The Relationship Between Cooperating Teachers' and Student Teachers' Concerns

Dan A. Gerbens
Western Michigan University

Follow this and additional works at: http://scholarworks.wmich.edu/dissertations

Part of the Teacher Education and Professional Development Commons

Recommended Citation
Gerbens, Dan A., "The Relationship Between Cooperating Teachers' and Student Teachers' Concerns" (1997). Dissertations. 1636.
http://scholarworks.wmich.edu/dissertations/1636

This Dissertation-Open Access is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate College at ScholarWorks at WMU. It has been accepted for inclusion in Dissertations by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks at WMU. For more information, please contact maira.bundza@wmich.edu.
THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN COOPERATING TEACHERS' AND STUDENT TEACHERS' CONCERNS

by

Dan A. Gerbens

A Dissertation
Submitted to the
Faculty of The Graduate College
in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the
Degree of Doctor of Education
Department of Educational Leadership

Western Michigan University
Kalamazoo, Michigan
April 1997
THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN COOPERATING TEACHERS' AND STUDENT TEACHERS' CONCERNS

Dan A. Gerbens, Ed.D.
Western Michigan University, 1997

The notion that student teachers progress through identifiable stages of concern in their professional development originated in the 1960s. The late Frances Fuller (1969) identified three stages of student teachers' concerns: (1) self concern, (2) task concern, and (3) impact concern. Using the Fuller concerns model, the relationship between cooperating teachers' and student teachers' concerns was examined in 31 cooperating teacher/student teacher dyads during the fall of 1995. Cooperating teachers were categorized as either self-concerned or task-concerned based on their responses to a concerns questionnaire derived from the Fuller (1974) Teachers Concerns Check List (TCCL). The student teachers of each corresponding category completed a TCCL at the beginning, middle, and end of the student teaching semester. The change in student teachers' concerns as the semester progressed was compared between the two categories to determine whether the student teachers supervised by task-concerned cooperating teachers had a greater change in concerns than the student teachers supervised by self-concerned cooperating teachers. No differences were found between the two groups.
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CHAPTER I
PURPOSE AND RATIONALE

Introduction

Good teaching is ephemeral and hard to define, but we all recognize it when we experience it. The sign of it is a feeling we have been touched by something meant just for us. We have seen with piercing clarity what we know not and then in a twinkling, we know! . . . It is so wonderful that everyone who has known it tries for it again. . . . We ought especially to try to have it happen to those who will themselves become teachers. (Fuller, 1974, p. 3)

The challenge facing teacher education programs is to not only provide this experience for their students, but also to produce effective teachers who will, in turn, be able to provide this experience for their students. Unfortunately, professional preservice education courses are commonly perceived as worthless and a waste of time. Fuller (1969) cited two possible explanations for the existence of this state of affairs: (1) preteaching courses are, in fact, worthless; or (2) beginning education program students are simply not ready to benefit from such study. In other words, while preservice education courses answer questions about the teaching-learning process, they are answering questions that the education students are not yet asking. Most proposals for teacher education reform are unable to present substantive, empirical evidence that the changes being suggested will have an impact on the quality of the students' preparation for teaching. Due to the complexity of teaching and learning, there may never be clear-cut evidence that certain
programs are more effective in producing "good" teachers than others beyond a reasonable doubt (Griffen-Jeansonne, & Caliste, 1984).

The notion that teachers progress through identifiable stages of concern in their professional development originated in the 1960s (Alterman, 1965; Campbell, 1967; Fuller, 1969; Kracht & Casey, 1968; Lantz, 1964; Thompson, 1963). One line of research on teacher development centered on defining and describing the stages of concern through which student teachers progressed in their professional development. A concern is generally regarded to be what an individual is trying to do, or accomplish, at a particular time or in a particular situation. This construct, identified as teachers' concerns, and the related theories regarding the developmental nature of teachers' concerns, were first identified and later refined by the late Frances Fuller. She identified and described a sequence of dependable motives, or concerns, for undergraduate education students (Fuller, 1970). Her original work presented a three stage model of teacher concerns: (1) preteaching phase, nonconcern; (2) early teaching phase, concern with self; and (3) late teaching phase, concern with pupils. Subsequent data and analysis resulted in a revision of these original phases of teacher development into a four stage developmental sequence: (1) preteaching concerns; (2) early concerns about survival, called self concern; (3) teaching situation concerns, called task concern; and (4) concerns about pupils, called impact concern. The theories of Fuller and her associates have been further investigated in studies designed to document the actual concerns of teachers and how these concerns vary with teacher experience (Adams, 1982; Adams, Hutchinson, & Martray, 1980; Briscoe, 1973;
Pataniczek, 1979; Rogan, Borich, & Taylor, 1992; Ryan et al., 1980; D. J. Smith & Sanche, 1993). In each of these studies, the construct of teacher concerns has been shown to be measurable and to be comprised of identifiable stages.

Developmental concerns theory is based on the assumption of growth as a result of appropriate interaction in facilitating environments that promote teacher concerns maturation. Fuller (1969) also suggested that regularities in the interests and concerns of beginning teachers could be identified and used to guide the course content and experiences of preservice teacher candidates. Recognizing and addressing the concerns of novice teachers during student teaching and in their beginning years may impact their professional development and career satisfaction.

Purpose of the Study

The premise that consideration of the stages of teacher development is important in the professional development of preservice education students is well documented in the literature (Andrews, Houston, & Bryant, 1981; Bents & Howey, 1981; Beyer, 1987; Brundage & MacKeracher, 1980; Burden, 1982a; Hall & Loucks, 1978; Hargreaves & Fullan, 1992; Thiessen, 1992). Teachers commonly cite fellow teachers as the most valuable source of professional development (Thiessen, 1992). It follows that the cooperating teacher with whom a student teacher is placed has the potential to be a primary, if not the greatest, influence on the concerns development of tomorrow's teachers. Feedback from experienced educators on how to teach is one obvious way to contribute to teacher development (Jackson, 1992).
Statement of the Problem

If, indeed, student teachers' concerns change in a predictable manner and if the cooperating teacher is able to exert a substantial influence on this concerns development, to what extent, if any, does the student teacher's placement affect the change in their concerns? It follows that student teachers who are supervised by cooperating teachers who are themselves at higher concerns levels may exhibit greater change in concerns than student teachers supervised by cooperating teachers who are at lower concerns levels. The basic premise of this study is that a relationship exists between the current concerns level of cooperating teachers and a change in student teachers' concerns during student teaching.

Hypothesis of the Study

The hypothesis of this study is that student teachers who are supervised by task-concerned teachers demonstrate significantly greater changes in concerns than student teachers who are supervised by self-concerned teachers. The null hypothesis is that there is no significant difference in the changes in concerns between the two groups.

Rationale for the Study

Teacher "development" implies an internally mediated personal and professional growth rather than externally imposed changes (Feiman-Nemser & Floden, 1986). Studies of the socialization of beginning teachers indicates that student and novice teachers acquire the
beliefs, attitudes, and values of teaching from the experienced teachers with whom they interact. No other group has the potential to exert as significant an influence on the establishment of the teaching culture in these individuals (Feiman-Nemser & Floden, 1986). Different groups of teachers have different norms and values. The group with which a student or novice teacher associates is critical in directing the internal guidance to personal and professional growth. Student teachers tend to perceive the practices they observe in their placement as the upper and lower limits of possibilities. They accept the ways in which knowledge is communicated as natural and right (Beyer, 1987). Thus, the student teacher's placement serves as the model for accepted practice and the student teaching experience and supervision by the cooperating teacher are, therefore, of critical importance in the concerns development and enculturation of future practitioners.

**Student Teaching**

Progression through the Fuller (1969) stages of concerns may be related to increased proficiency and satisfaction in teaching, especially in the beginning years. Teachers with higher levels of task and impact concerns are consistently described as flexible, responsive, adaptable, and empathetic to student needs (Sprinthall & Thies-Sprinthall, 1983). Fuller (1970) noted that experienced teachers express task and impact concerns more frequently than do beginning teachers. Further, experienced teachers rated as effective are more likely to express task and impact concerns than experienced teachers rated as ineffective. The latter are more likely to express concerns about survival, a self concern
(Fuller, 1970). In other words, task- and impact-concerned teachers appear to perform in a manner which fits closely with behaviors associated with effective teaching. Fuller, Parsons, and Watkins (1974) suggested that task- and impact-concerned teachers use creative and effective instructional strategies and classroom interventions more than self-concerned teachers. Teachers at higher, more mature and complex levels appear to be more effective than their peers at lower levels (Glassberg & Sprinthall, 1980).

The work in developmental concerns theory presents powerful implications for teacher education programs. It follows that student teaching which arouses and develops higher level concerns in teachers will produce more qualified, effective, and professionally satisfied teachers who, after developing a basic, stable instructional style in the beginning years, including student teaching, will, in later years, continue to redefine, add to, and mold their instructional repertoire (Hargreaves & Fullan, 1992). If concerns about teaching are expressions by preservice teachers of perceived needs which probably possess motivating power for relevant learning, any regularities in these concerns should be of interest to the teacher educator, including the cooperating teacher.

It also follows that when teachers are more concerned about task and impact than self, they are likely to do a better job of teaching, derive greater satisfaction from their job, and remain in the profession longer. Student teaching is often cited by teachers as the most valuable component of their entire teacher education program. It is during student teaching that students begin to find value in the theoretical and methodological aspects of their education. Clearly, student teaching plays a
critical role in teachers' development and warrants research on differences that may exist in the concerns changes of student teachers supervised by cooperating teachers who are themselves at different concerns stages.

The Cooperating Teacher

Reports on student teaching frequently indicate that its effectiveness is largely dependent on the specific classroom assignment and the skill, involvement, and conscientiousness of the cooperating teacher, neither of which are designed to prepare student teachers (Glickman & Bey, 1990; Guyton & McIntyre, 1990; Lortie, 1975). Haberman and Harris (1982) called the cooperating teacher the unsung hero of teacher education. Bain (1990) noted that the primary agents during student teaching are the college/university supervisor and the cooperating teacher. "The university supervisor appears to be less influential because of the limited time spent in the setting and because the cooperating teacher and student teacher seem to have different perceptions and expectations" (Bain, 1990, p. 768). Student teachers believe they learn the most during their program from their cooperating teacher (Yates, 1981).

Given the major responsibility of the cooperating teacher, it would follow that these teachers should be selected with considerable care, provided training in supervision, and substantially reimbursed for their efforts. This is simply not the case (Howey & Gardner, 1983). Rather, student teachers are commonly placed wherever the university/college is able to locate an individual willing to accept what is widely considered to be the burden of a student teacher. If indeed it is possible to identify
specific teacher concerns and to measure them, there are direct implications for the supervision and leadership of teachers during student teaching. Effective leadership can provide a supportive context for teacher concerns development (Hargreaves & Fullan, 1992). The person of the supervising classroom teacher, commonly identified as the cooperating teacher, may play a critical role in the concerns changes of a student teacher. The cooperating teacher’s perceptions and sensitivity to the current concerns of the student teacher, while seeking to arouse higher level concerns through meaningful experiences and feedback are likely to be an essential factor in the dynamic of concerns change during the student teaching experience. According to developmental concerns theory, a student teacher is more likely and able to benefit from a supervisor’s observation and feedback when they are congruent with his or her current concerns (Simmons & Dennen, 1983). This construct implies that an educational supervisor should deal with resolving the student teacher’s current, specific developmental concerns while at the same time keeping in mind the desired goal of arousing higher-level concerns.

Study of the student-cooperating teacher dyad suggests the need for careful selection of and work with the cooperating teachers, who have traditionally been relegated to the status of "worker bees" in teacher education programs (Copeland, 1986). Cooperating teachers, perhaps because of minimal training at best, largely provide minimal developmental supervision of student teachers (Tannehill & Zakrajsek, 1988) at the very time when their leadership and supervision have the greatest potential to exert a career-long influence on new teachers. The task-concerned cooperating teacher may be capable of providing
different levels of supervision and promoting concerns development according to the current needs of the student teacher (Sprinthall & Thies-Sprinthall, 1983). This study was designed to investigate the nature of the relationship between the cooperating teachers' and student teachers' concerns.

Summary

Research should address the question of teacher development and effectiveness as they are shaped by the conditions and expectations placed on students during student teaching. When the current concerns of student teachers are considered, the supervision emphasis shifts to providing relevant instructional experiences and activities to induce a change from self concern to task and impact concern (Sprinthall & Thies-Sprinthall, 1983). Higher stages of concern are better in the sense that they are more cognitively and affectively complex. Higher stage educators are better equipped to meet the needs of a broader range of students. In other words, higher stages of psychological (concerns) development benefit both the teacher and the student (Sprinthall & Thies-Sprinthall, 1983). Continuing research is needed to investigate the kinds of preservice experiences that lead to student teachers' concerns development. Investigation of the student-cooperating teacher dyad is needed to determine the nature of effective student teacher supervision by the cooperating teacher, arguably one of the most influential individuals in the entire teacher education program.
CHAPTER II

TEACHER DEVELOPMENT THEORY

Introduction

Teacher development theories are based on the assumption of personal and professional growth that results from appropriate interventions and other interactions in facilitating environments which may be encountered during the student teaching experience or in the school at which the teacher is employed (Sprinthall & Thies-Sprinthall, 1983). Examination of the various developmental theories reveals that they all emphasize aspects of teacher development generally under-emphasized in teacher education programs. All concern themselves more with the psychological development of the student teacher than with content or behavioral development and acknowledge the reality of differences between preservice and in-service teachers. All identify changes that occur in teachers over time, beginning with preservice field experiences, and present the need to consider teachers' current psychological needs and concerns in designing appropriate developmental interventions (Feiman & Floden, 1980a). The seminal work in preservice teacher development occurred in the late 1960s. Since then, several researchers in teacher development theory have focused on the development of preservice teachers (Caruso, 1977; Fuller, 1969; Haberman, 1983; Sacks & Harrington, as cited in Burden, 1990). All of these investigators initially identified six preservice teacher concerns stages (Table 1). Fuller
Table 1
Preservice Teachers’ Development Models

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theorist</th>
<th>Fuller and Brown</th>
<th>Caruso</th>
<th>Sacks and Harrington</th>
<th>Haberman</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stages:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preteaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self</td>
<td>Anxiety/euphoria</td>
<td>Anxiety</td>
<td>Ritualistic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Confusion/clarity</td>
<td>Entry</td>
<td>Reality centered</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task</td>
<td>Competence/ inadequacy</td>
<td>Orientation</td>
<td>Learning skills</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Self evaluator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact</td>
<td>Criticism/awareness</td>
<td>Trial and error</td>
<td>Insightful analyst</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Confidence</td>
<td>Integration</td>
<td>Professional decider</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lost/relief</td>
<td>Mastery</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
et al. (1974) later reconceptualized her model by condensing the six concerns she identified into three categories that were exhibited in the course of student teaching. Since then, other investigators have revisited and confirmed the Fuller model (Beyer, 1987; Burden, 1983; Rogan et al., 1992; D. J. Smith & Sanche, 1993). If developmental theory is to be useful in promoting student teacher concerns development, several factors must be considered, beginning with an understanding of the nature of teacher concerns. Next, a description of the changes in concerns leading to the desired outcome is necessary and, finally, an understanding of the mechanism by which this change, or maturation as it is often called, is accomplished (Feiman & Floden, 1981). The Fuller model of student teacher development was the model used in this investigation of the relationship between cooperating teachers' concerns and student teachers' concerns development.

Overview of Student Teacher Development Models

Caruso (1977), noting the concerns of preservice education students, suggested that teacher education programs need to reassess and redesign the content, timing, and actual experiences of the preprofessional program to better meet the concerns of education students when those issues are foremost in the students' awareness. He also noted that the stages of concern are not mutually exclusive; that, in fact, there may be substantial overlap of concerns within any given individual at any given time. The six concerns stages of Caruso were identified as (1) anxiety/euphoria, marked by separation from the campus and anticipation of the classroom environment; (2) confusion/clarity, in
which the student is confronted by the complexity of the classroom and the requirements of their supervisor; the student teacher's response is typically to narrow the scope of his or her attention to facilitate greater clarity; (3) competence/inadequacy, marked by insecurity and the question, "Am I going to make it as a teacher?" as well as beginning successes, which should be reinforced by the cooperating teacher; (4) criticism/new awareness, during which the scope of attention broadens and the student teacher gives greater time and thought to student's learning; (5) confidence/inadequacy, which is similar to the competence/inadequacy phase except at a higher and deeper level with a foundation of confidence; and (6) lost/relief, which occurs at the end of the student teaching experience as the student teacher separates from the students and reassesses his or her own performance.

The six developmental stages suggested by Sacks and Harrington (as cited in Burden, 1990), anticipation, entry, orientation, trial and error, integration/consolidation, and mastery, comprise the basis upon which they recommend early diagnosis of difficulty and subsequent intervention with the developing student teacher. Noting that student teachers initially focus on the details of the student teaching assignment and finish with a focus on teaching behaviors, Sacks and Harrington posited that student teacher remediation and development is most effective when the supervisor responsible for the experience interacts with the student teacher in a manner that is congruent with the student teacher's current developmental phase. The Sacks and Harrington model placed a great deal of the responsibility for teacher development firmly on the shoulders of the student teacher's supervisors, primarily the cooperating teacher.
Haberman (1983) also identified six stages that are manifested during the student teaching experience. Stage 1, ritualistic, and Stage 2, reality centered, are closely related as the student teacher initially seeks to imitate as much observed teacher behavior as possible and eventually identifies those behaviors to imitate which are most complementary to his or her own perceptions of teaching. Stages 3 and 4, learning skills director and self evaluator, can also be closely linked as the student teacher seeks to perfect existing skills and comes to also develop the ability to evaluate his or her own teaching. Stage 5, insightful analyst, and Stage 6, professional decision maker, parallel each other closely. Stage 5 begins with the development of the student teacher's intuition regarding pupil response and behavior and is culminated in Stage 6 as the student teacher seeks to connect daily classroom activities to expedite moving students toward the learning goals.

The Fuller Developmental Concerns Model

The late Frances Fuller and her associates in the Center for Teacher Education and Research at the University of Texas, Austin, investigated student teachers' concerns with the goal of improving student teacher preparation. Her original work, published in 1969, was the combination of two separate investigations. In her first study, Fuller conducted small group discussions with student teachers during which their comments were recorded and later categorized. Review of interview transcripts revealed a sequence of concerns which student teachers appeared to experience from the beginning to the end of the student teaching experience. These concerns were replicated in three different
student teacher populations (Fuller, 1967). Fuller noted two primary areas of concern which she categorized as concerns about self and concerns about pupils. Statements of concern with self dominated the discussions until very late in the student teaching semester (Fuller, 1969). A subsequent study introduced the administration of a free response instrument called the Teacher's Concern Statement (TCS). Subjects were allowed 10 minutes to respond to the question, "When you think about your teaching, what are you concerned about?" (Fuller, 1969, p. 214). Responses were coded and grouped into categories of concern that sorted into roughly three phases. The preteaching phase could be characterized as a period of nonconcern in which young, inexperienced undergraduate education students in the education department's introductory courses were apparently unconcerned or did not have a clear idea what to be concerned about in the practice of teaching. The second stage, the early teaching phase, could be characterized as a period of self concern. Fuller noted that these concerns were expressed only during confidential interviews and were so influential in directing student behavior that their strength could be easily underestimated. The student teacher is highly concerned with his or her ability to control the class, to understand the content, to know the answers, and a fear of failure. Within this phase, Fuller noted a subgrouping of responses into three categories she labeled as concerns: (1) Where do I stand? (2) Am I adequate to the task? (3) What do the pupils think of me/how do I feel about the pupils? The third phase described by Fuller was called the late teaching phase, marked by a growing concern with pupils, with assessing pupil learning, and a developing ability of self
evaluation. Again, Fuller noted a subgrouping of responses into three areas of concern: (1) Are pupils learning what I'm teaching? (2) Are pupils learning what they need? (3) How can I improve myself as a teacher?

Fuller's (1969) original investigation concluded with a review of the teacher development literature from 1932 to 1968. In this review, Fuller noted that three seminal points emerged. First, there was a fundamental consistency between all studies over a period of 36 years despite their diverse populations. Second, none of the studies supported the perception that beginning teachers are concerned with instructional design, methods of instruction, pupil assessment, or tailoring instruction to individuals. Third, the concerns of beginning in-service teachers parallel those of preservice teachers (Fuller, 1969).

Fuller and Parsons (1972) noted that response coding systems developed in the 3 years following the original study consistently indicated that each subgrouping within the three original phases could also be considered to comprise a distinct stage of concern for student teachers. These six concerns stages were identified as (1) concern about role, encompassing relationships with the cooperating teacher, principal, parents, and pupils and fitting into the social and psychological environment of the classroom, the school, and the community; (2) concern about adequacy, encompassing subject matter competence and classroom control; (3) concern about being liked and liking the pupils; (4) concern about teaching, encompassing whether the students are learning what they are being taught; (5) concern about pupil needs, which focuses on whether the students are being taught what they
need; and (6) concern about educational improvement, encompassing instructional improvement in the classroom as well as concern with the general scope of education.

Reporting the findings of continued research on the Developmental Concerns Model, Fuller et al. (1974) and Parsons and Fuller (1974) presented a reconceptualization of the six stage model. Reliability studies, described in the Methodology section of this work, led Fuller to discard concern with being liked (3) and concern about educational improvement (6) and to combine concern about role (1) and concern about adequacy (2) into a single category. The result of this reconceptualization was a three stage model of concerns. Self concern was comprised of Categories 1 and 2, role and adequacy. Task concern was comprised of Category 4, teaching. Impact concern was comprised of Category 5, student needs. When responses were examined using the three concerns model, Parsons and Fuller found that preservice teachers had consistently higher self concerns scores, while in-service teachers had consistently higher task scores. In a seeming departure from the anticipated sequential nature of the model, no difference was found between preservice and in-service teachers in concern about impact. Both groups demonstrated high pupil concerns scores. Parsons and Fuller presented three possible explanations for this surprising finding. First, while both groups are equally concerned about pupils, the source of that concern is different. Preservice teachers are still very close in age and experience to the pupils they teach. Thus, their expression of pupil (impact) concern may, in fact, be an expression of self concern. Second, it may be that impact scores reflect a socially acceptable influence; it
would be considered un-teacher-like to not express concern for pupils. Third, the similarity in impact scores may simply reflect an innate level of altruism in teachers, regardless of whether they are preservice or inservice. Regardless which, if any, of these explanations reflects the true reason for the similarity in concern about impact between pre- and inservice teachers, the original proposal that teachers experience stages of concern during their development remains intact. However, teachers who have strong self concerns are likely to be less able to act on their concerns about pupils than teachers who are not concerned about self but who focus on the task of teaching as the mechanism for putting their concerns about pupils into action (Parsons & Fuller, 1974).

A fundamental postulate of the Fuller Developmental Concerns Model is that more mature concerns emerge as less mature concerns are resolved. This emergence may occur spontaneously or higher concerns may need to be aroused by the cooperating teacher and the college/university supervisor. Thus, the education program’s curriculum and the supervision during student teaching become the principal contributors to the resolution of current concerns and the arousal of higher concerns in the development of the student teacher. The model is premised on the willingness and ability of the cooperating teacher, in concert with the college/university supervisor, to provide educational supervision and leadership that creates an atmosphere conducive to student teacher concerns development.
Recent work in teacher development has also provided substantiation for the presence of concerns in preservice education students and student teachers (Beyer, 1987; Hargreaves & Fullan, 1992; Mahan, 1981; Rogan et al., 1992; D. J. Smith & Sanche, 1993; Thiessen, 1992). Mahan (1981) found that the initial highest concerns of both elementary and secondary student teachers were knowledge of teaching methods. The concerns that increased the most during student teaching were the selection of effective teaching strategies, finding curriculum materials, and evaluating student progress. Beyer (1987) noted what he described as an excessive concern with survival, a self concern.

Other contemporary investigations on teacher development have revisited Fuller's (1969) model. Hargreaves and Fullan (1992) noted that teacher education programs are comprised of phases that embody the three characteristic concerns and that the higher levels of concern may not be reached until several years after most individuals enter the teaching profession, if at all. Other investigators have challenged the conceptualization that teachers' concerns represent a sequential pathway along which individuals progress. Rogan et al. (1992) noted that "Fuller's three stages of concern and the general notion that the concerns of teachers change over time appears to have been confirmed. But there is no clear evidence that all teachers progress in lock-step fashion through the stages" (p. 46). Rather, all concerns appear to be present in most teachers, but to differing degrees. Consequently, Fuller's concerns stages might be more appropriately viewed as semi-independent dimensions in
which teachers' concerns are differentially focused at various points in their careers (Rogan et al., 1992). This is consistent with Fuller's (1974) finding of no difference in impact concern between preservice and in-service teachers. D. J. Smith and Sanche (1993) provided further support for the reconceptualization of Rogan et al., noting that student teachers' concerns follow the general developmental pattern originally identified by Fuller (1974). However, this concerns development is most accurately interpreted as a series of shifts that occur among overlapping domains of concern, self, task, and impact, rather than a linear progression.

Implications for Student Teaching

The concerns of preservice teacher education students have been found to be resistant to change unless meaningful experiences are provided during the course of the program. "The process and success of teacher development depends very much on the context in which it takes place. The nature of this context can make or break teacher development efforts" (Hargreaves & Fullan, 1992, p. 13). A teacher education program that neglects student concerns is itself suspect, because the survival concerns of prospective teachers are rooted in the context in which education students are expected to work (Beyer, 1987). Yet the current model for student teaching tends to focus on strategies that emphasize controlling student behavior and class management, issues of self concern, rather than on facilitating student learning, which are issues of task and impact concern (Evertson, Hawley, & Zlotnik, 1985). This can create a disheartening environment in which survival, a self
concern, becomes the primary emphasis rather than the task and impact concerns of professional development and improvement. In this regard, Calderhead (1987) noted that student teaching had a negative impact on what and how students learned about teaching and the teaching culture.

The classroom is the place where teachers learn most, where they frame their practice, deliberate strategies, and evaluate possibilities. It is both the means and the end to the teacher development process (Thiessen, 1992). The end of teacher education need not be, as is now often the case, the replication of current practice. The message often communicated to prospective teachers is that becoming a professional entails little more than identifying the knowledge to be communicated, breaking it into manageable bits, and presenting it to students in an efficient fashion (Beyer, 1987). Other critics of the current status of student teaching charge that it has failed to evolve much, if any, beyond an apprenticeship training model (Guyton & McIntyre, 1990). Studies demonstrate the consequences of the widespread and uncritical acceptance of an apprenticeship type clinical approach to student teaching. Spending time in classrooms getting students through the lesson on time and in a quiet, orderly fashion, issues of self concern, become the basis for accepting or rejecting the use of particular teaching activities. If a technique "works," it is perceived as good. In this approach, the techniques of teaching often become the ends in themselves rather than a means toward the achievement of educational goals and student teacher development (Beyer, 1987). Student teaching then becomes a sort of driving test that does not provide adequate opportunities for experimentation, reflection, and self assessment, all issues of task and impact.
development (Carter, 1990). The consequence is that beginning teachers are ill prepared for the abrupt entry into teaching in which, from the first day, a novice teacher is expected to assume the full responsibilities of those of 25 year veterans (Copeland, 1986; Lanier & Little, 1986; Lortie, 1975).

To improve the preparation of beginning teachers, Calderhead (1987) suggested that the student teaching experience be divided into two blocks, a period of initial survival training, issues of self concern, followed by a period with emphasis on experimentation, development, and reflective practice, issues of task and impact concern. The Holmes Group (1992) called for the establishment of professional development schools where students of education are mentored by specially prepared master teachers and supported by a cadre of program based clinical faculty, reflecting the model of a teaching hospital in graduate medical education. Students should receive relevant clinical experience through exposure to several faculty for whom experimentation with teaching strategies and self assessment are the norm (Association for Teacher Education, 1995). In either setting, the consideration of the relationship between the existing concerns level of the cooperating teacher and the concerns development of the student teacher is of critical importance.

Summary

Teacher development theory originated in the 1960s. Most models of student teacher development can fit comfortably into the three stage model of self concern, task concern, and impact concern developed by the late Frances Fuller. Contemporary research on teacher development
has confirmed the presence of identifiable stages of development during
student teaching, and their resistance to change without meaningful
experiences that arouse higher level concerns while resolving current,
lower level concerns. Fuller's (1969) Developmental Concerns Model has
been confirmed, although modified to account for the simultaneous
presence of all three concerns in student teachers, but to differing
degrees. Concerns development is now considered to be a series of
shifts of emphasis between the overlapping domains of self, task, and
impact concern.

Student teaching is the time during which the developmental
process is set in motion in a clinical setting. Critics charge that student
teaching has evolved little beyond a clinical apprenticeship which
emphasizes survival and classroom management, a self concern issue, to
the detriment of subsequent task and impact concern development.
CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

Population

The original population for this study was comprised of all the elementary and secondary student teachers at Hope College, Holland, Michigan, during the Fall Semester of 1995. Of the 60 individuals available for the study, 41 were elementary teacher candidates and 19 were secondary teacher candidates, including 1 student teacher who was placed in a middle school. The cohort consisted of 37 females and 4 males at the elementary level and 8 females and 11 males with secondary student teaching assignments. All were either seventh or ninth semester seniors who had completed the Education Department prerequisite courses. Consent to include the student teachers at Hope College in this study was obtained from the Director of Student Teaching and the chair of the Education Department (Appendix A). All student teachers were initially informed of the study and their participation was solicited at the first student teaching seminar prior to the beginning of the student teaching experience. At this time, all student teachers indicated an interest in participating. The 60 cooperating teachers who would supervise these student teachers were also mailed a letter describing the study and soliciting their participation (Appendix B). The investigator was also present at the cooperating teacher-student teacher dinner held prior to the start of student teaching. Individual contact at this function
plus telephone follow-up with the cooperating teachers who were not present at the dinner resulted in 18 cooperating teachers declining to participate, thus yielding an initial sample of 42 cooperating teacher-student teacher dyads. During the course of the study, attrition due to unreturned questionnaires on the part of either the cooperating teacher or the student teacher resulted in a final sample of 31 pairs, despite follow-up calls placed to those who had not returned questionnaires.

The teacher education program at the college consists of a sequential core of courses that culminates in the student teaching experience. Each education student must complete the core education courses of Educational Psychology, the Exceptional Child, and a reading course, either Teaching of Reading for Elementary or Teaching Reading in Content Areas for secondary education candidates. Elementary education students are also required to take Language Arts for the Elementary Teacher, Elementary Curriculum and Methods, the Diagnosis and Treatment of Reading Problems, and the capstone course, Student Teaching in the Elementary School. The language arts and curriculum and methods classes each include an 18 hour classroom observation and teacher-aide field experience. The course sequence for secondary education students following completion of the core courses is Special Methods (by discipline) in the Secondary School, Secondary Principles and Methods, and the capstone, Student Teaching. The principles and methods course includes a 40 to 50 hour classroom observation and teacher-aide experience. Both elementary and secondary education students also complete Perspectives in Education, a class designed to introduce the organization and operation of American education.
Student teaching assignment and placement is the responsibility of the director of student teaching and an administrative assistant. Students are typically placed in the West Michigan school districts surrounding Hope College. By request, students may be placed in schools in or near their residence, including out of state assignments. Students with such assignments were not included in this study.

Instrumentation

This study was conducted using the Fuller (1969) Model of Developmental Stage Theory in Education to assess the concerns of the student teachers at the beginning, middle, and end of the student teaching semester. Fuller (1969) initially investigated teachers' concerns using an instrument she had developed, called the Teachers' Concerns Statement (TCS). Administration of the TCS required a 10-minute period during which the subjects wrote a free response answer to the question, "When you think about your teaching, what are you concerned about? Do not say what you think others are concerned about, but only what concerns you now" (Fuller & Case, 1969, p. 20). Response coding and analysis revealed six categories of concerns: (1) concern about the teaching role (Where do I stand?), (2) concern about adequacy (Am I able to do this?), (3) concern about being liked or liking the pupils (How do students feel about me? Will I like the students?), (4) concern about teaching (Are pupils learning what I teach?), (5) concern about pupil needs (Are pupils learning what they need?), and (6) concern with educational development (How can I improve my teaching?) (Parsons & Fuller, 1974). An instructional manual for coding and scoring the TCS
was subsequently published in which detailed examples of statements for each of the six categories were provided (Fuller & Case, 1969, 1972). The initial scoring scheme utilized frequency scores based on the raw number of responses identified for each category. Difficulty with varying verbosity of responses challenged this scheme, forcing a change to scores which were calculated as the ratio of the frequency score to the total responses (Fuller et al., 1974).

Working with a population comprised of 1,309 preservice and 251 in-service teachers, Fuller and Parsons (1972) gathered data on the TCS using factor analysis and reliability coefficients. Factor analysis provided evidence for the presence of distinct concerns categories, with concerns about adequacy and concerns about pupil needs receiving strong loading values. Concern about teaching loaded with concern about adequacy. Rater stability analysis in which raters scored a set of 50 TCS responses twice with a 2-week interval returned reliability coefficients that ranged from .55 to .94. Using the same set of 50 responses, interrater reliability coefficients were determined for each concern category. Two categories, concern about being liked (3) and concern about teaching (4), returned unacceptable coefficients of .14 and .25, respectively. The remaining four categories returned coefficients that ranged from .48 to .93 (Fuller & Parsons, 1972). Further reliability research conducted with 1,028 preservice and 265 in-service teachers confirmed the presence of a significant difference between the two groups, with preservice teachers demonstrating consistently high concerns with Categories 2 and 3, concern about adequacy and with liking, while in-service teachers consistently had high scores in Categories 5 and 6, concern about pupil
needs and educational improvement. No differences were found between elementary and secondary teachers in either group. Reliability analysis returned correlations lower than expected or desired, leading Fuller to discard Category 3, concern with liking, due to persistent low reliability. Category 6, concern with educational improvement, was also discarded due to low reliability and inconsistent factor loadings. Category 1, concern about role, was combined with Category 2, concern about adequacy, due to low individual frequencies and a perceived close conceptual relationship between the two items. The remaining categories comprised three broad domains of concern: concern with self, comprised of Categories 1 and 2; concern with task, Category 4; and concern with impact, Category 5. The difficulties encountered with coding and rater reliability were again found to be exacerbated by subject verbosity. This and the potential for responses to be influenced by perceived social acceptability led to the conclusion that the TCS contained serious psychometric limitations (Fuller et al., 1974).

The desire to increase reliability pointed to the need to design a forced-choice, machine scorable instrument (Fuller & Parsons, 1972). In 1974, Parsons and Fuller reported the results of a pilot study on an instrument called the Teachers' Concerns Checklist (TCCL). This instrument was comprised of 56 items derived from responses to the TCS. Respondents rated their level of concern for each item on a 5-point Likert scale of no concern, slightly concerned, moderately concerned, very concerned, or extremely concerned. Parsons and Fuller (1974) reported Cronbach's alpha reliability coefficients ranging from .79 to .91 and test-retest stability coefficients of .77 to .87 for each concerns.
domain. Additionally, self concern, task concern, and impact concern categories clearly emerged by factor analysis.

Contemporary research has consistently confirmed the reliability of the TCCL. Adams (1982) reported results that supported Fuller's (1974) findings of decreased self concern and increased task concern as teachers gain experience. No differences were found in impact concern. Adams suggested that the TCCL may not be sensitive to impact concern development across time and/or that respondent bias may consider it to be un-teacher-like to not respond with concern on impact statements, resulting in spuriously high impact concern scores. This is also consistent with previous finding by Parsons and Fuller (1974). After paring the TCCL to 45 items based on previous studies, Rogan et al., (1992) found acceptable factor loading values of .55 and above for impact statements, .49 and above for all but one self statement, and .37 and above for all but two task statements. Cronbach alpha reliability coefficients were .84 for task, .91 for self, and .94 for impact. Clearly, the TCCL has been extensively studied as an investigative instrument. A condensed version, comprised of the five highest loading statements in each concerns domain, was used as the instrumentation for the present study.

Data Gathering Procedures

Each building principal of the participating dyads was informed of the study (Appendix C). Each participating cooperating teacher was mailed a TCCL prior to the start of the year to assess their individual concerns levels (Appendix D) and a preaddressed, postage-paid envelope
for the return of the instrument.

Data were gathered from the student teachers during their weekly Monday evening seminar. Students were verbally introduced to the investigation at the first seminar of the semester. They were informed that participation was voluntary and would not affect their student teaching evaluation and final grade (Appendix E). Participating students were then asked to complete a TCCL to assess their initial concerns levels (Appendix F). The completed instruments were collected and each also received a TCCL with a preaddressed, postage-paid envelope which they were requested to deliver to their cooperating teacher the following day. This form was designed to assess the cooperating teachers' perception of their student teachers' concerns (Appendix G). Student teachers who were absent from the seminar were mailed the instructions and a TCCL with a return envelope. Their cooperating teacher was also sent a TCCL and a return envelope under separate cover.

Four data gathering points were scheduled throughout the semester. However, a slow return of questionnaires from several cooperating teachers presented the potential for an overlap in which a cooperating teacher might receive the next questionnaire before completing the previous instrument, resulting in a blurring of their responses. With advisory committee approval, the number of data gathering points was reduced to three to avoid such overlap. Individuals who had not returned their questionnaires within 1 week were telephoned and reminded to complete and return the instrument. Thus, data were gathered in the first week of student teaching, at midterm, and in the final week of the student teaching semester. Data gathering from cooperating teachers
and student teachers occurred within a few days of each other at each data point. All cooperating teacher and student teacher questionnaires were precoded, with the sole key to the code remaining in the possession of the investigator to ensure confidentiality. The key was destroyed at the conclusion of the study.

Data Analysis

In determining the appropriate statistical analysis, the concerns level of the student teacher was considered to be the dependent variable. The independent variable for each analysis was the cooperating teacher's level of concern. Cooperating teachers were grouped into one of two categories, self or task, based upon which category emerged as the predominant characteristic from analysis of their response to the TCCL administered at the beginning of the Fall Semester of 1995. Cooperating teachers were categorized as self-concerned if their mean self score was higher than the sample mean for self and their mean task score was lower than the sample task mean. Cooperating teachers were categorized as task-concerned if their mean task score was higher than the sample mean for task and their mean self score was lower than the sample self mean.

A group of 18 cooperating teachers had self and task concern means that were either both above or both below the sample means for each category. Cooperating teachers whose means for self and task were both lower than the sample means for self and task were categorized according to the least difference between their self and task score and the respective sample means. If the difference between the
individual's self score and the gross sample self mean was smaller than the difference between their task mean and the gross sample task mean, the individual was considered to be more self concerned, and vice versa for task concern.

Cooperating teachers whose self and task scores were both higher than the sample means for each concern were categorized according to the largest difference between each mean. If the difference between the individual's self score and the gross sample self mean was larger than the difference between the individual's task score and the gross sample task mean, the teacher was considered to be more self concerned, and vice versa for task concern. As experienced teachers, these categories were assumed to be static during the course of the investigation. The responses to the items on the TCCL are on a 5-point Likert scale which is considered to be an interval scale of measurement. In each analysis, the alpha level used for significance was .05.

A t test for independent sample means was employed to determine whether student teachers supervised by task-concerned cooperating teachers demonstrated greater change of concerns during the student teaching period than student teachers supervised by self-concerned cooperating teachers. Difference scores for each concern category for each group were determined between data gathering Points 1 and 3 to encompass the gross change in each concern during the entire period of student teaching. Difference scores were also determined between data gathering Points 1 and 2 and between data gathering Points 2 and 3 to reveal time sensitive changes from the first half to the second half of student teaching. The difference scores for each concern were tested for
significance using a t test for independent sample means.

Subjective data were also gathered at the end of the student teaching semester by means of individual interviews with selected cooperating teacher-student teacher dyads. Four dyads were selected, two self-concerned cooperating teachers and their student teachers and two task-concerned cooperating teachers and their student teachers. The two cooperating teachers with the highest self concern scores and whose task scores were below the sample mean and the two cooperating teachers with the highest task concern scores and whose self concern scores were below the sample mean were those selected for interview. Each cooperating teacher and student teacher was contacted and an individual interview scheduled. Informed consent was secured from each interview participant, as was permission to tape record the conversation.

The interviews followed a semistructured format in which the investigator presented a number of pre-prepared questions but was free to probe answers that appeared to be unusual or of special interest or concern to either the interviewer or the interviewee, as well as nuances that encouraged further questions. The six pre-prepared questions paralleled each other in the cooperating teacher and student teacher interviews. The questions for the cooperating teacher interview were:

1. What do you think were your student teacher's major concerns when he or she started student teaching last fall?
2. What do you think are his or her major concerns now?
3. Which of the concerns that you just mentioned seem most crucial to you right now? Why? Which do you think are most crucial to
4. Are there any unresolved concerns that seem to be recurring?
5. At what point in the year did those concerns arise?
6. What are your major concerns regarding your student teacher entering the classroom as the teacher of record?

The questions for the student teacher interview were:
1. What were your major concerns when you started student teaching last fall?
2. What are your major concerns now?
3. Which of the concerns you just mentioned seem most crucial to you right now? Why?
4. Do you have any unresolved concerns or concerns that seem to be recurring?
5. At what point did those concerns arise?
6. What are your major concerns regarding entering the classroom as the teacher of record?
CHAPTER IV

DATA ANALYSIS AND RESULTS

Overview and Organization of Analyses

The basic premise of this study was that a relationship exists between the current concerns level of cooperating teachers and a change in student teachers' concerns during student teaching. In order to answer the question to what extent, if any, the student teacher's placement affects the change in their concerns, data were gathered from the cooperating teachers and student teachers at the three data gathering points during the Fall Semester 1995 and were analyzed using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) for the Apple Macintosh. As previously described, the entire sample was grouped into two categories, self-concerned or task-concerned, based upon the responses to a concerns questionnaire completed at the start of the semester by each cooperating teacher. To test the hypothesis that student teachers who were supervised by task-concerned teachers demonstrated a greater change in concerns than student teachers supervised by self-concerned teachers, student teacher difference scores were computed for each concern category for each group. The difference scores from Time 1 to Time 3, representing the gross change in concerns from the start to the finish of student teaching, were then tested for significance using a t test for independent sample means, with significance assessed at p < .05. Difference scores from Time 1 to Time 2, and from Time 2
to Time 3 were also computed for each concern category and similarly tested for significance. This was accomplished to provide additional insight regarding any differences in concerns changes from the first half to the second half of the student teaching semester.

Concern arose regarding the potential for spurious results due to the method of categorizing the cooperating teachers who were not clearly self or task concerned. A second analysis using the same statistical test was conducted using only the data from cooperating teachers who could be categorized as clearly self-concerned or clearly task-concerned, that is, whose self-concern score was higher than the sample self-concern mean and task-concern score was lower than the sample task-concern mean, and vice versa for task-concern. The sample for this second analysis consisted of 13 cooperating teacher-student teacher dyads, with 9 identified as self-concerned and 4 identified as task-concerned. Any remarkable differences between the two analyses have been noted in the following section.

Results of Analysis

Cooperating teachers' responses to the TCCL were used to separate them into two groups, self-concerned and task-concerned. As indicated in Table 2, when the responses to each concern category were compared between the clearly categorized groups, significant differences were found. Cooperating teachers categorized as self-concerned were, in fact, significantly higher in self-concern than those identified as task-concerned. Similarly, cooperating teachers categorized as task-concerned were significantly higher in task-concern than those identified as
self-concerned, as predicted by the Fuller (1969) model. No difference was found between the two groups for impact concern, findings consistent with the work of Parsons and Fuller (1974), Rogan et al. (1992), and D. J. Smith and Sanche (1993).

Table 2
Cooperating Teacher Concerns Levels--Clearly Categorized Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Prob.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self</td>
<td>Self-concerned</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Task-concerned</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.003*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task</td>
<td>Self-concerned</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Task-concerned</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.010*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact</td>
<td>Self-concerned</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Task-concerned</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.590</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at p < .05.

When the entire cohort was compared by grouping (Table 3) a significant difference in task concern was found, but there was no difference in self or impact concern.

When student teachers' concerns were compared to cooperating teachers' concerns (Table 4), student teachers were found to have significantly higher self-concern than the cooperating teachers and significantly lower task concern. These findings are also consistent with the work of Parsons and Fuller (1974), Rogan et al. (1992), and D. J. Smith
Table 3
Cooperating Teacher Concerns Levels--Entire Sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Prob.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self</td>
<td>Self-concerned</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2.49</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Task-concerned</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task</td>
<td>Self-concerned</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.003*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Task-concerned</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact</td>
<td>Self-concerned</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Task-concerned</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at p < .05.

Table 4
Student Teacher and Cooperating Teacher Concerns Levels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Prob.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self</td>
<td>Student teachers</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.045*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cooperating teachers</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task</td>
<td>Student teachers</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cooperating teachers</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact</td>
<td>Student teachers</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cooperating teachers</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at p < .05.
and Sanche (1993). In addition, each group demonstrated substantially higher impact concern than their respective self or task concern.

The hypothesis of this study was that student teachers supervised by task-concerned cooperating teachers would demonstrate greater change in concerns during the student teaching experience than student teachers supervised by self-concerned cooperating teachers. No significant differences between the two groups were found (Table 5). Thus, for this study sample, the null hypothesis that there is no difference in the change in concerns between the two groups was accepted.

Table 5
Change in Student Teacher Concerns
Levels--Entire Sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time Variable</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Prob.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-3 Self</td>
<td>Self-concerned</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>-0.91</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>.062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Task-concerned</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>-0.33</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task</td>
<td>Self-concerned</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>-0.27</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>.733</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Task-concerned</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>-0.18</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact</td>
<td>Self-concerned</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>-0.34</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.826</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Task-concerned</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>-0.27</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A more detailed examination of the data, however, yields several noteworthy observations. First, all three concerns decreased with time as indicated by the negative mean values. While this is expected and, in fact, desired for self concern, an increase in task and impact concern
would be expected based on the model used in this study. It is also of interest to note that the students supervised by self-concerned cooperating teachers demonstrated larger but still nonsignificant decreases for each concern.

Although all are nonsignificant, the differences in concern changes that occur in the first half of the semester compared to the changes that occur during the second half are notable (Table 6). The greatest decline in self concern occurred between Times 1 and 2 for the self group, while the task group’s self concern decreased consistently in each half of the semester. Task concern decreased the greatest between Times 2 and 3—a period when, according to the model, task concern should be increasing as self concern continues to decrease. Student teachers’ impact concern demonstrated a larger decrease during the first half of the semester. However, the task-concerned cooperating teacher group’s student teachers demonstrated a modest increase in impact concern during the second half of the semester, as predicted from the model, while the self-concerned cooperating teacher group’s student teachers’ impact concern continued to decrease.

Although still nonsignificant, when only those pairs in which the cooperating teachers whose TCCL responses were clearly self concerned or task concerned are considered, trends in the data for self and task concerns fit more closely with the predictions of the model (Table 7).

Self concern decreased the most in the first half of the semester for both groups, but remained essentially unchanged during the second half. In the clearly task-concerned cooperating teacher group, student teachers’ task concerns increased during the second half of the
Table 6
Change in Student Teacher Concerns Levels
With Time--Entire Sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Prob.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>Self-concerned</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>-0.68</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>.086</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Task-concerned</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>-0.15</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Task</td>
<td>Self-concerned</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.922</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Task-concerned</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Impact</td>
<td>Self-concerned</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>-0.32</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.876</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Task-concerned</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>-0.28</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-3</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>Self-concerned</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>-0.22</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Task-concerned</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>-0.18</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Task</td>
<td>Self-concerned</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>-0.26</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Task-concerned</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>-0.15</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Impact</td>
<td>Self-concerned</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>.885</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Task-concerned</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

semester, while the clearly self-concerned cooperating teacher group student teachers' task concerns continued to decrease. Like self concern, impact concern decreased the most during the first half of the semester for both groups, and it continued to decrease at a slower rate during the second half of the semester, contrary to the predictions of the model.
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Table 7
Change in Student Teacher Concerns Levels With Time--Clearly Categorized Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Prob.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>Self-concerned</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-0.73</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Task-concerned</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-0.50</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Task</td>
<td>Self-concerned</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-0.24</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Task-concerned</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Impact</td>
<td>Self-concerned</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-0.49</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Task-concerned</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-0.45</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-3</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>Self-concerned</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Task-concerned</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Task</td>
<td>Self-concerned</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-0.22</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Task-concerned</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Impact</td>
<td>Self-concerned</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-0.16</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Task-concerned</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-0.25</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cooperating teachers' perceptions of student teachers' concerns correlated poorly with the student teachers' actual concerns (Table 8).

However, as illustrated graphically in Figures 1, 2, and 3, it is of interest to note that the cooperating teachers as a whole consistently perceived student teachers' concerns to be greater than actually reported by their student teachers. This is the case for each concern level at
Table 8
Correlation Between Cooperating Teachers' Perceptions of Student Teachers' Concerns and Actual Student Teachers' Concerns

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Self concern Pearson r</th>
<th>Task concern Pearson r</th>
<th>Impact concern Pearson r</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>-.32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. n = 62 (31 student teachers and 31 cooperating teachers).

Each data gathering point, and it also holds true when the sample is broken down by the two cooperating teacher concerns categories of self-concerned or task-concerned. Further, cooperating teachers' perceptions of student teacher concerns and student teachers' actual concerns essentially parallel each other, with only minor deviations other than that the cooperating teachers were consistently higher in their perceptions. This may suggest that, while cooperating teachers are generally not aware of the degree of their student teachers' concerns at any given point, they are at least sensitive to changes in student teacher concerns.

Summary

The cooperating teachers in this study were not sensitive to and/or aware of the concerns of their student teachers. Comparison of the data on student teachers' concerns development from the first half of the semester to the second half rather than from start to finish alone, indicates that the student teachers did, in fact, experience concerns...
Figure 1. Cooperating Teachers' Perceptions of Student Teachers' Concerns and Student Teachers' Actual Concerns--Self Concern.

Figure 2. Cooperating Teachers' Perceptions of Student Teachers' Concerns and Student Teachers' Actual Concerns--Task Concern.
development, although no significant differences were found between the two groups. Trends in the data may suggest that student teachers supervised by task-concerned cooperating teachers demonstrate greater concerns development than student teachers supervised by self-concerned cooperating teachers. Both groups exhibited a decrease in self concern during both periods of the semester. The self-concerned cooperating teachers group student teachers also demonstrated a decrease in task and impact concern for the entirety of the semester, while the task-concerned cooperating teachers group student teachers exhibited an increase in task concern when only those dyads in which the cooperating teacher is clearly task-concerned are considered. The task-concerned cooperating teachers group student teachers as a whole also demonstrated a modest increase in impact concern during the second half of the semester.
CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to examine the relationship between cooperating teachers' and student teachers' concerns. The presence of a relationship between supervision by self-concerned or task-concerned cooperating teachers during student teaching and student teacher concerns development would present a strong argument for the careful selection of cooperating teachers by teacher education programs. No differences were found between the two groups.

Support for the Fuller Model

Fuller (1969) suggested that teachers' concerns develop in a sequential manner in which concern about self is replaced by concern about task, which, in turn, gives way to concern about impact. Contemporary research has challenged the sequential interpretation of concerns maturation, suggesting that all concerns are present in teachers at all times, but to differing degree (Rogan et al., 1992; D. J. Smith & Sanche, 1993). Thus, changes in teachers' concerns are now considered to be shifts in concern that occur among the overlapping domains of self, task, and impact concern rather than linear progression from one concern to another. The results of the present study lend support to the contemporary interpretation of Fuller's model while also reflecting some
of the original tenets.

As suggested by the contemporary interpretation, each concern was present at each data point, but to differing degree. Also in keeping with the findings of Parsons and Fuller (1974), the student teachers indicated consistently high impact concern from the very start of the semester. Unexpectedly, all concerns levels decreased during the semester, with self concern showing the greatest decrease. While the decrease in self concern is in keeping with the model, the modest decrease in task and impact concern is not. Given the minor changes in task and impact concern compared to a substantial decrease in self concern, it appears reasonable to accept the reconceptualization of the model as proposed by Rogan et al. (1992) and D. J. Smith and Sanche (1993), as well as Fuller's (1969) basic concept that concerns are present in student teachers and subject to change.

Further evidence supporting the model is found in the concerns reported by the cooperating teachers on the original self-inventory. After categorization into the two groupings, self-concerned and task-concerned, examination of the data revealed that both groups reported similarly high impact concerns. However, the clearly task-concerned cooperating teachers reported a significantly higher level of task concern and a significantly lower level of self concern than reported by the clearly self-concerned cooperating teachers. This is in keeping with the suggestions that all teachers expressed high impact concern but differing levels of self and task concern (Fuller et al., 1974; Rogan et al., 1992).

Parsons and Fuller (1974) reported that in-service teachers had consistently higher task concerns and lower self concerns than
preservice teachers. Additionally, Parsons and Fuller reported little difference in impact scores, with both groups returning high impact scores. The findings of the present study are consistent with those results. In-service cooperating teacher impact and task scores are significantly higher than the impact and task scores of the preservice student teachers, while in-service cooperating teachers' self scores are significantly lower than the self scores of the preservice student teachers, indicating that in-service teachers are less self-concerned and more task- and impact-concerned than their student teachers. Both groups' impact scores were higher than either their self or task scores.

Conclusions

The student teachers in both the self-concerned group and the task-concerned group demonstrated higher impact concern scores than self or task concern scores, and substantial decrease in self concern during the first half of the semester. This finding suggests that early experience during student teaching appears to help student teachers reduce their self concern, and may facilitate a beginning arousal of task concerns. However, these initial changes are not maintained during the remainder of the semester. Calderhead (1987) found that student teachers tend to compare their teaching to that of their cooperating teacher, believing they were successful and their performance was acceptable if they were able to survive the student teaching experience. The lack of task and impact concern development on the part of the student teachers in the present study may be interpreted as confirming the findings of Calderhead. It may be that once the student teachers realized they could
and would survive the experience, little, if any, need for change was considered important.

Lanier and Little (1986) suggested that an approach to student teaching as a practical apprenticeship rather than an intellectual pursuit of reflective practice and continual self improvement perpetuates a management approach to teaching that too often encourages the continuation of the teaching practices by which student teachers were themselves taught and those of their cooperating teacher. It also increases the tendency to perceive current practice as the only one acceptable. If student teaching is nothing more than survival training, then once the student teachers realize they can survive the experience, they will perceive little need for further development. The early substantial decrease in self concern and lack of a subsequent increase in task and impact concern would support the presence of this perception of student teaching.

The large decrease in self concern found by this study during the first half of the semester suggests that student teachers enter the student teaching experience highly apprehensive of their qualifications and ability to teach. This apprehension rapidly declines, however, perhaps as they gain experience and become more realistic in their perceptions. This also supports the assertion that student teacher learning and change plateaus at the mid-point of the student teaching experience (Calderhead, 1987). While all student teachers are inclined to reduce their self concern initially, a desirable outcome, it may be that student teachers supervised by self-concerned cooperating teachers are less likely to arouse and resolve task and impact concerns with further
experience than those student teachers supervised by task-concerned cooperating teachers. It also may be that the clearly task-concerned cooperating teachers are, in fact, able to promote a decline in self concern and a modest increase in task concern in their student teachers, a pattern that supports the hypothesis.

The findings of this study suggest the need to prepare cooperating teachers for their role in student teacher supervision by training them in the Fuller Concerns Development Model. The participating cooperating teachers in this study were uniformly unaware of the concerns of their student teachers. In concert with this lack of awareness, and perhaps as a result of it, the student teachers as a whole failed to demonstrate statistically significant task and/or impact concern maturation. However, the tendency toward modest task and impact concern gain exhibited by student teachers supervised by task-concerned cooperating teachers is encouraging. At the very least, it suggests that if task-concerned cooperating teachers are more likely to promote the concerns development of their student teachers than self-concerned cooperating teachers, an even stronger relationship would be found if the cooperating teachers were aware of and able to apply the fundamentals of concerns development theory. It seems reasonable to suggest that student teachers placed with task/impact-concerned cooperating teachers who are knowledgeable about concerns development theory and student teacher supervision will demonstrate concerns changes from survival, a self concern, to the beginnings of reflective practice and self assessment, issues of task and impact concern.
Implications

Are student teachers experiencing concerns development during their student teaching? The answer appears to be yes and no. As early as 1974, Fuller suggested that perhaps only survival training should be presented by preservice teacher education programs. The findings of this study appear to indicate that this is being accomplished. However, if teacher education programs are going to break the cycle of producing teachers who perpetuate the present predominant teaching culture, then the notion that preservice education programs, capped by the student teaching experience, produce complete teachers lacking only experience must be replaced by the realization that preservice teacher education programs actually produce novice teachers who still need further education and professional development. The task, then, is to produce novice teachers who are sufficiently competent in basic teaching practice to survive and who have the predisposition to embark on career-long learning, experimentation, and professional development (Copeland, 1986). The results of this study provide evidence that the student teaching experience accomplishes little beyond survival training.

Are cooperating teachers effective in promoting student teacher development? Again, the answer appears to be yes and no. If teacher education programs are content to produce teachers who are trained to survive their beginning years in teaching, the large decrease in self concern found by this study appears to support the position of continuing the current role of the cooperating teacher. If the role of the cooperating teacher is to facilitate and promote the task and impact concern
development of student teachers, the findings of this study appear to support the view that many cooperating teachers are ill prepared and unable to accomplish such a task. The results of this study suggest that student teacher development may be served by assigning student teachers to cooperating teachers who are task-concerned rather than self-concerned.

Weaknesses of the Study

Several factors in the design and instrumentation of this study may have affected the findings. Perhaps the greatest weakness is associated with the sample itself. The external validity of the study is suspect by virtue of the small sample studied and the relative homogeneity of the subjects. All were students at Hope College, which in and of itself creates a substantial degree of nonrandomness. The voluntary nature of participation in the study may also influence sample homogeneity in that individuals who are predisposed to certain characteristic concerns may be more likely to volunteer for such a study. This would further increase sample homogeneity and decrease the extent to which the sample is representative of all student and cooperating teachers.

Another factor that may have affected the results of this study is the relatively short time between administrations of the questionnaire. Student teachers and cooperating teachers may not have had sufficient time between administrations to experience changes in concern, or to recognize and identify those changes. The relatively short time between administrations may have permitted recollection of previous responses such that second or third responses did not reflect actual concerns
present at that specific time. This threat to the internal validity of the study is exacerbated by the fact that the same form was administered at each data gathering point. Familiarity with the form and with previous responses could have influenced responses in such a way as to render them nonrepresentative of actual concerns at that time.

The nature of the questionnaire itself presents substantial potential for spurious results. Several participants noted difficulty interpreting the meaning of the term concerns. During an interview, one cooperating teacher commented that a concern may be a problem or it may be something of interest or importance that may or may not be a problem. Rating an item as a high concern does not necessarily mean that it is something that should or could be "fixed." The questionnaire specifically stated that a concern is something you think about often and would like to do something about. However, this definition did not distinguish between concern as a problem and concern as something of importance. If participants interpreted concern to mean a problem, they may have rated items differently than if they thought of concern as just something of importance. For example, a teacher may have no problem with meeting the needs of different kinds of learners, an impact concern, and thus rate it as a low concern even though it is of high importance. Such an interpretation and rating would seriously misrepresent this teacher's concern about meeting different learners' needs from the interpretation given by the Fuller concerns model. Differential interpretation by participants would certainly cloud all results.

Another cooperating teacher commented that many concerns become second nature with experience and, therefore, drop below the
level of consciousness. In such a situation, it may be difficult for the student teacher or the cooperating teacher to recognize the presence of a concern and its relative importance. In this situation, the participant may tend to rate an item as of little or no concern, even though, in fact, it is of daily importance to him or her. Evidence of either or both of these difficulties may be found in several student teacher responses that rated every item as "no concern," starting with the second questionnaire administration. Surely this pattern appears to indicate a misinterpretation of the meaning of the term, a failure to recognize the presence of the concern or, perhaps, a desire to not respond in a meaningful fashion to the instrument. More careful introduction to the questionnaire and further definition of the meaning of concern may alleviate these weaknesses.

Suggestions for Further Research

Further research is needed on the effects of supervision on the concerns of student teachers. Trained cooperating teachers have been found to provide more feedback, a more stable environment, and a more positive affective experience for student teaching (Guyton & McIntyre, 1990). Building from the present study, further research on the relationship between cooperating teachers' and student teachers' concerns should be conducted to compare the concerns changes of student teachers supervised by cooperating teachers who have been trained in concerns development theory to the concerns changes of student teachers supervised by cooperating teachers who have not received such training. It may be that cooperating teachers who are knowledgeable
about concerns development theory would be able to effect a significant change from self concern to task and impact concern in their student teachers when compared to cooperating teachers who are unaware of concerns development theory. If this study is replicated, a larger, more heterogeneous sample should be used and the meaning of the term concern should be more fully defined for each participant in an effort to avoid misinterpretation.

Summary

In this chapter, the results of the study were analyzed and several conclusions were drawn. These results were intended to identify the nature of the relationship between cooperating teachers' concerns levels and student teachers' concerns development. Although inconclusive, the findings do appear to lend support to the placement of student teachers with cooperating teachers who are task-concerned rather than self-concerned. Through continued research comparing the supervision of student teachers by cooperating teachers who are knowledgeable about concerns development theory with cooperating teachers who are not, a more thorough understanding of the nature of the relationship between cooperating teachers' concerns levels and student teachers' concerns development will occur.

Several weaknesses were inherent in the study and may have affected the findings. Small sample size and sample homogeneity bring the external validity of the study into question. Differences in the interpretation of the meaning of the term concern may have caused
participants to rate an item as a high concern when in reality it represented a low concern, or vice versa.
Appendix A

Consent to Use Student Teachers
August 25, 1995

Dr. Carl Schackow - Chair
Department of Education
Hope College

Dear Dr. Schackow:

I am conducting a research project as part of my doctoral dissertation on student teaching programs. The purpose of the investigation is to assess the differences that may exist in the professional development of student teachers during their student teaching program as influenced by their cooperating classroom teacher. Both the cooperating teacher and the student teacher will derive the benefit of an analysis of the supervisory behaviors that benefit student teachers' development during their internship experience. The Hope College Education Department will benefit from information regarding the supervision and preparation of effective teachers.

This letter is to request your permission to request the participation of the student teachers in your department this semester. Participation is completely voluntary. Each participant will complete a questionnaire at four separate student teaching seminars during the course of the semester. It will take approximately ten minutes to complete the questionnaire. All responses will be confidential. No information that personally identifies participants will be released at any time. Following completion of the study, all coding keys will be destroyed. There is no anticipated risk to the participants. However, as in all research, there may be unforeseen risks to the participant. If an accidental injury occurs, appropriate emergency measures will be taken; however, no compensation or treatment will be made available to the subject except as otherwise stated in this form. If you have any questions about this study, you may contact either Dan A. Gerbens, (616) 245-9614 (H) or (616) 395-7631 (W), or Dr. Uldis Smidchens, (616) 387-3889. You may also contact the Chair of the Human Subjects Institutional review Board at (616) 387-8293 or the Vice President for Research with any concerns you may have. A report of the findings of this investigation will be sent to you upon completion of the study.

Cordially:

Dan A. Gerbens
3478 Bromley SE
Grand Rapids, MI 49508

CONSENT

I agree to permit the involvement of student teachers from Hope College as subjects in the study described in the cover letter above.

Education Department Chair
Date
August 25, 1995

Mr. David Zwart
Director of Student Teaching
Hope College

Dear Mr. Zwart:

I am conducting a research project as part of my doctoral dissertation on student teaching programs. The purpose of the investigation is to assess the differences that may exist in the professional development of student teachers during their student teaching program as influenced by their cooperating classroom teacher. Both the cooperating teacher and the student teacher will derive the benefit of an analysis of the supervisory behaviors that benefit student teachers' development during their internship experience. The Hope College Education Department will benefit from information regarding the supervision and preparation of effective teachers.

This letter is to request your permission to request the participation of the student teachers in your department this semester. Participation is completely voluntary. Each participant will complete a questionnaire at four separate student teaching seminars during the course of the semester. It will take approximately ten minutes to complete the questionnaire. All responses will be confidential. No information that personally identifies participants will be released at any time. Following completion of the study, all coding keys will be destroyed. There is no anticipated risk to the participants. However, as in all research, there may be unforeseen risks to the participant. If an accidental injury occurs, appropriate emergency measures will be taken; however, no compensation or treatment will be made available to the subject except as otherwise stated in this form. If you have any questions about this study, you may contact either Dan A. Gerbens, (616) 245-9614 (H) or (616) 395-7631 (W), or Dr. Uldis Smidchens, (616) 387-3889. You may also contact the Chair of the Human Subjects Institutional review Board at (616) 387-8293 or the Vice President for Research with any concerns you may have. A report of the findings of this investigation will be sent to you upon completion of the study.

Cordially:

Dan A. Gerbens
3478 Bromley SE
Grand Rapids, MI 49508

CONSENT

I agree to permit the involvement of student teachers from Hope College as subjects in the study described in the cover letter above.

[Signature]
[Date]

Director of Student Teaching
Appendix B
Letter to Cooperating Teachers
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Western Michigan University  
Department of Educational Leadership  
Principal Investigator: Dr. Uldis Smidchens  
Research Associate: Dan A. Gerbens

[Date]
[Name]
[Address]

Dear [Cooperating Teacher]:

I am conducting a research project as part of my doctoral dissertation on student teaching programs. The purpose of the investigation is to assess the differences that may exist in the professional development of student teachers during their student teaching program. I am requesting your participation in this research as a cooperating teacher. Participation is voluntary and you are free to discontinue participation at any time during the semester. All responses will be confidential. No information that personally identifies participants will be released at any time. Following completion of the study, all coding keys will be destroyed. There is no anticipated risk to the participants. However, as in all research, there may be unforeseen risks to the participant. If an accidental injury occurs, appropriate emergency measures will be taken; however, no compensation or treatment will be made available to the subject except as otherwise stated in this form. Both the cooperating teachers and the student teachers will derive the benefit of an analysis of the student teachers’ development during their internship experience. The Hope College Education Department and individual schools will benefit from information regarding the supervision and preparation of tomorrow’s effective teachers.

If you decide to participate, you will be requested to complete a questionnaire concerning your student teacher four times during the fall semester months of September, October, November, and December, 1995. It should take no more than 10 minutes to complete the form. The questionnaires will be delivered to you by your student teacher and returned to me in a postage paid envelope included with the form. You will also complete a questionnaire concerning yourself at the start of the student teacher’s time with you. In order to ensure confidentiality, you will code each questionnaire using an assigned number. To maximize the validity of this study, I request that you do not discuss your responses to the questionnaires with your student teacher.

Your building principal has been notified of this request and your student teacher has also agreed to participate in the study.

If requested, a brief summary of the findings of this investigation will be sent to you upon completion of the study. You can make your request by submitting your name and postal address to me. If you have any questions about this study, you may contact either Dan A. Gerbens, (616) 245-9614, or Dr. Uldis Smidchens, (616) 387-3889. You may also contact the Chair of the Human Subjects Institutional review Board at (616) 387-8293 or the Vice President for Research with any concerns you may have. Thank you in advance for your participation in this research.

Cordially,

Dan A. Gerbens  
3478 Bromley SE  
Grand Rapids, MI 49508
Appendix C

Letter to Principals
Western Michigan University
Department of Educational Leadership
Principal Investigator Dr. Uldis Smidchens
Research Associate Dan A. Gerbens

[Date]
[Name]
[Address]

Dear [principal],

I am conducting a research project as part of my doctoral dissertation on student teaching programs. The purpose of the investigation is to assess the differences that may exist in the professional development of student teachers during their student teaching program as influenced by their cooperating classroom teacher. This letter is to inform you that I have requested the participation of the student teachers and their classroom supervisors in your building. Participation is voluntary and will not require any class time. Both the cooperating teacher and the student teacher will derive the benefit of an analysis of the student teachers' development during their internship experience. The Hope College Education Department and individual schools will benefit from information regarding the supervision and preparation of tomorrow's effective teachers.

Each participant will complete a questionnaire four times during the fall semester months of September, October, November, and December, 1995. All responses will be confidential. No information that personally identifies participants will be released at any time. Following completion of the study, all coding keys will be destroyed. There is no anticipated risk to the participants. However, as in all research, there may be unforeseen risks to the participant. If an accidental injury occurs, appropriate emergency measures will be taken; however, no compensation or treatment will be made available to the subject except as otherwise stated in this form.

If requested, a brief summary of the findings of this investigation will be sent to you upon completion of the study. You can make your request by submitting your name and postal address to me. If you have any questions about this study, you may contact either Dan A. Gerbens, (616) 245-9614, or Dr. Uldis Smidchens, (616) 387-3889. You may also contact the Chair of the Human Subjects Institutional review Board at (616) 387-8293 or the Vice President for Research with any concerns you may have.

Cordially:

Dan A. Gerbens
3478 Bromley SE
Grand Rapids, MI 49508
Appendix D

Cooperating Teacher Concerns Questionnaire

---

Cooperating Teacher Questionnaire.

For each of the following items, please completely fill in the bubble that best represents your response with a sharp, #2 pencil. Thanks!

Teacher # ____________________ School: ___________________________

Student # ____________________ Grade Level: 
- Elementary
- Secondary

Gender: 
- Male
- Female

Date: _____/____/____

Read each statement, then ask yourself:
WHEN I THINK ABOUT MY TEACHING, HOW MUCH AM I CONCERNED ABOUT THIS?

1 = NOT CONCERNED
2 = A LITTLE CONCERNED
3 = MODERATELY CONCERNED
4 = VERY CONCERNED
5 = EXTREMELY CONCERNED

1. Lack of instructional materials
2. Feeling under pressure too much of the time
3. Doing well when a supervisor is present
4. Meeting the needs of different kinds of students
5. Too many noninstructional duties
6. Diagnosing student learning problems
7. Feeling more adequate as a teacher
8. Challenging unmotivated students
9. Being accepted and respected by professional persons
10. Working with too many students each day
11. Guiding students toward intellectual and emotional growth
12. Whether each student is getting what he needs
13. Getting a favorable evaluation of my teaching
14. The routine and inflexibility of the teaching situation
15. Maintaining the appropriate degree of class control

Please return in the enclosed postage-paid envelope as soon as you have completed this form.
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Appendix E

Text of Statement Read to Participating Student Teachers
TEXT OF STATEMENT TO BE READ TO STUDENT TEACHERS AT THE FIRST SESSION OF THE STUDENT TEACHING SEMINAR.

Western Michigan University
Department of Educational Leadership
Principal Investigator Dr. Uldis Smidchens
Research Associate Dan A. Gerbens

I am conducting a research project as part of my doctoral dissertation on student teaching programs. The purpose of the investigation is to assess the differences that may exist in the professional development of student teachers during their student teaching experience. I am requesting your participation in this research as a student teacher. Participation is voluntary and you are free to discontinue participation at any time during the semester. All responses will be confidential. No information that personally identifies participants will be released at any time. Participation will have no impact on your student teaching evaluation or grade from either your supervising teacher or college coordinator. Following completion of the study, all coding keys will be destroyed. There is no anticipated risk to the participants. However, as in all research, there may be unforeseen risks to the participant. If an accidental injury occurs, appropriate emergency measures will be taken; however, no compensation or treatment will be made available to the subject except as otherwise stated in this form. Both the cooperating teachers and the student teachers will derive the benefit of an analysis of the student teachers' professional development during the internship experience. The Hope College Education Department and individual schools will benefit from information regarding the supervision and preparation of tomorrow's effective teachers.

If you decide to participate, you will be requested to complete a questionnaire in four of the weekly student teaching seminars during the fall semester months of October, November, and December, 1995. It should take no more than 10 minutes to complete the form. In order to ensure confidentiality, you will code each questionnaire using an assigned number. You will also code each questionnaire for the school in which you are doing your student teaching, your cooperating teacher, and whether you are in elementary or secondary education. To maximize the validity of this study, I request that you do not discuss your responses to the questionnaires with your cooperating teacher.

Your college supervisor and building principal have been notified of this request. Your cooperating classroom teacher will also be participating in this study. If requested, a brief summary of the findings of this investigation will be sent to you upon completion of the study. Individual data will be made available upon specific request and will be shared with only the individual represented by the data. You can make your request by submitting your name and postal address to me. If you have any questions about this study, you may contact either Dan A. Gerbens, (616) 245-9614, or Dr. Uldis Smidchens, (616) 387-3889. You may also contact the Chair of the Human Subjects Institutional review Board at (616) 387-8293 or the Vice President for Research with any concerns you may have. Thank you in advance for your participation in this research.
Appendix F

Student Teacher Concerns Questionnaire

Student Teacher Questionnaire

For each of the following items, please completely fill in the bubble that best represents your response with a sharp, #2 pencil. Thanks!

Student # __________________ School: ____________________________

Grade Level: ☐ Elementary ☐ Secondary

Date: ___/___/____

Gender: ☐ Male ☐ Female

Read each statement, then ask yourself: WHEN I THINK ABOUT MY TEACHING, HOW MUCH AM I CONCERNED ABOUT THIS?

Do not respond with what you think others are concerned about, respond according to what concerns you NOW.

1 = NOT CONCERNED
2 = A LITTLE CONCERNED
3 = MODERATELY CONCERNED
4 = VERY CONCERNED
5 = EXTREMELY CONCERNED

1. Lack of instructional materials
2. Feeling under pressure too much of the time
3. Doing well when a supervisor is present
4. Meeting the needs of different kinds of students
5. Too many noninstructional duties
6. Diagnosing student learning problems
7. Feeling more adequate as a teacher
8. Challenging unmotivated students
9. Being accepted and respected by professional persons
10. Working with too many students each day
11. Guiding students toward intellectual and emotional growth
12. Whether each student is getting what he needs
13. Getting a favorable evaluation of my teaching
14. The routine and inflexibility of the teaching situation
15. Maintaining the appropriate degree of class control

Please return in the enclosed postage-paid envelope as soon as you have completed this form.
Appendix G

Cooperating Teacher Perception of Student Teacher's Concerns Questionnaire

Cooperating Teacher
Student Teacher Questionnaire

For each of the following items, please completely fill in the bubble that best represents your response with a sharp, #2 pencil. Thanks!

Teacher: # ___________________________ School: ___________________________

Student: # ___________________________ Grade Level: ☐ Elementary ☐ Secondary

Gender: ☐ Male ☐ Female — Date: __/__/____

Read each statement, then ask yourself:

HOW MUCH DO I THINK MY STUDENT TEACHER IS CONCERRED ABOUT THIS?

1 = NOT CONCERNED
2 = A LITTLE CONCERNED
3 = MODERATELY CONCERNED
4 = VERY CONCERNED
5 = EXTREMELY CONCERNED

1. Lack of instructional materials
2. Feeling under pressure too much of the time
3. Doing well when a supervisor is present
4. Meeting the needs of different kinds of students
5. Too many noninstructional duties
6. Diagnosing student learning problems
7. Feeling more adequate as a teacher
8. Challenging unmotivated students
9. Being accepted and respected by professional persons
10. Working with too many students each day
11. Guiding students toward intellectual and emotional growth
12. Whether each student is getting what he needs
13. Getting a favorable evaluation of my teaching
14. The routine and inflexibility of the teaching situation
15. Maintaining the appropriate degree of class control

Please return in the enclosed postage-paid envelope as soon as you have completed this form.
Appendix H

Letter of Approval From Human Subjects
Institutional Review Board
Date: October 4, 1995

To: Dan Gerbens

From: Richard Wright, Chair

Re: HSIRB Project Number 95-10-03

This letter will serve as confirmation that your research project entitled "Student teachers' concerns: an investigation of the influence of supervision on concern development" has been approved under the exempt category of review by the Human Subjects Institutional Review Board. The conditions and duration of this approval are specified in the Policies of Western Michigan University. You may now begin to implement the research as described in the application.

Please note that you must seek specific approval for any changes in this design. You must also seek reapproval if the project extends beyond the termination date. In addition, if there are any unanticipated adverse reactions or unanticipated events associated with the conduct of this research, you should immediately suspend the project and contact the Chair of the HSIRB for consultation.

The Board wishes you success in the pursuit of your research goals.

Approval Termination: October 4, 1996

xc: Uldis Smidchens, EDLD
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