development program evaluators would also benefit from this proposed research. The data would be useful to these groups in the following ways:

1. Each group of CTs and STs would be interested to know what this particular group believed was transpiring during the field experience.
2. Particular instances of implicit and explicit patterns involving time sequence, readiness, and degrees of freedom allowed STs by the CTs could be analyzed.

3. CTs might seek to rectify their own perceived process of transferring control or to develop one where it had not previously existed.

4. STs might develop patterns involving time-frames when they should begin to seek the transfer of control.

5. STs might develop positive attitudes toward seeking degrees of freedom and appropriate proximity from the CT in an aggressive although non-belligerent manner.

6. SVs could review the data relative to conferencing and cues and signs between the CTs and the STs to learn about the implications of imitation, reflection, and actual time spent on instructional and classroom management.

7. Principals and university staff could benefit by obtaining ideas of how the STs and CTs feel about course work and its value and usefulness to the internship.

8. All supervisors could determine the extent instruction and curriculum, classroom management, teaching styles, risk-taking, and the legal and moral responsibilities of the transfer of control have on the field experience.

9. Educational reformers could analyze the entire research data to obtain viewpoints as to the state of teacher education currently in the field. Are any of the new reforms being implemented or is it business as usual?

10. Researchers and doctoral candidates in education could review this research and obtain ideas from which they could develop further studies.

These ten ways are merely a few suggestions as to how this research might be utilized.

Studies by Eddy (1969), Kidder (1989), Moran (1990), Oestreich (1974), and Shulman (1987) indirectly give support to the significance of the topic of transfer of classroom
management and instructional control. They found that data describing the immediate impact of what preservice teachers must discover and contend with in order to have a positive field experience to be limited in the available research. The review of literature in Chapter 2 will lend support for the development of interview protocols, observational techniques, questionnaire methods, and the construct categories utilized in this research.
CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Introduction

Educators have long assumed that the shifting of responsibility from the CT to the ST is crucial to the establishment by the ST of his/her freedom to try, to take risks, and to evaluate success or failure during the field experience. These decisions may allow the ST to be reflective and to modify and build his/her pedagogical theories of effective teaching techniques. Yet, even in its obvious significance, the transfer of control between the CT and the ST has not been researched as a central focus of the student teaching experience.

The literature review for my research focused on the following areas: student teaching, classroom instruction and management, socialization of the ST, teaching styles, reflective teaching, supervision and mentoring by the CT, types of supervision, teacher education programs, and educational reform. This review of the literature provided the identification of the selected categories used in this study. These categories are Time Sequence, Readiness, Formal Communication – Conferences, Informal Communication – Cues and Signs, Degrees of Freedom and Proximity, and Legal and Moral Responsibilities (APPENDIX B). These categories were identified in the literature and then developed into a
disciplined framework for conducting this research because they appeared to be factors in the transfer of control.

2.2 Student Teaching Field Experiences

This current research looked directly at a major component of the field experience site, the classroom, and specifically at the events occurring during the transition involving the transferring of authority to make decisions from the CT to the ST. This process may be central to the positive socialization of the ST and is what allows the ST to assume the role of teacher. During this assumption of control a ST must display an adult learning mentality which is characterized by risk-taking and avoidance of imitation. Duke (1990) and Locke (1979) advocated this risk-taking challenge to increase the opportunity for a positive learning situation. Without risk-taking the ST is deprived of his/her opportunity for growth and experimentation during the preservice experience. Educational reformers, such as the Holmes Group (1986), have found the following:

The typical student teaching experience is not a genuine laboratory experience because the possibilities of failure and risk are minimal. The emphasis is upon imitation of and subservience to the supervising teacher, not upon investigation, reflection, and solving novel problems. (p. 55)

This type of commentary is not universally accepted but has opened dialogue on the role and format of the student teaching field experience in the training of future teachers.
In the process of reviewing the literature this one reference was found which focused on the transfer of control:

One might suppose that the classroom has a well developed plan for gradual induction of the student teacher into increasingly complex teaching responsibilities. But one can rarely find planned and systematic procedures for this induction. Only rarely can we find evidence that the supervising teacher shifts responsibility with the student teacher’s growing ability to make instructional decisions. (Oestreich, 1974, p. 336)

The question of who has the authority to make decisions and if a process exists for the CT to know when to transfer control to the ST led to the identification of the Readiness category. As an outgrowth from the concept of readiness it was believed that a pace-setting factor exists that controls the rate at which the authority to make decisions is transferred. In order to analyze this pace-setting variable, a Time Sequence category was designed to investigate the significance of the number of days or weeks and during which week or weeks the transfer of control takes place.

The structure and content of a field experience, the characteristics of placement sites, and the relationships between education students and other people led Zeichner (1983) to an extensive study of all the extant literature on student teaching experiences relative to these areas:

These studies represent all of the reports of individual research efforts with a focus on field experience and teacher development which have appeared in the two major referred U.S. journals devoted primarily to teacher education: (1)
There is little evidence in Zeichner’s review (1983) that researchers have conceived of student teaching as involving a series of steps through which the CT transfers control to the ST. Only the more general questions relative to the student teaching experience and the role decision-making plays in the classroom have been addressed in the literature (Applegate, 1986; Campbell and Williamson, 1973; Mistretta, 1988; Shulman, 1987). The review of the literature did not reveal an instrument for investigating the transfer of control during student teaching.

2.3 Organizational Patterns of the Methodology

In the survey of the literature descriptions of oral interview and classroom observation techniques obviously suited the focus of my research. The oral interviewing techniques of McCracken (1988) and Spradley (1979) and the classroom observation techniques of Good and Brophy (1984), Metzler (1981), and Siedentop (1976) were chosen as references in constructing a framework to discipline this research into Phases 1 and 2.

In observing classrooms Good and Brophy (1984) advocated observing a limited number of items because "when one attempts to measure too many things, one becomes confused and cannot measure objectively" (p. 59). Specific limitations they recommend for consideration are different perceptions by different observers, misinterpretation of
classroom behavior, certain beliefs, past experiences, prejudices, and personal biases such as values and preferences (p. 47). In addition they further recommended "looking for specific behaviors in the classroom is one way to minimize the degree to which our attitudes and biases will color what we see" (p. 51). Another reason for limiting the framework of the observation was suggested by Goodlad (1984):

Studying all of a school at once is virtually impossible. One inevitably looks at pieces and then seeks to put them together. The results are neither fully satisfying nor completely accurate. They are an approximation of reality - and then only one's own approximation. (p. 16)

The classroom observation of the CT and the ST pair in their classroom setting as described in my research might be significant because Zeichner (1983) in his research emphasized the lack of study relative to the entire ecology of the classroom.

The failure of studies to attend to the complex, dynamic, and multidimensional nature of settings and people, individually and in interaction ("the ecology of field experiences") is a major reason for the current unsatisfactory state of our knowledge base related to the influence of field experience on teacher development. (p. 95)

One possible reason for this lack of research on the "ecology of the field experience" is the tremendous amount of variables involved. Haberman (1983) paraphrased Ebel in his 1969 study regarding variation in student teaching by stating:

In addition to what some "call for" and assume "should be" in student teaching, what we actually know about this process in practice can be summarized in one word
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After analyzing the data from Phases 1 and 2, I sought to focus more clearly on the aspect of decision-making authority within the realm of the transfer of control. It was recalled that in the literature that Cussen (1974) had utilized a questionnaire developed by Wolfson and Nash (1965) listing primary grade routines in order to investigate who was making the decisions within the classroom, the teacher or the pupil. The concept for using a questionnaire involving CT’s and ST’s decision-making authority was incorporated into this research. Upon finding no such instrument in the literature reviewed, in particular in Miles and Huberman (1984), I developed my own questionnaire as an adaptation of the idea presented by Wolfson and Nash in their "Who Decides?" Questionnaire. This objective questionnaire was utilized in Phase 3 of this study.

Wolfson and Nash (1965) had also reported that "according to modern theories of perceptual psychology [Combs and Snygg (1959)], there is a relationship between perception and behavior. How individuals see a situation influences how they act" (p. 436). This was an additional variable as to what role perception and behavior play in the reality of what is decided between the CT and the ST during the student teaching experience. To offer a subjective perspective within this third phase of the triangulation I
developed an Instrument which was based on the Paragraph Completion Method utilized by Hunt et al. (1978), Ingersoll (1984), and Nisbet (1990). This became part of Phase 3 as the Paragraph Response Questionnaire and was used in conjunction with the "Who Decides?" Questionnaire.

2.4 "Transfer of Control" in the Literature

A continued review of the literature indicated a limited amount of research existed as to what happens between the CT and the ST during the transfer of control. Applegate and Lasley (1986) have done extensive study on the practicum field experience throughout the early 1980’s. One of their many astute observations was their finding in the literature an absence of data describing what really confronts student teachers once they enter the classroom. What I found absent in the literature were descriptions of who makes the decisions about the transfer of control, how the decisions are made, and what appears to influence decisions about the timing of this process. While reporting on the limited body of worthwhile student teaching research, the authors Griffin, Barnes, Hughes, O’Neal, Defino, Edwards, and Hukill (1983) stated:

There does not presently exist a solid knowledge base regarding student teaching. A survey of the literature related to teacher education reveals a paucity of information regarding student teaching from a research perspective. Research-based propositions are conspicuous by their absence. (p. 3)

It did not make a great deal of sense for the purpose of my research to review any major portion of what has now
become a mountainous accumulation of research on student teaching. To support the research and the use of particular methods of data collection, this review was limited largely to studies that have touched upon the question of the ST's assumption of instruction and classroom management control and authority. Evidence concerning the role of the CT in transferring control and authority to the ST over the period of the preservice clinical experience was examined. What role these variables occupy in the field experience was also investigated. Due to the absence of research focused on this topic, most of this review necessarily depended upon studies in which questions of transfer of control were secondary to the primary focus of the study. For example, Moran (1990), in writing about schools and the beginning teacher, stated:

Beginning teachers frequently experience supervision that feels like surveillance and evaluation that feels like a reading of the charges. . . . Advice from friendly teachers and supervisors too often comes unsolicited and takes the form of correction of an 'error' that was, in fact, a brave but flawed experiment. Rarely are beginners encouraged to take risks and experiment. (p. 211)

2.5 The Experience of Student Teaching

The positive and negative skills learned during the apprenticeship have aided STs and forewarned them in many everyday classroom situations. Davies and Amershak (1969) reported the student teaching experience as possibly being significant. They were supported in studies by Applegate (1986), Brimfield and Leonard (1983), and Felman-Nemser and
Buchman (1986), all of whom described the positive experiences of student teaching. An opposing viewpoint was presented by Kaltoounis (1968) wherein he described a student teaching experience as neither positive or negative.

Student teaching is simply an experience, good or bad. ... student teaching accepts status quo in teaching. ... student teaching prepares them to fit into a complacent, non-critical role in the school. ... The student teacher is unable to be a young Turk, and the field of education needs some bright, young Turks. (p. 281)

This quote raised the question that if all student teaching experiences were not positive, then what factors were needed to make for a positive experience? And, under what circumstances is a ST ready to accept the role of teacher?

2.6 Educational Reform in Student Teaching

Due to the perceived ambiguous nature of the field experience those in the vanguard of reform in education are restructuring teacher education programs. The lack of effective research instrumentation and the absence of a standard terminology within education may be causing this ambiguity. Formerly held beliefs of educators are being modified. The ideal of the ST entering the classroom and finding a consensus of professionalism and teaching skills which they then incorporate into their socialization as teachers is no longer accepted. Goodlad (1990a) recognized the necessity for major change in how educators view the student teaching experience.

Finally [student teachers] must become junior members of school faculties engaged in the renewal process. The conventional practice of assigning a student
teacher to a cooperating teacher and a classroom—a practice suggesting that classroom duties are the sum total of a teacher's job—falls far short of what is required. (p. 294)

The Holmes Group (1986) and the Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy (1986) advocated Professional Development Schools. These schools, ultimately financed by the Carnegie Forum, were to consist of on-site internships involving a collaboration between the university faculty and the school site personnel. Goodlad (1990a), four years later, commented on the progress of these reforms:

Rather than focusing only on the classroom, we must expand our thinking to embrace whole schools maintained jointly by school districts and universities. . . . At this time of writing, all of these [reforms] are in an exploratory, embryonic stage: few of the problems of control, funding, division of labor, and the like have been worked out. (p. 281)

In further investigation into the immediate needs of the ST relative to the university and the intern site, Goodlad reported in a 1991 magazine article that the collaboration between the university faculty and the school site faculty was practically non-existent: "Campus-based and school-based faculty in our sample rarely came together to discuss a mutually shared mission for student teachers" (p. 8).

In 1986 the Holmes Group found imitation of and subservience to the CT by the ST to be prevalent. Apparently it would be in the area of instruction that one would find reflection, investigation, and the solving of novel problems in constant practice. Actual development of these qualities would be necessary for the ST to actualize
true socialization. It is generally accepted by educators that a reflective teacher will make an excellent teacher. It is also generally accepted by educators that self-analysis helps the ST to understand his/her own actions and to develop a knowledge of self that is carried over into his/her teaching, as reported by Applegate in 1986:

Thompson (1982), in interviews with 113 students at different points in their teacher preparation, found that gains in self-knowledge were a major outcome of field experience. . . . She concluded by speculating that perhaps early field experience provides a vehicle for the development of self-knowledge and self-confidence. (p. 28)

2.7 The Reflective Experience in Student Teaching

While reviewing the literature a question constantly recurred in my mind: Is the self-knowledge gained during the field experience of a theoretical base wherein the ST reflects on the theory of education and/or is it a self-knowledge of finding one’s own role and identity in its most practical sense? Knowledge and acceptance of self usually creates a confidence to strive for and to achieve personal goals. Dewey (1904) advocated reflection during the field experience as the most effective purpose of the field experience in order for the ST to become more developed in the areas of personal inquiry. This he called the laboratory experience. In contrast, he spoke of the habits of teaching, the apprenticeship experience, as the most utilitarian to the ST. It is understood that Dewey was, as are the majority of today’s reform-minded educators, seeking a reflective student teaching experience over a
non-reflective, affective one. It was reported in the literature that STs are not preoccupied with self-analysis in the reflective-theoretical sense but concentrate on the basic application of their skills to the task at hand. Even though STs were constantly encouraged to use reflection and self-analysis, what the STs wanted was "how to" and the resources with which to do it. Because of the frequency of this request many educators feel that STs are lacking in certain cognitive areas, as in this comment by Zimpher (1983):

Because Copeland (1980) summarizes most current theoretical literature as favoring the more nondirective approach of clinical supervision, he speculates that student teachers may lack the experiential background necessary to analyze their teaching problems under nondirective supervision, but prefer instead the concrete solutions to their problems that are typical of directive supervision. (p. 138)

Nondirective clinical supervision (Cogan, 1973) can, and does, encourage reflective self-analysis, which is perceived as necessary to the field experience. In some programs one of the major components is the maintaining of a journal by the ST of which the purpose is reflection. Also, when a resource seminar component of clinical supervision is utilized it tends to strongly advocate sharing and "show and tell" aspects of the ST's classroom experiences. This sharing often includes brainstorming which results in concrete alternatives being reviewed. This interaction, often on a weekly basis, is immediate and convincing because the suggested solutions are not merely from the clinical
supervisor but from one’s own peers in the field (Goldhammer, Anderson, and Krajewski, 1980).

Research surveyed in the literature suggested that the STs want supervision, consultations and feedback, and interactions with anyone willing to help them (Britzman, 1985; Deal and Chatman, 1989; Shulman, 1987). Many educators believe the interactions between CTs and STs involving consultations and cues and signs are a form of symbolic reflection. Clift, Houston, and Pugach (1990) reported that in a 1934 study Mead stated:

Student teachers must organize their interactions through cognitive representation . . . [and] assume the roles they believe others want them to acquire . . . [and] learn to anticipate the response of others to their gestures and actions. . . . As a result, role-taking becomes an important mode of self-reflection and self-criticism. (p. 62)

Although the role of reflection emerged constantly in student teaching it was seen as secondary to the learning by experience philosophy of many CTs. This limitation to reflection was possibly, as Feiman-Nemser and Buchman (1986) had described, due to the poor quality of feedback from the CT to the ST.

An example of this problem was their case of a student teacher who failed to learn how to develop and extend the content side of instruction because the cooperating teacher did not provide feedback on this topic. (Richardson-Koehler, 1988, p. 28)

Britzman (1985) reported that STs often expect and welcome CT consultation and feedback. "Because [CT] was constantly in the room, [ST] expected her feedback. . . . [The ST] was
looking forward to on-going interaction and feedback from [the CT]" (p. 301).

2.8 Supervision and the Student Teacher

A review of the literature relative to supervision indicated the importance of the university SV on the ST (Campbell and Williamson, 1973; Copeland, 1980; Zimpher, 1983). In a study by Frye (1988), however, it was found that although teacher education program personnel, university SVs, and principals play a role during the field experience, the CT as mentor is crucial. He stated, "A recent study on role-modeling influence revealed that one-half the student teachers identified their supervising (cooperating) teacher as the major source of professional advice" (Frye, 1988, p. 56). It is generally believed by educators that the mentor should have extensive communication skills. The ideal communication situation is one in which the ST and the CT collaborate with each other and eventually raise the quality of the ST's cognitive abilities. Colton and Sparks-Langer (1992) in referring to both the CT and the SV as supervisor sought a restructuring of student teaching experiences and stated:

The supervisor provides emotional cues about the nature of the situations, nonverbal models of how to behave, verbal and nonverbal interpretations of behaviors and events, and verbal labels that classify objects and events. This bridging occurs in the "zone of proximal development" (Vygotsky, 1978) - the mental "distance" between a person's current problem solving ability and the ability the person can achieve if coached and supported by a more skilled individual. (p. 158)
The day-to-day interactions and conferences between the CT and the ST require these problem-solving skills. From this need two categories were developed to examine how the CT and the ST communicate. These categories became Formal Communication - Conferences and Informal Communication - Cues and Signs. The first category was developed to examine how the CT and the ST communicated formally. The supervisory method and frequency of conferencing, the initiator of the conference, and the reflective content of the conference may be important factors in the transfer process.

The second category was created to examine those communications informally exchanged between the CT and the ST during classroom activities. These informal exchanges between the CT and the ST include positive and negative verbal and nonverbal cues and signs in the form of interjections and gestures. How these informal communications are received and perceived may be important to the eventual opportunity for the ST to experience the freedom to take risks and the confidence to make decisions.

In addition, a category of Degrees of Freedom and Proximity was developed to accommodate descriptions of how the CT facilitates the supervision of the transfer of control to the ST in instruction and classroom management. This category focuses on two specific areas: the abstract, the liberty to experiment and take risks, and the physical, the actual presence and/or location of the CT in relation to
the ST. Kidder (1989) referred to the difficulty a CT has in transferring the control of authority to a ST:

Sometimes rivalry develops between a practice teacher and the one whose class she borrows. Neither Pam nor Chris committed any rivalrous deeds, though. Chris really liked Pam. She ached for Pam while she sat on the sofa imagining trouble back in the room. But Chris had more on her mind than Pam's travail. In December, the real test began, both for Pam and Chris. Pam took over the class for three whole days in a row. Chris couldn't sit still. She roamed the olive-carpeted halls like an expectant father. Two days went by. Finally, Chris sat down on the sofa. "Oh!" she exclaimed. "I want my class back!" (p. 129)

2.9 Supervisory Methods in Student Teaching

The supervisory role of the CT led to a review of the literature focusing on supervisory methodology. Several types were found, such as the directive method which calls for both the SV and the CT to give concrete responses to the ST's problems (Copeland, 1980). In a study by Zimpher (1983) it was found that a review of the literature favored a nondirective, clinical approach involving a non-judgmental, reflective, self-analytical method advocated by Acheson and Gall (1987), Cogan (1973), and Goldhammer et al. (1980). However, in a 1980 study Copeland found that STs preferred a more defined response resulting in concrete solutions to their problems. According to Colton and Sparks-Langer (1992) the CT becomes the conscience for the ST.

The supervisor guides the student to consider alternative interpretations and encourages him to take risks in an atmosphere of trust. This guidance includes discussions and modeling of the thinking the supervisor performs in her own planning and decision making. Over time, more and
more of the decision making and responsibility are relinquished to the student teacher. At the end of the process, the student has acquired the necessary mental representations to interpret information, set goals, and assess his actions and thinking on his own. (pp. 158-159)

Goodlad (1990a) reported the lack of supervision and communication between the myriad of different participants in the field experience a major reason why reflective processing during student teaching is not an accomplished fact.

The perception of teaching that candidates near completion were developing called for them simply to fit into existing circumstances. Thus . . . the transition was not a deeply intellectual one— from reflective student to reflective practitioner, so to speak. Rather, students saw themselves as observing what teaching requires and then taking on the mantle of teachers observed. If, in student teaching, their reflective position on best procedures clashed with . . . the cooperating teacher's practices, they yielded to the status quo. (p. 219)

Does this lack of supervisory guidance to reflect cause the STs to grasp the life preserver of imitation of what they have seen in their classrooms? Does this expedient action limit the development and/or application of their own teaching styles? Britzman (1985) reported the ST imitating the CT largely because the ST lacked confidence in his own ability. "Jack attributed his classroom difficulties to inexperience with both the material and methods of presentation. With little experience to fall back on, Jack was hard pressed to do anything but follow in [CT's] footsteps" (p. 279).

Eddy (1969) and Locke (1979) emphasized that learning does take place during student teaching; moreover, all
values, rubrics, and assumptions about teaching do not have to be imitated or accepted by the ST. Whether this supervisory guidance takes place and how and to what degree it is communicated from the CT to the ST may be significant to a successful transfer of control (Lortie, 1975; Yee, 1969; Zeichner, 1983).

### 2.10 The Role of Classroom Management

Lortie (1975) viewed student teaching to be "earthy and realistic when compared with education courses, but also short and parochial" (p. 71). He feared the retention of traditionalism and individualism over progressive new ideas in a collegial enterprise. He believed that traditionalism and individualism appeared mostly in the area of classroom management. Routine and disciplinary systems are set in place early in the school year and become sacrosanct as the months progress. Lortie also wrote about the demands of classroom management.

> Teachers' sovereignty over classroom affairs; that beginning teachers must learn classroom control or be fired; that teachers who fail to keep control over students soon find that teaching is intolerable work; and that the teacher must be in charge and must be so perceived. (1975, p. 151)

This perception is apparently what the reality of student teaching is also. A ST may have to obtain the transfer of control to make decisions or feel that he/she has not experienced the role of teacher. The ST may have to be allowed the degrees of freedom to experience risk-taking and decision-making. The literature review indicated this may
exist but was not openly in evidence with any specific, focused statement (Hollingsworth, 1989; Moran, 1990; Shulman, 1987; Yee, 1969). This variable of degrees of freedom to make decisions was viewed as helping the ST grow and mature. However, "one cannot expect that student teachers' overt performance was independent of their cooperating teachers' control of classroom methods and activities" (Yee, 1969, p. 328). What we need to do as educators is to develop a method by which the STs can channel this experience into a more progressive application within their own future classroom. In spite of these limitations Eddy (1969) reported that learning does occur during student teaching.

Yet it seems clear that important learnings about the role of teacher do occur during student teaching and that this time may be particularly useful for the transmission of written and oral traditions about teaching from one generation of teachers to the next. (p. 14)

The latter part of the quote is what reform-minded educators fear most about present student teaching field experiences. They seek to remove from education many of the considered negative traditional aspects which are outmoded. They also seek to incorporate reflection and decision-making into the student teaching experience (Association of Teacher Educators, 1986; Carnegie Forum, 1986; Holmes Group, 1986). Educators speak of the ST's need for survival during the student teaching experience (Etheridge, 1989; Fuller, 1969; Shipman, 1967). It seems by necessity, not chance, that during student teaching the main focus is on classroom
management (Applegate, 1986). Classroom management demands reflective thought and criticism of self-confidence, self-concept, and self-beliefs by the ST. However, as a central focus, does it limit reflection on pedagogical theory such as content, instruction, and teaching styles?

Students entering student teaching were "concerned about the outcome of the practicum and how they [would] survive it" (Fuller, 1969, p. 214). They related these concerns to their interrelationships with the entire ecology of the field experience setting. How they interacted in this setting was crucial to them. When questioned about their practicum, their response was that:

Virtually nothing is said about curriculum. What is taught is either not noticed or is taken for granted in the given situation. Little is said about instructional strategies, except in relationships to pupil conduct or interest. The affective nature of the classroom takes precedence over the cognitive. (Applegate, 1986, p. 31)

The question lingers as to whether classroom management is the proverbial "cart before the horse" of curriculum. In fact Joyce, Yarger, Howey, Harbeck, and Kluwin (1977) frequently referred to the ST's inadequate use of management and discipline strategies as the most common reason for failure. According to Hourcade (1988), this is also the most common cause for burnout and extreme stress among teachers (pp. 347-350).

Classroom management and discipline strategies are usually set in place early in the school year. The amount of influential input by the ST depends on the time of year
the ST begins his/her practicum. Because of the nature of classroom management and its role in successful instruction the majority of CTs do not want their methodology interfered with. "What works" usually determines the process and, in conjunction with tried and true methods, then becomes sacrosanct with only minor adjustments tolerated. In many cases CTs may often assume the readiness of the ST by how they master the affective routines of the classroom (Applegate, 1986).

Generally cognitive-instructional procedures are allowed to be experimented with whereas affective-classroom management procedures are restricted to those already in place. Although limited manipulation is allowed with general discipline, there is extremely little change or experimentation allowed in the status quo of classroom management routines. In the literature it was reported that CTs will not allow the STs to change the ecology of the classroom, such as desk arrangement, or the socialized routines, such as the seating charts, or other expectations and appropriate behaviors for specific routines which they have in place (Copeland, 1979). In a magazine article Goodlad reported university professors telling STs "not to move the chairs in the minister's house" (1991, p. 8).

The Holmes Group (1986) stated that STs imitate their CTs (p. 55). The tremendous impact of being placed in a setting totally recognized as belonging to the CT affects the ST (Watts, 1983). What to do, how to do it, and when to
do it become searing questions in the mind of STs. How they react may determine the success of their relationship with their CT. In the literature Veldman (1970) wrote that although CTs are extremely influential, the student's own personality is a more powerful determinant of ultimate teaching style (pp. 165-167). This involves the ST's readiness to accept the transfer of control in order to assume the role of teacher.

2.11 Student Teacher Expectations from the Field Experience

Notwithstanding the concern of educators, such as Zeichner (1980), that the content areas of the field experience do not encourage reflective thinking and are in fact merely field experiences composed of conservative strategies to socialize prospective teachers into already established patterns of school practice (p. 45), the fact still remains that STs do seek a transfer of control. One of the most observable points when viewing STs is their constant look of frustration. They claim to be overburdened with work and social commitments, but in reality, it is a frustration brought on by a lack of control over their field experience.

Hultgren (1987) found a ST who stated, "My frustrations have little to do with teaching itself but rather the time and the feeling of not being able to do things as I want to do them" (p. 44). They totally understand that they are visitors in a student teaching experience involving role change which is, as Eddy (1969) stated, "deliberately
Intended to enable students to make the transition to the role of teacher . . . [and to make them aware of] the dissimilarities between the roles of student teacher and actual teacher" (p. 9).

When student teaching is entered upon by students they are seeking the ultimate goal of teacher. They are seeking knowledge and skills of how to put their learned theory into practice. They fully realize that practice teaching for them has the "texture of reality" (Lortie, 1975, p. 71).

Watts (1983) stated the following:

Cooperating teachers may simply instruct trainees in "this-is-how-I-do-it" methods and techniques. Thus, trainees learn only their cooperating teachers' pedagogical methods. This leads to an acceptance of and dependence upon the personal experiences of their cooperating teachers. As a result, teacher trainees fail to develop a body of professional knowledge, skills, and attitudes needed by and common to all teacher practitioners. (p. 161)

This statement speaks to whether the ST learns to imitate the CT or develops alternative skills and techniques to utilize in the future role as teacher. The opportunity for the ST to take risks in instruction and management and experience failures and successes must be made available. Are these experiences gained a result of learning behavior or teaching behavior? Haberman (1983) believed this confusion extended beyond the ST/CT interaction and had an effect on the manner in which the field experience is interpreted. He indicated that research in student teaching is often regarded, mistakenly, as teaching behavior rather than learning behavior (p. 98). He also reported that
individual behavior driven by knowledge and personality is not what student teaching should be viewed as but actually more an organizational behavior driven by the ecology of the field setting (p. 98).

The perceptions of the CTs and the STs are apparently crucial to this behavior. It should come as no surprise that the CT who spends sixteen weeks as the authority figure is perceived as influential by the ST. Many educators believe that this is because the ST is in the CT’s classroom, with his/her pupils and in his/her school. Watts (1983) concurred and believed that this results in an imitation of his/her attitudes and practices by the ST (p. 155).

2.12 The Cooperating Teacher and Supervisory Training

One of the questions probed was to determine why CTs chose the role of classroom supervisor. Under what circumstances and for what reasons do CTs accept the role of ST supervisor? Zimpher, deVoss, and Nott (1980) reported that CTs were not professionally involved with the training of their STs and apparently perceived STs as aides who could lighten their duties (Watts, 1983, p. 155). In contrast to this finding Applegate (1987) reported the following:

Walker and Applegate (1985) studied the expressed concerns of cooperating teachers about working with field experience students. Nine areas of concern were noted. Of particular interest were: evaluation concerns (How am I to evaluate students in field experiences? How are my evaluations used? Am I responsible for the success or failure of the student in the course?); cooperating teacher preparation concerns (How much supervision is enough? When do I
It appears from this statement that CTs could benefit greatly from supervisory training courses. Haberman and Harris (1982) conducted a study to determine what states established legal requirements for cooperating teachers. Of the fifty states contacted only two stated that they required teachers to be certified as CTs. Only nine states required supervisory courses related to student teaching.

The necessity for the CT to have some form of certification or supervisory training became obvious after reviewing some of the literature (Hoffman, 1979; Kilgore, 1979; Veldman, 1970). Moreover, Hoffman (1979) reported, "At least two-thirds of the states had no legal requirements or regulations for the appointment of a cooperating teacher" (p. 8).

Research evidence showed that more than what CTs say, but how they act, often shapes the way in which STs act. It has been suggested by Kilgore (1979) that if CTs are taught how to act, then the STs will at least imitate the correct methods of teaching styles (pp. 10-12). It has been shown by Stahl (1979) in his study that CTs trained in supervisory techniques have shown constructive changes in their attitudes and behaviors toward the STs. Possibly, as Huebner (1984) stated, an underlying component exists: "Those who claim to be educators must care for, indeed love, those they would presume to educate" (p. 118). This is not to say that supervisory training would not be advantageous.
but rather how one interacts with the trainee may depend largely on diplomatic skills and professional courtesies extended, and therefore this dimension should be included as part of the training.

2.13 Legal and Moral Responsibilities in Student Teaching

The category of Legal and Moral Responsibilities utilized in this research was developed from ideas garnered from a review of the literature by Goodlad, Soder, and Sirotnik (1990), Huebner (1984), and Veldman (1970). They presented a caveat that although supervisory training may be important, other variables involved in student teaching, including student personality and a genuine sharing between the CT and the ST, must be analyzed. Goodlad (1984) reported on an even more significant variable.

The almost unquestioned, supportive relationship between home and school that characterized earlier periods deteriorated substantially. . . . Principals and teachers could no longer assume that they stood "in loco parentis." (p. 7)

Because it seems obvious that this lack of support also had tremendous effect on the authority the CT could transfer to the ST during the practicum, the question of legal and moral obligations became an important aspect of this research. A review of the Massachusetts General Laws Annotated (1990) to peruse the legal or moral requirements necessary to participate in the student teaching field experience proved inconclusive. At best they were vague. Substitution by the ST was shown in my research to be a significant time when the ST and the CT believed a transfer of control had
Guyton and McIntyre (1990) reported the following:

Very few lawsuits and court cases have grown out of student teaching conflicts. The most common causes of lawsuits are injury to a child by the student teacher, denial of entry to student teaching, negligence, and the grade given in student teaching. . . . Considering the small number of lawsuits and even smaller number of court cases arising from student teaching, tort issues do not seem to be the most compelling legal aspects of field experiences. (p. 521)

CTs and STs have believed they had to be forever vigilant, obviously for the initial safety of the children, but also for any legal implications possibly resulting from their actions. This vigilance may be the reason why complete control may never be transferred to the ST. Many questions are largely unanswered regarding the legal status of STs and CTs. Watts (1983) reported:

In view of student teaching's central position in teacher education, it is odd that the legal and professional position of student teachers while in the school setting has not been carefully defined. . . . About three-fourths of states have no statutory definition of student teachers. Their legal status varies widely even among those states that have such definitions. . . . It is apparent, therefore, that the legal status of student teachers remains largely unresolved. (pp. 152-153)

However, regardless of the STs' legal status, it remained a constant worry for the CTs.

You have to kind of monitor the kids of things that might come off the top of a student teacher's head. You do run into problems. . . . And occasionally you do get feedback from students [pupils]. . . . What I didn't realize was what was going on behind closed doors. The student teacher was getting very informal with the students and in order to discipline, he was using swear words, words just not acceptable in the
classroom. But . . . parents had heard about this. And here we are in this situation, responsible for what's going on in the classroom and we didn't know. You have to monitor more carefully. I just made some assumptions that nobody would walk into a classroom and swear. (Britzman, 1985, p. 422)

2.14 The Socialization of the Student Teacher

It is believed that the socialization of the ST is significant in the development of his/her ability to deal with classroom situations. Many studies have employed the theme of ST socialization to examine student teaching and have suggested the relationship of that classroom process to instruction and management (Davies and Amershak, 1969; Deal and Chatman, 1989; Houston, 1990; Lortie, 1975; Richardson-Koehler, 1988; Zimpher et al., 1980). Questions arose in this literature as to which participants (SVs, CTs, principals, etc.) are involved in the overall field experience and play a role in the socialization of the ST. Socialization and the eventual assumption of the role of teacher is an expectation that all STs seek to experience. Shulman (1987) confirmed this by stating that the STs' perspectives on teaching change positively as they assume the role of teacher. Those who achieve the transfer of control early and are actively involved in the instructional aspects of their field experience are extremely enthusiastic, whereas those who remain as observers and aides and do not receive a transfer of control are extremely frustrated and discouraged (p. 17).
Eddy (1969) stated that the primary function of the student teaching experience is to make the transition to the role of teacher (p. 9). For this to occur the CT must be willing to transfer control. The obvious authority differences between the ST and CT cause the necessity for the transfer of control to the ST. Although the transition is gradual, it is perceived as a role change of limited degrees between the CT and the ST. This transition occurs from the onset of the practicum. Eddy (1969) stated that "van Gennep called this the 'rites de passage'" and noted that "most of these rituals have three components—separation, transition, and incorporation—and provide a symbolic expression of the actual changes in the relationships of the individuals to others in their society" (p. 21).

The three components involve the ST's separation from the role of student at the university to the transitional phase of obtaining the transfer of control, and ultimately the assumption of the role of teacher. Socialization, active throughout the internship, is a total immersion by the ST into the process of obtaining the role of teacher and of becoming an integral part of the school-based field site.

However, a ST often feels like a stranger in a strange land. Is the historical isolation of many classroom teachers, especially beginning teachers, as cited by Moran (1990, p. 211), endemic and therefore incorporated by the ST during the practicum into his/her understanding of what the
role of teacher is? "Wilbur and Goodling (1977) noted that teacher trainees became progressively more concealing and less willing to share professionally with their peers" (Watts, 1983, p. 156). Does this isolation create a stronger bond between the CT and ST and hasten the transition of the transfer of control and the ultimate socialization of the ST? Obviously the demographics and ecology of the school-based site play an important role. The question is does this isolation also create a dependency on the CT by the ST which may result in imitation and further impede the total socialization process?

Lortie (1975) reported that student teaching is part of a continuum of learning that involves life experiences and beliefs. These experiences are brought to bear on the socialization of the trainee. However, the problem arises in the lack of a specific structure to welcome the ST into the profession. He believed that this may be a problem peculiar to education.

We begin, then, with the general expectation that initial socialization into teaching will be somewhat less involved than that found in the historic professions or arcane crafts, since the conditions we generally associate with a rich subculture do not prevail for classroom teaching. (Lortie, 1975, p. 56)

As previously stated, it is believed the socialization process is related to instruction and management (Houston, 1990; Lortie, 1975; Richardson-Koehler, 1988). The review of literature implied that possibly the major factor indicating socialization and thus the readiness of the ST to
assume the role of teacher may be found in the area of classroom management.

2.15 The Impact of Classroom Management on Student Teaching

The literature referred to classroom management as being a primary concern of both the CTs and the STs. Classroom management, in a general sense, refers to the routines of teaching and running a classroom; in particular, it refers to discipline. Reed (1989) reported on a recent survey regarding classroom management/discipline.

Forty-four percent of public school teachers reported more disruptive behavior in their schools in 1986-87 as compared to five years earlier. Because of the discipline problems, 29% had seriously considered leaving the teaching profession. Fourteen percent said that student behavior greatly interfered with their teaching, and 27% said it greatly interfered with effective learning. (p. 59)

Shulman (1987) found a ST, Debbie, not knowing whose responsibility it was to discipline the students, seeing conflicting expectations and looking for what was good for her, and then conferencing with Kathy, her CT, about management problems and setting up strict guidelines with the students. Shulman does not disclose the in-depth discussion of the conference, but her concluding sentence implied that Debbie may not have been allowed to define her own discipline strategies, and possibly may have disagreed with some of her CT's input. "[Debbie] tried to adhere to these restrictions until she assumed the teacher role" (p. 19).
Two major generalizations we can glean from the literature regarding student teaching are first, the practicality of learning teaching techniques or theories of teaching and second, that classroom management, as stated by Haberman (1983), is not only "a major priority but a concern of overriding magnitude" (p. 110). The reality of discipline is so overwhelming to many STs that until they internalize it and develop solutions, problems in instruction exist. In her study on student teaching Hollingsworth (1989) found that STs adjusted to classroom management demands.

Both Chris and Lynda changed their incoming beliefs about classroom management and established balanced routines. . . . They developed cognitive "scripts" for management that appeared to free mental "space" to think about subject, task design, and what pupils were learning from those tasks. (p. 176)

From these two previous statements it seems obvious that an emphasis on developing disciplinary strategies should be included as part of the STs' preservice courses. Reed (1989) found that at the Virginia Commonwealth University, Richmond, the STs are "required to participate in weekly seminars whose topics include School Law, The School as a Social Organization, and Classroom Management and Discipline" (p. 60).

Solid classroom management skills create the atmosphere to develop learning and teaching styles. These styles encourage the use of a variety of instructional techniques which increase the interest and enthusiasm in the children and decrease discipline problems. However, STs must
consider the latitude in the degrees of freedom to make decisions as allowed by the CT. STs studied by Hultgren (1987) lamented:

I'm being told to do it my way but the real message is "Do it your own way but make sure it's our way". . . . We are too vulnerable at this point to break the system no matter how much we may want to. (pp. 44-45)

In surveying selected areas of the literature, it became quite evident that there are multiple variables involved in the transfer of control and the degrees of freedom to make decisions allowed by the CT to the ST. This leads the reader to believe that unless the transfer takes place, the possible result is failure in the field experience. Feiman-Nemser and Buchman (1986) stated:

If no one requires Sue to practice making and justifying instructional decisions or to consider the consequences of given actions in a specific practical context, she may get confirmed in a view of teaching as filling time, keeping children busy, perpetuating familiar practices without considering their consequences for pupil learning, in the short and long run. (p. 69)

It is obvious that Feiman-Nemser and Buchman believed that the transfer of control was not occurring for Sue and she was destined to be unsuccessful during her practicum. Perceivably Sue might also develop perceptions and attitudes detrimental to her role as a future teacher.

Ryan (1975) believed that as with beginning teachers, STs vary in wanting authority and they are less assertive in the classroom because they do not necessarily want to be like the CT (p. 180). In addition to this Applegate (1987) found that "success in student teaching comes from the
personal relationships developed with the cooperating teacher" (p. 81). Is there a conflict between the ST developing a personal relationship with the CT but not wanting to imitate his/her instructional or classroom management strategies and techniques? It does not appear to be the case. In spite of the ST/CT relationship, to develop the ST’s own teaching style and management techniques, deviation from the CT’s norm must occur.

It would seem that, although conflict may be minimal, disagreements and differences do occur in the ST/CT relationship due to the ST deviating from the norm of the CT (Hultgren, 1987). If these eventually create a conflict, it should be resolved as soon as possible. It is apparently another hurdle for the ST to overcome. Haberman (1983) expressed the difficulty in trying to create change: "Studies on deviation . . . suggest that the freedom to deviate is fairly fragile even for members who have paid their dues with long years of obedience" (p. 113).

Although Felman-Nemser and Buchman (1986) reported that instructional teaching styles and classroom management techniques are significant concerns in student teaching, Deal and Chatman (1989) found that STs are placed in classrooms with little background information or support to help them explore and eventually utilize their educational philosophy. They are often left to sink or swim, to be set adrift with no evidence of communication or guidelines from either the SV or the CT (Deal and Chatman, 1989, p. 24).
This raised the question of how much learning can take place during the practicum in this absence of direction, especially for those STs whose educational philosophy and strategy and their allowed degrees of freedom to act upon it are in their infancy. The degrees of freedom are apparently doled out based on the criteria, both implicit and explicit, of the CT. However, the ST can play a major role in initiating the transfer by being assertive, questioning, and involved in classroom activities. Also, the ST's personality could have a great influence on the transfer of control (Veldman, 1970, p. 166).

These degrees of freedom must be tempered with support and feedback unlike the experience of Shulman's (1987) Debbie: "Ms. Cathcart gave Debbie complete freedom to design and implement instruction in any way she chose, and essentially left the class for six weeks" (p. 26). This is not merely allowing the ST the freedom to make decisions; this is unrestricted license by the CT and it may be unprofessional. More specifically, it may be abusive to the ST for the CT to practice this. The prevalence of leaving the STs to fend for themselves led Deal and Chatman (1989) to examine this strategy:

The "sink-or-swim" strategy is very common in public schools. . . . "Sink-or-swim" is clearly the strategy employed most often as teachers are thrust into classrooms with little information and limited support. (p. 24)

Although this can be devastating to a ST, the literature recorded that he/she can adjust to this situation
What lies in doubt is the quality of his/her field experience and his/her readiness to function in his/her own classroom as a beginning teacher. Etheridge pointed to a phenomenon called "strategic adjustment" wherein the ST consciously selects those practices which modify or replace initially desired practices. This allows the ST to perceive what he/she is doing is acceptable even though it is not part of his/her own beliefs (1989, p. 32).

This "sink-or-swim" mentality should not be a part of a qualified CT's organizational approach to allowing degrees of freedom in decision-making and ultimately transferring classroom control. It is with this transfer that the ST grows professionally and becomes qualified to be called teacher.

2.16 Conclusion

The review of literature pointed out the importance of the student teaching experience as a period of professional growth, incorporating a tremendous number of variables. These variables play a role in the ST's acquisition of professional pedagogical skills and theory. These skills and theories should be tried and tested during the preservice experience. This expression of professional development involves adult learning and requires STs selecting goals, that, as Duke (1990) determined, must characterize a form of risk-taking, and not an acceptance of the status quo. Without risk-taking and experimentation the ST is neglecting his/her opportunity for growth during the
preservice experience. However, Duke cautioned that "too slavish a devotion to goal-guided growth actually may interfere with meaningful professional development" (p. 75).

The review of literature demonstrates that for professional growth to occur an atmosphere as well as an arena must be available wherein the transfer of control can take place. It is necessary then that an awareness of the transition of authority between the CT and the ST must be identified and regularly scheduled implementation of risk-taking goals and activities must be allowed. The degrees of freedom allowed by the CT to the ST to make decisions are a significant factor for the success of the preservice experience.
3.1 The Research Design

The research explored the perceptions and expectations of elementary school STs and CTs relative to the events leading up to the transferring of authority for classroom control. The methodology involved a triangulation of data from oral interviews (McCracken, 1988; Spradley, 1979), classroom observations (Good and Brophy, 1984; Metzler, 1981; Siedentop, 1976), and questionnaires (Cussen, 1974; Wolfson and Nash, 1965; Hunt et al., 1978; Ingersoll, 1984; Nisbet, 1990). Collected data from these three phases were analyzed to identify rationales, patterns of agreement, and signals and processes used by the ST and the CT to facilitate a mutually acceptable transition. In addition, a purpose of the research was to describe, through the presentation and analysis of collected data, the significance of the transfer of control and the degrees of freedom allowed in decision-making during the transition process.

A major consideration involved the definition of the transfer of control and the degrees of freedom as the CT transfers the role of authority to the ST. Appendix A lists specialized terms and defines how they were utilized in this research. Various questions were considered. What criteria do the ST and the CT use to determine readiness? Is it
mostly subjective or have specific goals, objectives, and expectations been met? Is there a predictable time-sequence for this transition of responsibility? Is there a lead-in discussion to set the stages for this transition or does it occur randomly? What implicit and explicit rules of control and empowerment are involved in the decision? When is the ST allowed to deal with the consequences of decision-making? At what point is the CT willing to "let go" of his/her control? At what point is the ST willing to accept this control? These and other questions concerning the transfer of control, responsibility, and authority were investigated.

3.2 Categories Guiding the Research

The following major constructs indirectly derived from the literature were used to guide the analysis of the data in the research: Time Sequence, Readiness, Formal Communication - Conferences, Informal Communication - Cues and Signs, Degrees of Freedom and Proximity, and Legal and Moral Responsibilities (APPENDIX B). The list of these six categories was developed and defined after a review of the literature pertinent to the topic of student teaching research, in particular Miles and Huberman (1984), failed to produce an adequate conceptual framework or instrument to guide or measure the investigation of the transfer of control from the CT to the ST. The derivation of these categories is explained as follows:

Time Sequence was developed as a category because an organizational structure needs a time-frame in which to
work. Also significant to analyze were the perceptions of CTs and STs as to when they perceive they have transferred and/or received control. It was believed that the analysis might show an existing series of steps within a required period of time allowing for the transfer of control to begin and to regulate its progression.

**Readiness** was designed as a category because it was believed that some form of criteria must be present in order for the transitional period to begin. It was believed that there might exist patterns of readiness utilized by CTs before they would begin the transfer of control.

**Formal Communication - Conferences** was included as a category because the literature indicated the significance of feedback exchanged between the CT and the ST during student teaching. It was believed that conferencing played a significant role leading toward the transfer of control.

**Informal Communication - Cues and Signs** was developed as a category because of the numerous times it emerged as a significant factor in seminar discussions involving supervisory observations and the role of the CT as a facilitator. It was believed that there might be a significant amount of verbal and non-verbal communication between CTs and STs which sets the stage for the transfer.

**Degrees of Freedom and Proximity** was designed as a category because it was believed that the proximity of the CT might regulate or limit the degrees of freedom that the
ST experienced in decision-making during the transfer of control.

Finally, a Legal and Moral Responsibilities category was included because it was believed that a pattern might exist in the awareness by the STs and CTs of their legal responsibilities and the moral obligations and risk factors that legal responsibility has on instructional and classroom management organization relative to the transfer of control.

3.3 Instrumentation

The instruments utilized to collect the data across the three phases of this research were interviews, observations, and questionnaires. The interviews were the taped audio responses of STs and CTs to specific sets of questions designed for each group relative to the transfer of control. The observations were conducted in classrooms of the participating STs and CTs to investigate their actual interactions throughout the practicum affecting the transfer of control. The interviews and observations comprised Phases 1 and 2 respectively and simultaneously involved the same population of STs and CTs.

In Phase 3 two questionnaires, one objective and the other subjective in design, were utilized to investigate the perceptions and beliefs of STs and CTs relative to decision-making authority during the transfer of control. The questionnaires were administered simultaneously to the same population of STs and CTs although a different
population and student teaching semester than those utilized in Phases 1 and 2 were involved.

3.4 Research Populations

The participants in all three phases of the research were elementary preservice STs and elementary school CTs. The STs were students affiliated with a teacher education program at a university located in western Massachusetts. The CTs were staff members of schools located in communities surrounding the university. The elementary preservice student teaching field experience involved a sixteen-week elementary level practicum.

3.4.1 Population in Phases 1 and 2

In Phase 1 - Oral Interviews and Phase 2 - Classroom Observations a population of the same sets of STs and their CTs were paired in the research process. The rationale for this was to interview the STs and CTs individually and then to observe the participant pairs in their classrooms in order to compare and contrast their interview responses with actual classroom interactions. There were ten STs and their CTs who volunteered to participate. All ten ST/CT sets satisfactorily completed the oral interviews and classroom observations (TABLES 1 and 2).

The ST/CT population of Phases 1 and 2 was located in two school districts. Grades one through six inclusive were represented in this stage of the research. In the first
TABLE 1

Student Teacher Profiles - Phases 1 and 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code Name</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Year in College</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sarah</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Senior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>5th year Senior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debra</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Senior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joanne</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Senior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donna</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>Post B.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taylor</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Senior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gerry</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Senior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casey</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>2nd year Masters Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marle</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Senior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marva</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Senior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code Name</td>
<td>Highest Degree Earned</td>
<td>Number of Years Teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claire</td>
<td>M.Ed.</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janice</td>
<td>M.Ed.+60</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dana</td>
<td>M.Ed.</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fran</td>
<td>B.A.</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara</td>
<td>M.Ed.+30</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gall</td>
<td>M.Ed.+30</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris</td>
<td>B.A.</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meg</td>
<td>B.S. El.Ed.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joyce</td>
<td>M.Ed.</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robin</td>
<td>B.A.</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
school district three of the STs were assigned to a small rural school. The total population of this school was 202 pupils. One of the three STs was assigned respectively to a Grade 3, a Grade 4, and a Grade 6 classroom. In the second district the other seven STs were distributed within three schools in a large, economically and ethnically diversified community. One ST was assigned to a combined classroom of Grades 1 and 2 in a school having a total population of 416 pupils. The next four STs were assigned to a second school with a total population of 395 pupils. The first two STs were each assigned to a Grade 1 classroom, one ST to a Grade 4 classroom, and the fourth to a Grade 6 classroom. The remaining school had a total population of 591 and the last two STs were assigned respectively to a Grade 3 and a Grade 5 classroom.

Initial contact was made with the STs at a seminar in the teacher education program at the university. Of those ten STs interested in participating, permission to visit the school sites where they were assigned to do their student teaching was obtained. Principals at all the involved school sites were visited by the researcher prior to any formal contact with the CTs. The principals allowed the ultimate choice to accept or reject participation in this research to the CTs. When the ten STs and CTs agreed to participate in the research they each signed a waiver consent form (APPENDIX C). All of the participants
satisfactorily completed all components of the research agreed upon for Phases 1 and 2.

3.4.2 Population in Phase 3

In Phase 3 - Questionnaires the population surveyed was not the population interviewed and observed in Phases 1 and 2. The difference was due to the fact that the STs participating in Phases 1 and 2 had completed their practicums. It was desirable for this third phase of the research to have STs currently serving in the field, and their CTs, as participants. This population was comprised of STs and CTs serving in the field at the same time but not necessarily in the same classrooms. For this phase of the research process it was not required to have responses from paired sets of STs and CTs. The rationale for this was that the data collected were not to be analyzed in sets of STs and CTs but rather in a more general contrast and comparison to augment the data throughout the research.

There were fifteen STs and their CTs who volunteered to participate. The rationale for the large number of STs and CTs requested to participate was due to the advice of the researcher’s advisors who warned the percentage of returns on questionnaires to be unpredictable at best. From the fifteen STs and CTs volunteering to participate, eight STs and nine CTs satisfactorily completed the questionnaires (TABLES 3 and 4).

In Phase 3 the population was located in two school districts. Except for Grade 5, all Grades 1 through 6 were
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code Name</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Year in College</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emily</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Senior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terry</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Senior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marissa</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Senior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elaine</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Senior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Senior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patricia</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Senior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roberta</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Senior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meghan</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Senior</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## TABLE 4

Cooperating Teacher Profiles - Phase 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Highest Degree Earned</th>
<th>Number of Years Teaching</th>
<th>Number of Student Teachers</th>
<th>Cooperating Teacher Training Program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carol</td>
<td>C.A.G.S.</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tim</td>
<td>M.Ed.</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lee</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kate</td>
<td>C.A.G.S.</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lauren</td>
<td>B.A.</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>25+</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pat</td>
<td>M.Ed.+30</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>30+</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lois</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>15+</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gayle</td>
<td>M.Ed.</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N/A = Not Answered
represented in this phase of the research. Three of the STs were located in a small rural school with a population of 215 pupils. This was a different rural district and school than the one utilized in Phases 1 and 2. This change of school had no impact on the research because the school site was not a variable investigated in the research. The three STs were assigned to classrooms for a Grade 1, a Grade 3, and a Grade 3/4 combination respectively. The second community was the same ethnically and economically diversified community utilized in Phases 1 and 2, but this time four school sites were involved. In a school with a pupil population of 416, four STs were assigned to a Grade 1/2 combination, a Grade 3/4 combination, a Grade 3, and a Grade 6 classroom respectively. Another ST was assigned to a Grade 6 classroom in a school with a population of 395 pupils. Three other STs were assigned to classrooms for a Grade 1/2 combination, a Grade 2/3 combination, and a Grade 4 respectively, in a school with a population of 250 pupils. The remaining four STs were assigned to a school with a population of 591 pupils in classrooms for Grades 1, 2, 4, and 6 respectively.

Initial contact was made with the STs, school principals, and the CTs involved in Phase 3 in the same manner as in Phases 1 and 2. A Questionnaires Package was then distributed and explained to each ST and CT at his/her school site. Each package contained the list of terms and their definitions (APPENDIX A), the list of categories
(APPENDIX B), a copy of the waiver consent form (APPENDIX F), the directions and instrument for the "Who Decides?" Questionnaire (APPENDICES G and H) and for the Paragraph Response Questionnaire (APPENDICES I and J), and a ST/CT profile sheet (APPENDIX K). Only eight of the fifteen STs and nine of the fifteen CTs returned the completed forms and questionnaires in compliance with the directions to be included in the actual research data.

3.4.3 Population Coding Process

Because there were so many participants across the phases of this research it was believed a numbering system of assigning a code number for each of the participants could cause the reader to inadvertently or incorrectly match STs with their CTs, or otherwise confuse their identity. For record keeping and reporting purposes in this research, a system of assigning a code name for each of the participants was used. No real names were used at any point in this research in order to maintain the anonymity of all the participants.

To protect their identity, code names were substituted for each real name of the participants. In order to eliminate any matching clues or gender clues from the context of the quotes, whenever necessary [CT] was substituted for all references made by a ST to the name of or pronoun for his/her CT and [CT's] for all possessive adjectives. The same pattern was used for the reverse situation of a CT's references to his/her ST. Additionally.
all other informational data, such as class size or grade assignment, that might identify participants or match CT/ST pairs, were not included in the reference tables.

3.5 Oral Interviews

In Phase 1 the oral interview technique was the instrumentation utilized to collect the data. Common pools of interview questions relative to the six research categories were put together. There was a separate set of thirty-plus questions for the STs and for the CTs (APPENDICES D and E). The first few questions were introductory and informational in nature to establish a rapport with the interviewee. Spradley (1979) referred to this type of questioning as "grand-tour questions" (pp. 86-87).

The main body of questions centered on the transitional period and the major components affecting the transfer of control within the framework of the six categories. These sections were comprised of the terms as listed in Appendix A and were defined further for the interviewee as they were introduced during the progression of the interview session. This procedure disciplined the responses and gave direction to the interview.

When the data showed some of the questions drew unclear responses from more than two-thirds of the interviewees, those questions and responses were eliminated from the final analysis. When valid and significant responses appeared in the data for which there had not been any originally
assigned specific questions, this new information was added to the final analysis. The data were then presented in the body of the research as general findings and more specific comments as quoted material. The rationale for this part of the process was to maintain a focus on the transfer of control and the relative patterns involved in the transfer.

This first phase of the study involved audio-taped oral interviews of the ten ST/CT pairs. McCracken (1988) advocated the long interview technique as the most revealing instrument of inquiry for descriptive and analytical purposes (p. 9).

Separate fifty-minute interview sessions were set up for each member of the ten pairs with specific questions to determine how they each arrived at the decision to yield/accept the transfer of control. In addition, opportunities for free responses and comments were presented and encouraged. The interviews were scheduled at the convenience of the interviewees. Various places and times, such as in their home, at the university, and at the school site during and after school hours were arranged. A Sony tape recorder equipped with a digital counter was used. A TDK D90-minute tape was used for each participant to insure adequate response time.

Each of the taped interviews of the CTs and the STs were processed by coding the name of each interviewee as described in the research design. The data from the oral interview tapes were reviewed and recorded in the following
manner. A portfolio comprised of the six categories was compiled for each participant. The quotes from each interview tape were transcribed and the counter readings for all representations within each category were recorded. This facilitated the location and documentation of specific remarks as quoted in the context of the research.

3.6 Classroom Observations

The second phase of the study involved classroom observations on the same population and pairs of ST/CT participants involved in the oral interviews of Phase 1. One rationale for this approach was based on Spradley's (1979) statement that the participant observer should observe the activities, people, and physical aspects of the situation under study (p. 54). All procedures and waiver consent agreements were those utilized in the first phase of the study (APPENDIX C). All processing procedures involving ST and CT information were continued in Phase 2 in order to protect the identity of each participant.

Guided by the observational techniques proposed by Good and Brophy (1984), Metzler (1981), and Siedentop (1976) the ten paired participants were observed in their classrooms over a period of twelve weeks starting the fifth week. The fifth week was chosen because Shulman (1987) had suggested that the transfer of control, as a rule of thumb, took place during the fourth week of the practicum. Another reason observations began at this time was because it was believed by this researcher that by this time the CT and the ST might
have already established a relationship that could sustain an outside observation of their interactions, thus limiting classroom interruptions. The classroom observations consisted of two fifty-minute periods per week for each pair.

The tools of observation were a pencil and pad and the "eyeballing" technique discussed by Metzler (1981, p. 152) and Siedentop (1976, p. 24). This method was used only as an observational technique by this researcher and not as a supervisory technique to be followed up with feedback in conferencing with the ST. The process was to observe the CT and ST interacting and was limited to investigating the transitional period of the transfer of control and the degrees of freedom and proximity allowed the ST by the CT in regards to decision-making. As reviewed in the literature by Good and Brophy (1984), these limited patterns of behavior between the CT and the ST were observed in order to limit prejudices on the part of the researcher. The classroom observations were perceived as being the framework for the physical and visual interpretation and understanding of the oral interview data collected in Phase 1. The data from these observation sessions were used to complement and contrast the data from the oral interviews.

Good and Brophy (1984) warned those who were looking in classrooms that "observers who want to see what life in a classroom is like must be careful not to disturb the natural flow of behavior in the classroom. By natural we simply
mean the behavior that would take place in the classroom if the observer were not present" (p. 61). In keeping with this caveat, this researcher was introduced to all the pupils by the CT and ST of each classroom to explain the process of the research. I requested they try to ignore me as much as possible whenever I was present for observations. During these classroom visitations the CTs and STs were observed in transition during and between lessons and on their way to specialists, drama practice, lunch, recess, art, and gym classes. Observations were made as to who was making the decisions during these classroom activities and transitions. The primary focus was on the question of degrees of freedom and proximity and their relationship to the decision-making authority involved in the transfer of control. In particular observations were made on the verbal and non-verbal interjections of the CT and the physical presence of the CT in relation to the ST and to the pupils within the classroom. Focus was on both of these areas because it was believed that they might be crucial aspects of the transfer of control and because they might afford the investigation a point of uniformity within each classroom under observation. This uniformity would allow for a strict discipline of maintaining the focus of the research.

3.7 Questionnaires

The third phase of the research consisted of two questionnaires, the "Who Decides?" Questionnaire and the
Paragraph Response Questionnaire (APPENDICES H and J). The first questionnaire was developed by the researcher as an adaptation of the "Who Decides?" Questionnaire used by Wolfson and Nash (1965) and revised by Cussen (1974). Its purpose was to investigate who is making the decisions about what is happening in the classroom. All areas of instruction (e.g., curriculum and teaching styles) and classroom management (e.g., routines and discipline) were components of the questionnaire. The respondent was to check one of three categories for each of the one hundred questions. The second questionnaire was designed by the researcher and utilized a paragraph response strategy similar to the Paragraph Completion Method used by Hunt et al. (1978), Ingersoll (1984), and Nisbet (1990). Its purpose was to allow the participants a more open-ended response in addition to the limited response style of the first questionnaire. Directions asked for a brief answer, beyond a mere yes or no, in response to each of the twenty questions. This allowed the respondents to expand on their thoughts where they deemed it necessary. Both instruments were administered individually and completed privately by each respondent. Each respondent was given the questionnaires during the ninth or tenth week and the completed materials were collected at the conclusion of the practicum.
3.7.1 The "Who Decides?" Questionnaire

The first questionnaire was comprised of one hundred questions designed to determine who is making the decisions during the student teaching preservice experience. The respondent selected from one of three categories (ST for student teacher; CT for cooperating teacher; SV for supervisor) by checking one category for each question item to determine who makes the decision for that item. The questions are organized in the following manner. Questions 1-21 are general overview questions. Then a set of nineteen questions is repeated for each of four time periods during the course of the practicum. Questions 22-40 are for Weeks 1-3; questions 41-59 are for Weeks 4-8; questions 60-78 are for Weeks 9-13; questions 79-97 are for Weeks 14-16. Questions 98-100 apply directly to Master Week, the traditional final week of student teaching. The purpose was to identify a pattern of decision-making involving the transferring of control from the CT to the ST and to determine if there was an identifiable time frame within which this transfer occurs.

3.7.2 The Paragraph Response Questionnaire

The second questionnaire was comprised of twenty questions related to the six categories guiding this research and to which the respondents were asked to briefly answer in paragraph form. A yes or no response was not considered a proper response. Participants were specifically directed not to answer in this limited way.
The purpose of the paragraph response questionnaire was to determine the perceptions of the CT and the ST and the degrees of freedom in decision-making as experienced during the transfer of control over the course of the practicum.

3.7.3 Questionnaires Data Collection Process

The process for collecting the data from the "Who Decides?" Questionnaire involved the compilation of the ST and CT responses as recorded as Table 5 (APPENDIX L). The first group analyzed was the set of CT responses. A tally was made for each question based on the selection of the ST, CT, SV column chosen by each participant in this group. The totals of the CT responses were recorded in Table 5 as the numerator. The same process was used for a second time for the set of ST responses. The totals of the ST responses were recorded in Table 5 as the denominator. With this method of recording the data the totals for each individual question could be compared between the two sets of participants, the CTs and the STs, as well as to analyze the responses of each group separately to discern any patterns or perceptions in the shifting of the decision-making responsibility throughout the course of the practicum. Although there were eight CT and nine ST respondents, the total tally of CT or ST responses for each question was sometimes greater than or less than the actual number of participants. The reason for this difference was sometimes a respondent made no response by leaving the item blank or
checked multiple columns indicating a sharing of the decision-making authority.

With the Paragraph Response Questionnaire the collected data were presented through specific quotes which were included within the body of the research. These responses allowed for a contrast and comparison analysis of the data from the "Who Decides?" Questionnaire. The total collected data from this third phase of the research were further analyzed for contrast and comparison with the collected data from the other two phases of the research.

3.8 Presentation of the Collected Data

The collected data from all three phases of the study were presented within the body of the research. Various methods were utilized for this presentation. First, the data supplied general background information about the CTs and the STs. This information was reported in the first four tables. Second, the data were comprised of perceived and actual situations, both reported and observed, involving decision-making between the CT and ST during the transfer of control. This information became the main material for the completion of the framework of the study. Third, the data were comprised of specific details supporting the research questions. When multiple participant responses to a single question or variable in the research were referred to in the written text of the research, the general thoughts were quoted, but not referenced in order to economize space and to maximize fluidity. In reporting longer, more specific
responses the material was quoted and referenced with the respondent's name. With the oral interview data, the material was quoted with the respondent's name followed by the counter reading for that specific portion of the interview tape. Fourth, data collected from the "Who Decides?" Questionnaire were tallied and recorded in Table 5 as well as being interpreted and incorporated within the text of the study with all the other components of the three phases of the research.

3.9 Conclusion

The data collected from the three phases of the research were analyzed and interpreted within the framework of the questions guiding the research. Significant factors that affect the transfer of control in instruction and classroom management were sought. Some of these factors were time sequences, series of steps for readiness, cues and signs, degrees of freedom, proximity of the CT, nature of conferences, and perceptions of legal and moral responsibility. Data from all three phases of the research, the recorded interviews, the classroom observations, and the questionnaires, were contrasted and compared to find patterns of congruence within the six categories guiding the research. In particular the data were perused to determine the importance of the degrees of freedom in decision-making as experienced by the ST to the rate of progress of the transfer of control and overall mastery of the process by the ST during the preservice clinical experience. The
collected data involving decision-making between the ST and the CT during the transfer of control are substantial and may be worthy of consideration as significant components of the student teaching field experience practicum.
CHAPTER 4

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

4.1 Introduction

The purpose of this study was to focus on the granting of authority by the CT to the ST involving the transfer of control and decision-making authority during the ST's field experience. The limitations and restrictions on the degrees of freedom allowed in instruction and classroom management styles during this transition were investigated and the findings are presented here. The research techniques utilized in this triangulation methodology were audio-taped interviews - Phase 1, classroom observations - Phase 2, and questionnaires - Phase 3.

4.2 Presentation and Analysis of Interview Data

Following the interview techniques espoused by Spradley (1979) and McCracken (1988), the researcher sought in Phase 1 to obtain responses from the CTs and STs within the frame of reference of an actual on-going experience following the fourth week of a sixteen-week, semester-long student teaching practicum.

The interviews were processed and substantial evidence was found to support the existence of the transfer of control involving decision-making and the major role it plays in the success of the student teaching field experience.
In order to adequately report on all six categories (APPENDIX B) across both groups of participants each of the twenty tapes was listened to and the data transcribed from each tape were coded, analyzed, and documented in every category. The data in each group were studied separately for uniqueness and then again for comparison within that group for generalizations and patterns. Then various responses from both groups as well as the generalizations from both groups were compared and contrasted to determine the significance of the transfer of control and the degrees of freedom in decision-making allowed during the transition of the transfer of control.

4.2.1 Student Teacher Interviews

4.2.1.1 Time Sequence

During the course of the research the STs stated that they were not overwhelmed by the impending practicum experience as one might generally expect. In fact, several interns expressed their exasperation at the slow immersion process followed by their CTs in getting them involved in real duties, as reported in Shulman (1987). When interviewed in this research, none of the ten STs had developed a personal set of criteria for the transition from the role of ST to the role of teacher.

At the beginning it was . . . very difficult . . . [the pupils] like you: you’re their friend . . . you have to break that. . . . The hardest part is keeping the role of the teacher . . . it came slowly.

(Taylor, 41-49)
It became a period of mutual testing between the CT and the ST. The CT time sequence was an implicit rather than an explicit criterion for the CT, so the ST reacted accordingly. There was no definite time sequence; therefore the different personality traits of the STs came into play. The range for these traits started from "non-assertiveness":

I just followed basically what [CT] did . . . [CT] introduced me to [CT's] discipline ways . . . I took on slowly what [CT] expected of [CT's] classroom because I did not feel I was ready to do what I felt like in [CT's] class. I don't want to step on anybody's toes . . . there may be things that bother [CT] if you go too far. (Anne, 46-59)

Because of this non-assertive attitude, even though Anne believed she had assumed control to make decisions concerning the classroom by about the sixth week, the researcher's classroom observations and discussions with the CT discerned that it was about the twelfth week. Clearly a difference in perception existed in this situation. This is a crucial aspect of understanding the transfer of control and the degrees of freedom allowed, in reality and perception, by both the ST and the CT.

The range continued to "assertiveness" where the STs felt confident from past prepracticum experiences that they could begin the transition. Six out of ten believed they were approaching it gradually and were not being thrown in unprepared. Responsibility was progressive and included feedback from the CT (Joanne, 38-43). However, some of the other assertive STs guessed they were being tested (based on the CT data, they were) to see how they behaved in the
classroom and with the students (Sarah, 32-37). In the majority of cases the STs felt a gradual time sequence that was not random. It was orchestrated by the CT, but it was never clearly defined.

During the course of the semester as [CT] gave me more control, [CT] would say, "Oh! We're at this point now . . . four weeks, you should be doing. . . ." Maybe [CT] has something set in [CT's] head, but we didn't have anything down on paper. (Taylor, 117-128)

Four out of ten of the CTs stated that they did in fact have an implicit time sequence, but only two ever mentioned it to the STs, and those who did, mentioned it in a very vague manner. Although they had not received one, many of the STs felt a time sequence would have been extremely beneficial. One ST commented

I think from my style, I happen to lack confidence. I tend to hang back . . . it would have been beneficial for me to have more of a timeline. (Donna, 47-52)

As the range continued it was hard to define the STs as being overly assertive or naively unaware of the realities of the situation in which they actually were and in which they perceived themselves. This suggested the possibility of making Perception a category in future research in this area. One ST reiterated the fact that she had control from "day one," but this was not supported by her CT or by the classroom observations. Her statement continued

[There was] no time sequence . . . [CT] would not have chosen me as a teacher if [CT] thought I couldn't take control. (Debra, 45-51)

As regards the STs' perceptions of time sequence, it was apparent they were not aware of an explicit one but were
definitely aware of an implicit sequential and gradual time sequence to assimilate the classroom routines. When they were asked if they received instruction or classroom management assignments first, seven out of ten were mostly unsure. "I think they came hand-in-hand . . . but possibly I think instructional before managerial, but I'm not sure" (Sarah, 65-70).

The study showed the STs having uncertainty about any definite time sequence except that the transfer of control had, or had not, taken place prior to Master Week. STs' reflection on the educational philosophy of what they were striving to achieve seemed very vague. This vagueness could be attributed to the survival mentality prominent in the minds of the STs. As Fuller (1969) observed, "STs entering teaching are concerned about survival: Where do I stand? How adequate am I? How do others think I am doing?" (p. 214). It follows that, as Campbell and Williamson (1973) found, "the criterion of success was often the amount of personal satisfaction generated rather than the achievement of instructional objectives" (pp. 168-169).

4.2.1.2 Readiness

For the most part the STs stated they had developed no personal criteria for establishing readiness to assume control. While one ST felt "nothing," three others felt their course of action was to "do what I'm told," "just plunge in," or "jump right in," while another tried to "seek respect." As a semblance of a pattern for readiness three
STs used "past prepracticum experiences" and "feelings of having to establish a figure of authority with [pupils]" by observing . . . seeing what [CT’s] responsibilities included. . . . I stepped in foot-by-foot until I felt I had control over what [CT] has control over. (Marva, 27-32)

However, all of the STs were fully aware of teacher control and the necessity for the transfer of that control to have occurred before they could assume the role of teacher.

When asked if the transition during the transfer of control had been a tug-of-war or smooth sailing, seven out of ten responded that it was smooth with a few minor tugs, back and forth. Most of the small tugs related to the proximity of and the interjections by the CT, although some were a little more serious, as this ST described:

Sometimes I’ll try to take on more, then [CT] will step in. . . . I might do something a little bit different than [CT] did . . . then [CT] will realize . . . "Oops, I gave [ST] all this control, I should just leave it with [ST]." (Taylor, 130-137)

The question arose regarding the feelings of the STs when they realized the transfer of control was taking place. It involved their readiness to assume that responsibility and was reflected quite strongly in how they perceived the transfer. One ST expressed her feelings as follows:

It was mine . . . I was planning it. . . . It wasn’t me trying to teach something [CT had planned] . . . [CT] took a morning off [and] . . . I did it. [The pupils] knew, they asked. . . . I almost didn’t want to tell them because I thought they’d go mental. (Taylor, 152-167)

This type of emotional reaction to the feeling of what happened when they assumed control was felt by eight of the
STs. One ST felt she "didn't experience anything" (Debra, 168-176) because she mistakenly believed she had received the transfer of control the first week of school. Four of the STs believed the transfer had occurred when the pupils started paying attention to them and, as one ST felt, if "the students remained on-task and on good behavior, I was in control" (Marie, 170-182). Five STs reported they felt terrific planning their own lessons and, as one ST stated, seeing the "signs and comments on the class calendar indicating the next subject to be studied was [my] planned lesson" (Gerry, 148-157).

Not all the STs felt this sense of elation. For one the baton of authority being passed to her was slipping from her grasp. She looked at the gaining of authority as no longer feeling like an aide just running off dittos for the CT. As she strengthened her grip on the baton and brought the transfer of authority into perspective, she realized that routine duties were encompassed in the definition of classroom control and reflected

I'm running dittos now and I'm having coffee breaks, [just like before], but once I got that control, that transfer of control, [things changed]. I felt I was like a teacher for the first time. (Marva, 138-146)

Another ST having difficulty with the transfer spoke of feeling disheartened. She felt that dealing with some of the pupils was extremely difficult. "I wasn't dreading going in, but I wasn't having successes that energized me" (Donna, 266-280). When asked if she had been familiar with
how the CT used the word control. Donna stated she had because she had experienced very little success with classroom management. What control meant to her was disciplinary control of the pupils, not the extensive definition as used in this research of classroom instruction, management, and routines, all involving decision-making authority. Her focusing solely on that one aspect of the definition possibly resulted in her not gaining the transfer of authority from the CT. However, she felt terribly inadequate because STs apparently believe student teaching is the time to put it all together and, as Feiman-Nemser and Buchman (1986) stated, it is "the definitive test of the relevance and practicality of formal preparation" (p. 69).

A final aspect of readiness is the idea of one's beliefs being challenged in order to accept the transfer of control. Data clearly suggested that the ST's emphasis is on classroom management, because of all those who stated their beliefs were challenged, all related it to matters concerning discipline techniques. They felt the CT "interfered with student independence," "classroom was more negative than positive," "having to raise one's voice," "problems from home being brought into the classroom," and was generally summed up in this ST's words:

Yes, [my beliefs were challenged], because what [CT] thinks and I think are pretty . . . there's a big difference there . . . so . . . whenever [CT] intervenes, [CT] is challenging what I think and instituting [CT's] own. (Casey. 321-329)
One can come to understand the survival theme present in student teaching. It seems to be, perceptually, a constant struggle for the STs to maintain their equilibrium. They are balanced on a tightrope of interrelationships where they assume many of the supporting characters involved are not listening. Eddy (1969) found "transition is the time most laden with insecurity and anxiety for the individual [ST] and for those associated with him" (p. 22).

4.2.1.3 Formal Communication - Conferences

In the literature, Guyton and McIntyre (1990) identified conferencing to be an important element in student teaching. The opportunity for feedback enables the ST to further understand the expectations of the CT and to rectify any problem of inaccuracy or misunderstanding. An investigation was initiated as part of this research to find out if there was an organizational structure to conferencing and if the STs perceived it as being organized. STs were questioned relative to lead-in discussions, their frequency and content, and if they changed as the semester progressed.

The data showed that all ten STs had conferencing, but the frequency and content varied greatly. There was a definite change in the content and frequency over the semester. Several STs indicated that the lead-in discussions generally expressed a concern for the ST to have a brief overview of the expectations of the CT, classroom routines, and, according to one ST, "[my CT said], 'this is what I want, show me how you can do it'" (Debra, 60-77).
Although Debra expressed these feelings in a matter-of-fact way, the other STs felt they were gradually being introduced and encouraged to learn as much as possible about the classroom environment without undue pressures. One CT made it a point to give the ST "future assignments one week ahead" (Joanne, 47-50). A concern expressed by several STs was the vagueness of the CTs in their expectations and explanations, as exemplified by one ST:

"This is how . . . this works" . . . but [CT] really didn't tell us exactly. . . . There were a lot of things I had to learn as I went on. (Anne, 46-50)

It was found that this vagueness went to further extremes when one ST stated there were no lead-in discussions because expectations were just assumed and "I knew what was right and appropriate" (Casey, 52-58).

It was encouraging to find that lead-in discussions referred directly to the future transfer of control. One CT stated that the ST should "just jump right in and take control of whatever is given: get in as quickly as you can because there are only sixteen short weeks in the practicum" (Marie, 61-64).

Another ST had been involved immediately by the CT regarding responsibility of the practicum in relationship to working with the pupils and the criteria they might have had for assuming that control. The ST stated:

We talked a lot about control. We spent a lot of time after school about it. [CT] asked me how I felt . . . about how much responsibility I wanted to take in the classroom. (Sarah, 32-37)
Regarding the frequency of conferences, the wide range of time from fifteen or twenty minutes per week in one instance to several hours per day in two instances was questioned. One of the major changes occurring with all ten STs as the semester progressed was a decrease in the frequency and duration of the conferences. Both CTs and STs insisted, however, that it was more quality time toward the end of the practicum. During the observational visitations the researcher spoke with the STs and sat in on several conferences; most of them dealt with planning the lesson, individual pupils, and classroom discipline problems. It was disappointing, as Zeichner (1983) learned, that reflective thinking and philosophy of education topics were not discussed at these later conferences, especially since the routines of the classroom had been learned by the ST. The conferences involved a one-to-one conversation, except in two situations where classroom aides were also present.

Most of the content dealt with in the conferences was "lesson planning," "student progress," "students on-task," "students off-task," "how the ST felt," "classroom management," "basic information," and "general feedback." These conferences would take place "at lunch," "before school," "during breaks," and "over the phone if ST had a particularly distressful day." During the school day there was little time or opportunity for anything but limited comments to be exchanged between the CT and the ST.
Obviously the times of the conferences varied and the content varied; so too did the quality as reported by the STs. Their evaluations varied from "getting sidetracked" and "off the topic" to "being very useful and productive." One ST felt it really didn't matter what was discussed because it was the CTs informing the STs of their expectations and class routines.

I became aware of what [CT] expected of the kids . . . I more or less adapted to what I knew [CT] wanted . . . it's [CT's] class . . . [CT] is ultimately in control . . . I . . . had to follow what [CT] wanted to have done. (Casey, 69-77)

In spite of these early semester feelings regarding the lack of ST input and the vagueness of expectations by the CT, a major change occurred as the semester progressed. Elements of the transfer of control had taken place and the degrees of freedom extended by the CTs allowed the STs to increase their input into the conference.

The substantial evidence from the interview data and the observation data indicated that those STs who had neither been involved in the transfer of control nor adjusted successfully to the transition continued to have rudimentary conferences and were limited as to the amount of personal input in the conferences. One ST lamented

My nature is to hold back . . . [CT's] nature is that [CT] knows what [CT] is doing. . . . [CT] is not good about delegating stuff. . . part of it is a [conflict] going between our personalities . . . we never really had a time line . . . I've been fitting into [CT's] plans . . . I don't have ownership. (Donna, 106-131)

However, in general, the conferences took on a better perspective for the majority of STs as the semester
progressed. Remarks described them as "more sophisticated," "more independent," "I have more questions," "better quality feedback," "more relaxed," "discussions about non-superficial things," and, according to one ST, "yes . . . [it's] more comfortable . . . I feel . . . closer to [CT's] equal. . . . Before I felt like a student and [CT] was the teacher" (Anne, 82-88).

Several STs felt that the conferences had been very important due to the feedback, encouragement, and confidence building it gave them. Several expectations had been "too high and unrealistic" (Marva, 69-73) and the conferencing and resultant feedback helped the ST to be more practical than idealistic.

4.2.1.4 Informal Communication - Cues and Signs

Earlier the criteria used to determine readiness were examined. In this section an attempt was made to determine if there were cues or signs which the STs had given to the CTs to signal they were ready to assume additional responsibilities in the transitional transfer of control. The STs were questioned to find out if they perceived they had received any cues or signs from the CTs to let them know that the transfer was ready to take place and that they could be involved in the decision-making process.

All ten STs were aware of the authority transfer in process and three had reactions of "not being ready to assume control," "willingly accepting it," and "not perceiving it to be offered at all." The STs experienced
"more and more responsibility," "[CT] inquiring what I wanted to teach," "[CT asking] what do you think?" "[doing my] own planning." "[CT finding it] difficult to turn over classroom, but . . ." and as one ST stated

[CT] says, "I'm leaving now. Can you handle this? . . . You have interests in this certain area. Would you be willing to do something with that?" (Gerry, 111-116)

In conjunction with the STs' awareness of CTs' readiness to relinquish control came the cues and signs from the STs to the CTs. The inputs reported here were "making suggestions," "asking questions," "something I'd like to try," "just do it," "when I felt comfortable asking," "offering to help," and as remarked by one ST

By accepting when [CT] said, "Would you like to do this?" I said, "Sure, I'd like to try it." . . . by trying more and more and doing more and more.

(Sarah, 93-96)

What was evident in the exchange of cues and signs was the transfer of control. Nine out of ten STs were anxious to receive it, but not all CTs were willing to grant decision-making authority without restrictions to the degrees of freedom under which it might be utilized. Many of these cues and signs were positive and negative interjections by the CTs. In the early stages of the transition period how these cues and signs were interpreted by the ST often determined the ST's readiness in the mind of the CT. In the latter stages of the transfer a sign that the transfer of control was nearing completion was a definite decrease in the necessity for CT and ST cues and signs.
4.2.1.5 Degrees of Freedom and Proximity

The category of Degrees of Freedom and Proximity is one of the more significant categories to the transfer of control because it determines the degree to which the ST is allowed by the CT to make decisions while gradually assuming the role of teacher. This category was researched by investigating elements of the transfer of control affecting classroom management and instruction and also teacher proximity relative to modes and styles of the ST in these two areas.

An initial question sought to garner evidence that the STs perceived a series of steps granting the degrees of freedom in a limited format. The response was that the transfer of control was a gradual process. Further questions sought to find out if the amount of freedom was the component of the transfer that forced a gradual transition and, if so, what organizational structure was used, if any. The responses delineated in the data indicated a definite weighing of the merits of each phase of the transfer. The data also indicated that certain limits set on the degrees of freedom within that transfer of control were real, not just perceptions held by the ST.

Seven of the ten STs felt unsure if there was a series of steps leading up to the transfer of control. The STs were not certain of a specific routine, yet they responded that they had gone from small groups to large groups, and from Math and Reading groups to whole class activities.
What they did not comprehend was the CT's method of slowly turning over decision-making control as an explicit organizational pattern. Comments such as "there were and there weren't," "talked about how far I could go," "no, right away [CT] said, 'Show me your stuff,'" "not a formal series of steps," "we didn't have a set outline," "I just observed," and "because of the nature of the class there were steps at the beginning" were typically reported by the STs. Only one ST specifically referred to an explicit series of steps.

As far as steps . . . [CT] started off with small projects and then to the point now where [CT] will leave for the whole morning and I'll be there. (Anne, 102-105)

The STs were questioned on the probability of their setting limits on themselves during the transfer of control. It was expected that the less assertive STs would set limits on themselves, but in general, this did not happen. Only isolated cases, both assertive and non-assertive types, placed limits on themselves. These STs commented

I'm more afraid of going too far . . . [CT] always makes me feel comfortable . . . but it's still [CT's] class. I've done little things, but nothing major. (Anne, 191-196)

and

I don't feel limited in what I can do. I feel that some of the things I'd like to try, I would like to do [eventually] in my own class. (Joanne, 208-222)

In seeking a response to the limits set by the CT, it was found that there was a general ST belief that the CT did not limit their classroom management style and set few
limits on their teaching style. This was neither the researcher's perception from the observations nor the viewpoint of the CTs, in particular in regard to management. When one ST was asked about limits set on management style, the response was different than most of the others.

With my own style, yes... I think every teacher says, "I don't want to make a clone"... but [CT] says, "It's my classroom... kids are used to a certain kind of management"... [CT] wanted me to manage as [CT] did. (Taylor, 203-210)

When inquiry was made regarding the limits set on teaching styles there were more responses in the affirmative. Six out of ten STs believed there were no limits set at all and even fewer parameters within which to try one's own teaching style. Three STs reported their CTs allowed them to try instructional techniques that the CTs would never use themselves. During the classroom observations this was never seen in evidence, but the reader must be reminded of the researcher's limited observation time over the course of the practicum. However, one ST supported this belief and remarked

I think [CT] gives me quite a bit of latitude in things I teach... My style is "hands-on activities"... because of moving around, [CT] sees it as classroom disorganization. (Casey, 217-233)

However, when proximity was discussed with Casey, it was the ST, not the CT, who had extended pseudo-degrees of freedom. The ST had physically removed the entire group from the classroom and explained

I tried to... feel more comfortable... to go to an empty classroom... rather than working in a
section of the classroom . . . that doesn’t work too well because when I’m there, [CT] interjects.  
(Casey, 204-212)

The proximity of the CT played an enormous role in the reported perceptions held by the STs as to their degrees of freedom. They felt such things as "uptight if [CT] was there," "[CT saying], ‘Keep the noise down’," "[CT] constantly interjects," "not that I’m doing anything crazy, but . . . ," "[CT] always makes me nervous anyway," "[CT saying], ‘Oops, I shouldn’t interrupt’," until the ultimate ST statement of proximity-related anxiety would possibly be that

If [CT] is in the classroom, it doesn’t matter where [CT] is, . . . that’s close enough. . . . Whether ten feet from me or sitting as far away as [CT] can be, . . . it limits my freedom . . . just the fact [CT] is in the classroom.  (Casey, 262-269).

The reader is reminded that Casey was the ST who emphatically stated that no limits were placed on teaching style and also removed the entire group from the classroom as often as possible. This belief of no imposed limits showed an ambivalence resulting from Casey’s understanding of the degrees of freedom contained in the transfer of control and the degrees of decision-making allowed to this ST in instruction and management by the CT. That ambivalence was also evident in the responses of four other STs. Shulman (1987) reported that STs will seek ways to establish a position of control.

To separate her image from that of Ms. Cathcart and to establish her own authority, [the student teacher] changed the physical arrangement of the room. (p. 19)
The proximity question was perused further to inquire as to its effect in possibly dictating the modes of instruction and classroom management. Eight out of ten STs' responses were in the affirmative that the CT's proximity dictated the mode of instruction and limited the degrees of the ST's own teaching and classroom management styles. The two STs who responded that their mode and style were not interfered with expressed a strong similarity with the teaching and classroom management styles of their CTs, as determined by the researcher's classroom observational data.

Those STs who felt strongly that proximity affected their modes and styles spoke of it in this way: "if [CT] is in the classroom, definitely it alters the ways I do things," "we each have our own beliefs, . . . [CT] is here in the room . . . I'll do it a way [CT] has done it," "when [CT] isn't there . . . when I sub . . . I'm so much more energetic . . . I'm buzzing around the room," "you tend to pick up [CT's] traits," "it's intimidating to feel that someone is watching," and as one ST commented:

Well, for my personality I have a hard time. I feel like I've squelched some of my own style and personality when [CT] is in the classroom . . . when we strategize things that [CT] does, I then take on those techniques and use them when [CT] is around.

(Donna, 370-379)

The significant point was that the transfer of control was gradually taking place and the degrees of freedom and teacher proximity became the fibers of the rope used in a slight CT/ST tug-of-war. In many cases this struggle may have involved the CTs trying to retain classroom control and
the STs trying to lay claim to this control as their own. The STs saw this ownership of control as their symbol of becoming a teacher. But how did they see their role as it involved the assumption of the legal and moral responsibilities that go along with that control?

4.2.1.6 Legal and Moral Responsibilities

One of the ramifications of a transfer of control was the assumption of legal and moral responsibility that went hand-in-hand with that control. It was found that the STs readily accepted the transfer of control but reported they were unaware of the legal responsibilities, even during Master Week when they were to have complete control. Up until this question regarding legal responsibilities was asked, the STs felt they had or would receive complete control. From this point on the definition of complete control took on another meaning for them. One ST said

I see myself as a teacher, but I don't see myself as an official teacher hired by the school . . . not 100% responsible. Within the classroom . . . yes . . . to a point. (Gerry, 162-167)

Six of the STs were totally unsure of their legal responsibilities. While the STS claimed ownership to "their practicum" (Marie, 194-196), they played down the legal responsibility and fully accepted the moral responsibility. One ST described it this way:

Morally I felt I was a representative since I had to be a model for [the pupils] . . . my language had to change . . . I had to dress appropriately . . . I felt I had to be a leader. (Marva, 167-174)
All ten of the STs related positively to the moral aspects of the transfer of control. None felt that limits were set on their degrees of freedom to work within that sphere. They felt they had a responsibility to fulfill the moral role of the teacher as they perceived that role. However, they all felt it to be an area of their practicum that indicated they were assuming the role of teacher.

Morally . . . as I take on more control, there are little things where [CT] will not be there . . . I have to make a judgment . . . and that's kind of scary. (Taylor, 179-185)

In probing further the question of legal and moral responsibility the STs were asked if they had considered any risk factors as they continued to accept the transfer of control. While all felt that it was the nature of student teaching to take risks in instructional style and classroom management, the STs believed there were set limitations.

I think that in the position I'm in I have to be more . . . careful . . . recess duty . . . if something ever happened to a student . . . I'm not a teacher . . . the school system could get in trouble. (Sarah, 164-171)

Many of the apprehensions involved risk-taking. If left in charge and a child was injured, one ST questioned how she would react in a crisis situation (Anne, 170-173). One response directly referred to the threatening language used by children toward other children and the ST not knowing whether it was only a cultural slang or something that might really happen (Gerry, 185-189).

The STs found the most difficult aspect of accepting authority to make decisions was for them to be consistent
and firm, and they felt that both of these values were moral in and of themselves (Taylor, 188-197). They felt their "firmness" was threatened when reactions to certain situations had come too late to be effective. They felt their "consistency" waivered when they saw how they could respond differently to similar offenses committed by different pupils.

It was during these reflective moments resulting from the research questions that the STs realized the burden of accepting authority and the realities of the responsibility in assuming the role of teacher. However, the one overriding fear among STs still related to classroom management.

[My] biggest fear was "What if I lose them totally - not the lesson - the management? What if they totally go off the wall if I step in?" (Joanne, 191-195)

Hollingsworth (1989) mentioned this fact of classroom management being a predominant factor in both the STs' and the CTs' minds relative to the student teaching experience (pp. 175-176). This issue continues to cause concerned discussion about the future direction of student teaching. This may be an area requiring further study in that the purpose of student teaching may solely be to transfer the authority in order that the ST may learn its intricate machinations. Upon comprehending these learned skills the ST might eventually feel confident to achieve in his/her own classroom.
Regardless of how STs perceive the legal and moral responsibilities they must become aware of their significance in the assumption of control from the CT. This significance certainly calls for courses in school law to be included in the ST’s academic preparation. Otherwise, the STs may only learn from trial and error.

My legal responsibilities . . . well, I found out the hard way . . . when a child has raised a stick to you . . . the legainess [sic] of discipline is you have a right to defend yourself . . . the rest, I’m not quite sure." (Marva, 175-180)

Obviously the degrees of freedom to make decisions were relevant here as in all aspects of the transfer of control. The inclusion of the awareness of the legal and moral responsibility in the transfer of control emerged as an integral part of complete control. Because of restrictions placed by the CT, principal, or other school authorities limiting the transfer of control, a transfer of complete control from the CT to the ST probably never occurs.

One could argue here that it was immaterial because of the ST’s reported perception of having received complete control. This shift in control is functional and therefore real to the extent that an understanding exists between all participants. However, the reality was that the question raised caused challenges to the latitude of the ST’s risk-taking range and decision-making potential. It also limited the ST in his/her experimentation with specific areas of the role of teacher.
4.2.2 Cooperating Teacher Interviews

4.2.2.1 Time Sequence

In the Time Sequence category of the nine out of ten CTs who believed they had no explicit time sequence for the transfer of control to occur, the research data indicated that all but two CTs had at least an implicit pattern to the initiation of their STs to the role of teacher. All ten CTs agreed that it gradually expanded and totally depended on the individual ST’s initiative, maturity, ability, and experience. Griffin et al. (1983) mentioned in the literature how teacher education programs have a pacing guide that is supposed to influence the STs during transition, but in practice a set sequence of events did not seem to have any significant influence.

CTs also varied on the approach they use to immerse the STs into the role of teacher. Although all ten CTs have the ST observe for an initial limited period of time, two have the STs observe for as long as it takes for the ST to get a sense of what is happening. Another variable in the approach is the type of assignments given, content versus non-content. Four of the ten CTs start their STs with non-content related instruction or duties, such as running the Morning Meetings, supervising class and recess transitions, or reading a story to start each day. The CTs with the most experience as CTs have used the Morning Meeting to have the ST "get the day started on the right foot. [They] found it a good gauge to signify if the
student teacher was ready" to start assuming control in other areas (Chris, 98-105). Another CT believed that if the ST could handle the issues in the Morning Meeting, especially those issues the children would bring from home, this would help "set the tone for the day and other issues would start to fall into place" (Janice, 143-149). All of the non-content activities involved the whole class instruction or management, but the duties were limited in depth. One of the ten CTs starts her interns off with an Art lesson because

STs are usually comfortable doing an Art lesson... The children... are easier to motivate with Art... and the [STs] have to be sure that they've got all the materials ready, explain step-by-step... a great way to organize a lesson and they can see if they've reached their goal at the end. (Barbara, 179-191)

The other five CTs start their STs with content related instruction, such as Language Arts, Reading, or Math. These activities usually involve individual, small group, or large group work, but never the whole class at first. As reported previously, after the initial ST immersion is completed, all ten CTs follow the expanding pattern of gradually increasing the ST's responsibility and authority from small group to large group to whole group. The immersion process often differs from this pattern by allowing the ST to start with a large group, usually in a non-content area. One CT had a definite sequence for the first month and then the initiative and abilities of the ST determined the amount of decision-making granted in the transfer of control thereafter.
Yes. [I use a time sequence], I always start out by having the student teacher read a story to the whole group for a period of a week: following that . . . working with a small Reading group and helping a few children in Math each week for the first month . . . adding maybe another twenty minutes where they would be in control of a group. (Barbara, 68-78)

From this response on time sequence arose the idea of determining in what area the CT usually would begin the transfer of control. In the literature Goodman (1985) found that small Reading groups was where this most often occurred. His findings stated that

Usually, the first teaching task assigned to student teachers was to help a child with Reading assignments. Eighty-six percent of the lessons observed had something to do with this subject. (p. 44)

Six of the CTs interviewed concurred with Goodman and assigned Reading groups first. One of the reasons stated for selecting Reading groups first was because the groups usually were small in size. Of the remaining four CTs, all indicated the preference of starting with small group instruction, but they differed in which area to begin. Even those CTs who started their STs with non-content related teaching with large groups, such as Morning Meeting, Art or Story Time, once content subject matter was included, they preferred small group instruction. One CT explained

I want a certain degree of consistency . . . usually [the] first area an intern takes over is in a very prescribed, specific learning task, working with a small group. (Claire, 120-133)

While two CTs used small Math groups for similar reasons, one CT emphatically stated that the interns would “never receive a Math group right off the bat because it was
highly-managed time, involving specialists and mainstreaming" (Fran, 201-206). Two CTs stated they follow the ST's interest and strengths to determine the content of the first subject taught, but two other CTs have definite subject areas they prefer the ST to teach first. While one CT chose "Math, Science, or Social Studies because these lessons can be very well structured . . . very concrete" (Gail, 164-166), another CT eliminated Science as a first choice and explained, "I don't always start with Science because I . . . think that's a whole different style of teaching" (Fran, 224-226). Whatever subject or area chosen to start the immersion process with, the process was definitely a gradual build-up of the transfer of control in content instruction "so eventually [the ST] can do content lessons with the whole group, that's the end result" (Gail, 75-77).

As these interviews were conducted during the tenth through the twelfth weeks, an inquiry was made as to the status of the authority already transferred. Specifically asked was if complete control had been allowed yet. The CTs generally agreed that a noticeable transfer of control could be seen by the fourth week, but that a discernible amount of control was not transferred until the eighth week, "in some cases, the tenth week" (Chris, 40-45). However, complete control would rarely be transferred by Master Week, which is the sixteenth and final week. In most cases STs had
perceived the transfer to be much earlier than the eighth week.

In probing further it was asked what was the CT's definition of complete control and did it ever happen for the ST? The CTs' responses varied from classroom management, to curriculum management, to combinations of both, but the general consensus was that the CT would never grant complete control. The CTs would create a perception of complete control transferred or, as Lortie (1975) said about the ST and the assumption of the role of teacher, "a texture of reality" (p. 71). As one CT commented

I never relinquish complete control . . . I want [ST] to be perceived by my students in the class as . . . being in complete control . . . never to be perceived as being in complete control equal to or above me.

(Dana, 213-223)

This indicated a power play on the part of the CT. In probing further it was found that most of the CTs were not willing to transfer decision-making authority one-hundred percent. Reasons varied from "we are striving toward team teaching," "Master Teaching Week . . . about eighty percent," "not yet, totally," to specific reasons, such as

I think when you have two people in the room, no one person can have complete control . . . so I don't think there's going to be a complete transfer of control . . . We'll be peers. . . . [ST] is looking to be a teacher, not a super-teacher or something. (Joyce, 316-324)

This CT had well established the fact that ultimate control was hers. She referred to it again from a different perspective in her final comments.

I think it is hard to give up your authority. . . . People who teach like authority and I don't care how
liberated they are ... I think teachers like control and it's very, very hard to give it up. (Joyce, 443-450)

One further comment is appropriate here because it was so dogmatically stated. One particular CT had extended control to the area of instruction and somewhat to the area of classroom management. In the classroom observations she was found to have extended to her ST the greatest amount of degrees of freedom in decision-making than any other CT.

Complete control in terms of an intern interacting with parents - no! It does not happen! ... I have had some very bad experiences with parents when I haven't been involved, and interns in their naivete have made comments or judgments that have come back and have literally been jammed down my throat. ... Parents expect me to be the one in charge. (Janice, 311-343)

4.2.2.2 Readiness

The CTs had implicit patterns of when their STs were ready to begin the transfer of control. Although interspersed with lesson plans and content knowledge, their patterns were mostly designed with the classroom management as the main focus. The following CT's statement was representative of the group.

I looked at management style ... how much in control of [the] students ... in terms of manipulating them ... to do what [ST] wanted them to do and what they needed to do. ... Every ST I've ever had ... said what they needed to work on the most was management ... and they're right. (Gail, 53-58)

The modus operandi of the majority of the CTs involved observation of the ST's behaviors such as: "interactions with students," "follow-through," "knows the routines and expectations," "is consistent," "absorbs what you [the CT]
In probing more deeply it was found that management style and techniques of the ST were key components as to how early in the practicum the transfer of control would start and at what rate it would gradually increase as the semester progressed. The extent of the degrees of freedom given to the ST to implement the transfer of control was obviously very limited. The latitude allowed by the CTs often related to the amount of responsibility the CT was willing to relinquish.

Three of the CTs reported it was more of a sharing of authority. However, in the research interviews and observations, it clearly showed that these particular CTs had great difficulty relegating responsibility, which resulted in the ST being unable to firmly grasp the baton of control during the transition of authority. One CT said

I don't operate . . . in a "I have the wheel, then they have the wheel" . . . you learn how to sail . . . how to scrub the wall . . . how to navigate. Eventually you share the wheel . . . I have a schedule . . . but it's not etched in stone. (Fran, 66-78)

This seemed to evoke feelings of mutual acceptance on the part of the CT and the ST. Further questions asked if they felt the transfer of control was a tug-of-war. The general response was that it goes smoothly depending on the
intern and "it's certainly not a battlefield" (Gail, 218-220). Usually the children can be an indicator if there is difficulty in the transfer as they "will have a harder time" (Claire, 154-160).

Nine out of ten of the CTs believed that if a tug-of-war existed, it was because the ST lacked assertiveness and was pushing away the baton of control. The CT was ready to offer it, but he/she "couldn't get the ST to take it" (Chris, 138-147). Six of the STs disagreed with that perspective. They indicated that the CTs were reluctant to relinquish control. One CT agreed with the STs' position:

[There were] times when it was hard for me to step back, to give more and more control... [ST] is ready... [at] times I jump in when I don't need to or shouldn't... Part of that is... it's my class. (Meg, 145-154)

Reflection on this suggests that it was not that the transfer of control was being held back, but rather an uncertainty on the part of the CT as to how extensive the degrees of freedom to make decisions ought to be.

It was obvious the transfer took place as evidenced by the decision-making authority allowed to the ST in classroom activities. It was endeavored to find out if the time of gradual transfer reached a point of completion and if there was a noticeable change in the ST which was recognized by the CT. When previously asked this question the STs' responses varied from "didn't feel anything specific"
The CTs' responses indicated they were very much aware of what was happening. One CT stated that if the ST did not show this excitement of acceptance of the transfer of control, then it wasn't happening and "it was time to shape up or ship out, and for the CT to take a long, hard look at what's going on" (Janice, 232-242).

A CT responded that it was not necessarily what was happening to the ST that she noticed first as the transfer of control was reaching fruition. Rather it was the feelings felt by the CT that indicated the gradual termination of the transition.

If you've been kind of close to a kid and they get close to the other person [ST] . . . you might feel a little bit of jealously. . . . Or all of a sudden, if you're the close to fifty-year-old, old maid [laughter] schoolteacher and a young person comes in . . . you might feel jealous of that person. Or if the kids automatically thought this was a cool dude and you're just an old-fogey teacher who's been there forever . . . you have to sort of fight it. (Joyce, 234-246)

Nine of the ten CTs indicated that the ST's interaction with the pupils was an essential part of the transfer and did not oppose it or feel bad about it. One CT reported that it was one of the expected criteria for a successful transfer of control.

[The transfer of control] . . . is pretty much a preplanned thing . . . discussions have taken place. . . . It is something that does not happen unconsciously. It is a very conscious transfer. (Dana, 110-113)
Upon asking if the CTs would ever take back the control they had transferred to the ST, there was an unequivocal response of yes. All ten of the CTs stated they would rescind the authority if it interfered with the education or safety of the pupils.

4.2.2.3 Formal Communication - Conferences

A constant response to many of the questions asked of the CTs was that they had discussed these issues while in conference with the STs. A probe was made to find out if there were lead-in discussions involving the transfer of control, and if so, what were their frequency and content. It was also endeavored to see if they differed from the viewpoint of the STs, that as the semester progressed, the conferences increased in quality and decreased in quantity of time involved.

Initially the CTs stated the conferences emphasized how the CT's discipline plan worked and whether the ST was familiar with the CT's expectations. The CTs reported that the discussions were from fifteen minutes to many hours in length. Some of the items discussed involved "management skills," "understanding where you're headed," "issues of management and behavior," "curriculum development," "what went on in class," "when intern can take more control," "my giving feedback," "getting ST's perceptions of the situation," "really getting to know each other," "we role play, especially instructional lessons," and "different techniques to settle the class down."
Topic changes in these discussions occurred as the degrees of freedom to make decisions were increased. The CTs found themselves having less and less input and "the conversation turning from the CT's lecturing to the ST's questioning, commenting, and offering suggestions" (Chris. 60-67). There was a similar communicating language used. Skeptics might say it is a language of conformity based on imitation, but that is certainly not what is believed by the CTs and the STs. One CT summed it up as follows:

With some it changes dramatically . . . the ST becomes more of a team member . . . We're making decisions . . . our insights are more equal so that we're working together. (Gail. 112-116)

This coming together was also suggested by Iannacone (1963) as he observed:

As the student teacher makes the transition from observer to teacher her diary references change from "Mrs. Jones and I" to "we." (pp. 75-76)

The CTs felt that as the ST became aware of what their role was, it was not necessary to conference frequently. Personal assumptions would be that here would be the ideal opportunity to start discussions relative to knowledge-base theory and educational philosophy. They could fill in the freed-up conference space with some reflective thinking skills or pedagogical theories. However, it seemed clear that when the classroom management skills were nearly mastered by the ST, a period of "comfortability" set in which lasted to the beginning of Master Week.
4.2.2.4 Informal Communication - Cues and Signs

In the observations numerous signals were exchanged between the ST and the CT. Responses to the question of cues and signs being transmitted between the CT and the ST were sought. It was crucial to the success of the transfer of control that if cues and signs were being dispatched, then they had better be received correctly. For example, a ST’s humility and respect for the CT’s leadership role might be regarded as his/her lacking initiative, whereas his/her "jumping right in" might be considered arrogant. In either of these situations the opposite could be true. The manner in which the action was interpreted is significant to the rapport between the participants.

The CTs were asked if they received any cues and signs from the STs to indicate their readiness to begin the transfer of control. There was a consensus that social dynamics were constantly in effect. The CTs reported the STs would pass through phases of "being friends with the children but unsure of themselves," to the point of "being in charge and feeling very sure of themselves" and their role as teacher (Gall, 133-147). Another CT consensus was the aspect of the STs "being assertive without being overbearing" and the STs "realizing that they might receive a negative response to their questions concerning a lesson suggestion" (Joyce, 133-142).

It was believed that "the cues and signs were important and showed the CT that the ST was willing to take risks"
The initiative enacted by this risk-taking indicated to the following CT that the ST was gradually assuming the role of teacher.

Questions being very specific ... dealing with detailed issues going on in the classroom ... noticing how one child responds from another child. ... being aware one strategy works here but not there ... he or she suggesting possible modification to that strategy. (Chris, 60-78)

It was of interest to the researcher to find out if the CTs gave any cues and signs to the STs making them aware of the impending transfer of control. Throughout the classroom observations it was obvious that the CT and the ST were relating messages to each other in non-verbal ways. An unexpected response from eight out of ten of the CTs was that they would verbally tell the STs when they were ready to transfer the control. Most remarks were made in the form of encouragement which the CTs felt would convey a strong message to the ST during the transitional period. One CT found that she constantly traded cues and signs with the ST. She stated that by doing this they were both letting each other know they were feeling good about what was happening.

Yes, I think if a lesson needs to be ended or we need to switch to something ... either by eye contact or just a hand signal, we're able to communicate very easily ... [It] seems to be very easy to check in with each other. (Meg, 94-99)

What emerged from the cues and signs was a communication between the CT and the ST regarding the limits on the degrees of freedom relative to decision-making. During the observations it was found that the STs were constantly sending out signs to their CTs testing for the
amount of latitude allowed them in decision-making. In most cases the CT was fielding the signs by responding with an encouraging cue of some sort. Those STs who failed to interpret the exchange correctly encountered great difficulty during the transitional period.

4.2.2.5 Degrees of Freedom and Proximity

The further into the research, the more obvious it became that an essential component to the transfer of control was the degrees of freedom in decision-making, involving latitude, which the CT was willing to allow the ST. It also became obvious that the proximity of the CT was a factor limiting the latitude of the degrees of freedom to make decisions.

The perceived success of the field experience depended on the ST evaluating the CT and drawing more and more degrees of freedom to make decisions within the instructional and classroom management areas. From the classroom observations and interviews surfaced a belief that the STs were more successful in gaining authority in the area of instruction and teaching style than they were in the area of classroom management, contrary to the STs’ perceptions.

Was there a series of steps the CT followed for the allowance of the degrees of freedom? Once again the responses indicated an implicit series of steps but no defined, written account, as one CT stated
Although the steps were not explicit many CTs felt they made the STs aware of a series of expectations in their initial interviews. These initial interviews were seen by all of the CTs as crucial to a successful semester. The CTs felt the "steps were not clearly defined ones but rather transitional kinds of things where the CT was willing to extend further control" (Dana, 90-97).

Several areas were looked at where the degrees of freedom might be observed. The one related here involved the proximity of the CT to the ST and whether that proximity tended to dictate modes or styles of instruction and classroom management. The ST was influenced by the proximity of the CT even though most of the CTs hoped their presence did not interfere. If it did, they hoped it had a positive influence.

The CTs were asked if the proximity of the CT indicated to the ST whether the transfer of control had occurred and if some authority had been relinquished by the CT. The general response was that they would leave the classroom for a brief period and return to see if the ST had maintained control. The absence was generally perceived as necessary to allow the ST room to breathe and feel comfortable. Two of the CTs deliberately created errands and reasons for being out of the classroom. One CT stated
Working at my desk . . . pretending to be working at my desk . . . to demonstrate to a ST that they have more control of a situation . . . We fake it . . . you have to create the situation . . . create the need to be away from the lesson . . . (it) gives them more the feeling they are in charge. (Chris, 443-467)

This certainly showed an organized effort by the CT to relinquish control. The classroom observations showed that there was concentrated effort to allow things to happen without an immediate intervention. The CTs believed "the STs perceived themselves as being accepted by the pupils in the role of teacher" (Dana, 245-254). When this transitional point was reached by the ST, and both the CT and the pupils believed learning was taking place, the transfer of control was complete.

However, the limitations involving the latitude of the degrees of freedom to make decisions were spelled out quite differently by each CT and lasted until the conclusion of the field experience. In one situation the ST had felt so fulfilled during the latter part of the Master Teaching Week that the ST returned the following week to do an additional week. This ST had not experienced the transfer of control and the degrees of freedom prior to Master Teaching Week. This ST explained

Verbally [CT] wanted to give me a lot. . . . It still was kind of hard because I’d throw out ideas and if they did not quite strike [CT’s] fancy, then they’d kind of get squelched . . . but I also did not do a lot of pushing and advocating for myself." (Donna, 191-196)

When probing further to find out if the CTs encouraged the STs to develop their own style in classroom management
and instruction, the resultant response was yes in instruction and no in classroom management.

When CTs were asked if the STs were encouraged to take risks in developing their own teaching style, an affirmative response was by far the most common one. However, there were several limitations made at the same time. Some of the responses were: "I don't have a problem with that ... it takes five years to become a professional," "You're aware of it, but realistically you're restricted," "I think they already have a style when they enter the classroom." "Sometimes I give them that power too much or too early and they don't have the skills to do it," and then the CT who believed

Definitely take risks ... being yourself in the classroom is a wonderful thought ... evolving your own style ... tends to happen in your own classroom, not as a ST. (Chris, 499-509)

As far as classroom management was concerned it was obvious that this area was sacrosanct. "[STs are] encouraged within the bounds of the kind of atmosphere the CT wants in the classroom" (Claire, 197-310). It was clear that the classwork must go on as the literature review suggested. The CTs believed that successful classwork could only happen if the classroom management system they had developed was kept intact.

My first priority is to my students ... what has caused havoc in the classroom is kids confused about expectations whether it's behavior or academic ... I like [ST] to use my strategies ... my model as the basis, and to develop strategies for the model.

(Chris, 218-229)
Although one CT emphasized the point of the ST developing his/her own strategies and not wanting a clone of themselves (Janice, 247-254), the classroom observations indicated that the STs were not experimenting with new management techniques. In fact, one CT gave carte blanche on instruction and a firm no on anything that might interfere with established classroom management.

Instruction doesn’t bother me at all . . . I love new things. . . . The only thing I selfishly hold on to is the discipline plan . . . that I’ve set up from the beginning of the year and feel that it is consistent. (Robin, 457-475)

An overall reluctance by the CTs to entertain any thoughts of allowing the STs to interfere with the management scheme may be summed up in the following statement:

When an intern takes over control . . . there already is a set of limits in place . . . the children know . . . five basic rules . . . [if the] intern is redefining those five basic rules, I might redefine what’s going on in terms of them. (Janice, 472-482)

Another area analyzed within proximity was the influence it has on dictating the modes of instruction and management of the ST and how the CT perceived the influence of proximity. As reported the STs believed that the CT’s proximity did reflect on and dictate their modes of instruction. Although the CTs would like to believe that it did not, they felt that their proximity may have dictated modes of ST styles. One CT remarked, "In general, yes . . . when I’m there things are generally on target" (Chris, 475-482) and another responded, "There’s a certain
atmosphere . . . that has to do with how curriculum is
brought to the children . . . that's very important to me . . . that there be some consistency" (Claire, 310-317).

4.2.2.6 Legal and Moral Responsibilities

Maintaining consistency was a key issue among all the CTs, but it was not certain that it extended into the area of legal and moral responsibility. This was probably due to the fact that their understanding of the technicalities in this area was limited. Their responses to inquiries justified the establishment of the category of Legal and Moral Responsibility and how they impacted the transfer of control.

The insistence by the CTs for a consistent atmosphere being maintained in all aspects of classroom procedures led to the asking of the CTs if they were aware of any legal or moral responsibilities during the transfer of control. Two of the CTs stated that they never thought about the legal responsibilities and assumed that the moral responsibilities would take care of themselves. They were very aware of immediate classroom legal and moral responsibilities but assumed that outside the classroom the responsibility lay with the principal and the school system. This included school events and field trips. One CT stated, "Ultimately I'm the one in control . . . the one who has the authority. I'm the mentor to that person and they . . . technically are not allowed to take recess duty, not allowed to be alone on the playground with children for various reasons" (Joyce,
The other CTs were not absolutely sure about recess but had assumed the STs were responsible. STs assigned to recess duty were also very unclear about ultimate responsibility. In general, however, the CTs accepted the ultimate responsibility for their classroom. recess, and their ST. One CT responded

Legal and moral, wow! I didn’t know it was such heavy duty here . . . I’m ultimately in charge . . . I don’t really feel that ultimate power is ever given to an intern . . . I don’t ever give up that part of the power. (Gail, 272-294)

Obviously this was a definite limitation to the degrees of freedom of the ST during the transfer of control. It was at this point in the investigation that it became obvious that the transfer of control takes place, but absolute authority to make decisions probably never takes place, and the degrees of freedom are dependent totally on the latitude allowed by the CT. One CT referred to this possibility by stating

As a CT you want them to take more and more . . . classroom control and they need to do this. . . . However, areas I am ultimately responsible for . . . [the] more serious and significant areas of control and responsibility, I continue to be in that role. (Meg, 230-234)

As reported earlier one CT stated her position that

"complete control in terms of an intern interacting with parents and whatever - no! It does not happen . . . parents expect me to be the one in charge" (Janice, 311-343).

The question surfaced whether the CTs were aware of any risk factors when they transferred control to the STs. The area that stood out as a high risk area was recess duty.
Another area mentioned as high risk was during Science lessons. Because of the risk factors raised one CT believed it was crucial to have the CT and the ST match regarding program, philosophy, and values (Claire, 264-270). She believed this would eliminate the probability of legal and moral conflict becoming an issue.

It has been stated in this research that possibly only a perception of complete control ever takes place. The STs perceive they have received it and the CTs perceive they have granted it. Richardson-Koehler (1988) brought into perspective the realities governing this transition and where the real responsibility lay.

This "full responsibility" included planning and implementing the full day's activities. . . . This, of course, is an unrealistic expectation in that the legal responsibility for the classroom resides with the cooperating teacher. But beyond that, it is unrealistic because the student teachers are, by and large, compelled to work within classroom structures and routines that are established by someone else. (p. 31)

However, there is possibly one area where both the CT and the ST are in agreement on the transfer of complete control - substitution. When the CT is absent, the ST often assumes the role of substitute teacher. All ten STs experienced substitution either within their CT's classroom or in another classroom within the building. All participants believed this was a period of complete control wherein the decision-making process was totally within the authority of the ST. The question one must ask is whether CTs believe substitution is legal or not for STs.
"Substituting? [Legal?] Yes . . . I have no idea . . . I'm not sure anybody has an idea . . . [laughter]" (Robin, 305-316). However, it was obvious to this CT that substitution was a point where the ST had complete control.

Substituting for me, totally . . . totally in complete control of that class . . . totally in charge of the class, behavior, management, and the kids, making all decisions that go on every day . . . everything. (Robin, 354-368)

In several instances both the CTs and the STs used the day of successful substitution to determine readiness to assume the transfer of control. Nine out of ten STs used substitution to assert themselves in front of the pupils and "to create their own aura in the classroom" (Donna, 390-399). STs also "felt legally responsible when substituting" (Anne, 157-163) and believed they were "so much more energetic . . . and buzzing around the room" (Taylor, 317-322).

In the 1990 Massachusetts General Laws Annotated: 71, Sec. 38G., nowhere was it stated that substitution by a ST was illegal or that STs were limited in any legal and moral sense regarding the application of the transfer of control and authority allowed them by the CT. In addition to the benefits cited by the CTs and the STs, was the continuity substitution by the ST gave to the pupils by having someone they were familiar with in control during the absence of the classroom teacher. After perusing the topic of substitution and its significance to the CT, the ST, and the pupils, this researcher believes the State Department of Education should
consider having the legislature enact specific laws allowing for substitution by STs and should incorporate them in future guidelines for Teacher Education Programs.

4.2.3 Summation of Interview Data

The oral interview data indicated there were convergent and divergent opinions between the CT and ST responses. The categories developed for this research were helpful in gathering qualitative data on the subjects relative to the transfer of control and the degrees of freedom in decision-making. Opinions relative to the categories regarding pattern, time, significance, value, and necessity were definitively expressed. Emotional responses frequently appeared in the data. Responses from both the STs and the CTs were surprisingly candid. Their willingness to share their beliefs and perceptions added to the quality of the data.

STs had no explicit time sequence to receive the transfer of control and they believed their CTs had no explicit one either, although they would have preferred the CTs to have had one. The STs stated there was an implicit, gradual immersion planned by the CT but it was never clearly defined to them. This lack of a clear set of criteria allowed for other variables to determine the time sequence. One variable which clearly affected it was the assertiveness of the ST. Over-assertive or under-assertive STs had greater difficulty during the transitional period of the transfer of control. CTs had no explicit time sequence to
allow the transfer of control and they believed they could not have one because of STs variation in areas such as maturity, ability, initiative, and experience. Most CTs stated they were unsure of an implicit time sequence although one existed. It started with an initial observation period of varying lengths and continued with a gradual immersion process that followed one of two paths. Those CTs who started their STs with whole group instruction were more likely to have assigned non-content areas and activities. Those who started with content areas assigned their STs to work with individuals or small groups. Regardless of which path was first followed, the STs progressed slowly as the responsibility increased gradually, and the grouping patterns and processes associated with non-content and content areas and activities progressed the same when the second path was followed.

STs had no personal criteria for establishing their readiness to assume control. STs were fully aware of the CT's control and the necessity for the ST to receive the transfer of that control before they could assume the role of teacher. CTs had implicit patterns of when their STs were ready to begin the transfer of control. Their pattern was designed with successful classroom management as the main focus and positive interaction with the pupils as a significant factor in determining readiness of the ST to begin the transfer.
Although conferencing was universal the frequency and content varied greatly and changed as the practicum progressed. STs believed the conferences decreased in quantity and increased in quality. Reflective thinking techniques were not often shared by the CTs and the discussions did not frequently include theories of educational philosophy. STs believed CTs were extremely vague in the explanation of their expectations, and conferencing topics varied but were often directed at the transfer of control. After the elements of the transfer of control had been in transition for a while, the degrees of freedom allowed the ST by the CT within that transfer enabled the STs to have increased input during conferencing. STs valued conferencing because of the positive aspects of the feedback, encouragement, and confidence building. CTs stated that initial conference discussions centered on their own discipline plan and expectations. As the degrees of freedom increased for the ST the CTs found themselves listening more to the comments and suggestions of the STs. As the STs' awareness of their role of teacher increased the CTs decreased the frequency and length of the conferences. The opportunity for discussions relative to a more cognitive rather than an affective conference was not grasped by either the STs or the CTs as the need for discussion of the routinization of the practicum decreased.

A ST's awareness of the CT's readiness to transfer control came through the cues and signs exchanged between
the CT and the ST. Correct interpretation of these cues and signs often determined the success of the transfer of control. Cues and signs between the CT and the ST often communicated the limits in the degrees of freedom relative to the latitude of decision-making allowed the ST by the CT. Interjections, both positive and negative, were usually initiated by the process of cues and signs. A sign that the transfer of control was nearing completion was a decrease in the necessity for the CT and ST to exchange cues and signs.

STs did not see an explicit organized pattern in the degrees of freedom to make decisions as they were transferred from the CT. STs perceived that CTs did not limit the degrees of freedom in classroom management and only slightly limited them in teaching style. The proximity of the CT to the ST influenced the degrees of freedom set by the CT by forcing the ST to question possible limitations. STs equated the amount of degrees of freedom and proximity allowed by the CT with the process of gradually assuming the role of teacher. CTs stated they had related a series of expectations relative to the degrees of freedom during the initial interview with the ST. They also frequently allowed more degrees of freedom in instruction and teaching style than in classroom management. CTs deliberately created situations where they removed themselves from the classroom in order to decrease the affect of their proximity on their ST's degrees of freedom to make decisions.
STs were unaware of their legal responsibilities during their practicum; however, they understood and accepted moral responsibility. They questioned if they were responsible for anything legal because the authority rested with the CT or the administration. The STs realized that legal ramifications within the classroom would create limitations on their degrees of freedom, curtail their risk-taking, and decrease the latitude allowed by the CT to make decisions. However, CTs were unsure of their legal responsibilities relative to their extending the degrees of freedom to make decisions to the ST. In general, the CTs accepted the responsibility for their class and their ST. CTs believed that although the transfer of control to the ST takes place an absolute transfer of authority equal to that of the CT never occurs. One CT believed matching the CT with the ST regarding philosophy and values would decrease the potential for any legal risks during the practicum. CTs and STs had found substitution by the ST to be an area where they could measure readiness to accept further degrees of freedom in processing the transfer of control. Both CTs and STs believed that the period of substitution by the ST involved as near to complete control of decision-making as the ST was likely to possess at any time during the practicum. The question was raised as to the legal aspects of the ST substituting relative to rubrics of the State, the University, and the School System. Future studies need to
be undertaken to answer this question and to investigate the impact of substitution on the transfer of control.

4.3 Presentation and Analysis of Classroom Observation Data

The second phase of the research was to follow the observational techniques proposed by Siedentop (1976), Metzler (1981), and Good and Brophy (1984). The classrooms of the ten paired participants in Phase 1 were observed by the researcher over a period of twelve weeks, with two fifty-minute observations per week. The focus of these observations was on the degrees of freedom in decision-making, the proximity of the CT to the ST, and the relationship of these variables to the transfer of control. In particular the verbal and non-verbal interjections of the CT and the physical presence of the ST in relation to the CT and to the students within the classroom were observed.

The methodology utilized in reporting the data from classroom observations involved selected comments from the oral interview data. These comments correlated to observed behaviors of the ST and the CT and were interwoven throughout the presentation of the observational data. The observations concentrated on a specific element of the field experience process by observing the nature of the relationship between the CT and the ST. Were the activities observed to happen, as related by the responses during the oral interviews? Could these observations substantiate the remarks and responses of the interviewees? These were the major components for analysis.
4.3.1 Cooperating Teachers’ Interjections and Their Effect on the Degrees of Freedom

The perception of interjections as being positive or negative and the individual reactions toward interjections varied greatly. Both groups, the CTs and the STs, believed there were interjections one could consider positive and there were those one could consider negative. The surprising aspect was that the negative impact of the interjection was the timing of it and the perceptions the pupils received from the interjection and not necessarily the content of the comment, as one ST commented:

I just feel like it takes away from me . . . [it’s] hard enough for kids to see me in that role [teacher] as it is. . . . When I’m up there trying to instruct, for [CT] to jump in . . . I don’t jump in when [CT’s] doing something like that. . . . It’s just [CT’s] classroom and it’s so difficult [for CT] to turn that over. (Taylor, 302-309)

This fact was observed to be true. As the CT was interjecting a thought, the expression on the ST’s face would turn from one of initial apprehension and anticipation to one of slight anger for having been interrupted. As the weeks progressed it was noticed that the initial reactions changed from apprehension and anticipation to a raising of the eyebrows, a leaning over the desk, as much as to say "what is the CT going to say now?" to the ST completely tuning out the comment from the CT by turning and looking out the window. When the STs were questioned on these observations, some were aware of having tuned out the CT, but most of them did not realize they were doing it. Several of them said they were angry because it was limiting
their degrees of freedom and completely catching them unawares. One ST described this feeling this way:

Sometimes . . . [CT] shouldn’t be doing it as much . . . it kinda breaks up my train of thought. . . . [CT] asked me something one day and I didn’t know the answer to it at all. . . . It just threw me a curve. (Marie, 268-277)

Even in the case where the ST was mature enough and self-confident enough to handle interjections by smiling or verbally responding to it in a nice way, it was clear that as the semester progressed, there was no difference between positive or negative interjections. They were basically all perceived as negative because they were all interruptions, as one ST described it:

I think they are mostly negative. They are not negative to me . . . well, they are negative to me indirectly because by the interjection, it’s [CT’s] opinion what’s going on is not right, so I’m responsible. . . . [CT] thinks it’s something [that] should be changed in the class. (Casey, 283-289)

Although eight out of ten of the STs felt that the interjections were not as welcome in the latter part of the practicum, nine out of ten had felt they were welcome in the beginning. One felt the interjection was "positive and informative . . . I like it" (Marva, 235-237). During the researcher’s observations, this particular ST indicated a reluctance toward the interjections with a latitude of acceptance ranging from a smile to a complete tuning out of the comment. This included both the verbal interjection and the physical interjection. The physical interjection, such as the CT actually, though silently, repositioning a child or creating a distraction by distributing materials within
the lesson, was the most resented as the practicum progressed. It definitely interfered with the ST’s perceptions of the degrees of freedom granted by the CT.

I think my answer to [CT’s interjections] would change over the semester. As the semester progressed and I was trying to establish my own personality and control of the classroom, I would probably appreciate that less. (Donna, 354-358)

As the interjections decreased the STs felt more positive about the degrees of freedom being extended. When asked what they would do if they were the CT, a common response was "I would not interject! Give the ST the feeling they [sic] can do it. . . . When you make the call, just stick with it" (Taylor, 519-544). "Making the call" referred to the process of transferring the control and the transition which accompanies it. In another remark by a ST it was obvious the degrees of freedom to take risks and balance successes and failures were paramount in her mind when she said, "In the beginning if I needed help with control, [CT]’d help . . . [now I’d prefer to] just let the freedom increase" (Marie, 407-416).

The increase of the degrees of freedom allowed to the ST during this transition was as critical and painful for the CT as for the ST. This classroom observation was reinforced by this CT’s reaction:

[The] hardest thing . . . when you’re teaching and the intern is teaching . . . if you see something going wrong . . . you think it’s really serious . . . whether or not to intercede . . . [it’s] difficult for me not to intercede. (Joyce, 106-112)
This was observed to be an extremely difficult period of adjustment for the CT. Should the CT allow the transfer of control to take place smoothly and without interruption or should he/she intervene? The review of the literature found this problem to be a reality experienced by other CTs as observed by other researchers.

Chris didn’t want to preside over the destruction of a promising career. She worried that Pam would lose her enthusiasm if being alone with this class turned into torture. Chris wanted Pam to taste success, so from time to time Chris continued to sit in on some of her classes. The children always behaved on these occasions. . . . "If I stay in the room, she won’t learn how to discipline," Chris thought. . . . Next year . . . there’d be no Mrs. Zajac to intervene and to help out. Pam had to learn how to control a class now. So for the most part, when it was Pam’s turn to teach, Chris gathered up her books and went out to the hall, and told herself as she left, "You have to sink a few times before you learn." (Kidder, 1989, p. 122)

During the observation period the STs were found to be moving from feelings and emotions of nervousness (which were outwardly apparent) to feelings of comfortability. The term "comfortable" was the most commonly used descriptor by both the CTs and STs. The seeking of this comfortability indicated a transition was taking place within the practicum that involved the transfer of control in order that the ST could assume the role of classroom teacher. One ST remarked

I’d probably do it the same way [as CT did it] . . . no matter what way . . . I’d have been nervous . . . no matter how long it took [CT] to give me control, you know, that feeling of control . . . I would have gone about it in probably the same type of way.  

(Anne, 358-366)

It was observed that the perceptions of interjections held by the CTs were different than those held by the STs.
The CTs understood how interjections could be interpreted by the STs as interference on their degrees of freedom, but the CTs hoped they were not guilty of this trespass. So strong was their hope that many CTs anguished about untimely interjections and wondered about their proximity to the ST and its influence on the ST's degrees of freedom. Classroom observations revealed CTs placing their heads in their hands when they believed they had interjected at the wrong moment. However, regardless of how far removed from the actual situation, the CT still exhibited a controlling involvement. This was also evidenced in the review of literature in Kidder (1989).

As November wore on, Pam taught more and more. Chris grew increasingly restive out on the couch in the hall. Now and then Chris felt a little consternation at Pam. One afternoon, she stood on a chair outside the door, taking down an old bulletin board display. While she pulled staples, Chris eavesdropped. A fair amount of noise came out of the room. "Does it always sound like this?" Chris muttered under her breath. From the room came Pam's voice. "Felipe! Why are you out of your chair?" "That's a good question, Miss Hunt," muttered Chris. "Why is he?" (pp. 128-129)

Although my observations were handled as discreetly as possible, I found myself being involved. Although located in the most inconspicuous place in the classroom, so as not to distract the ST or the pupils, it was obvious that my proximity was also felt. Good and Brophy (1984) in suggesting methods in observing in classrooms warned about disturbing the natural flow of behavior in the classroom (p. 61). On several occasions, if questions arose during the instruction, the ST would relay mostly non-verbal, but
sometimes verbal, signs to me for a response. I avoided these and later explained to the ST that it was undesirable for me to interject because it could interfere with the ST's degrees of freedom or impact on the impartiality of the observer. By his/her positive reaction to this comment it was very apparent to me that the concept of degrees of freedom involving proximity was understood by the ST. The significance of various aspects of proximity in relation to the degrees of freedom within the transfer of control as examined earlier in the interviews of Phase 1 was corroborated during the classroom observations of Phase 2. That is, the STs stated that the CTs proximity did effect their behavior. Initially it was often welcomed but as the transfer of control progressed the CTs proximity was considered an intrusion. The CT had expressed the belief that proximity may indeed effect the ST's behavior. However, it was necessary in order for the CT to observe and impart cues and signs of reinforcement or point out possible areas where problems might exist. CTs sincerely hoped that their proximity was a positive interruption and not a negative one.

4.3.2 Cooperating Teacher and Student Teacher Perceptions Relative to Pupil Involvement in the Transfer of Control

One of the most revealing features of this study was the ecological aspects of the field experience as explained by Zeichner (1983) and involved. In particular, the role of the pupils in the classroom. Both the CTs and the STs
continuously referred to the pupils as prime movers in the actual and perceived transitional transfer of control. One CT related

[When] the kids were over their little honeymoon period where they thought [ST] was wonderful, [they] saw [ST] more as a teacher, so they would act out once in a while and not hand their work in. . . . Around the third or fourth week [ST] saw self more as a teacher and the kids also did at the same time. (Meg, 179-184)

Many CTs gauged the ST’s readiness to assume control by the reaction of the pupils to the ST. They saw the ST as having the same disciplinary reactions from pupils as substitutes and even specialists in the building. They saw the "reaction of the children as indicating the children were most affected by the transfer of control" (Barbara, 58-62). Once these reactions changed for the better, the CT extended more control to the ST.

Students in class go to [ST] as often as they would go to me for assistance . . . for any reason . . . children go to us as equals. . . . To see the children always go to [ST], that’s one sign that the change in the balance of power [is taking place]. (Gail, 249-261)

The data from the observations showed this to be the case in all aspects of classroom activities.

CTs were very much aware of the changes within the classroom as the ST took over more bulletin board space and increased levels of activity, but also by the calmness settling in on the overall classroom environment. This transformation was observed by a CT as follows:

Kids perceive there are two teachers in the room . . . I have to watch less . . . classroom becomes smoother with the transition [of control] . . . not as many erratic changes going on. (Fran, 290-294)
As the classroom observations continued over the weeks, the classes were settling down. A developing fluidity of control was noted, in particular, as the ST performed transitional activities, such as cleaning up for the next lesson: taking pupils to recess, specialists, or lunch; conferencing with individual children while maintaining general classroom behavior and keeping pupils on-task.

The ST also referred frequently to the pupils in the classroom as significant players in helping the ST understand the occurrence of the transfer of control. One time when a ST was substituting she realized:

[CT] is not here. You can't say [to pupil], "Go ask [CT]." You're there and you deal with it . . . and that's when I felt definitely that control had been transferred. (Anne, 443-459)

The classroom observation data were filled with the interactions between the STs and the pupils. The activities going on between them were as involved as those between the CT and the ST. This involvement, although mostly affective in nature, may be another variable in the myriad of variables as to why field experiences are limited in cognitive reflection. The study of the entire ecology of the site referred to by Zeichner (1983) suggests the significance of these variables. The ST/pupil relationship is an important area one might focus on in a future study to further determine the factors influencing the success of the transfer of control from the CT to the ST and the degrees of freedom involving decision-making during this transition.
4.3.3 Summation of Classroom Observation Data

The classroom observations indicated an outer struggle existed in the interactions between the CT and the ST during the transfer of control. This substantiates the oral interview data that indicated an inner struggle was experienced by both the CT and the ST. One ST believed the CT was continuously trying to take back control. "Yes, when I'm teaching a lesson sometimes I think that's what [CT's] trying to do . . . [CT's] trying to take control" (Casey, 354-359). This struggle was apparent even in the most cooperative of situations wherein the CT and the ST were uncertain as to the limits placed on decision-making, proximity, and the eventual transfer of control. The struggle was not a battle but rather a slight tug-of-war involving a trial period of feeling each other out as to limitations and expectations. One ST explained, "She says she is willing to give me control . . . and she does in that she lets me teach, but she's still in the classroom and she will frequently interrupt my lesson to reprimand some of the students" (Casey, 124-138). This same uncertainty caused concern for the CT who said, "If I feel I'm [taking back control] too much, I go home and think I've got to step backward to let some of the situations go through" (Fran, 599-604).

Classroom observations showed this concern to exist. It was an important factor in the developing interrelationship between the CT and the ST. It was also a
significant factor in determining readiness to assume the role of teacher and accept the transfer of control. The manner in which the ST reacted to or accepted this interaction often determined the ST's readiness to assume control as perceived by the CT.

These following three classroom observations during Phase 2 relate the progression of the transfer of control in several different steps of transition throughout the practicum.

On one occasion I observed a ST boiling water for a Science project she had prepared. She was using the stove in the Teachers' Room. Around the table were various materials for the lesson. I was about to ask her for her lesson plans when the CT walked in, turned off the stove, and told the ST to forget it. After the CT left the room, the ST was visibly upset. I suggested she ask the CT for an explanation. At the first opportunity she asked the CT why she had acted the way she did. The CT apologized and said she was not upset with the ST. She stated that a colleague had complained to her that the Teachers' Room was not a kitchen or a Science room and her ST should not be in there doing Science or cooking lessons or whatever she was doing. The result of this altercation was the further isolation of the CT and the ST from the school community. However, the maturity and the respect for other teachers with which the ST showed understanding of the situation increased the social and professional bonds between the CT and the ST.
The CT realized the ST was ready to begin the process for the transfer of control.

On another occasion a ST was conducting a Reading lesson while the CT was at the back of the room building scenery for an up-coming class play. The ST was having great difficulty with disciplining the group. She constantly looked at the CT to observe her reactions. Quite suddenly the CT stopped what she was doing and told the Reading group to disband without saying a word to the ST. The ST was embarrassed and smiled at me and shrugged her shoulders. The ST's transitional period for the transfer of control had to begin all over again.

Once I observed the transfer of control in progress. A ST was teaching a Math lesson when the principal came to the classroom upon the CT's invitation. As he observed, he began to question the ST's approach to presenting the lesson. The ST showed visible signs of nervousness. The CT left her desk and walked over to the principal, put her hand on his shoulder, and told the ST to tell the reasons for her unique approach as it was a wonderful teaching technique. The ST beamed, and although still nervous, proudly relayed her reasoning for doing the Math lesson the way she did.

The perceptions of specific incidents by the STs and the CTs often determined the realities of the actual transfer of control. Also, they often determined the latitude allowed to the ST by the CT in the degrees of freedom to make decisions. When analyzed the collected data
from all the observations substantiated the resultant data from the interviews. In the areas of convergence between the STs' and the CTs' responses, this was verified in the observation data. In the areas of divergence, the observation data corroborated this contrast by substantiating one or the other's viewpoint.

4.4 Presentation and Analysis of Questionnaire Data

A third phase of the study consisted of two questionnaires (APPENDICES G & H). The first questionnaire, the "Who Decides?" Questionnaire, was the researcher's adaptation of the format of the "Who Decides?" Questionnaire developed by Wolfson and Nash (1965) and revised by Cussen (1974). This adaptation was developed by this researcher to determine who was making the decisions, the ST, CT, or SV, during the student teaching experience. The second questionnaire, the Paragraph Response Questionnaire, utilized the researcher's adaptation of the Paragraph Completion Method as used by Hunt et al. (1978), Ingersoll (1984), and Nisbet (1990). This adaptation was developed by this researcher to determine the perceptions of the CT and the ST regarding who decides and what degrees of freedom are involved in decision-making experienced during the transfer of control over the course of the practicum. Both questionnaires were designed to cross-check the collected data in Phases 1 and 2 on the decision-making process in the transfer of control.
4.4.1 The "Who Decides?" Questionnaire

The instrument was designed by the researcher as an objective questionnaire of one hundred questions. The questions were organized into an introductory set of twenty-one questions, then a set of nineteen questions were repeated for each of four time-frames of the practicum, and then three final questions pertaining to Master Week. The respondents were directed to check off the respective category (ST, CT, SV) to indicate who is making the decisions regarding the topics of each of the one hundred questions. The process for the analysis and presentation of the CT and ST responses involved comparisons and contrasts of the data. Table 5 (APPENDIX L) lists the complete numerical responses of all the nine CTs and eight STs participating in Phase 3. The number for each category is written as a ratio with the numerator representing the tally of the CTs’ responses and the denominator representing the tally of the STs’ responses. The actual totals of the tallies for each group was sometimes greater than or less than the actual number of participants for that group. This is due to multiple selection of categories (representing a sharing of authority) or a question item being left blank. Table 5 indicates there were several areas of convergence between the ST and the CT responses. Also, several responses indicated divergence amongst the participants.
4.4.1.1 The "Who Decides?" Questionnaire Data Analysis

The first twenty-one questions were general questions relating to the practicum experience.

1. In deciding who has the most significant input into where the practicum will be located, responses of the CTs and STs differed. The CTs indicated that SVs have the largest input while the STs have slightly more input than CTs. In contrast the STs indicated that STs had major input with minor input by the CTs and very little input by the SVs. I experienced the ST choosing the location with the CT having the option whether to accept or reject the placement. The CTs usually based their decision from observations of the ST during the initial interview process.

2. In deciding in which grade level to teach CTs reported the STs had the most influence, with the SVs having significant input. The CTs believed they had minor input. STs disagreed by stating the SVs had minor influence and the CTs had more influence than the CTs believed. They agreed that STs had the major influence in the decision.

3. In the matching of the CT with the ST the CTs stated that the CT and ST had equal input, but the majority of the decision-making rested with the SV. In contrast the STs stated equality of decision-making authority by the ST and the SV with only slight influence by the CT.
4. In responding to who decides who is the authority figure during the practicum the CT placed the SV and the CT as in charge. The ST was not mentioned as being an authority figure by the CT. This was in contrast to the STs who believed a triad of authority existed. The pecking order of this authority was CT, ST, and SV.

5. In responding to who decides on the SV's observation schedule, both the CT and the ST indicated the SV makes this decision more than the CT or the ST.

6. In deciding who decides if a logbook should be maintained both the CT and the ST indicated the SV does.

7. In responding to who decides the content of the logbook, the CT and the ST both indicated the SV decides.

8. In responding to who decides who has access to this logbook, the CT and the ST both indicated the SV decides, but the ST makes the decisions half as often as the SV with the CT having no input into that decision.

9. In deciding who selects the criteria for determining the readiness for the transfer of control the CTs and STs chose the CT as the most influential. A major comparison here is the mutual agreement of the CTs and the STs that the SVs had no decision-making authority in determining readiness.
10. In responding to who decides who determines readiness for the transfer of control, both groups indicated the CT makes this decision.

11. In selecting the cues and signs to determine readiness the CT was designated by both CTs and STs as having the major input. STs disagreed with the statement of the CTs that they, the STs, had some input also.

12. CTs stated that CTs determine how the cues and signs will be exchanged with input only from the STs. STs agreed and stated that SVs are slightly involved in the decision.

13. In who decides on the initial transfer of control the CTs and the STs believed the CT had the major influence with STs having little input and SVs having no input.

14. In responding to who decides in what area the initial transfer will take place, although there may be some sharing by the ST, the CT always made this decision. The STs indicated agreement. The SV had no input.

15. CTs had major influence in the decision to allow STs to teach small groups. Although STs had minor influence the SV had none.

16. CTs stated they determined when STs taught the whole class, with a limited input by the STs. STs disagreed and weighed ST input nearly equal to CT input. Noticeably absent in both responses was SV input.
17. CTs stated they decide when the first lesson plan is developed. Minor ST and SV input is allowed. STs disagreed and indicated that there was equal influence by CT and ST.

18. In responding to who decides on the curriculum area of the first lesson, both the CT and the ST indicated that slightly more decision-making is done on the part of the ST. In contrast the collected data in Phase 1 seemed to indicate that CTs believed they chose specific content area, not the ST.

19. In deciding on the content of the first lesson the CTs believed almost equal input had occurred with the ST slightly ahead. The STs disagreed by stating they had a major influence in the decision.

20. The STs claimed major authority in deciding on the length of the lesson. In contrast, CTs believed they had a little more influence in the decision.

21. CTs believed they decided on the scope and sequence of the first lesson with a strong input from the STs. The STs disagreed and twice as many STs stated they have more input than the CTs.

The following set of nineteen questions was asked relative to four blocks of time throughout the entire practicum. The questions were identical during each block of time and were repeated for Weeks 1 - 3, Weeks 4 - 8, Weeks 9 - 13, Weeks 14 - 16, with question #22 being
repeated as question #41, #60, and #79 respectively, with question #23 being repeated as question #42, #61, and #80, and so on. The same corresponding questions over the four time blocks are analyzed together.

22/41/60/79. In deciding on the arrangement of the classroom settings the CTs believed they had shared decision-making with the STs from Weeks 4 - 8 with major ST influence by Weeks 14 - 16. STs disagreed and stated they had only attained equal authority by Weeks 14 - 16.

23/42/61/80. By Weeks 14 - 16 the CTs had stated they still had major input into the arrangement of the classroom with major influence also exercised by the ST. The STs disagreed that the CTs still maintained major influence at this time. This pattern became a dominant factor throughout the responses to the questions, i.e., the STs believing the CTs had given up more authority to make decisions than the CTs admitted to.

24/43/62/81. Throughout the four week time blocks it was indicated that the decision-making started out with the CT and gradually shifted to the ST. There was more sharing indicated on the part of the CTs than indicated by the STs, who felt they were making more of the decisions.

25/44/63/82. CTs disagreed with the STs' claims to decision-making regarding the composition of the class groups by Weeks 14 - 16. STs reported that CTs only had
minor input whereas CTs believed they held on to major input.

26/45/64/83. Concerning the selection of the content of classwork a major contrast showed in Weeks 4 - 8. CTs had stated that STs had shown a dramatic increase in decision-making. STs believed they had not. STs also believed they had relegated the CTs to minor influence by Weeks 14 - 16. CTs claimed they had retained much stronger authority of control.

27/46/65/84. By Weeks 14 - 16 STs reported overwhelming decision-making authority in regard to the content of written work. The CTs stated they still retained major input, which differed from the ST viewpoint.

28/47/66/85. From Weeks 1 - 3 both the STs and the CTs indicated that twice as often the CTs make the decision as to who corrects student work. For the next two sets of time, Weeks 4 - 8 and 9 - 13, there is a sharing of this decision, but by the last stage, the decision is made more often by the ST.

29/48/67/86. In who decides to display student work during Weeks 4 - 8 the CTs had indicated a major increase in the ST input. The STs reported that their degrees of freedom to make decisions during this time had only seen minor increases.
30/49/68/87. CTs stated that STs had major input into the decision of the theme of the bulletin boards by Weeks 9 - 13, but the STs believed this did not happen until Weeks 14 - 16. The CTs disagreed with the STs who stated that the CTs retained only minor influence in the decision.

31/50/69/88. The STs had believed a slight increase had occurred during Weeks 9 - 13 on who decides on classroom routine/schedule whereas a majority of the CTs had believed they had transferred more of the control to the STs by this time. Another diverging response occurred in Weeks 14 - 16 when the STs believed their decision-making authority had increased dramatically and proportionately to the decrease of CTs' influence.

32/51/70/89. In deciding what discipline procedures to use the CTs completely made decisions through week three and the STs agreed. Gradually STs increased their input, but most CTs held onto the authority, as some CTs described it as sharing. The same pattern continued from the STs' viewpoint, but they believed they gained more autonomy by Weeks 14 - 16.

33/52/71/90. In deciding what types of risks are allowed in classroom management STs stated that dramatic rise in ST decision-making and a major decline in CT decision-making occurred during Weeks 9 - 13. By Weeks 14 - 16 STs stated that they were in major control of the decision-making
process; however, the CTs still claimed significant influence.

34/53/72/91. STs stated they had been allowed greater degrees of freedom in decision-making for instruction than they had been allowed for classroom management during Weeks 1 - 3. The CTs claimed a major increase in decision-making occurred during Weeks 4 - 8. STs believed that they had gained no increase during this period. Although the STs believed they had major influence by Weeks 14 - 16 and that the CTs had only minor influence, the CTs disagreed. CTs stated that they still retained significant influence in the degrees of freedom to take risks allowed in instruction.

35/54/73/92. The CTs disagreed with the STs' statement that CTs dramatically transferred control to make decisions on the degrees of freedom to experiment by Weeks 9 - 13. Even during Weeks 14 - 16 the STs felt the CT influence to be minimal and the ST influence to be much greater.

36/55/74/93. CTs reported that the latitude allowed in the degrees of freedom was overwhelmingly in their control during Weeks 1 - 3. STs believed they had some influence. By Weeks 9 - 13 the STs noticed a slight increase whereas the CTs stated they had transferred a dramatic increase in the decision-making process to the STs. By Weeks 14 - 16 the STs claimed an absence of significant control by the CTs. However, the CTs reported they still held significant control.

145
On who decides whether the proximity of the CT is helpful/hindering during Weeks 1 - 3, the STs disagreed with the CTs. The CTs had indicated significant decision-making authority by the ST, but the CTs had retained major input. STs indicated the reverse, major ST input and significant CT input. By Weeks 9 - 13 STs reported that CTs had no input at this time. The pattern of CT/ST disagreement emerged again when the CT stated they still retained major input.

In deciding whether CT/ST conferences should take place, the CTs believed they held major decision-making authority. They allowed slight increase in ST input but felt that the SVs had no influence in the decision. The STs stated that they had held equal input with the CTs during Weeks 1 - 3 and also believed that the SVs had slightly influenced the decision. Throughout the practicum the STs believed they had been transferred an increasingly major portion of the control involving the decision-making process as the weeks progressed. Disagreement occurred when the STs stated that by Weeks 14 - 16 the SV had some influence, but the CT had no influence in the decision-making regarding conferencing.

The CTs reported contrary to the STs regarding who decides the content/length of conferences during Weeks 1 - 3. The CTs stated that the STs had a significant input whereas the STs reported that major input by them with a
minor input by the CTs did not occur until Weeks 14 - 16. A few STs also involved the SVs in the decision-making process whereas no CTs did.

40/59/78/97. STs believed their degrees of freedom to make decisions on the frequency and necessity of conferences increased significantly over the weeks of the practicum. CTs indicated that a much slower rate of increase had occurred for the STs. The STs reported the absence of CT influence by Weeks 14 - 16 which was contrary to the CTs' selections which declared significant decision-making control still held by the CT and not completely transferred to the ST.

The final three questions, #98 - #100, apply specifically to Master Week and resulted in the following responses.

98. In responding to who decides on the readiness for assumption of the role of teacher the CTs believed that both the CT and the ST had major input into the decision with the CT a little more than the ST with a slight influence being made by the SV. In contrast, the STs stated they had a major role in this decision with a slight input by the CT and no input by the SV.

99. In deciding the readiness of the ST for Master Week CTs believed they had slightly more influence in the decision than the STs. CTs also stated that the SVs did have a very
minor influence in the decision. In disagreement the STs believed they had held a major influence in the decision with only minor input from the CT and none from the SV.

100. As far as who decides if a successful practicum has occurred the CTs responded that they have slightly more influence than the ST. The SV was given a minor input by the CTs in this decision. In contrast the STs stated that they held major influence in this decision with the CT and the SV equally sharing a minor input into the decision.

4.4.1.2 Summation of "Who Decides?" Questionnaire Data

The responses to the "Who Decides?" Questionnaire disclosed numerous contrasts in the opinions of the CTs and STs as to the degrees of freedom extended to the ST to make decisions. The myriad opinions of the CTs and the STs indicated a variance between the CTs' and the STs' perceptions and realities during the transitional period involving the transfer of control. The constant pattern which emerged was the belief of the STs that they had, on numerous occasions, completed the transfer of control from the CT, yet the data indicated that the CT had not completely relinquished the authority to make decisions. The data indicated that the CT continued to limit the degrees of freedom and retained strong influence throughout the transfer of control of the decision-making process.

Several major points emerged from the "Who Decides?" Questionnaire data.
1. A divergence of perception frequently occurred between the CT and the ST as to who was making the decisions.
2. Both STs and CTs reported SV's role was limited to the opening sequence of events and the final evaluation of the success of the practicum. The only area the SVs were reported to influence the transfer of control in was conferencing.
3. Both CTs and STs agreed the CT determined ST readiness to begin the transfer of control.
4. Both CTs and STs believed CTs selected the cues and signs for determining ST readiness.
5. CTs believed they determined when ST would teach the whole class. Only half the STs agreed, the other half believed they determined this.
6. Both CTs and STs agreed CTs decided in which area, content or non-content, the transfer will begin.
7. STs perceived they had more input in the decision than the CT regarding length and the scope and sequence of the lesson. The CTs disagreed with this.
8. The CTs believed they shared decision-making earlier in the practicum than the STs had perceived.
9. Even though the CTs extended the degrees of freedom in classroom management and instruction to their STs, they actually reported they still retained a significant amount of control in these areas right till the end of the practicum. The STs believed CTs still held control but not to the degrees the CTs believed it.
10. Specifically in the area of discipline the CTs retained the largest amount of control throughout the practicum. The STs were aware of this retention of control.

11. STs believed they had more input into conferences as the practicum progressed. CTs agreed, but they also held more control of input by the end of the practicum than the STs perceived.

12. CTs believed they determined ST readiness for Master Week with major input by the STs. In contrast the STs believed they had a major input in the decision with only minor input by the CT.

4.4.2 The Paragraph Response Questionnaire

The instrument was designed by the researcher as a subjective questionnaire of twenty questions. The respondents were directed to briefly answer each question in paragraph form, with a reminder that a yes or no was not an adequate response. The methodology for reporting the data involved recording the responses to each question from the CTs' point of view and immediately following with the STs' viewpoint for the same question. Utilizing the format of "gang quotes" from Phase 1 of the research, the researcher grouped several minor quotes together for impact and brevity. The CT or ST code name was placed at the conclusion of a major quote wherever applicable. These code names are to be found in Tables 3 and 4. The initial questions dealt with the specific categories used as the framework for this research study and were expanded
throughout the Paragraph Response Questionnaire for a total of twenty questions.

4.4.2.1 The Paragraph Response Questionnaire Data Analysis

1. Was there a definite series of steps in the transfer of control from the CT to the ST?

Seven CTs stated that a definite series of steps occurred. One CT believed that a series of steps existed, but it was more implicit than explicit. "Very gradual with mutual shared decisions. My STs are empowered with decision-making from day one" (Carol). Two CTs stated that no definite series of steps were in place. One in particular stated that if steps existed they were not continuous, but rather "sometimes it's two steps forward, one step backwards. It's different each time, too" (Gayle).

Only five STs agreed that a series of steps was part of the CT's process for the transfer of control. One ST stated, "Yes. A series of steps [existed] throughout the semester starting with the least challenging, and then increasing with time" (Meghan). Other STs believed it was gradual and related to specific systems already in place within the particular school or classroom. One ST stated, "Transfer of control was immediate in my experience because of the 'quad system.' I was given my own groups for spelling and math during the first week" (Jennifer).

2. Was there a specific time sequence for each phase of the transition from ST to the role of teacher?
The CTs emphatically stated that there was no time sequence. One CT related this to the readiness of the ST to accept the transfer of control.

No. Readiness was determined by observation and mutual consent. Each ST is ready for transition in different areas at different times. For example, one may be ready to run group meetings after only two days, but may need six weeks to write a lesson plan. On the other hand, another ST might come prepared to write plans but can't manage a group for another twelve weeks. (Gayle)

Another CT related the time sequence for the transfer of control to the preparation the ST had obtained in the Teacher Education Program. "Yes, varies with the strength of skills intern starts experience with" (Pat).

STs were not as certain as the CTs that a time sequence was not in effect with only four stating no time sequence existed. The responses varied from "every two weeks," "depending on readiness," or "definitely during Master Week" to more specific time references. One ST indicated a very definite time sequence, "We scheduled around a time when I could get chick eggs" (Marissa).

3. What criteria were used to determine the ST's readiness to assume control?

The majority of CTs stated that they most often made this determination through shared decision-making in conferences. "Shared decisions: If the ST was comfortable and confident in trying out groups" (Carol). An important indicator was the CT's analysis of the progress of the ST.

The way in which the ST related with the students, seemed to understand curriculum content, demonstrated desire to try ideas, etc. We developed a calendar at
the beginning of the semester to set out areas of the curriculum ST would assume... with an eye on practicing with one area/week. We followed this schedule, though not rigidly. (Kate)

Two CTs added classroom management skills as indicators of the ST's readiness. This significance of the ST's management ability was critically assessed. One CT judged the ST's "academic abilities and familiarity with the curriculum in conjunction with requisite classroom management skills" (Tim).

A majority of STs believed they shared equally with the CT in the evaluation of readiness. This was in contrast to the responses on the "Who Decides?" Questionnaire where the CT received most decision-making votes in the area of readiness. A typically occurring ST expression indicative of readiness was "when I was comfortable" (Patricia). The vagueness of this response raised the question of whether STs are dealing with reality or perception. Two STs responded that they believed they were ready to accept the transfer of control from the CT by "feelings" (Emily) and "no specific criteria other than my feelings, my level of confidence and willingness to try" (Elaine). Several STs were more specific, as in "the CT decided or suggested when [CT] felt I could be responsible for classroom duties" (Roberta). One ST mentioned earlier reminded us of the demands of our profession as she described the evaluation of readiness: "When I could get chick eggs, (I was raising chicks), my comfort level and my teacher's opinion" (Marlissa).
4. Did you feel the CT was testing the ST's readiness to assume control?

Controversy arose concerning feelings that the CT was testing the ST's readiness to assume control. Two CTs mentioned they did not like the word testing. One CT underlined the word testing and wrote in the word assessing (Kate). Another CT qualified the term by stating, "Yes, testing in the sense of observing and measuring" (Gayle). Five CTs believed that a measurement of achievement for readiness is utilized. One CT explained, "Yes, the schedule we developed was designed to provide experience in each curriculum area, before Master Teaching, without overwhelming the ST" (Kate). Another CT responded, "No, [it was] rather a watching and helping a process happen" (Lauren).

A majority of STs responded to the question without questioning the term testing. Although two said yes, one ST qualified the word testing, "I don't know if I would call it 'testing.' [CT] watched me with my first few lessons and then we talked about my lesson and [CT] gave me suggestions" (Jennifer). In contrast to the responses of the CTs, five STs believed that no testing of readiness was taking place. One ST expressed a surprising response, "No, I was just 'thrown in.' It was very helpful" (Patricia). One must question how "thrown in" could be considered by the ST to be a positive action. STs were aware of various aspects of measurement that the CT utilized to determine readiness. Several ST responses included the following: "time alone in
the classroom, "observing my readiness," "mutual
determination," "talked about my lesson and gave me
suggestions," and more specifically, as stated by one ST.
"Yes. I started assuming control with single lessons, on to
a mini-unit, then units" (Elaine).

5. During what week did the ST first perceive he/she was
making decisions?

Five CTs stated that decision-making began Week 2.
three said Week 1, and one said it varied. One CT related
to a specific situation, "Single class - 4th Week (Novel
Group) - all class - 2nd Week in charge" (Pat). Another CT
stated, "I would guess early on (maybe 2nd or 3rd week) in
areas such as choice of book to read (from a given category)
and bulletin board design" (Kate).

STs responded more directly relative to a time
schedule. Four said Week 1: typical responses were "I made
decisions my first week" (Marissa) and "small decisions
began on Day One, during many parts of the day" (Meghan).
Four others said Week 3: typical responses were "I made all
decisions during Master Teaching Week. I made decisions
about my lessons after about the third week" (Jennifer) and
"by the third week I was making every day decisions about
curriculum and management" (Roberta).

6. Did the ST perceive the CT was transferring control to
him/her?

All nine CTs believed that the STs had perceived the
transfer of control. One CT commented, "I believe so. We
talked about that. But there was always the understanding that the CT was there to support and provide a safety net" (Kate). A proviso seemed to be imparted by the following response: "It is different with each ST. This semester it was made verbally explicit. Other semesters, there was a more tacit agreement" (Gayle).

All eight STs also believed that they had perceived the CT was transferring control. Responses ranged from "yes, every week I saw my responsibility increasing," "yes, [CT] asked me my thoughts and feelings on things before making a decision," "yes, [CT] clearly stated that [CT] was slowly moving out of the picture for me to take charge," "yes, as a matter of fact it was stated, 'Go ahead, it's your decision now,'" to a most revealing point that the CT had to be personally aware, "yes, a little bit. [CT] was used to doing things and had to consciously let me do them instead" (Terry).

7. Was the ST aware of the CT's control and the ST's need to assume that control?

All CTs emphasized a positive response to this question. Specific references to being made aware during conferencing were reported as follows: "yes, reminded throughout the semester," "usually STs are very much aware and need to be assured that with time they too will gain that control," "yes, this was a frequent topic of discussion," and finally a distinct personal CT observation, "Yes. That is always the most frightening aspect of student
teaching. I believe. It is the area in which the ST needs the most support" (Kate).

Seven STs also agreed with the CTs on this question. Several interesting ST responses were "fully aware in all cases. It was the respect from the [pupils] that I needed to assume," "yes, because that is what we are taught student teaching is all about," and "yes, we met weekly to discuss my role and eventual total control of the classroom." Two STs gave specific responses relative to the significance of the CT in the classroom: "Yes, the control a CT has is obvious. The [pupils] respect the CT more than the ST" (Elaine) and "Yes. But there is only so much control a ST can have -- the classroom teacher has natural control -- I try to control -- I tried to manage" (Meghan). One ST said, "No. We worked well together (Emily).

8. Did CT/ST conferencing help the ST gain the transfer of control?

All CTs answered that conferencing was helpful for the ST to gain the transfer of control. One of the comments included, "Yes, especially in maintaining consistent expectations" (Tim). Some CTs mentioned the difficulty of letting go of the control and how the proximity of the CT influences the exchange process and how conferencing aided the transfer of control: "Yes, it clarified some questions about what to do when I didn't let go [of control] and share" (Lois) and "In some cases, yes, in other cases the
only thing that helps it happen is for the CT to leave the room. Conferencing paves the way" (Gayle).

All STs said conferencing was helpful, but they varied on the degree to which it was helpful. STs stated that conferencing was important to their need for positive feedback. "Yes, very much. Conferencing with [CT] helped clarify any questions that I had" (Jennifer). Several ST comments included "CT/ST conferencing was a help. My CT left it up to me," "yes, discussing our thoughts and ideas helped me to successfully take control," and "yes, somewhat -- we discussed how I felt about taking bits and pieces of the day over." One ST's view was "conferencing helped a bit, but the experience is what really helped" (Terry).

9. Were reflection and discussion of educational philosophy major components of these conferences?

All CTs stated that reflection and discussion of educational philosophy were major components of conferencing. Some of their comments included "yes, especially reflection, probably not so much educational philosophy in the formal sense," "definitely, and much discussion of individual's [ST's] needs," "yes, as well as the need for the ST to develop a personal style," and the response of one CT indicated the belief that the theory had been learned at the university and was now being played out in the classroom: "Certainly they were integral, but more often it was related to specific events and children. This
practical experience is what is so important to student teaching. Relating theory to practice" (Kate).

In contrast five STs said no and indicated a nuts and bolts discussion was the major content of conferences rather than reflection and philosophical discussion. Typical ST responses were "no -- deciding on what the needs of the individual students was the focus," "no, we never discussed educational philosophy, only what went well and what didn't go well," "occasionally we would talk about our beliefs about different learners." Two STs responded that Site/CT placement as part of the initial interview process for the selection of the CT and the ST pairing had diminished the need for discussion of educational philosophy during conferencing. "It was not a major component in discussion because [CT] and I knew from the beginning that our philosophies were similar" (Jennifer). Another ST stated, "Sometimes - there is an underlying philosophy that we shared which made us a good match and we both knew the other's philosophy" (Meghan). Only one ST answered yes to this question and stated, "Yes. We shared our philosophies and learned a lot from each other" (Roberta).

10. In what week do you feel the transfer of control begins? CTs' responses varied as to which week they believed the transfer of control actually took place. It was evident from the responses that most CTs believed the process is gradual and that it "depends greatly on ST readiness" (Lauren). The range extended from the first to the fourth
week. Another CT stated, "The transfer is a slow process over the semester. It begins with the ST making decisions on a single class and progresses to all day control. Should start the Fourth Week" (Pat). One CT qualified her response somewhat by stating, "It is a gradual process. For some STs it has taken two to three weeks to get past the pure observation process, though" (Gayle).

Many of the STs' responses differed from those of the CTs. Six STs were split between the first and the second week with comments that included "actually, I feel it begins the First Week with taking over groups," "right away in the First Week this gradual process began," and "some transfer of control begins the Second Week." One ST said it was the eighth week, but another ST believed the transfer of control had not started before the end of the fifteenth week, the week preceding Master Teaching Week, although she had experienced complete control prior to that week due to the absence of the CT. "The week before Master Teaching. I also had full control when the CT was absent" (Meghan).

This comment referring to substitution by STs once again highlighted the continual reference to the possible significance of substitution by the ST in the CT's absence. Comments presented throughout this research indicate a firm belief by the STs that substitution instilled self-confidence in the ST. All of those STs who had substituted during their practicum stated that it had proven to them that they were indeed capable to successfully assume
the role of teacher. One Phase 1 ST related her reluctance to assume control until the CT encouraged her to substitute for her in her absence. "A few times she would give me control and I would say 'Are you sure I'm ready for this?' My first day subbing . . . she reassured me I could do it and I found I could do it" (Marva, 125-130). From the comments by the CTs about substitution it was clear that it was a common occurrence in some placement sites, even to the point that the CTs used a successful day of subbing as a gauge of readiness for the CT to begin the transfer control in the classroom. As one Phase 1 CT stated, "All STs substitute for me when they demonstrate that they are competent" (Chris, 336-342).

I found that the substitution policy varied from school to school even within a school district. One principal allowed substitution only within the CT's classroom, another allowed substitution at any grade level, while yet another placed an aide in the room with the ST in the CT's absence. However, this is an area for future study because many Teacher Education Programs and many School Districts do not allow ST substitution.

11. In what week do you feel the transfer of control is completed?

CTs had a wide range of responses to the actual week they believed the transfer of control had been completed. This was obviously a difficult question for the CTs. One reason it may have been difficult was owing to the necessity
for reflection by the CTs as to exactly how complete control, and the degrees of freedom to make decisions within the bounds of that control, had literally been actualized. Four mentioned by Master Week, three said a few weeks before "so that Master Teaching is not a jolt" (Linda). CT hesitancy was evidenced with responses such as "Final Week, usually, but as I said, it is gradual and different for each ST" (Gayle). Another CT expressed the belief that complete control is "never transferred -- always shared -- except Master Week" (Carol). One CT seemed almost cryptic as she stated. "It varies - sometimes never" (Lauren). One CT left it blank while another referred to the significance of proximity and the degrees of freedom allowed the ST in the decision-making process and the eventual transfer of control. "Ideally, it happens during Master Teaching when the CT stays away from the classroom. As long as the CT is in the room, [pupils] see the CT as the authority figure" (Kate).

Six STs emphasized Master Week as the week they completely assumed control. Several of the more definite responses included "the week after the first part of Master Teaching. Master Teaching [was] two weeks, after week one" (Meghan), "the last week; I still had major responsibilities in the classroom" (Roberta) and "week sixteen, when I was in charge of the curriculum and the [pupils]" (Elaine). While one ST answered in "week fourteen," another ST felt it was much earlier in the practicum because it "depends upon the
subject. If the 'transfer of control' means in all subjects, I would say in week five when the pupils feel comfortable" (Patricia).

12. Do you feel an understanding exists between both participants that a transfer of control takes place from the CT to the ST?

All the CTs believed that an understanding did exist between both participants that a transfer of control does take place between the CT and the ST. Three CTs were more specific in their remarks: "only during Master Week" (Carol), "yes, an understanding exists as well as the need and methodology of the transfer" (Tim), and "usually, yes, sometimes a ST is unwilling to assume autonomy. In other cases the ST will take charge of something prematurely and without the consent of the CT" (Gayle).

In comparison all the STs agreed with the CTs. Three STs responded: "yes, we both knew that at some point I'd take over the class" (Emily), "yes, we were both aware of the transfer of control" (Terry), and "yes, both CT and ST realize this transfer should take place" (Elaine). One ST indicated how significant this understanding was to the assumption of the role of teacher. "Yes. This understanding helped to make the transition smooth and effective" (Roberta).

13. Do you believe the CT's proximity dictated the mode of the ST's teaching style?

The CTs were divided on their response to this question. Six CTs responded with brief comments: "no."
"yes, to some extent." "yes." "sometimes." "this semester yes, other cases no." and "I would not say dictated, but I do think it influenced the ST's style." Three other CTs were much more emphatic in their replies: "Probably. That is why I think pre-internship interviews are helpful. They allow ST to choose a classroom in which CT's style is somewhat compatible to that of the ST, or at least belief systems are similar" (Kate). "It certainly is affected -- but it is also something I discuss in detail with my STs. I want them to find their own style and what works best for them. I don't want another me" (Lauren), and "Perhaps, at first. But I try to help the ST find his/her style as long as it is at least complementary to mine" (Linda).

The STs' responses were in slight contrast to the CTs' responses. One said yes and five STs believed that proximity had a much greater influence on their teaching style but within certain limits. "My CT influenced me a lot, however, encouraged me to try new things . . . experiment . . . create my own style" (Marissa). "In the beginning it did" (Jennifer). "In some respects [the CT] influenced my behavior/management style" (Emily). "Of course, a little bit. If the ST does not have their own teaching style, then the CT influences it a great deal" (Terry), and "In some instances, yes. However, no matter how much a ST tries to adopt the CT's teaching, the ST's style comes through even a little" (Elaine). Of the two STs who said no, one explained it as "teaching style security"
and the other justified the answer by stating it was a "blending of CT/ST style."

14. Are the degrees of freedom allowed the ST in decision-making dependent on the latitude granted by the CT?

Eight CTs stated that latitude was a significant component affecting the degrees of freedom allowed the ST. Five CTs' comments follow, showing once again the apparent reservation of the CTs to allow degrees of freedom to make decisions to be transferred to the STs: "I imagine so. I try to give a lot of latitude" (Linda), "Yes, and also the ST's ability to handle that freedom" (Lauren), "Yes, it is my responsibility ultimately" (Tim), and "Yes, but also on the the CT's sense of the ST's readiness. The CT has dual responsibilities to the [pupils] in the class and to the ST" (Kate). The one dissenting CT stated, "The CT can put an absolute cap or ceiling on this latitude, but within that the ST will only assume as much as she chooses" (Gayle).

Seven STs were in total agreement with the CTs. Four STs made specific allusions as to how the CT influences whether the latitude is allowed or not. "Yes, but the ST needs to know what latitude they [sic] have -- this is done through conferencing" (Meghan). "Yes. If I wasn't allowed an equal say or the availability of running my own section of the classroom by my [CT], it would change" (Patricia). "Yes. The CT has to feel confident that the ST is capable of making decisions" (Elaine), and finally "Yes. My CT gave me a lot of room for decision-making, but this was [CT's]
perrogative" (Roberta). The remaining ST simply stated, "I don't understand."

15. Do you believe the SV influences the transfer of control between the CT and the ST?

An overwhelmingly negative response was given by all the CTs. CT responses ranged from "not in my case," "no, not at all," "not particularly," "if necessary, yes," and finally "no, only in rare cases." CTs stated the lack of SV influence on their decision-making was because of the CT's perception of what the role of SV was. "No, not to a great extent -- it is not their role" (Tim) and "Perhaps. But that was not something that heavily influenced our decision-making" (Kate).

Seven STs agreed with the CTs, while one answer was "somewhat." Four STs responded as follows: "My SV did not. I think some might" (Terry), "Not in my history as a prepracticum and a practicum student. I had a strong relationship with my [CT]" (Patricia), "Somewhat in that the SV makes sure that the Programs requirements of transfer of control are met" (Elaine), and finally "Not really. The SV is not there enough to have any bearing. The SV is there to observe, give feedback, and insure that the university requirements are fulfilled as well as to provide resources, etc." (Jennifer).

16. Do you feel the transfer of control must occur in order to have a successful student teaching experience?
CTs overwhelmingly stated that the transfer of control must take place, with only one negative reply. The affirmative responses ranged from "yes, absolutely" to more specific responses, such as "yes, definitely! The ST needs the opportunity to see what teaching is really like," "yes, the experience is a necessity!" "yes, if this is to be an accurate milestone." and finally "yes -- without it the ST is never confident that he/she can takeover his/her own classroom. It is part of the confidence building, but the road is sometimes rocky" (Kate).

STs agreed with the CTs. Four STs stated: "Yes, my Master Teaching really helped me realize what goes into having your own classroom" (Emily), "Yes. This needs to happen in order for the ST to have a successful Master Teaching experience" (Roberta), "Definitely. The ST needs to be able to feel what it is like to be in control of the classroom" (Terry), and "Yes. The ST needs to find ways that are comfortable to him/her. A discovery occurs through the transfer of control that is vital to the ST because the transfer of control lets the ST know if he/she is cut out to be a teacher and if he/she wants to be one" (Jennifer). One ST responded with a no but added, "It certainly helps. One can learn a great deal from observation and teaming" (Elaine).

17. Does the transfer of control become a reality or is it a perception of the practicum experience?
CTs were divided on this question. Three CTs said it was a reality, three said it was a perception, and three said it was somewhere in between and involved sharing. Five CTs responded to this question as follows: "This depends to a large extent on the CT and the ST" (Tim), "A reality, except that I am ultimately responsible for my children and classroom, so I have to know what is going on" (Linda). "It is perception. If things were not working out, I would have to step in for the sake of my students and what we had developed together. But that would be an extreme case" (Kate). "Somewhere in between. In an ultimate sense, control still lies with the CT in that he/she is accountable to parents, and will need to incorporate the work the [pupils] do with the ST into the rest of the year's work. But the ST does indeed have control within that framework" (Gayle); and finally "I feel that Master Teaching is a simulation at best as to what it is like to have a classroom of your own. The 'buck' still stops with the CT" (Pat).

Five STs stated that the experience had been a reality. Three STs stated it was somewhere in between reality and perception. Responses ranged from "No, it becomes a reality. This is obvious in the attitudes of the [pupils]" (Roberta), "It becomes a reality if the CT and the ST want it to be" (Elaine). "I think it is a reality. I could tell when the transfer of control had taken place. The [pupils] perceived it too" (Jennifer). "The transfer of control becomes a reality, however, [pupils] perceive the CT as the
real authority figure" (Marlisa), and finally "It is a reality up to a point, but again, the classroom teacher is the teacher [pupils] met on Day One. I didn't come in until January" (Meghan).

18. If the transfer of control and the degrees of freedom to make decisions does not occur, how is the practicum affected?

Three CTs' responses were vague: they ranged from no answer written to the "degrees of freedom is throughout" and "I can't imagine this." The other five CTs' responses indicated that the practicum would be adversely affected if the transfer of control and the degrees of freedom to make decisions did not occur. Their responses included: "it is not a success," "It isn't successful and the ST is unaware of strengths and is unprepared," "greatly! I think there is a need to seriously reevaluate and ask why?" and finally "the ST has not had a successful experience and that would need to be addressed in the Three-Way [conference with ST. CT and SV]. That is part of the SV's role." Two CTs placed stronger emphasis on how the practicum was affected if the transfer of control did not occur. One stated, "It is an exercise in servitude, with the ST simply carrying out the wishes of the CT. Without the experience of feeling the responsibility for the workings of the classroom the ST will never feel confident or prepared for a classroom" (Gayle). The other responded, "If this does not happen it probably means that the ST was not ready for it and therefore is not ready to be certified" (Linda).
STs held similar beliefs to the CTs on this particular issue. Seven of the eight STs felt the practicum would be an unsuccessful experience. Their comments included: "I believe the [pupils] would not respect or rely on the ST as much." "I don't think the practicum would be as effective of an experience as it is," "you wouldn't feel as though you could manage a classroom," and "the ST leaves knowing that he/she has to work on being able to take control." Three STs indicated a stronger interpretation than the others. One ST stated, "The practicum student feels like he/she has not done a good job; feels discouraged and frustrated" (Marlissa). The next ST said, "The ST will not be prepared to have his/her own classroom" (Terry). The third ST responded, "The ST will not be getting the experience and preparation s/he needs to explore what it is really like to be a teacher and have your classroom" (Jennifer). The eighth ST stated this question was not applicable.

19. Do you believe the CT should take specific training courses?

Six CTs stated that training courses would be beneficial, while three were not really against training but questioned it being required. In the group not espousing a CT training course, one CT referred to the experience of the CT as a criteria to judge the necessity of course work but added "in general, it is probably a good idea" (Linda). Another CT also believed other issues to be more important than the training and stated, "It is helpful, but I'm not
sure it is essential. More important is the CT's ability to relate to interns" (Kate). The third CT qualified his answer, "No, but it would be helpful for those who would like to participate, particularly to establish expectations and lines of communication" (Tim). The responses of the CTs who recommended training included these ideas: "I feel this should be done in a workshop format on sight" (Pat). "I think all CTs should have some training in supervision, as well as on-going supervision seminars or support groups" (Gayle), and finally "Yes, if we truly believe we want to offer the best in education -- then it must be first reflected in our own training" (Lauren).

STs were less certain of the need for CT course work than the CTs. Once again there was a variety of responses that were quite interesting. Four ST statements included: "I don't feel training courses are necessary," "not necessarily. However, the CT should be willing to be open-minded and chosen very carefully," "no, a ST learns from the CT and needs to see a natural teacher with faults so the ST can develop their teaching style," and "no, he/she needs to be supportive but should just apply his/her experiences." One ST answered, "It depends. Veteran teachers are experienced enough, but may need refresher courses." Some of these responses seemed to indicate that some STs may have misunderstood the wording of the question to mean teacher training courses, rather than the researcher’s intention of training courses specifically to
be a cooperating teacher. Three other STs believed that the CT should take course work. The first said, "Yes, I think it is important for the CT to understand how to transfer the control to the ST" (Terry). The second stated, "Yes. I believe that there are necessary steps that a CT can take, like mine did, to help the ST" (Jennifer). The last wrote, "Two out of four CTs I have worked with in the past two years might have benefited from taking a CT training course" (Elaine).

20. Do you believe the SV should take specific training courses?

All the CTs responded in the affirmative. Five CTs responses were emotionally charged: "Definitely! The SV has a great responsibility to maintain consistency and to provide communications with the School of Education" (Lois), "Absolutely! I have had too many SVs who do not understand supervision" (Linda), "Yes. I also believe no school of education should hire anyone to supervise a ST that has not had classroom experience" (Gayle), "Most definitely! It is sad to think of the number of SVs who have been taking on this responsibility, are not teachers, and have never been in a classroom" (Lauren), and finally, as one CT stated.

Yes! At least some supervisory training within the university program. It is also helpful for the SVs to have some understanding of principles related to subject area or grade level. The most successful SVs who have worked with my STs had a wealth of their own personal experience on which to draw, more than theory. (Kate)
STs overwhelmingly agreed with the CTs. Seven STs suggested that training be required to help the SVs do their jobs adequately. Two of them felt training was important for SVs so they could "support ST and have a more active role" because "formal observing is most effective if the SV can observe for as many things as possible and relay this information to the ST." Four others stated further, "I think training courses helps [sic] the SV in his/her job, as well as later on should he/she continue supervising teachers or teach" (Marissa). "Most definitely. It's difficult to observe someone and collect data and I think required courses in that process would help the SV's" (Elaine), "Yes. to help prevent subjective observation and judgement [sic] calling, also to eliminate culture barriers. For example, if the SV comes from a place where schools are run entirely different from the American School Systems as a whole" (Jennifer), and finally "Definitely. A SV can be a very important part of ST, but if she/he does not know what they [sic] are doing, their [sic] position is wasted" (Terry). Even the one ST who responded that specific courses were not necessary also added that "before s/he begins entering the classroom s/he should have full knowledge of what the semester will 'look like' instead of weekly seminars" (Patricia).

4.4.2.2 Summation of Paragraph Response Questionnaire Data

The analysis of the Paragraph Response Questionnaire outlined numerous contrasts and comparisons between the
viewpoints of the CTs and the STs relative to the transfer of control. The responses of the CTs and the STs throughout the data disclosed the necessity for the transfer of control to take place in order for the STs to feel confident that they had assumed the role of teacher. The degrees of freedom to make decisions within that transfer were deemed crucial by both participants. They both acknowledged the importance of the ST being given the latitude to take risks and benefit from successes and failures.

The data from the Paragraph Response Questionnaire clustered around ten themes based on the concepts of the six categories and the six questions guiding the research.

1. Series of Steps

Seven CTs stated there was a series of steps in the transfer of control from the CT to the ST, while two said none existed.

The STs concurred with five responding in the affirmative and three in the negative.

2. Time Sequence

The variation in the responses by the CTs indicated they felt there was no time sequence for each phase of the transition from ST to the role of teacher because of many factors, in particular the readiness of the ST.

Four of the eight STs believed that at most an implicit time sequence existed: the other four said none existed.
3. Readiness

The CTs stated the criteria used to determine the ST's readiness to assume control were the ST's interaction with the pupils, the ST's understanding of curriculum content, and the ST's classroom management skills. All criteria were discussed in conferences. Five CTs said they were testing the ST's readiness to assume control, although two qualified the term to mean assessment, observation, and measurement of skill level.

The STs reported the criteria they used were their feelings of comfortableness based on their confidence and willingness to try and on feedback from CT's observations and assessment. Five STs felt their readiness was not being tested by the CT, two felt it was, and one qualified the term testing to include observation, discussion, and suggestion.

4. Making Decisions

Three CTs felt the ST first perceived he/she was making decisions during week one, five CTs felt it was week two, and one CT said it varied.

Four STs felt they first perceived themselves to be making decisions during the first week: the other four by the third week.

5. Conferencing

All CTs felt conferencing helps the ST gain the transfer of control because it maintains consistent expectations, clarifies issues between the CT and the ST.
and paves the way for the transfer of control. CTs use conferences to discuss criteria for readiness with their STs. All CTs felt that reflection and discussion of educational philosophy were major components of these conferences, although most reported that reflection was included more often than was philosophical discussion.

All the STs agreed conferencing was helpful, especially with positive feedback from the CT, but they were varied on the degree to which it was helpful. Five STs felt reflection and discussion of educational philosophy were not major components of the conferences, two other vague responses were given, and only one ST felt there was a sharing of educational philosophies and that she learned from this experience.

6. Proximity

Five CTs believed the CT's proximity dictated the mode of the ST's teaching style, three felt it did affect it, and one felt it did not.

One ST believed that it definitely affected the ST's teaching style, five others agreed but qualified their statements to say proximity certainly affected it, and two said no.

7. Degrees of Freedom in Decision-Making

Eight CTs said the degrees of freedom allowed the ST in decision-making are dependent on the latitude granted by the CT. One CT disagreed by explaining the CT controls the latitude but the ST will only assume the
control allowed within that latitude as much as he/she chooses to do so.

Seven STs agreed with the CTs that the decision-making they experience is dependent on the latitude granted by the CT. One ST simply replied that she did not understand.

8. Transfer of Control

The CTs felt the transfer of control began between the first and the fourth week and was a gradual process dependent on ST readiness. A few CTs felt it was completed as early as around the twelfth week, but most felt it was in place by Master Week. All CTs believed the SV did not influence the transfer of control with one explaining it was not the SV’s role. Eight CTs were emphatic about the transfer of control having to occur for the ST to have a successful experience. Only one CT stated it was unnecessary. Three CT responses were vague, but the other five stated the degrees of freedom to make decisions must occur in the transfer of control because without decision-making authority the ST would lack success, confidence, and preparedness for his/her own class as a teacher, even for certification.

Six STs felt the transfer of control began between the first and second weeks, with one indicating the eighth week and another the fifteenth. Most STs felt it was completed late in the practicum, with one stating the fourteenth week, six stating Master Week, and the one
exception who stated week five. Seven STs said the SV did not influence the transfer of control. One explained there was a partial influence due to requirements of the Teacher Education Program. Seven STs said the transfer of control is necessary for the success of their practicum, whereas one said no, but added it certainly helps. Seven STs said without decision-making authority in the transfer of control, the experience would be unsuccessful and they would be unprepared to be in their own class without control.

9. Reality or Perception

All nine CTs stated the STs were aware of the CT’s control and the ST’s need to assume that control. Nine CTs said the STs perceived the CT was transferring control to them. All CTs agreed an understanding exists between both participants that a transfer of control takes place. On the question of whether the transfer of control becomes a reality or is a perception, three CTs felt it was a reality, three felt it was a perception, and three felt it was somewhere in-between as a sharing experience.

Seven STs commented positively they were aware of the CT’s control and their need to assume it. One ST said no because the control was shared. All eight STs agreed they perceived the CT was transferring control to them. All the STs agreed an understanding exists between both participants that a transfer of control takes place.
Five STs reported the transfer of control was a reality and three STs said it was a sharing experience.

10. Training Courses

Six CTs believed that CTs should take specific training courses in the form of workshops, seminars, and support groups. Three CTs disagreed, not because they felt they were unnecessary, but that they should not be required. All nine CTs believed the SV should take specific training courses because of the importance of this role.

Three STs believed CTs should take specific training courses to understand how the transfer of control takes place. One ST said maybe, while four others said no, but these five responses may be a misinterpretation of the intended question by the STs as indicated by their responses. Seven STs believed the SV should take specific training courses, while one ST stated specific courses would be unnecessary, but the SV should have certain knowledge before entering the classroom in that capacity.

4.5 Concluding Remarks on the Presentation and Analysis of the Questionnaire Data

The data presented throughout the three phases of this research have shed insight on the transfer of control and the degrees of freedom in decision-making authority granted to the ST by the CT. The instrumentation used in the triangulation methodology has shown that many of the beliefs
of the CTs and STs were oftentimes perceptions of what was taking place and not the reality.

There were several findings which surfaced across all three phases of the research. There was no explicit series of steps in the transfer of control processes. The transfer of control was crucial to a productive student teaching experience. The degrees of freedom, and the latitude in which to utilize them to make decisions, had to be granted by the CT in order for the ST to eventually assume the role of teacher. The transfer of control was also seen to be a gradual process with no particular time sequence held by the CT to begin the transition and carry it through to completion. The only specifically planned time sequence was Master Week and that may have been because it is a requirement. Readiness was determined by the CT and usually was assessed by the ST's classroom management skills, understanding of curriculum, and interaction with the pupils.

Decision-making by the STs indicated that the transfer of control was in progress, which was generally by week four. Degrees of freedom to make decisions were dependent upon the latitude allowed by the CT. Over-assertive and under-assertive STs had difficulty obtaining this latitude from the CTs. Although conferencing was universal, the content and length varied greatly and changed as the practicum progressed. Reflective thinking and educational philosophy discussions were generally not elements of the
conferences. STs did value conferences for their positive feedback from the CTs.

Correct interpretation of cues and signs exchanged between the CT and the ST played an important part in the ST’s preparation for determining readiness. Cues and signs often communicated the CT’s latitude in the degrees of freedom allowed to the ST. STs did not see an explicit pattern in the CT’s latitude in the degrees of freedom to make decisions during the transfer; however, they did equate the decision-making allowed by the CT with the gradual assumption of the role of teacher. The STs realized that their degrees of freedom were also restricted by legal and moral responsibilities relative to where the authority to make decisions resided.

A number of interesting factors emerged from the data which were unexpected. A sharing of the decision-making authority was reported by some CTs and STs. This raised the question of the transfer of control not being allowed to occur and the ST not really assuming the role of the teacher in being solely in charge of the classroom. How does this affect their risk-taking, successes and failures, and their first year as a novice teacher if not in a team/sharing situation?

Another point of interest to emerge was the limited role of the SV. Both CTs and STs believed the SVs played a role in the events which commenced the practicum; however, they played a minimal role in the transfer of control. The
only other two areas in which they were utilized were in the three-way conferences and the final signature certifying the completion of the practicum. The CTs and STs strongly recommended the necessity for the SV to be specifically trained as a SV and experienced as a classroom teacher familiar with the grade level and subject matter of their STs. The significance of the resource seminars and the SV as a resource was mentioned but not emphasized. I believe this is an untapped resource which calls for clarification of the role of the SV and how the CT and ST view and utilize the offerings of that role.

A final interesting factor was the extent to which substitution by the ST gave significance to the transfer of control. It affected readiness, time sequence, degrees of freedom and proximity, legal and moral responsibilities, and latitude in decision-making allowed by the CT. When the ST substituted for the CT, the CT also gave up complete control to the ST, and the ST, while in this situation, actually assumed the role of teacher, even to the point of receiving monetary compensation from the school system.

The literature had emphasized the context of the socialization of the ST, the site, and the significant others involved throughout the practicum. The purpose of my study was to focus on the CT and the ST as they directly interrelated with each other in the process of the ST assuming the role of the teacher. The results of the accumulated data across the three phases of this research
clearly showed that the transfer of control was necessary for a successful student teaching experience and that all STs do not achieve the transfer in sufficient amounts to allow them to achieve the role of teacher. All STs completed the practicum; however, not all STs successfully obtained the latitude within the degrees of freedom granted to them by their CT to make all classroom decisions by Master Week. The three phases of the data delineated the myriad reasons why this anomaly occurred and numerous examples were given to support the ST and CT viewpoints. The degrees of freedom actually transferred from the CT to the ST varied from CT to CT and from ST to ST. Regardless of the latitude of the degrees of freedom actually granted by the CTs, the STs adjusted and perceived the transfer to be totally adequate for them to achieve in instructional and classroom management. However they were deprived of the fullness of their personal and professional development in their quest to become a teacher.
5.1 Introduction

This research investigated several variables of the field experience relative to the interaction between the CT and the ST. Six categories utilized as a framework to guide and discipline the research consisted of Time Sequence, Readiness, Formal Communication - Conferences, Informal Communication - Cues and Signs, Degrees of Freedom and Proximity, and Legal and Moral Responsibilities. The research process involved three phases. In Phase 1 ten sets of CTs and their STs were individually interviewed on audio-tape cassettes using specific guide questions for each group (APPENDICES D AND E). In Phase 2 the researcher made a series of classroom observations of the same participant population as interviewed in Phase 1. Phase 3 required the distribution, collection, and analysis of two types of questionnaires, the "Who Decides?" Questionnaire (APPENDIX H) and the Paragraph Response Questionnaire (APPENDIX J). The population surveyed in Phase 3 was not the population interviewed and observed in Phases 1 and 2. The STs participating in the first two phases had completed their practicum. It was desirable for this research to have STs currently serving in the field as participants in the third phase. The population of Phase 3 participants consisted of non-matched sets of nine CTs and eight STs currently serving
in the field at the same time. All phases of this research were completed in schools located in communities in western Massachusetts surrounding a university at which all ST participants were enrolled.

5.2 Review of Objectives

This research examined the role of the CT and the ST and the manner in which they interrelated with each other during the transition period of the transfer of control. Several variables of the field experience relative to the interaction between the CT and the ST were investigated. The central focus was on the process of the transfer of control from the CT to the ST. The degrees of freedom in teaching style and classroom management techniques permitted by the CT and the proximity of the CT to the ST were also investigated. It was believed by this researcher that they might indicate the extent of the decision-making authority during the transfer of control as allowed to the ST by the CT. The first objective was to provide a rich description of the events that appear to pertain to the transfer of instructional and classroom management control and authority as expressed in the words of the participants in the interview data (Phase 1) and supported by classroom observational data (Phase 2). The second objective was to investigate the accounts of the transfer process as perceived by the ST and the CT in the questionnaire data (Phase 3).
The research methodology employed a process which allowed for triangulation through the use of three data sources: interviews (McCracken, 1988; Spradley, 1979), classroom observations (Good and Brophy, 1984; Metzler, 1981; Siedentop, 1976), and questionnaires, both an objective check-off type (Cussen, 1974; Wolfson and Nash, 1965) and a subjective paragraph completion type (Hunt et al., 1978; Ingersoll, 1984; Nisbet, 1990). This method of triangulation was utilized in this research as the instrumentation for collecting the data.

It is believed by this researcher that the data from the research will be useful to managers of teacher education programs, principals, SVs, CTs, and STs. It is also believed that further understanding of the relationship between the CT and the ST during the transfer of control may lead to a more complete and successful student teaching experience. Through the interplay between the CT and the ST personal interrelationships of a social and a professional nature will develop allowing for a smoother transition of the transfer of control. As the CT actively transfers the control and the ST is prepared to accept it the eventual outcome is believed to be a positive assumption of the role of teacher by the ST.

5.3 Presentation Methodology for the Results of the Study

In order to discipline the reporting of the results of the study the six categories which formed the framework of the research and the six questions guiding the research were
utilized. The six categories were Time Sequence, Readiness, Formal Communication - Conferences, Informal Communication - Cues and Signs, Degrees of Freedom and Proximity, and Legal and Moral Responsibilities. The six questions guiding the research were

1. What are the significant factors affecting the transfer of control in instruction and classroom management involving the CT and the ST during the preservice clinical experience?

2. Who makes the decisions about the transfer of control, the ST or the CT?

3. How are these decisions made within the framework of the transfer of control?

4. Does a pattern appear during the transfer, either implicit or explicit, by which the CT determines the ST's readiness to assume the role of teacher?

5. What appears to influence the CT's and the ST's decision about the timing of the process of the transfer of control?

6. What is the significance of the degrees of freedom in decision-making as experienced by the ST to the rate of progress of the transfer of control and overall mastery of the preservice clinical experience?

The data for each of the STs' and CTs' responses were reported in respect to each of the six categories. The data from the CTs' and the STs' responses relative to the six questions were analyzed and reported as combined comments for each of the questions. It must be noted that several variables within each category or question overlapped into other categories or questions.
5.4 Results Relative to the Six Categories Forming the Framework of the Research

The six categories were developed as a framework for guiding the research methodology and were instrumental in maintaining the disciplined focus of the study. The culmination of the findings across all three phases of this research relative to these six categories were reported category by category. The pattern for the presentation of the data within each category involved the definition of the category as used in this study, a composite review of the data among the STs, a composite review of the data among the CTs, and a culmination of the contrasts and comparisons between the data for the STs and the CTs.

5.4.1 Time Sequence

The category Time Sequence was defined as the organizational pattern involving the number of days or weeks during the transition period in which the transfer of control occurs.

Shulman (1987) found STs were exasperated by the slow immersion process practiced by most CTs. STs responses to different questions throughout the current research indicated that they were anxious to be quickly immersed into the practicum and to successfully obtain the transfer of control toward assuming the role of teacher. One ST nearly destroyed the CT/ST relationship by trying to force the transfer of control to begin. Only emergency steps taken at
a three-way conference (CT/ST/SV) restored the situation to a workable one.

This current research data indicated that there was no explicit time sequence for initiating or completing the transfer of control. One CT from Phase 3 remarked.

No, readiness was determined by observation and mutual consent. Each ST is ready for transition in different areas at different times. For example, one may need six weeks to write a lesson plan. On the other hand, another [ST] might come prepared to write plans, but can't manage a group for another twelve weeks.

(Gayle)

Further, there was no time sequence for the duration of the transitional period. The only specifically scheduled time-frame was Master Week, the sixteenth and final week of the practicum, the week by which the ST was expected to have assumed control of classroom management and curriculum instruction. In their research Griffin et al. (1983) reported that although many Teacher Education Programs suggest a time sequence or pacing guide, when used it was found to be insignificant in its influence on the practicum. In this current study STs believed that a time sequence would have been extremely beneficial to their understanding of the process of the student teaching experience. As a result of not having one they relied on their personality, self-confidence, and self-actualization to successfully complete the transfer of control in order to allow them decision-making authority.

Data in this study indicated that one ST who was non-assertive found great difficulty in obtaining the
transfer of control. Two STs who were assertive had rationalized CT/ST problems during transition by perceiving them as part of the overall process. These STs who were overly assertive either "strategically adjusted" (Etheridge, 1969) by accommodating the CT's style or techniques, continued in a tug-of-war which they ascribed to personality conflict, or compromised with the CT in order to ensure the success of the practicum. Resolution was often not found until engaging in a three-way conference among the CT, ST, and SV. One Phase 1 ST suggested the presence of a slight tug-of-war involving the CT and the ST and the transfer of control.

[My] CT's not good at delegating stuff. She's been doing most of the planning . . . . She hears [other] STs are doing much more than I'm doing . . . part of it is kind of a racket going between our personalities and part of it is not . . . . We never really had a timeline . . . on the whole, I've been fitting into her plans . . . which makes it hard for me because I don't have ownership. (Donna, 115-126)

STs generally believed that an implicit time sequence existed. It was both informal and gradual and eventually led up to the transfer of control. For those STs who believed their CT had a time sequence, it had never been defined, outlined, or discussed during conferences. STs believed a time sequence was important to the success of their field experience and had expressed a desire to see an explicit one in practice.

CTs reported they had no explicit time sequence for their STs to begin or complete the transfer of control. One CT had developed an informal calendar to help the ST. In
general, CTs reported that a formal time sequence was extremely impractical due to the diversity of ST candidates they received. All but two of the ten CTs in Phase 1 believed they had at least an implicit time sequence pattern for initiating and completing the transfer of control. All ten CTs stated that the pace of the time sequence accelerated or decelerated based on the initiative, maturity, ability, and experience of the ST.

Experienced CTs had specific reasons for pacing the assignment of certain levels of responsibility to the ST. Some CTs stated that non-content areas, such as Morning Meeting, Story-time, or an Art lesson, were the best first steps in which to transfer control to the ST. These non-content areas allowed the STs to concentrate on the management of large groups or an entire class, without the burden of a structured, content-laden lesson plan to be adhered to. Those CTs who chose content areas, such as Reading or Math, to initiate the ST usually started with individual instruction or small groups, seldom with a large group, and never with a whole class. In general CTs followed the pattern of expanding from small group to large group to whole class. Although there was similarity in the immersion scenarios from a lesser to a greater responsibility for control and decision-making authority on the part of the ST, responsibility to make decisions and the authority transferred from the CT to the ST to make those decisions was gradual. A pattern of small group to large
group seemed to develop in content areas with classroom management techniques being the criteria for determining when to increase group size. Non-content areas involving bulletin board projects, story-time, and disciplinary management while transferring between classes or during recess tended to account for most initial large group activities.

Goodman (1985) found that small Reading groups is the content area in which most CTs allowed their STs to start the process of the transfer of control. In this current study three CTs agreed because they believed issues relative to content and discipline were more manageable in Reading due to its structured format. Although CTs sought consistency in their approach to the initial transfer of control there was no explicit time sequence involving a pattern of events toward ultimately transferring control and the degrees of freedom to make decisions, even in commonly agreed upon areas such as Reading.

Data from this research indicate that some type of time sequence should be incorporated into the transitional period. In particular, the STs believed it would increase their knowledge of CT expectations and possibly increase ST self-confidence. This researcher believes initial phases of the practicum could be more structured in order to create a framework in which the STs could discipline and gauge their activities. This would enable the STs to form a common bond with fellow STs and allow for detailed discussions during
their whole group seminars. Some Teacher Education Programs establish a weekly support group for the STs to share their resources, failures, successes, and future trial-and-error creative projects. A sliding scale to guide the CTs and within which to allow the STs to have a frame of reference to gauge their progress could be developed. It is natural to assume that each individual case study would have to progress at its own pace, but some formal parameters could be established.

5.4.2 Readiness

The category of Readiness was defined as the criteria utilized by the CT to determine the ST's preparedness to accept the transfer of control and the ST's criteria for him/herself to demonstrate his/her willingness to accept the transfer of control.

In this current research data indicated that eight out of ten STs in Phase 1 had established no personal criteria for readiness to assume control. STs discussed understanding readiness as knowledge from "past prepracticum experiences," "Just jump right in," and just to "do what I am told." All ST participants stated that they were fully aware of the transfer of control, that they must be prepared to assume it, and that the possible success or failure of their practicum might depend on it. Deep emotional feelings were expressed by many STs as the transfer of control began. Feelings of anxiety, relief, and enthusiasm all intermingled. In the majority of cases the STs believed
that readiness had been determined by their CTs. STs believed that the criteria used by the CT was how much confidence they, the ST, had developed in the handling of discipline problems. Eddy (1969) had reported that insecurity and anxiety play a major role during the period of transition. In this current research STs believed CTs determined readiness by challenging the STs' beliefs. The manner in which the STs responded to this challenge was believed by the STs to be a major criteria by which the CTs determined their readiness. This was especially evident in the matter of substitution when the CT was absent and the ST was in charge of the classroom. The degree of success of this day of substitution was evaluated by the CT as an indicator of the ST's readiness to begin the transfer of control. A Phase 1 CT referred to this experience as a time of comfortability for the STs because they knew they had been successful.

Seeing ST be really comfortable . . . knowing [ST] felt in charge . . . [while] subbing, ST took over and really did an excellent job . . . and knew [ST] did a good job and [ST] was ready for that kind of responsibility. The sign there was my feeling that [ST] was comfortable, [ST] agreeing with me, and to prove it, [ST] actually taking over for a couple of days . . . and everyone survived. (Gail, 235-244)

CTs stated in this study that while they may not have a formal, explicit pattern for determining readiness they most certainly had an implicit one. Although a common determinant was the ST's ability to maintain classroom discipline, the data indicated that patterns of readiness were varied among all the participating CTs. In general.
the ST was expected to consistently follow the CT’s classroom management methods in order to maintain discipline. CTs indicated that STs became more exuberant and energetic as the transfer of control to make decisions began. CTs interpreted this enthusiasm as a sign of readiness. A Phase 1 CT stated

I think [ST] was seeing [self] as a teacher: "I can do this" and wanted to and was stepping in more naturally... spontaneously into situations that needed teacher attention. It just seemed to be a natural process. I felt my job was to back off more and more. (Peggy, 162-172)

Criteria for limiting or extending degrees of freedom to make decisions were frequently developed based on disciplinary procedures learned by the ST and the initiative of the ST in accepting the transfer of control.

Although no explicit pattern existed for determining readiness, there was a specific pattern by CTs for revoking the transfer of control. CTs were in agreement that pupil safety, interruption of the consistency of the classroom management procedures, or inadequate instruction called for a review of the ST’s acquisition of authority and the degrees of freedom to make decisions during the transfer of control.

Readiness to begin the transfer of control was of major significance to both the ST and the CT. Definite ideas of the need for the ST to be ready existed but were not formally stated. The degree to which the ST and the CT determined readiness often varied greatly. This sometimes led to problems, such as the CT extending the
decision-making authority and the ST not accepting the challenge or feeling inadequately prepared.

5.4.3 Formal Communication - Conferences

The category of Formal Communication - Conferences was defined as the meetings between the CT and the ST before, during, and after the transfer of control: their frequency, length, and content as well as any changes experienced in them as the semester progressed are significant factors of formal communication.

STs believed that conferences could be characterized as CT controlled in content, frequency, and length. Typical ST responses from Phase 1 included, "[CT] sat down in the beginning and said, 'This is how that works and this works'" (Anne, 61-62) and "I spend time with [CT] every day after school . . . every day. . . . I was expected to be there from eight to four and now it's from eight to five, so that we would always debrief every day" (Donna, 74-83). STs believed that very little ST input was sought in the early stages of conferencing. ST responses indicated CTs varied in establishing a specific time pattern for the conferences. They ranged from "once per week . . . lasts about ten to fifteen minutes," "a total of an hour for that week--a few minutes here and there," "from twenty minutes to an hour and a half," "fifteen to twenty minutes, almost every morning in the beginning," to "after school at least once per week from one hour to three hours." STs saw the conferences as important ways to gain positive feedback. Another Phase 1
ST stated, "I was gaining confidence . . . [CT] made [CT's] expectations clear and gave me a lot of reinforcement" (Marva, 62-64).

CTs believed conferences were to explain the classroom management system, establish discipline policies, discuss pupil ability levels, and develop lesson plans. CTs reported that they tended to mini-lecture initially but eventually allowed major ST input as the weeks passed. One Phase 1 CT summed up the importance of conferencing as a gauge of the ST's progress in the transfer of control in the following statement:

[I] generally look to see if the ST is asking more and more questions of a specific nature indicating . . . that he/she has a good idea what's going on in the classroom . . . . Conversations turn from my lecturing to the intern's questioning and also commenting, offering suggestions. I know we're in the ballpark of this student teacher to take charge of my classroom. (Chris, 56-67)

Guyton and McIntyre (1990) have identified conferencing to be an important element in the student teaching experience. Data collected in this research indicate that although CTs had numerous conference sessions they were not regulated to specific time, frequency, location, or content. In general, conferences began to decrease in number toward the middle of the practicum. STs reported that this was due to their increased proficiency in classroom management and not to teaching style or educational philosophy. Actually, the lack of discussion relevant to educational theory during conferencing was found to be prevalent among CTs and STs. Opportunities to increase theoretical discussions were not
sought even when the necessity for discussion relative to classroom management had greatly diminished. In general, content of the conferencing emphasized classroom management and discipline and minor discussions on teaching style and educational philosophy. Although a definite pattern of time committed to conferencing existed, its range varied from several hours per week at the beginning of the transfer of control to mere minutes per day after the eighth week.

Reflective thinking and discussions of educational philosophy were infrequently present during conferencing and were not major components of the conference at any time during the practicum. Emphasis was placed on mastering classroom management techniques and disciplinary procedures until a period of comfortability was achieved. At this juncture of comfortability reflection and philosophical discussions did not increase, rather the conference time frequency decreased.

5.4.4 Informal Communication - Cues and Signs

The category of Informal Communication - Cues and Signs was defined as the verbal and non-verbal signals exchanged between the CT and the ST indicating the latitude in the degrees of freedom to make decisions allowed during the transfer of control.

STs reported that not only were verbal and non-verbal cues and signs utilized by the CT, they were a major source of feedback, encouragement, and self-confidence builders
outside the conferencing. The statement by one ST from Phase 1 is representative of this finding:

Sometimes [CT] would say [to the pupils], "You need to go ask [ST]" . . . or . . . "I don't know, what do you think, [ST]?" . . . and [CT] would ask my opinion so that the whole class would see me making a decision as an authority. During recess [CT] would hand me the bell and whistle and state, "If you need me, send someone in to get me." (Marva, 104-112)

To STs the importance of understanding the cues and signs impacted on their perception of how limits were set upon their degrees of freedom to take risks, apply teaching strategies, and present new content material during instruction. Although the actual reality of limitations set on them may have hindered their enthusiasm to experiment, the impetus given them by the CT in exchanged cues and signs enabled STs to explore and extend the boundaries within the degrees of freedom to make decisions allowed them by the CT.

How the CT and the ST interpreted the verbal and non-verbal cues and signs was crucial to the eventual success of the transfer of control. CTs reported that social dynamics were constantly in effect with non-verbal cues and signs going back and forth with the ST. Responses from the STs were analyzed by the CTs who were being cautious about allowing degrees of freedom to take risks in classroom management and instruction. CTs believed they gave STs cues and signs through verbal and non-verbal encouragement informing them that the transfer of control still had limitations on it. How STs picked up on these cues and signs often determined the extent of the degrees of
freedom to make decisions allowed them by the CT and
determined future situations regarding the proximity of the
CT.

During Phase 2 classroom observations it was very
noticeable that an extensive non-verbal language was in
effect between the CT and the ST. A major aspect of the
cues and signs interaction was the developing
interrelationship between the CT and the ST. Failure to
recognize or correctly interpret the cues and signs, the
informal and oftentimes subtle communications, caused one ST
to misread most of the CT's verbal and non-verbal messages.
This Phase 1 ST was seeking formal, overt statements and
stated

I really hung back a lot. . . . I guess I was really
looking for a directive kind of situation . . . a
person who would delegate and delineate expectations. .
. . I was just hanging back. . . . maybe a little bit
overwhelmed by [CT's] style. (Donna, 232-240)

Only through extensive discussion during several CT
requested three-way conferences involving the CT, ST, and SV
was the problem ultimately resolved.

5.4.5 Degrees of Freedom and Proximity

The category of Degrees of Freedom and Proximity was
defined as the latitude allowed by the CT during the
transfer of control giving the ST the opportunity to make
decisions and experiment with instructional and classroom
management techniques, including the location of the CT and
its impact on the performance of the ST.
STs reported that eventual assumption of the role of teacher during the practicum was determined by the degrees of freedom to make decisions allowed them by the CT. Also, the proximity of the teacher physically determined limitations set upon the STs. The research data indicated that the degrees of freedom and the proximity of the CT to the ST as the transfer of control was in transition often determined the eventual outcome of the practicum. STs believed that limits were set by the CTs but that an organized pattern involving limitations was not in evidence. STs reported that they did not intentionally set limits upon themselves. Limits were set by the CT, by perceptions of the cues and signs interpreted by the ST, and by the proximity of the CT to the ST during classroom instruction. STs reported that even the mere presence of the CT in the room affected their degrees of freedom to make decisions. STs experienced a gradual process of increasing degrees of freedom as an explicit action by the CT. STs did not perceive limitations being placed on them as a specific goal of the CT. However, CTs stated that they did in fact set specific limitations on the degrees of freedom allowed the ST and classroom observations during Phase 2 supported this contention. Six out of ten STs in Phase 1 perceived no limitations whatsoever had been placed on their teaching style.

Proximity of the CT to the ST had a major role in determining the perception of the degrees of freedom to make
decisions held by the ST. Classroom observations in Phase 2 and specific remarks and actions by one ST indicated that it extremely effected the ST's mode of classroom management techniques and partially effected instructional techniques. The degrees of freedom allowed were used as a tug-of-war instrument between the CT and the ST during the transfer of control. One Phase 1 ST stated that while teaching a planned science lesson the CT curtailed her degrees of freedom and this presented a slight tug-of-war in processing the transfer of control.

Sponges incident . . . [CT] ended up jumping in, overstepping. . . . It's hard because that shows me as the second in control, which makes it impossible for me to gain full control by the end because the kids pick up what happens right away. . . . They know I still have to answer to [CT]. (Taylor, 137-141)

STs came to expect degrees of freedom to make decisions as the sign that authority was being passed on to them. It became their rite of passage in their quest to assume the role of teacher.

All CTs reported the presence of the degrees of freedom but stated that only an implicit pattern of administering it existed. They believed that proximity was necessary even if it did have an adverse effect on the ST. They hoped it did not, but their need to be present, to observe, to pass cues and signs, to watch for items of a legal and moral nature, and their professional need to maintain the ties with "their" class superseded the risk of any negative effect upon the ST. This Phase 1 CT explained, "When I'm there things are generally on target" (Chris, 481-482). There was
no consistency among CTs regarding time allotted to limitations placed on the STs’ degrees of freedom and proximity. One major fact did emerge: all CTs set greater limitations on the ST’s degrees of freedom to make decisions in the area of classroom management than they did in instruction and teaching style.

CTs acknowledged that their proximity did have an effect of the degrees of freedom experienced by the STs. CTs deliberately created situations in which to “absent” themselves from the lesson or the room to give STs “more feeling that they are in charge . . . more room to breathe” (Chris, 465-467). These created absences ranged from running errands to the office, to working with individual pupils in the library, to a whole day of absence which allowed for the ultimate in degrees of freedom, a day of substitution by the ST. These created absences were used by all the CTs in this study and showed a pattern of organized and deliberate attempts by the CTs to curtail the effects of their proximity to the ST. Different levels of absence occurred based on the maturity of the ST, the presence of an aide, and the willingness of the CT to allow the transfer of control to take place. However, one fact still remained evident, as reported by Kidder (1989), “CTs are supersensitive to being away from the classroom and want their class back” (p. 129).
5.4.6 Legal and Moral Responsibilities

The category of Legal and Moral Responsibilities was defined as the CT's and ST's perceptions related to the transfer of control and the degrees of freedom allowed during the transferring of authority and their understandings of the legal and moral risk factors involved in determining the completeness of the control actually transferred. This includes external controls and constraints of the setting as well as limitations set by contractual obligations.

STs reported that they were not aware of any legal or moral guidelines other than common sense. No real guidelines were forthcoming from the state, the university, the school district, the principal, or the CT. When probed the STs realized the significance of a legal determination of their role and limitations offsetting a complete assumption of the role of teacher during their field experience. STs believed they had been limited in the transfer of control because of legal and moral responsibilities held in the contractual authority held by the CT. One ST was discussing risk-factors involved in assuming the role of teacher and set limitations on the degrees of freedom to make decisions because of the realities of the transfer of control allowed the ST by the CT. This Phase 1 ST stated:

I think that in the position I'm in I have to be a little more careful. For example, when I have recess duty, if something ever happened to a [pupil] at recess, where I'm not under contract, and I'm not a
teacher, the school system could actually get into trouble if I were the only person out on recess duty. (Sarah, 164-171).

STs expressed dismay at never having thought about this nor what risk factors might be involved. They believed that fairness, consistency, and firmness completely covered any legal and moral questions.

CTs stated that they were not familiar with any legal or moral guidelines, other than safety issues, relative to student teaching. Areas of classroom activities, transition between classroom and specialists, and bus dismissal were not considered in legal or moral terms. Most CTs expressed concern over recess duties and science lessons as they analyzed the questions raised on their legal and moral responsibilities. "Yes, a primary [concern] is recess duty. I feel [ST] should have another teacher out there. . . . In terms of leaving [ST] alone in the classroom, I don't feel as if that's a high-risk area at all" (Peggy, 239-247).

Although all CTs believed the ST substituting for their class allowed the CT a complete granting of control and authority to the ST, the legal responsibility for it rested solely with the ST. One CT in Phase 1 summed up this belief by stating, "When someone subs for me, that's that. That's the real ultimate that you can do. You're out of the classroom, you're out of the building, the sub's being paid, and I'm not responsible" (Fran, 395-403).
5.5 Responses to Questions Guiding the Research

Investigation of the six questions provided parameters for the research methodology and maintained a focused direction throughout all three phases of the study. The responses are a culmination of the comparisons and contrasts of all the data collected and analyzed in this research.

5.5.1 Research Guide Question 1

What are the significant factors affecting the transfer of control in instruction and classroom management involving the CT and the ST during the preservice clinical experience?

The research data resulting from the three phases of the study indicated several factors deeply influence the transfer of control. These factors may be used as guidelines to question the process of the transfer of control and can be partially itemized as follows.

1. The initial matching of the ST and CT regarding teaching style and educational philosophy
2. The maturity/self-confidence of the ST
3. The absence of the CT's explicit, formal pattern for any of the six categories of this study
4. The absence of an organized set of personal or professional goals and objectives by the ST
5. Interpersonal communication skills, both formal and informal
6. The problem of lack of assertiveness or over-assertiveness by the ST
7. The personal difficulty experienced by many CTs to grant the transfer of control
8. The informality of the communication between the CT and the ST tending to lead to insecurity on the part of the ST
9. Because of implicit rather than explicit planning and expectations by the CT, the ST may seek survival tactics rather than risk-taking techniques.

10. The degrees of freedom for the ST to make decisions are limited by the proximity of the CT.

5.5.2 Research Guide Question 2

Who makes the decisions about the transfer of control, the ST or the CT?

Although many STs believed they shared the decisions with the CTs, the data indicated the CT decided all factors surrounding the commencement of the transfer of control, the transitional period during the transfer, and the culmination of the transfer of control. Although input by the STs was permitted, the CTs ultimately made the decisions regarding all aspects of the practicum. Regardless of the degrees of freedom allowed by the CT to the ST to make decisions the CT frequently set limitations that had to be adhered to by the ST. An authoritative relationship was in effect in all instances, albeit several were enlightened ones.

Of importance was the perceived absence of the SV input into the decision-making process between the CT and the ST. The SV tended to be limited to suggesting resource materials and being a mediator where necessary. They were not part of the planning team for the procedural steps to be taken during the transfer of control. The absence of the principal’s input into the time sequence or criteria for ST readiness was also evident.
5.5.3 Research Guide Question 3

How are these decisions made within the framework of the transfer of control?

Although no explicit pattern of decision-making was in evidence, the CTs definitely had an informally structured implicit pattern of dealing with the different stages of the transfer of control. Data indicated that structure and guidance were constantly in effect, but possibly because of the diversity of the CTs and the STs in educational and maturation levels, a pattern was never formalized.

The CTs concurred that they had not formalized a pattern of granting decision-making nor extending the degrees of freedom in which the ST could utilize their newly gained authority. STs believed that CTs should formalize the steps which process the transfer of control because they need a disciplined framework by which they can respond to the CTs' demands. This structure would also give STs high levels of self-confidence to achieve measurable goals.

5.5.4 Research Guide Question 4

Does a pattern appear during the transfer, either implicit or explicit, by which the CT determines the ST's readiness to assume the role of teacher?

A definite pattern was found in the data whereby the CT determined the ST's readiness to assume control. The STs stated that it had never been explained formally to them, but they knew it existed. The CTs stated that they were very conscious of a process evolving but that it was not preconceived, changed from ST to ST, and possibly could not
be formalized due to the diversity of practicum students. This researcher believes it could be formalized and would lend needed structure to the STs during the formidable period of the transfer of control throughout the student teaching practicum. Flexibility and patience would be the facilitators for the transfer of control and security and confidence would replace the ST’s need for survival techniques.

5.5.5 Research Guide Question 5

What appears to influence the CT’s and the ST’s decision about the timing of the process of the transfer of control?

The data indicated that readiness played a major role in the timing of the process. The CT looked for the ST’s attitude in accepting challenges, reaching out for new assignments, involvement with the pupils, and in particular success with classroom management and discipline techniques.

The STs determined the limitations set upon them by the CTs and reacted accordingly. The more assertive ST often began the transfer process earlier than the less assertive ST. In the following four cases the wide range of variables affecting the transfer can be seen:

ST A believed the transfer of control had taken effect the first week, whereas the CT stated it had not occurred until the twelfth week, and never completely, even during Master Week.

ST B stated that the CT never transferred the control while the CT stated the ST refused to accept it. ST B was obviously never in the role of teacher even though the ST perceived he/she was in control during Master Week.
ST C was overly assertive and commenced the transfer of control without the consent of the CT. Only the intervention by the SV, who requested a three-way conference, reestablished the interrelationship between the CT and the ST for a successful transfer of control to occur.

ST D was unsure of her CT's feelings toward her until the CT informed her that she was going to be absent from the room and she wanted [ST] to assume the control of the classroom. The ST was elated because she believed that the CT trusted her abilities. "Wow! She really trusted me, and even now when [CT] is absent I substitute! [CT] doesn't want anyone else in the classroom. She has enough confidence in me to say, 'I want you!'"

Substitution was a determining factor influencing the CT's decision to commence the transfer of control. Both CTs and STs emphasized the complete immersion by the ST into the role of teacher that "subbing" affords. Many CTs based their decision of the ST's readiness to receive control on how the ST had handled the class during the CT's absence. STs found a major uplift in their self-confidence while subbing and an increase in their assertiveness which they believed helped bring about the transfer of control.

Questions of the legality of STs' substituting were raised but no legal restrictions were found. University and school community policy varied on allowing substitution by STs. In general, principals usually encouraged STs to substitute when the CT was absent, although it was usually frowned upon by the university.

5.5.6 Research Guide Question 6

What is the significance of the degrees of freedom in decision-making as experienced by the ST to the rate of progress of the transfer of control and overall mastery of the preservice clinical experience?
The degrees of freedom played a major role in the transfer of control in decision-making from the CT to the ST and the ultimate assumption of the role of teacher by the ST. The CT set the limitations on the transfer of control by having the authority to set the time sequence, criteria for readiness, frequency and content of conferencing, and the message of the intended cues and signs transmitted to the ST.

The willingness of the CT to allow the transfer of control to take place, the amount of authority being transferred, and the limitations set affecting the degrees of freedom the ST had to operate under were all crucial to the successful transfer of control. The manner in which the ST accepted and reacted to the degrees of freedom allowed by the CT were also important to the ST's perception, and actuality, of the eventual assumption of the role of teacher.

The interaction and slight tug-of-war between the CT and the ST involved the decision-making process, the degrees of freedom allowed, and the ultimate mastery of the transfer of control. The outcome of the transfer of control may also play a major role in the efficacy of the ST as he/she ultimately assumes the actual certified role of teacher in future years.

5.6 Limitations

The purpose of this research was to investigate the degrees of freedom in decision-making during the transfer of
control in instruction and classroom management from the CT to the ST. As an outcome of this directed focus several limitations emerged. Locke, Spirduso, and Silverman (1987) stated, "There are times when all factors cannot be controlled as part of a study design, or when the optimal number of observations simply cannot be made because of problems involving ethics or feasibility . . . the investigator proceeds but duly notes the limitation" (p. 28). Although the research and the presentation of the data in this study included many of the following variables, they were not analyzed in depth. The asymmetrical characteristics of the CT and the ST, such as gender, age, race, or ethnicity, were variables which permeated the selected populations of this research. These are all significant aspects of any research population. To illustrate how these variables could impact the topic of decision-making in this research, the variable gender might be considered. Tannen (1990) reported on how men and women interpret each other's comments regarding decisions:

Many women feel it is natural to consult with their partners at every turn, while many men automatically make more decisions without consulting their partners. This may reflect a broad difference in conceptions of decision making. Women expect decisions to be discussed first and made by consensus. They appreciate the discussion itself as evidence of involvement and communication. But many men feel oppressed by lengthy discussions about what they see as minor decisions, and they feel hemmed in if they can't just act without talking first. When women try to initiate a freewheeling discussion by asking, "What do you think?" men often think they are being asked to decide. (p. 27)
This perspective can be related to CT and ST interactions during conferencing when different genders are involved.

Combinations of variables may create new variables. For example, one CT referred to herself, in comparison to the ST in the eyes of the pupils, as "the close to fifty-year-old, old maid" and to the ST as a "cool dude" young person (Joyce, 238-242). This comment revealed age, marital status, and lifestyle as possible additional variables affecting the interpersonal relationship between the CT and the ST. Future researchers may want to analyze these and other factors as significant variables in the process of decision-making in student teaching.

The possibility for variables continues when one observes the field site. Some factors are public/private school, class size, school size, and urban/suburban/rural setting. Although several of these factors were noted as important, their inclusion in the analysis might have encumbered and detracted from the focus of this research. The additional data might have interfered with this researcher's disciplined framework relative to the original purpose of the research, focusing on the CT and the ST.

Other limitations involved the instrumentation used to collect the data, such as when to administer the questionnaires. The questionnaires were distributed during the ninth and tenth week of the practicum and later collected at the conclusion of the student teaching internship. Possibly the "Who Decides?" Questionnaire
should be distributed and each subsection collected based on the time-frame of the particular sections of the questionnaire. This would allow each participant to deal specifically with the section of the questionnaire during the actual time-frame in which they were experiencing the transition. Future application of this questionnaire may determine the most appropriate time-frame for its distribution.

5.7 Remarks and Recommendations for Future Research

The collected data of this study point out the significance of the transfer of control from the CT to the ST. The process in which it is carried out and the patterns which exist in that process, explicit or implicit, are important to the ST assuming the role of teacher. The interpersonal relationship skills, the assertive or non-assertive characteristics of both the CT and the ST, the patterns or lack of them involved in the process, and the identification of categories affecting the process are significant to the success of the transfer of control. The degrees of freedom allowed to make decisions and the amount of authority granted to the ST by the CT are also major components.

Several recommendations for future study are mentioned here either as suggestions or questions to be investigated.

1. Each of the six categories guiding this research could be investigated as an individual focus of the transfer of control.
2. Are there specific criteria, such as values, instructional techniques, and educational philosophy, which should be examined in the initial interview between the CT and the ST?

3. What is the role of similar CT/ST teaching style and educational philosophy to the overall success of the practicum?

4. Does similarity of CT and ST beliefs create clones or allow for more in-depth risk-taking throughout the practicum?

5. Does the time of the semester of the student teaching practicum, Fall or Spring, affect the latitude of the CT's extension of the degrees of freedom in decision-making and authority to the ST?

6. In which area (content/non-content) does the transfer of control begin and what criteria determine this decision?

7. Should CTs be required to receive specific training relative to the role of a "cooperating teacher"?

8. Should refresher courses/workshops be required of CTs to update their training as a CT to keep abreast of current educational research or to sharpen their skills as a CT?

9. Should ST training include instruction and instrumentation relative to the evaluation process used by the SV and the CT to determine ST's readiness to assume the transfer of control?

10. What are the qualifications for the role of a SV: Should they include teacher certification, minimum period of classroom experience as a teacher, and specific training as a SV?

11. Should a SV be required to have certified teaching classroom experience in an American school system in order to relate to the educational methodology and philosophy necessary for a consistency in the evaluating process in student teaching?

12. Should there be guidelines for conferencing throughout the practicum concerning length, frequency, and content to allow for discussion time involving reflection and educational theory in addition to the routine topics of classroom instruction and management?
5.8 Concluding Remarks

This study was designed to explore the transfer of control from the CT to the ST and to analyze the significance of the degrees of freedom to make decisions as allowed to the ST by the CT. The proximity of the CT to the ST and its positive or negative effects were also investigated. A triangulation methodology involving Phase 1 - Oral Interviews, Phases 2 - Classroom Observations, and Phase 3 - Questionnaires was employed. Six specific questions guided the research and six categories were developed to give a disciplined framework to the research process.

In conclusion, based on ideas gleaned from the data collected in my research and partially based on the model of one of the programs in which this researcher was actively involved, I would like to briefly describe what a student teaching experience might ideally be like in the context of the university, the school site, and the significant others involved with the ST. This is not meant to be a formal proposal for a Teacher Education Program, but rather a vision of possibilities.

The Teacher Training Program would be a collaborative with the school site. They would allow the CTs to receive specific course work relative to school law, communication skills, and methods of delegating authority to the STs without a sink-or-swim mentality. CTs would be selected as adjunct faculty to teach courses to SVs as to how they might
relate to the CT, ST, and the pupils during the practicum experience. CTs would research and retrieve educational research which would benefit their STs and their own reflective and educational philosophy skills. Inservice workshops would be given by university personnel or experienced CTs to teachers who have requested to participate as future CTs or to update their existing knowledge base. Qualified CTs would possibly teach a course or conduct a workshop or seminar for STs, CTs, or SVs who are training for the student teaching practicum experience.

University professors would integrate their theory with actual participation in the student teaching practicum by giving staff development workshops or even guest lecturing or teaching a class in randomly selected ST classrooms. This would show the STs that there is a relationship between the theory and the classroom practitioner.

SVs would be selected for their prior teaching experiences and be recognized as potential mentors. Cultural background would be significant because of the wealth of diversity; however, prior teaching experience in an American classroom would be a prerequisite. Course work would be required to teach the SV methods of supervision that are not judgmental but rather ideas of how to develop a helping relationship with the ST. SVs would be more than resource persons and would have weekly group meetings with the STs to allow for a sharing of ST successes and failures and for requests for ideas for future lessons. SVs would
also meet with the CTs every two to three weeks to discuss the progress of their STs and the strengths and weaknesses of the program.

CTs would receive a university stipend or course work vouchers and/or increment credit or other merit rating bonuses from their school system for their participation. CTs would also have priority in their school system for sabbaticals and inservice workshops. Possible CT training might include methods of conferencing, language communication skills involving cues and signs, the setting of expectations for themselves and their STs, ways to delegate authority, and an update of current educational research.

STs would receive instruction in values clarification to help them develop a knowledge of how to make decisions and how to benefit from those decisions chosen. An assertiveness training course might be helpful to enable STs to actively seek the transfer of control without alienating the CT. Methods of interpretation of the various rules, regulations, and expectations might be taught in the form of case studies of previous ST experiences or routine classroom experiences reported by the CTs.

The culture of the school site should be learned by the ST as soon as possible. This requires the involvement of all significant others in the building welcoming the ST and not allowing the CT and the ST to remain in isolation. One significant other would be the principal. He or she must
become an integral part of the ST's practicum. Initial interviews with the ST, introduction of the ST to faculty members, invitations to all professional staff meetings, and personal interaction with the ST within the classroom to indicate administrative support are ways he or she might accomplish this. Delineation of the legal and moral responsibilities of the ST during the practicum and expectations of the school system for the ST should be shared with the ST. Professional seminars including such topics as what a principal is looking for in an applicant job-seeker might be beneficial to the STs and also to let them know that the system is interested, not only in their student teaching experience, but in their future endeavors as a professional colleague.

The classroom would be conducive to welcoming a ST by having a teacher desk and space for the ST to call his/her own. Classroom space would also be made available for the ST to display pupils' successes from particular ST instructed lessons. The pupils would be prepared for the new ST by being reminded of the professional status of the ST and the respect due him or her. The entire ecology of the site would be one of collaboration. It would be an exciting program in which to be involved. The end results would be a superior educational system for our children in which to learn and actively participate in the development of a corps of excellent future educators.
Results of this study indicate the necessity for future research within the particular framework and focus of this research. Investigating this research has been both enlightening and rewarding. This researcher welcomes those who wish to proceed in the direction of this study to do so and sincerely hopes the material presented here will be beneficial to their investigations.
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Teacher Authority
That authority which is granted to the teacher by the School Committee through the contract for employment which gives the teacher legal responsibility for the classroom and the students assigned there.

Teacher Control
The control that one as a teacher has within his/her own classroom for instruction, classroom management, and class routines, involving decision-making authority.

Transfer of Control
The point during the practicum at which the cooperating teacher gives the student teacher the opportunity to make decisions. This decision-making authority given to the student teacher increases in magnitude and responsibility until the eventual assumption of the role of teacher by the student teacher.

Degrees of Freedom
The latitude to control the decision-making process to allow the student teacher to experiment with his/her own style of instruction and classroom management throughout the preservice experience. This decision-making authority would range from a low-frequency input initially to a high-frequency input toward the onset of Master Week.

Proximity
The physical presence, location, or absence of the cooperating teacher and his/her verbal and non-verbal interjections during classroom instruction being conducted by the student teacher and its effect on the degrees of freedom.

Tug-of-War
A conflict that results when the student teacher is ready to receive the transfer of control, but the cooperating teacher is unwilling to give it, or, conversely, the cooperating teacher is willing to give the decision-making authority, but the student teacher is not ready to accept it.
Master Week

Usually the final week of the 16-week practicum wherein the student teacher is required by the University to have complete control of the classroom for all aspects of instruction and classroom management. At this point decision-making on the part of the student teacher is an integral part of the classroom instruction and management routines and activities.

Perception

The belief, either real or imagined, held by the cooperating teacher or the student teacher that an event or a series of events has occurred. This understanding is a result of direct or intuitive cognition on the part of the perceiver.
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Time Sequence
The organizational pattern involving the number of days or weeks during the transition period in which the transfer of control occurs.

Readiness
The criteria utilized by the cooperating teacher to determine the student teacher's preparedness to accept the transfer of control. Also, the student teacher's criteria for him/herself to demonstrate his/her willingness to accept the transfer of control.

Formal Communication - Conferences
The meetings between the cooperating teacher and the student teacher before, during, and after the transfer of control. Their frequency, length, and content as well as any changes experienced in them as the semester progresses are significant factors.

Informal Communication - Cues and Signs
The verbal and non-verbal signals exchanged between the cooperating teacher and the student teacher indicating the latitude in the degrees of freedom to make decisions allowed during the transfer of control.

Degrees of Freedom and Proximity
The latitude allowed by the cooperating teacher during the transfer of control giving the student teacher the opportunity to make decisions and experiment with instructional and classroom management techniques, including the location of the cooperating teacher and its impact on the performance of the student teacher.

Legal and Moral Responsibilities
The cooperating teacher's and student teacher's perceptions related to the transfer of control and the degrees of freedom allowed during the transferring of authority and their understandings of the legal and moral risk factors involved determining the completeness of the control actually transferred. This includes external controls and constraints of the setting as well as limitations set by contractual obligations.
APPENDIX C
AGREEMENT WITH PROJECT PARTICIPANTS - PHASES 1 & 2
"A Pilot Study: Transfer of Instruction and Classroom Control: The Degrees of Freedom Exchanged Between the Student Teacher and the Cooperating Teacher During the Preservice Experience."

I. My name is Patrick Daly and I am a doctoral candidate in the School of Education, Division I, Integrated Day Program, at the University of Massachusetts at Amherst. I am currently engaged in a pilot study which investigates the transfer of responsibility for instruction and classroom control from the cooperating teacher to the student teacher.

II. You are being asked to participate in this study. I will conduct classroom observations during the Spring Semester of 1990. I will meet with you, by appointment, for an oral interview lasting approximately one hour in duration. The interview will consist of questions relative to your experience as either a cooperating teacher or a student teacher involved in the exchange of control described in paragraph I.

III. The observations will be conducted using a clinical technique with absolutely no form of evaluation involved. The interview will be audiotaped and later transcribed. My goal is to analyze the information from the interviews of ten (10) sets of cooperating teacher/student teacher teams, of which you will be one participant. The information gathered will be used to develop an understanding of the process by which student teachers are given freedom to practice the tasks of teaching.

This understanding would be used in:
   a) my oral comprehensive examination
   b) my dissertation
   c) journal articles
   d) presentations to professional groups
   e) other professional purposes related to my work as a teacher/educator
In all written materials and oral presentations in which I may use information from your interviews, I will use neither your name, the names of people mentioned by you, nor the names of your school, school system, or institution for which you work. Transcripts will be typed with pseudonyms substituted for all names. In addition, no material gathered by observation, oral interview, or questionnaire will be shared directly or indirectly with other cooperating teachers or student teachers.

IV. While consenting at this time to participate in the study, you may withdraw at any time up to the final day of the oral interviews. If you need to contact me at any time, please call the University during the day at 413-545-3121. If I am not available, please leave your number with the secretary and I will return your call.

V. In signing this form you are agreeing to the use of the information from your interview as indicated in paragraph III. If I wish to use the information from your interview in any ways not consistent with what is stated in paragraph III, I will contact you to explain and request your further consent.

VI. In signing this form you are also assuring me that you will make no financial claims for the use of the material from my classroom observations, interviews, or questionnaires.

I. ______________________________________________________, have read the above statement and agree to be interviewed and to be a participant in the pilot study under the conditions stated above.

Signature: ______________________________________________________

Date: __________________________________________________________

Investigator: ___________________________________________________
APPENDIX D

INTERVIEW QUESTIONS FOR STUDENT TEACHERS - PHASE 1
INTERVIEW QUESTIONS FOR STUDENT TEACHERS - PHASE 1

1. How old are you?
2. What year are you in at the university?
3. At what grade level are you student teaching?
4. How many pupils are presently in your class?
5. How long will your student teaching experience be?
   * Define Teacher Authority to interviewee at this point.
6. Are you aware of the authority a teacher has received through contractual agreement?
7. Do you expect to gain the teacher authority level during your practicum experience?
   * Define Teacher Control to interviewee at this point.
8. What criteria did you use to determine your readiness to assume control at some point in your practicum?
9. Was there a time sequence for the beginning of the transition period?
10. Were there any lead-in discussions between you and your cooperating teacher to set the stage for this exchange of control?
11. What was the frequency, length, and content of these consultations with your cooperating teacher?
12. Did the consultations change in any way as the semester progressed?
13. Did you experience instructional control or classroom management control first?
   * Define Degrees of Freedom to the interviewee at this point.
14. Was there a series of steps to determine the degrees of freedom allowed during the transfer of control?
15. What cues or signs did you receive to indicate a transition of instructional or classroom management was taking place?
16. Did you give any cues or signs to the cooperating teacher to make him/her aware you were ready for the transfer of control to begin?

Define Tug-of-War to the interviewee at this point.

17. Do you feel the transfer of control was smooth or a tug-of-war?

18. What do you think happened as the transfer of control was taking place?

19. Would you please describe your understanding of the legal and moral responsibilities in this transfer of control?

20. Did you consider any risk factors in assuming the transfer of control?

21. Do you believe that limits were set on your degrees of freedom to explore and experiment with your own style of instructional and classroom management?

Define Proximity to the interviewee at this point.

22. Does the proximity of the cooperating teacher during your classroom instruction lead you to question the degrees of freedom you are allowed?

23. Does the proximity of the cooperating teacher dictate modes or styles of instructional or classroom management contrary to your beliefs or teaching styles?

24. Do you use your own styles or beliefs in your instruction and classroom management?

25. Did your beliefs come under any undue challenge after the transition of control had been undertaken by you?

26. Did the cooperating teacher ever use words like control or degrees of freedom during the transition period?

27. Do you ever feel the cooperating teacher trying to retake control from you?

28. Have you done anything to increase your degrees of freedom?

29. If you were the cooperating teacher, how would you help the student teacher with the transition of the transfer of control?

30. What is your definition of complete control and do you feel you will possess it by Master Week?
31. Is there anything else you would like to comment on that I have not asked you or that you feel is important to the transfer of control?
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INTERVIEW QUESTIONS FOR COOPERATING TEACHERS - PHASE 1
1. How many years have you been teaching?
2. What is the highest degree held by you?
3. How long have you been teaching at the elementary level?
4. How many times have you been a cooperating teacher?
5. Have you had any courses or inservice workshops relative to being a cooperating teacher or other form of supervisor?
6. Do you feel supervisory courses are necessary for cooperating teachers?
   * Define Teacher Authority to interviewee at this point.
7. Do you feel student teachers are clear about the degree and nature of Teacher Authority?
   * Define Teacher Control to interviewee.
8. What criteria did you use to determine student teacher readiness to assume control at some point of the practicum?
9. Was there a time sequence for the transition of this control?
10. Were there any lead-in discussions between you and your student teacher to set the stage for this exchange of control?
11. What was the frequency, length, and content of these consultations with your student teacher?
12. Did the consultations change in any way as the semester progressed?
13. Is there a favorite subject or area of classroom management where you first transfer control?
   * Define Degrees of Freedom to interviewee at this point.
14. Was there a series of steps to determine the degrees of freedom allowed during the transfer of control?
15. What cues or signs did the student teacher give you to influence your decision to establish the transfer of control at some point in the practicum?
16. Did you give the student teacher any cues or signs to make them aware that the transfer could begin?

* Define Tug-of-War to interviewee at this point.

17. Do you feel the transfer of control was smooth or a tug-of-war?

18. What do you believe happened as the transfer of control was taking place?

19. Did you know the moment/hour/day that it took place?

20. Did you deliberately encourage the student teacher to utilize his/her own style of instructional and classroom management techniques?

21. Would you please describe your understanding of the legal and moral responsibilities in this transfer of control?

22. Did you consider any risk factors in transferring the control?

23. Do you believe you have already, or will, transfer complete control to the student teacher?

24. Could you please define complete control?

* Define Proximity to interviewee at this point.

25. What in your actions, such as proximity to the student teacher during his/her instruction of a lesson, implied you had relinquished control?

26. Does your presence dictate the modes or styles of instruction and classroom management that the student teacher must pursue?

27. Do you believe proximity to the student teacher is necessary regardless of any transfer of control?

28. Do you believe this also for Master Week?

29. Do you encourage the student teacher to take risks and develop his/her own teaching style.

30. Did you ever take back control given to the student teacher?

31. Did you ever redefine your degrees of freedom to the student teacher?

32. What circumstances would force you to take back control?
33. Is there anything else you would like to comment on that I have not asked you or that you feel is important to the transfer of control?
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AGREEMENT WITH PROJECT PARTICIPANTS - PHASE 3
Dear

My name is Patrick Daly. I am a doctoral candidate at the University of Massachusetts at Amherst. The subject of my research is Transfer of Control in Instruction and Classroom Management from the Cooperating Teacher to the Student Teacher: The Degrees of Freedom in Decision-making Involved in the Preservice Clinical Experience. The focus of my study will be to identify the locus of control involving who is making the decisions during the preservice practicum. This information will contribute to research information on teacher education and will be beneficial to future Supervisors, Cooperating Teachers, and Student Teachers during the student teaching field experience.

I will be interviewing Cooperating Teachers and Student Teachers through a questionnaire process. The forms I will use are my adaptation of the "Who Decides?" Questionnaire (developed by Wolfson & Nash, 1965 and revised by Cussen, 1974) and my Paragraph Response Questionnaire utilizing the paragraph response strategy adapted from the format used by Hunt, Butler, Noy, & Rosser (1978) in their Paragraph Completion Method. The above questionnaires are to be filled out and returned to the ETEP office on or before May 14, 1991. Part 1 only requires a check-off selection in the appropriate columns. Part 2 does require more than a yes or no response, but a brief paragraph is more than adequate. If additional space is desired, please attach extra sheet(s) to the questionnaire(s).

The identity of the participants will remain anonymous and any information obtained will remain confidential and used in the following manner:
   a) my dissertation
   b) journal articles or books
   c) presentations to professional groups
   d) other professional purposes related to my work as a teacher/educator
In completing the questionnaires and signing this participation form you are agreeing to the use of the information from your questionnaire and statements as indicated above and you are assuring me no financial claims for the use of the information obtained will be made. If I wish to use the information in any way not consistent with the manner outlined above, I will contact you to explain and request your further consent. If you wish to contact me concerning these questionnaires, I may be reached at the telephone number listed below.

I deeply appreciate your time and effort to help me. As educators we must continuously strive to improve the process of teacher education. Together we will provide important data toward this goal.

Sincerely yours,

Patrick J. Daly

(413) - 545-3121

I, _______________________________, have read the above statement and agree to complete the questionnaires under the conditions stated above.

______________________________
Signature of participant

______________________________
Date
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DIRECTIONS FOR THE "WHO DECIDES?" QUESTIONNAIRE

1. Each participant will respond to the questions to determine who makes the decisions during the student teaching preservice experience. As you read each item, remember each question starts with the words "Who decides." The category choices are ST, CT, or SV. (Please see Direction #5)

2. Please determine, generally, who makes the decision for each item even though situations, at times, within the classroom may vary.

3. It is important that only one response be recorded for each item. Wherever this cannot be done, the category in which the decision is most frequently made will be identified by a double check.

4. If you wish to add any information or comments, please attach any sheet(s) with the item number(s) and your information or comments.

5. The following abbreviations have been used:
   ST for Student Teacher
   CT for Cooperating Teacher
   SV for Supervisor

6. One section of the questions will be asked four times, once each for the timeframes of weeks 1 - 3, 4 - 8, 9 - 13, and 14 - 16 of the practicum. Please consider your answers within each timeframe as you record your responses.

Developed by:
B. J. Wolfson & S. Nash
University of Wisconsin – Milwaukee
1965

Revised by:
M. P. Cussen
University of Massachusetts at Amherst
1974

Adapted by:
P. J. Daly
University of Massachusetts at Amherst
1991
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THE "WHO DECIDES?" QUESTIONNAIRE

Name: ____________________________
Gender: __________________________
Position: (Circle one) CT ST
Number of semesters in position: ____________________________
Are you trained for this position? ____________________________
Method of training: (Circle)
workshop
seminar
credited coursework
other ____________________________
Length of training: ____________________________
How do you rate this training?
unnecessary helpful necessary

Who decides:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Who decides</th>
<th>ST</th>
<th>CT</th>
<th>SV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. where the practicum will be located?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. with what grade the practicum will be associated?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. who is paired as CT and ST?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. who is the authority figure?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. on the SV's observation schedule?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. if a logbook or diary should be maintained?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. on the content of the logbook or diary?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. who has access to the logbook or diary?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. who determines criteria for readiness for the transfer of control?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. who determines readiness for the transfer of control?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. what cues and signs are used to determine readiness?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. how cues and signs are exchanged?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. when initial transfer of control should take place?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. in what area initial transfer will take place?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. when ST can teach small groups?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who decides:</td>
<td>ST</td>
<td>CT</td>
<td>SV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. when ST can teach whole class?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. when ST develops the first lesson plan?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. on the curriculum area of the first lesson?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. on the content of the first lesson?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. on the length of the first lesson?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. on the scope and sequence of the first lesson?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practicum: Weeks 1 - 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. on the arrangement of classroom setting?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. on the arrangement of classroom grouping?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. on the size of classroom groups?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. on the composition of the groups?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. on the content of classwork?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. on the content of written work?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. who corrects/grades student work?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. how to display student work?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. theme/design of bulletin boards?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. on classroom routine/schedule?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. what discipline procedures to use?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. on types of risks allowed in classroom management?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. on types of risks allowed in instruction?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. on degrees of freedom to experiment?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. on latitude allowed in the degrees of freedom?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. when proximity of CT is helpful/hindering?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. if CT/ST conferences should take place?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. on content/length of conferences?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. on frequency/necessity of conferences?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who decides:</td>
<td>ST</td>
<td>CT</td>
<td>SV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practicum: Weeks 4 - 8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. on the arrangement of classroom setting?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. on the arrangement of classroom grouping?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43. on the size of classroom groups?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44. on the composition of the groups?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45. on the content of classwork?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46. on the content of written work?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47. who corrects/grades student work?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48. how to display student work?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49. theme/design of bulletin boards?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50. on classroom routine/schedule?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51. what discipline procedures to use?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52. on types of risks allowed in classroom management?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53. on types of risks allowed in instruction?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54. on degrees of freedom to experiment?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55. on latitude allowed in the degrees of freedom?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56. when proximity of CT is helpful/hindering?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57. if CT/ST conferences should take place?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58. on content/length of conferences?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59. on frequency/necessity of conferences?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who decides:</td>
<td>ST</td>
<td>CT</td>
<td>SV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practicum: Weeks 9 - 13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60. on the arrangement of classroom setting?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61. on the arrangement of classroom grouping?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62. on the size of classroom groups?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63. on the composition of classroom groups?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64. on the content of classwork?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65. on the content of written work?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66. who corrects/grades student work?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67. how to display student work?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68. theme/design of bulletin boards?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69. on classroom routine/schedule?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70. what discipline procedures to use?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71. on types of risks allowed in classroom management?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72. on types of risks allowed in instruction?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73. on degrees of freedom to experiment?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74. on latitude allowed in the degrees of freedom?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75. when proximity of CT is helpful/hindering?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76. if CT/ST conferences should take place?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77. on the content/length of conferences?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78. on frequency/necessity of conferences?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Who decides:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>ST</th>
<th>CT</th>
<th>SV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Practicum: <strong>Weeks 14 - 16</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79. on the arrangement of classroom setting?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80. on the arrangement of classroom grouping?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81. on the size of classroom groups?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82. on the composition of the groups?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83. on the content of classwork?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84. on the content of written work?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85. who corrects/grades student work?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86. how to display student work?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87. theme/design of bulletin boards?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88. on classroom routine/schedule?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89. what discipline procedures to use?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90. on types of risks allowed in classroom management?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91. on types of risks allowed in instruction?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92. on degrees of freedom to experiment?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93. on latitude allowed in the degrees of freedom?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94. when proximity of CT is helpful/hindering?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95. if CT/ST conferences should take place?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96. on content/length of conferences?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97. on frequency/necessity of conferences?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practicum: <strong>Master Week</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98. on readiness for assumption of teacher role?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99. on readiness for Master Week?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100. if a positive practicum has occurred?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX I

DIRECTIONS FOR THE PARAGRAPH RESPONSE QUESTIONNAIRE
DIRECTIONS FOR THE PARAGRAPH RESPONSE QUESTIONNAIRE

1. From your personal experiences please respond to the questions using complete sentences to explain your answers. More than a yes or no response is required, but a short paragraph is more than adequate.

2. Use the space below each question for your response. If additional space is required, please attach sheet(s) with the item number(s) and your additional comments.

3. The following abbreviations have been used:
   - SV for Supervisor
   - CT for Cooperating Teacher
   - ST for Student Teacher

Sources:
D. E. Hunt, L. Butler, J. Noy, and M. Rosser
Ontario Institute for Studies in Education
1978

Adapted by:
P. J. Daly
University of Massachusetts at Amherst
1991
APPENDIX  J

THE PARAGRAPH RESPONSE QUESTIONNAIRE
THE PARAGRAPH RESPONSE QUESTIONNAIRE

Name: _____________________________________________________________

Gender: __________________________________________________________

Position: (Circle one)  CT       ST

Number of semesters in this position: ________________________________

Are you trained for this position? _________________________________

Method of training: (Circle)

- workshop
- seminar
- credited course
- other ________________________________

Length of training: ________________________________________________

How do you rate this training?

unnecessary _____ helpful _____ necessary _____

From your experiences please briefly respond to the following questions in complete sentences to explain your answers:

1. Was there a definite series of steps in the transfer of control from the CT to the ST?

2. Was there a specific time sequence for each phase of the transition from ST to the role of teacher?

3. What criteria was used to determine the ST’s readiness to assume control?
4. Did you feel the CT was testing the ST's readiness to assume control?

5. During what week did the ST first perceive he/she was making decisions?

6. Did the ST perceive the CT was transferring control to him/her?

7. Was the ST aware of the CT’s control and the ST’s need to assume that control?

8. Did CT/ST conferencing help the ST gain the transfer of control?

9. Were reflection and discussion of educational philosophy major components of these conferences?
10. In what week do you feel the transfer of control begins?

11. In what week do you feel the transfer of control is completed?

12. Do you feel an understanding exists between both participants that a transfer of control takes place from the CT to the ST?

13. Do you believe the CT's proximity dictated the mode of the ST's teaching style?

14. Are the degrees of freedom allowed the ST in decision-making dependent on the latitude granted by the CT?

15. Do you believe the SV influences the transfer of control between the CT and the ST?
16. Do you feel the transfer of control must occur in order to have a successful student teaching experience?

17. Does the transfer of control become a reality or is it a perception of the practicum experience?

18. If the transfer of control and degrees of freedom to make decisions does not occur, how is the practicum affected?

19. Do you believe the CT should take specific training courses?

20. Do you believe the SV should take specific training courses?
APPENDIX K

STUDENT TEACHER/COOPERATING TEACHER SURVEY FORM
STUDENT TEACHER/COOPERATING TEACHER SURVEY FORM

STUDENT TEACHERS:

Name ____________________________________________
Grade ___________________________________________
Number of Students ________________________________
Age ____________________________________________
Year in College ___________________________________
University Program ________________________________

COOPERATING TEACHERS:

Name ____________________________________________
Grade ___________________________________________
Number of Students ________________________________
Highest Degree Earned ______________________________
Number of Years Teaching __________________________
Number of Student Teachers _________________________
Supervisory Training as a Cooperating Teacher ________
APPENDIX L

TABLE 5

THE "WHO DECIDES?" QUESTIONNAIRE DATA
### TABLE 5

The "Who Decides?" Questionnaire Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Who decides:</th>
<th>ST</th>
<th>CT</th>
<th>SV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. where the practicum will be located?</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. with what grade the practicum will be associated?</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. who is paired as CT and ST?</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. who is the authority figure?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. on the SV’s observation schedule?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. if a logbook or diary should be maintained?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. on the content of the logbook or diary?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. who has access to the logbook or diary?</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. who determines criteria for readiness for the transfer of control?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. who determines readiness for the transfer of control?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. what cues and signs are used to determine readiness?</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. how cues and signs are exchanged?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. when initial transfer of control should take place?</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. in what area initial transfer will take place?</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. when ST can teach small groups?</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. when ST can teach whole class?</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. when ST develop the first lesson plan?</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. on the curriculum area of the first lesson?</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. on the content of the first lesson?</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. on the length of the first lesson?</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. on the scope and sequence of the first lesson?</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Continued, next page

Numerator = Tally of CT selections per category per item
Denominator = Tally of ST selections per category per item
Totals may differ due to blanks or multiple category selections
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TABLE 5 (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Who decides:</th>
<th>ST</th>
<th>CT</th>
<th>SV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Practicum: Weeks 1 - 3:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. on the arrangement of classroom setting?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. on the arrangement of classroom grouping?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. on the size of classroom groups?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. on the composition of the groups?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. on the content of classwork?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. on the content of written work?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. who corrects/grades student work?</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. how to display student work?</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. theme/design of bulletin boards?</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. on classroom routine/schedule?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. what discipline procedures to use?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. on types of risks allowed in classroom management?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. on types of risks allowed in instruction?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. on degrees of freedom to experiment?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. on latitude allowed in the degrees of freedom?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. when proximity of CT is helpful/hindering?</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. if CT/ST conferences should take place?</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. on content/length of conferences?</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. on frequency/necessity of conferences?</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 5 (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Who decides:</th>
<th>ST</th>
<th>CT</th>
<th>SV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Practicum: Weeks 4 - 8</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. on the arrangement of classroom setting?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. on the arrangement of classroom grouping?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43. on the size of classroom groups?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44. on the composition of the groups?</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45. on the content of classwork?</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46. on the content of written work?</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47. who corrects/grades student work?</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48. how to display student work?</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49. theme/design of bulletin boards?</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50. on classroom routine/schedule?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51. what discipline procedures to use?</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52. on types of risks allowed in classroom management?</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53. on types of risks allowed in instruction?</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54. on degrees of freedom to experiment?</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55. on latitude allowed in the degrees of freedom?</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56. when proximity of CT is helpful/hinderling?</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57. if CT/ST conferences should take place?</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58. on content/length of conferences?</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59. on frequency/necessity of conferences?</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Who decides:</th>
<th>ST</th>
<th>CT</th>
<th>SV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Practicum: Weeks 9 - 13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60. on the arrangement of classroom setting?</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61. on the arrangement of classroom grouping?</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62. on the size of classroom groups?</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63. on the composition of classroom groups?</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64. on the content of classwork?</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65. on the content of written work?</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66. who corrects/grades student work?</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67. how to display student work?</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68. theme/design of bulletin boards?</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69. on classroom routine/schedule?</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70. what discipline procedures to use?</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71. on types of risks allowed in classroom management?</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72. on types of risks allowed in instruction?</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73. on degrees of freedom to experiment?</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74. on latitude allowed in the degrees of freedom?</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75. when proximity of CT is helpful/hindering?</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76. if CT/ST conferences should take place?</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77. on the content/length of conferences?</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78. on frequency/necessity of conferences?</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### TABLE 5 (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Who decides:</th>
<th>ST</th>
<th>CT</th>
<th>SV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Practicum: Weeks 14 - 16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79. on the arrangement of classroom setting?</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80. on the arrangement of classroom grouping?</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81. on the size of classroom groups?</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82. on the composition of the groups?</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83. on the content of classwork?</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84. on the content of written work?</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85. who corrects/grades student work?</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86. how to display student work?</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87. theme/design of bulletin boards?</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88. on classroom routine/schedule?</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89. what discipline procedures to use?</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90. on types of risks allowed in classroom management?</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91. on types of risks allowed in instruction?</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92. on degrees of freedom to experiment?</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93. on latitude allowed in the degrees of freedom?</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94. when proximity of CT is helpful/hindering?</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95. if CT/ST conferences should take place?</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96. on content/length of conferences?</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97. on frequency/necessity of conferences?</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practicum: Master Week</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98. on readiness for assumption of teacher role?</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99. on readiness for Master Week?</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100. if a successful practicum has occurred?</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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