

Teaching Styles of Student Teachers as Related to Those of Their Cooperating Teachers

MARVIN A. SEPERSON*
BRUCE R. JOYCE

FOR many years it has been assumed that there are considerable relationships between the teaching behaviors of individual student teachers and their cooperating teachers, and that these relationships are cumulative due to the influence of the cooperating teacher on the student teacher.

However, there are a few reported investigations of the empirical dimensions of the relationships. One of the most widely quoted is that of Shirley Flint,¹ who studied student teachers and cooperating teachers at the Hunter College Laboratory School, using Medley and Metzel's OScAR. She found some patterns of relationship in several areas of teaching behavior. Her data were obtained during a relatively short teaching experience, and her finding of no long-term patterns of influence during a brief contact provides some confirmation of the common-sense belief. Brown's study² of student teachers during "participation" experiences found no relationships and, in fact, considerable differences between student teachers and cooperating teachers. The students

displayed much more indirect, inquiry-oriented, supportive styles than did the cooperating teachers they were exposed to as models of teaching during the "preparation" experiences.

The present investigation, which is one of a long series of investigations at Teachers College, Columbia University, into the development of teaching styles by young teachers, attempted to explore the relationship between the teaching behaviors of student teachers and cooperating teachers over a semester (about 15 weeks) of contact.

The subjects were 19 teacher candidates in the preservice teacher education program at Teachers College. The student teachers were in a year-long master's degree teacher education program. All were liberal arts graduates, and each of them engaged in "observation-participation" experiences during the first semester—that is, the fall of the year—and then in full-time student teaching during the second semester of the program.

Procedures. Four samples of the candidates' teaching behavior were obtained during the "observation-participation" experience when they were working in tutorial

¹ Shirley H. Flint, "The Relationship Between the Classroom Verbal Behavior of Student Teachers and the Classroom Verbal Behavior of Their Cooperating Teachers." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York, 1965.

² Clark C. Brown, "The Relationship of Initial Teaching Styles and Selected Variables in Student Teaching." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1967.

* Marvin A. Seperson, Associate Professor of Education, New England College, Henniker, New Hampshire; and Bruce R. Joyce, Professor of Education, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York City

sessions with small groups of children in language arts lessons. Tape recordings were made of each of these four lessons, and the tape recordings were coded according to the Conceptual Systems Manual (the "Joyce" system).³ Two samples of their teaching behavior were obtained early in the second semester when they were with their cooperating teachers; one sample was taken halfway through the semester; and two more samples of behavior were obtained late in their experience with the cooperating teachers. In addition, three samples of the cooperating teachers' behavior were obtained during the second semester. All samples of teaching behavior were obtained through live observation during the second semester.

Two types of analyses were made of these data. Indices of teaching behavior, eight in number, were computed by grouping subcategories for each of the student teachers for the "initial" contact with children; that is, the teaching experiences sampled in the fall of the year with small groups prior to exposure to their cooperating teachers, the "early" student teaching behavior sampled early in the second semester, and the "later" student teaching experience sampled late in the second semester when they had been with the cooperating teachers for several weeks. The same indices were calculated for each of the cooperating teachers.

Correlations were then made between the student teachers' behavior at the pre-teaching level, the "early" student teaching level, and the "later" student teaching level with the indices of the cooperating teachers. Part correlations then removed the effect of the early relationships to determine whether there was a cumulative relationship between the early and later student teaching behavior.

In addition, the means of each index were calculated for the initial teaching behavior, the early student teaching behavior, and the later student teaching behavior, and these were compared with the means for each index for the cooperating teachers. In this way, it is possible to determine whether the

individual student teachers moved toward the indices of the cooperating teachers as individuals and whether the student teachers as a group became more like the cooperating teachers they were with.

The Conceptual Systems Manual. The version of the manual which was used for the present study (and which has been supplanted by a more recent series of editions) includes certain categories. In its use, a communication is defined as one statement by a teacher on one topic for not more than 15 seconds.

The teacher's oral communications are placed in four general categories with 24 subcategories.⁴ The four general categories include: (a) Sanctions; (b) Information; (c) Procedures; and (d) Maintenance.

The general category of *Sanctions* includes all oral communications of the teacher that are likely to have a rewarding or punishing effect on one or more children. Under the general category of *Sanctions*, there are 10 subcategories with either positive or negative effect. These subcategories include:

1-2. *Search*: the behavior being rewarded or punished may be problem-solving behavior, an attempt to evaluate information, giving an opinion or reason, an attempt at self-expression or at suggesting a way of organizing an activity. An example of a communication classified as *Search* is: "Those are good explanations."

3-4. *Group Process*: the behavior being rewarded or punished in relations with other children in an attempt to improve a group situation. An example of a communication classified as *Group Process* is: "Stop bothering the reading group."

5-6. *Attainment*: the behavior being rewarded or punished is the attainment of having learned a concept or skill. An example of a communication classified as *Attainment* is: "That's correct, the answer is _____."

7-8. *Following Directions*: the behavior being rewarded or punished is on securing procedural conformity. An example of a communi-

⁴ The general category and subcategory names used in this study were based on a duplicated manual produced prior to the publication of *The Structure of Teaching*.

³ Bruce R. Joyce and Berj Harootunian. *The Structure of Teaching*. Chicago: Science Research Associates, Inc., 1967. Appendix A, pp. 228-46.

cation classified as Following Directions might be: "I am tired of waiting for you."

9-10. General Support: a communication from the teacher giving or denying the learner encouragement, indications of appreciation, and general approval. An example of a communication classified as General Support is: "Let's try together and we can do it."

The general category of *Information* includes all oral communications of the teacher relative to information, ideas, and skills. Three of the subcategories include communications from the teacher that invite children to give the information, suggest ideas, and practice the skills. These are:

11. Child Hypothesis: a communication from the teacher to help the child evaluate information, make inferences, define or advance problems. An example of a communication classified as Child Hypothesis is: "What makes you think so?"

12. Child Observation: a communication from the teacher asking the child to speculate or contribute an observation without rigor of examination. An example of a communication classified as Child Observation is: "What do you think made the fluid turn blue?"

13. Lecture Questions: a communication from the teacher which requires the child to give the one right answer based on recall or observation. An example of a communication classified as Lecture Questions is: "Who discovered America?"

Four additional subcategories are more teacher-centered and call for the teacher to give the information or ideas and demonstrate skills. These include:

14. Teacher Statements: a communication from the teacher in which he gives the information, demonstrates, or describes a skill. An example of a communication classified as Teacher Statements is: "Dogs are mammals."

15. Teacher Statements—Repeat: a communication from the teacher in which he repeats a statement that a child has made. An example of a communication classified as Teacher Statements—Repeat is: "Alice says dogs are mammals."

16. Teacher Concludes: a communication from the teacher in which he defines the issues,

states the criteria, makes the assertions, and carries the burden of analysis. An example of a communication classified as Teacher Concludes is: "This will prove that. . ."

The general category of *Procedures* includes all oral communications of the teacher related to procedures, plans, standards, and goals. Two of the subcategories include communications from the teacher that invite children to determine standards and procedures. These are:

17. Child Standards: a communication from the teacher in which he helps the child determine standards of performance. An example of a communication classified as Child Standards is: "How will we decide which stories to include?"

18. Child Procedures: a communication from the teacher in which he helps the child develop a plan or determine the procedures. An example of a communication classified as Child Procedures is: "How can you find some more information?"

Three additional subcategories are more teacher-centered and call for the teacher to determine procedures and standards. These are:

19. Teacher Determines Procedures—Group: a communication from the teacher in which he takes the authority for the group or class on how things will be done. An example of a communication classified as Teacher Determines Procedures—Group is: "Turn to page seven."

20. Teacher Determines Procedures—Individual: a communication from the teacher in

Index	Initial Style and Cooperating Teachers
Sanctioning—Positive	104
Sanctioning—Negative	256
Sanctioning—Convergent	402*
Total Information Handling	260
Information Handling— Total Questioning	511*
Information Handling— Open Questioning	476*
Total Procedure Handling	319
Procedure Handling—Reflective	795

* Indicates significance at the .05 level for a one-tailed test. Critical r with 17 df = .389.

Table 1. Correlation Coefficients Between the Mean of Indices for the Initial Teaching Style of 19 Student Teachers and the Mean of Indices of Teaching Style for Cooperating Teachers

Index	Early Teaching Style and Cooperating Teacher	Advanced Teaching Style and Cooperating Teacher
Sanctioning—Positive	.480*	.291
Sanctioning—Negative	.334	.136
Sanctioning—Convergent	.497*	.377
Total Information Handling	.562**	.513**
Information Handling—Total Questioning	.214	.489*
Information Handling—Open Questioning	.358	.342
Total Procedure Handling	.479*	.578***
Procedure Handling—Reflective	.163	.537**

* Indicates significance at the .05 level for a one-tailed test. Critical r with 17 df = .389.

** Indicates significance at the .01 level for a one-tailed test. Critical r with 17 df = .528.

*** Indicates significance at the .005 level for a one-tailed test. Critical r with 17 df = .575.

Table 2. Correlation Coefficients Between the Means of Each Index for the Early and Advanced Teaching Styles of 19 Student Teachers and the Means of Each Index of Teaching Style for Their Cooperating Teachers

which he takes the authority for procedures but singles out the individual. An example of a communication classified as Teacher Determines Procedures—Individual is: "John, turn to page seven."

21. *Teacher Determines Standards*: a communication from the teacher in which he determines the guidelines for performance and determines what is acceptable. An example of a communication classified as Teacher Determines Standards is: "This paper isn't neat."

The general category of *Maintenance* includes all oral communications of the teacher related to maintaining the social order within the school. Subcategories under Maintenance include:

22. *Transition*: a communication from the teacher that bridges thoughts, ends one activity and begins another, gives the teacher opportunities to stall for time or minimally acknowledge a contribution. An example of a communication classified as Transition is: "Mmmm."

23. *Small Talk*: a communication from the teacher that is personal in nature and not directly related to the objectives of the school. An example of a communication classified as Small Talk is: "My, it's warm."

24. *Discuss Routine*: a communication from the teacher that relates to physical arrangements or plans that involve the classroom in non-instructional matters. An example of a communication classified as Discuss Routine is: "Please open the window."

Relationships Between Teaching Styles

In Table 1, there are presented the correlation coefficients between the indices for the "initial" teaching styles and the mean indices of teaching styles for the cooperating teachers.

The initial teaching style, it will be remembered, was determined from samples of the student teaching behavior taken prior to the time when the student teachers had contact with their cooperating teachers. None of the correlations is positive. The pattern is negative, with three correlations significantly so. The negative pattern seems odd, but clearly there were no positive relationships.

In Table 2, there are presented the coefficients of correlation between the indices computed for the "early" and "advanced" teaching styles of the student teachers and the indices of the cooperating teachers.

It can be seen that four of the eight indices of the early teaching styles are significantly correlated with the indices for the cooperating teachers, and the others are positive although they are not significant. Four of the eight coefficients between the advanced teaching style of the student teachers and the styles of the cooperating teachers are significant. These correlations represent substantial evidence that the teaching behavior of the student teachers had moved from no association or negative ones with the behavior of the cooperating teacher prior to student teaching to being significantly related to a number of important dimensions by early in student teaching, a relationship

Index	Student Teachers with One Cooperating Teacher (n = 19)
Sanctioning—Positive	.016
Sanctioning—Negative	.093
Sanctioning—Convergent	.266
Total Information Handling	.365
Information Handling—Total Questioning	.461*
Information Handling—Open Questioning	.163
Total Procedure Handling	.429*
Procedure Handling—Reflective	.517*

* Indicates significance at the .05 level for a one-tailed test. Critical r with 16 df = .400.

Table 3. Coefficients of Part-Correlation Between Indices of Teaching Styles of 19 Student Teachers and Their Cooperating Teachers

Index _i	Lesson =1 Mean & (Range) of Differences		Lesson =2		Lesson =3		Lesson =4		Lesson =5	
	Mean	(Range)	Mean	(Range)	Mean	(Range)	Mean	(Range)	Mean	(Range)
Sanctioning— Positive	.05	(.18)	.06	(.29)	.05	(.22)	.05	(.19)	.05	(.25)
Sanctioning— Negative	.23	(1.33)	.23	(1.23)	.19	(.96)	.17	(.96)	.28	(1.56)
Sanctioning— Convergent	.27	(1.48)	.24	(1.36)	.23	(1.12)	.20	(1.03)	.21	(.84)
Total Information Handling	.11	(.47)	.08	(.44)	.12	(.51)	.10	(.42)	.09	(.66)
Information Handling— Total Questioning	.12	(.70)	.14	(.51)	.14	(.73)	.13	(.56)	.11	(.52)
Information Handling— Open Questioning	.11	(.50)	.11	(.40)	.15	(.81)	.13	(.54)	.12	(.58)
Total Procedure Handling	.08	(.35)	.08	(.34)	.08	(.45)	.07	(.24)	.09	(.73)
Procedure Handling— Reflective	.06	(.31)	.06	(.40)	.04	(.39)	.05	(.33)	.05	(.39)

Table 4. Means and Ranges of Difference Scores Between Eight Indices of Behavior of Student Teachers and Their Cooperating Teachers

which was maintained throughout student teaching.

Part correlations were computed to remove the effects of the associations between the "early styles" of the student teachers and their cooperating teachers. The results of those calculations are presented in Table 3.

It can be seen that three of the part correlations are significant, indicating that even after the effects of the initial relationship were removed, a significant relationship still existed in five of the eight indices. Hence, although the cooperating teachers evidently influenced the student teachers considerably during the early weeks of student teaching, their influence continued so that an even greater relationship could be observed by the end of student teaching with respect to three of the eight indices.

Difference Scores. An analysis was made of difference scores in an effort to track the patterns' influence more specifically over the five lessons. In Table 4, the difference scores are presented for each of the five lessons. Each difference score was calculated by taking the index for each student teacher for each lesson and subtracting it from the mean of the cooperating teachers' indices.

It can be seen that the difference scores did not change appreciably through the five lessons and remained, in fact, about the same throughout the lessons. Thus, although student teachers' behavior became correlated

with the behavior of their cooperating teachers in several important areas, differences in behavior existed and did not diminish entirely. Also there are fairly large ranges, indicating that some student teachers behaved quite differently from their cooperating teachers.

Interpretation. The evidence seems to indicate clearly that there were no relationships between the indices of the student teachers and cooperating teachers prior to their contact, but that there were relationships in several of the indices very shortly after student teaching began, and the relationships continued even when they were adjusted for the early relationships. However, inspection of the difference scores revealed no consistent pattern of influence once the early impact of the cooperating teacher had been felt.

The evidence supports the common-sense contention that the cooperating teacher substantially influences the behavior of the student teacher, and this evidence contradicts directly a finding in the previous study conducted by Brown and Joyce in which no significant relationships were found between student teachers and cooperating teachers.²

It is worthwhile noting that the influence of the cooperating teacher was felt during the very early weeks of student teaching rather than being the result of the slow and cumulative impact. We had expected that the initial correlations might be rela-

² Clark C. Brown, *op. cit.*

tively low, with a gradual rise in the course of student teaching. Such was not the case. It may well be that the entire setting of student teaching influences the behavior of the student teacher almost immediately on his contact with the cooperating teacher.

For example, if a student teacher is put into a room where all the children are organized into small groups, and his task is to help those groups maintain their functioning and to plan with them, he is likely to have to play a facilitative role even if these new behaviors are somewhat awkward for him. If, on the other hand, he is put into a classroom where the children are lined up in neat rows, and the teacher functions always by talking to them from the front of the room, then the student teacher is likely to have to adopt a lectorial, recitative pattern of behavior, however awkward that may be for him. Hence, it may be that the cooperating teacher models for the student teacher not

only a verbal behavior which he would expect to be influential only slowly and over a long period of time, but also affects his student teacher by the entire setting that he creates. The setting may be influential very rapidly in the experience, while a verbal model would be slower to have effect.

Be that as it may, the cooperating teacher apparently really is a powerful influence for good or for ill. Since it is well known that most experienced teachers carry on deductive recitation-style teaching rather than inductive or inquiry-oriented teaching, the fact of the early influence on the student teacher should not be considered to be an unmixed blessing.

Because the findings of this study conflict with the previous findings of the Brown investigation, we are replicating it currently to determine, among other things, the extent to which the setting is influential on the teaching styles of student teachers. □

A Call for Papers for the "Research Supplement"

Manuscripts are now being accepted for consideration for the "Research Supplement."

The "Research Supplement" is *not* designed for publishing reviews of research issues, calls for needed research analysis, or analysis of widely quoted research studies. *It has been established for the reporting of data.* Criteria for selecting articles include:

1. The manuscript must report data. Included in the article must be some evidence to support the reliability of the measures used in the study.
2. The article should concern itself with the behavior of teachers (or their surrogates) and that of students as dependent variables. Behavior is taken to mean achievement scores, responses to questionnaires, etc.
3. The article should present a discussion of the results in such a manner that the meaning of the research is clear to readers. Some suggestions to

meet this criterion include: a discussion of threats to the validity of the study's conclusion; an unambiguous definition of the independent variable; a distinction between the findings (data) of a study and the conclusion pertaining to the research hypotheses; a distinction between testing research hypotheses grounded in theoretical frameworks and answering research questions for which there exists no known theoretical base; and finally establishment of a basis for qualified conclusions.

Authors should send manuscripts to: Robert R. Leeper, Editor, *Educational Leadership*, 1201 Sixteenth St., N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036.

Manuscripts to be considered should be from 500 to 2,000 words, typed double-spaced. Submit original manuscript and three copies, and enclose return envelope and postage. All manuscripts will be submitted to an advisory panel, and prompt decisions will be made regarding their publication. □

Copyright © 1973 by the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development. All rights reserved.