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**ABSTRACT**

Teachers during training are in the unique position of alternating roles between learner and teacher whilst also studying the formal theories of the processes that they themselves are involved in. This thesis explores both pre-service and in-service teacher's personal perspectives on teaching and learning with particular reference to the psychology component of their course.

This work follows an ethnographic approach consistent with the research philosophy and goals. Research methods included focused interviews, college and school observations and documentation analysis. Participants from four primary education courses (B.Ed, PGCE, B.Ed.I-S and Dip.Ed.) took part throughout the period of one academic year.

As teacher educators, and indeed teachers, are concerned with groups of learners it was a concern of this study to present the research findings in terms of "commonalities" as well as "idiosyncrasies". Thus four chapters present the research findings in a summarised form looking at trends between the four courses (B.Ed, PGCE, B.Ed.I-S and Dip.Ed.) and between the two course types (pre-service and in-service). Four further chapters are in the form of individual case studies reminding the reader of the unique perspective of each individual within the group.

The study is reviewed in the final chapter. The research findings are discussed in terms of the summarised data and the individual within the group. It is suggested that the personal perspectives of student teachers are of importance to the teacher educator in facilitating their development as intelligent educators. The place of psychology in teacher education and the implications for psychology teachers on education courses is discussed. A more reflexive approach towards the teaching and learning of psychology is advocated.
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Exploring the Research Area
CHAPTER 1

Exploring the Research Area

"... every mentor has a philosophy of education. He may not call it such a pretentious label, but he has some purpose in teaching as he does. A philosophy of education is a statement of the values, purposes and reasons for the entire educational enterprise."

[Pittenger & Gooding, 1971, p.3]

1.0 Introduction

This chapter explores the research area that contributed to the development of this project. It is divided into eight sections. The first describes the personal interests of the author that led to initiating this exploration. The second section sets the scene by pinpointing some of the recent thinking on the training of teachers that has led to changes in teacher education in England and Wales during this decade. Section 1.3 then looks at some of the alternative educational perspectives or ideologies that may be identified in the western world at present. The view of grand educational theories is followed in section 1.4 by a review of the literature on predominant patterns of individual thought, or cognitive styles. It is argued that one's cognitive style relates to a preferred way of learning and may in turn affect the way one teaches. In order to be able to entertain alternative perspectives in education one must have developed the ability to be able to think relativistically, therefore the fifth section looks at the intellectual development of college students of which pre-service student teachers, at least, are members. This leads on to the sixth section reviewing learning, professional learning and change. As psychology offers a number of formal models of man and the nature of learners the seventh section explores the relationship between psychology and teacher education. The last section defines the research problem.
1.1 A Personal Perspective

The research area of interest has been developed from my personal experience of being a student teacher and a psychology undergraduate and reflecting on these experiences.

For me, education was about learning, and teaching was the activity by which learning could be promoted. It seems therefore that theories of teaching and learning lay at the crux of education. Psychologists offered a variety of such theories which in turn reflect more global models of man. Some of these theories I found personally relevant while with others, this was not the case, but this served to sharpen my awareness of how I viewed my world.

It was interesting to observe my peers during both my undergraduate studies and teacher training. Some, like me, grappled with the theories, taking on board those they found personally relevant and abandoning those they did not. From our discussions I became aware of others holding a variety of different viewpoints. What seemed even more interesting to me was that many students (and my impression was this was the majority of them) "did" psychology but seemed to remain untouched by the experience, that is they did not seem to take up a personal commitment. Psychology to them was a subject (like Maths, Geography, etc.) that was to be learned to be regurgitated for exams but had nothing to contribute to their understanding of either themselves or others.

It was not until some time later when I explored the ideas of psychologist George Kelly and the notion of constructive alternativism that I reflected on this experience again. From this experience a study investigating student teachers' personal perspectives on teaching and learning with special reference to the psychology component of the teacher education course evolved.

The next section sets the scene by describing the recent changes recommended for the training of teachers.
1.2 Teacher Education in the 1980s.

In 1972 two key papers, "The James Report" and the White Paper "Education: a framework for expansion", initiated significant changes in teacher education that are in evidence today. Such changes include the basic requirement of a degree for entry into the teaching profession, absorption of teacher education courses into larger institutions and a move toward CNAA validation.

In 1982 Local Education Authorities (LEAs) in England and Wales employed some 416,000 full-time teachers plus another 23,000 part-time or in occasional service. The following Figure 1(i) shows the distribution of graduate and non-graduate full-time, qualified teachers.

![Figure 1(i)]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Full-time Teachers Analyzed by School Type, Sex and Graduate Status</th>
<th>Nursery &amp; Primary</th>
<th>Secondary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>England and Wales (thousands, March 1981)</td>
<td>Men</td>
<td>Women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Graduate</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total*</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Because of rounding some totals are not the exact sum of their constituents.

[HMSO, Teaching Quality, 1983 p.3]

Of the 159,000 graduate teachers approximately 43,000 held B.Ed. degrees while some 21,000 had had no initial teacher training.
The majority of non-graduate teachers had completed a Certificate of Education course. The two year course had been extended to three years in 1960. The decision to move to an all graduate entry to teaching saw the last entry to the Certificate Courses in 1979. Figure 1(ii) sets out the breakdown of admissions for 1983.

Fig. 1(ii)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Estimated</th>
<th>Planned</th>
<th>1985 change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Primary B.Ed. :</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universities</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Sector</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>5,100</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary P.G.C.E. :</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universities</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Sector</td>
<td>1,100</td>
<td>1,150</td>
<td>1,150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary B.Ed. :</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universities</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Sector</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>1,600</td>
<td>1,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary P.G.C.E. :</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universities</td>
<td>5,200</td>
<td>4,250</td>
<td>4,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Sector</td>
<td>4,750</td>
<td>2,650</td>
<td>2,650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universities</td>
<td>6,050</td>
<td>5,150</td>
<td>5,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Sector</td>
<td>12,350</td>
<td>10,300</td>
<td>11,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18,400</td>
<td>15,650</td>
<td>16,750</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(HMSO, Teaching Quality, 1983 p.14)

The White Paper "Teaching Quality", March 1983, addresses the problem of match between the teacher’s training and his work. Section 26 states:

"Qualifications and training alone do not make a teacher. Personality, character and commitment are as important as the specific knowledge and skills that are used in the day to day tasks of teaching. Good teachers need to have a mastery of the subject matter they teach and the professional skills needed to teach it to children of different ages, abilities, aptitudes and backgrounds. But they also need those skills which are necessary for the effective performance of their role outside the classroom in the social and corporate life of the school and in relationship to parents and community."

An emphasis on the subject matter and professional skills has been well recognised and is outlined by the Council for the Accreditation of Teacher
Education (CATE) in CATE NOTE No.3. A summary of the requirements relating to subject studies given in the annex to CATE NOTE 3 is reproduced in the Appendix (See Appendix A1).

Although much consideration has been given at least to the amount of time that must be allocated to the study of subject matter, little has been done to define what is meant by "personality, character and commitment" and how it may be acquired or developed. Indeed strict criteria are adhered to in the academic ability of selecting suitable students for training courses, but criteria on which to select for personality, character and commitment are often implicit and idiosyncratic, perhaps reflecting the selector's personal perspectives on what makes a "good" teacher.

The political move to improve educational standards by improving teaching is to be applauded. But what are those educational aims to which we must aspire? Is there a consensus view as to what constitutes good teaching? Are teacher educators agreed on the educational goals to which their trainee teachers must conform? The next section outlines four alternative educational perspectives to illustrate the diversity of opinion in current Western thinking on education.

1.3 Alternative Educational Perspectives

There is a diversity of opinion apparent to what constitutes "good" teaching. Each opinion reflects the person's model of man and nature of knowledge. Pope & Keen [1981] suggest that at least four major schools of thought may be identified in the development of Western educational ideology. These schools are:

a) Cultural Transmission
b) Romanticism
c) Progressivism
d) De-Schooling.
Each theme is based on a coherent set of assumptions of psychological development and epistemology. Figure 1(iii) is an attempt to summarise these. Brief descriptions of these four themes are presented as a backcloth to this study. The Cultural Transmission model is based on the principles of naive realism in that we perceive the world as it actually is. As true knowledge and absolute values exist, the teacher's task is to pass on this knowledge to the essentially passive learner. This has been a dominant theme during the earlier part of this century as this quote from Hutchins in 1936 suggests:

"Education implies teaching, teaching implies knowledge. Knowledge is truth. The truth is everywhere the same. Hence education should be everywhere the same."

[Hutchins, 1936 p.66]

The psychological development of the learner is seen as being sponge-like in passively absorbing the information, in being manipulated by his environment, and having an external locus of control. The psychological theories that support this perspective would be found in the Associationist and Behaviourist Schools.

The philosophical stance of the Romanticists' philosophy would be Idealism emphasising that ultimate reality is spiritual and mental rather than physical and material. This view stresses a conflict-free environment in which the inner "good" can unfold and inner "bad" come under personal control. Psychological development is seen as maturational, and psychologists that may be seen to support this view would include Freud (psychosexual development), and Gesell (mental growth).

The third ideology, Progressivism, may be seen to be derived from Pragmatism in that reality is the interaction of man with his environment. Truth may be defined in the light of experience. Psychological development within this theme may be seen as a progression through a series of sequential stages that depend on the interaction of the learner with the environment. Psychological theorists whose views are akin to these views would include cognitive theorists e.g. Piaget and Bruner, and role theorists e.g. G.H. Mead.
## Alternative Perspectives on Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Western Educational Ideology</th>
<th>Cultural Transmission</th>
<th>Romanticist</th>
<th>Progressivist</th>
<th>De-Schooling</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Compatible Philosophy</strong></td>
<td>Naive Realism</td>
<td>Idealism</td>
<td>Pragmatism</td>
<td>Existentialism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Learner</strong></td>
<td>biological; empty vessel; external motivation/incentives; emphasis on behaviour; reactor</td>
<td>biological/developmental; unfolding development; growth; natural goodness; stress thoughts, feelings and emotions</td>
<td>interactive; interacts with environment; pursues own interests; goal to reach higher stages</td>
<td>resource; dialogue; offer own interpretation of knowledge which learner is free to accept or reject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teacher</strong></td>
<td>transmitter of knowledge; expert; manipulator</td>
<td>permissive; unrestrictive; non-directive;</td>
<td>guide; advisor; facilitator; challenger; problem poser; questioner</td>
<td>mutual trust; respect; no power structure between teacher, learner or community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pedagogic Environment</strong></td>
<td>knowledge/subject centred</td>
<td>totally child centred; permissive; conflict free</td>
<td>is not preparation for living but life itself; stimulating; promotes cognitive conflict</td>
<td>Phenomenological; depends on person's understanding of reality; emphasis on meaning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Knowledge Development</strong></td>
<td>objective; independent of person; e.g. tabula rasa (John Locke)</td>
<td>knowledge stresses feelings and experience e.g. Plato and Kant</td>
<td>knowledge results from active change in patterns of thinking, by experiential problem solving situations.</td>
<td>Humanistic interpersonal psychology, e.g. Carl Rogers, R. D. Laing, Harry Stack Sullivan, Bateson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Compatible Psychological Theories</strong></td>
<td>stress behaviour, e.g. associationism, behaviourism, stimulus-response theory, contingency theory</td>
<td>stress, emotions, thoughts and feelings, e.g. maturational theories, Freud's psychoanalytic theory</td>
<td>actor interacting with environment; interactional theories of cognitive development, e.g. Piaget, Bruner; role theorists stress social development e.g. Mead</td>
<td>Humanistic interpersonal psychology, e.g. Carl Rogers, R. D. Laing, Harry Stack Sullivan, Bateson</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(After Pope and Keen, 1981)
The fourth theme Pope & Keen labelled De-Schooling after the views of Ivan Illich [1971] and others who are concerned with the lack of relevance to the learner of much of the school curriculum. Illich suggests bringing together those who wish to teach with those who wish to learn within a given area and abolishing the school as a unit. De-schoolers may be seen as reflecting an existentialist philosophy emphasising personal knowledge and reason informed by passion. In contrast to the Cultural Transmission model the teacher must find the subject they offer personally relevant and it is the learner's responsibility to accept or reject the teacher's interpretation in an atmosphere of mutual trust. The focus is on the personal perspective and interpersonal relationships favoured by the humanistic psychologists e.g. Carl Rogers, R.D. Laing, D. Bateson and Harry Stack Sullivan.

These four 'grand' theories suggest different educational aims and goals. Each individual may be seen to hold a unique, personal perspective which may, or may not, reflect one or other of the grand theories proposed by Pope & Keen [1981].

In contrast to the grand theories, these "within skin" theories are often tacit but are reflected in the teacher's or trainee's practice. It is, therefore, an important issue for the teacher educator to address in training. There are obviously many factors that contribute to the evolution of such personal perspectives. Such factors would include those that are within the individual (e.g. personality, a predisposition to behave in a particular way) and those without (e.g. social, life events etc.) Butt suggests that biography can be seen to play a significant part in understanding teacher thinking [Butt 1985, 1986]. Such life events contribute to the idiosyncrasy of the individual viewpoint.

Teachers and teacher educators are not only interested in the individual differences of their learners but also in commonalities or the shared characteristics of learners. Some psychologists suggest that individuals have habitual, preferred ways of thinking that influence their behaviour. These 'cognitive styles' are reflected in the way we learn and therefore, we might expect, influence the way we
teach. The next section looks at some of the research on cognitive styles and how these may relate to learning and teaching.

1.4 Cognitive Styles and Teacher Thinking

One of the most extended series of investigations into complex conceptual learning has been by Pask in the 1970's. He identified two distinct ways of thinking based on a learner's need to regulate uncertainty about the body of learning material over a range of different tasks. The principle of uncertainty regulation asserts that people vary in the amount of uncertainty (ignorance, lack of control etc) which they are willing to tolerate while learning new material. One way of coping is to work in a step by step fashion learning discrete packets of information until all the material has been worked through. An alternative way would be to gain an overview or structural framework before proceeding to fill in the details. This involves a higher degree of uncertainty than the former method and the two approaches are mutually exclusive, as it is not possible to attend to the details of individual concepts and to the relationship between concepts simultaneously.

Early experiments [Pask & Scott, 1972] required the learning of a taxonomy of fictitious Martian creatures. Two groups of subjects emerged. The first emphasised a local approach to learning, working in a linear progression from one hypothesis to the next. This was described as "serialist" behaviour. In contrast the second group showed a global approach requiring a general overview first. This was described as "holist" behaviour. Further distinctions between holists and serialists show that the former revel in anecdote, illustration and analogy while the latter use these sparingly. Holists also tend to have a wider focus of attention. Given a learning task consisting of a parallel series of abstract and real world topics, serialists work sequentially through either series only bringing the two together when forced to achieve overall understanding, while the holists move between the two making analogies. However, it is important to note that both groups reach a similar level of understanding despite using different routes to achieve it.
Pask [1976(b)] introduced conversational techniques as a framework for learning experiments where learning is demonstrated by understanding in the deep sense of Marton & Saljo [1976]. Some conversations involve a human participant in dialogue while others utilise a "mechanically instrumented participant" through which the student "talks to himself" under the restrictions imposed by the device (e.g. computer). The subject matter of a conversation is represented as a conversational domain consisting of an entailment structure (having one or more description schemes showing the way in which one topic may be known in terms of, or derived from others), and behaviour graphs (one for each topic) which are prescriptions for the explanation of the topic.

Pask's serialist/holist distinction is seen as an example of different learning strategies exhibited in "strict conversation" and as such are not sufficiently refined to account for learning in general or to be considered a learning style [Pask, 1976(a)]. Holist and serialist behaviour seem to be manifestations of more fundamental processes induced by the requirement for understanding. In less demanding situations some students act as holists or "comprehension learners," and others like serialists or "operation learners". Some students are able to act in either way and if they excel in both are called "versatile learners". It is these distinctions between comprehension, operation and versatile learning that Pask accepts as learning styles. Comprehension learners acquire an overall picture of the subject matter and recognise where information may be obtained. They are able to build descriptions of topics and describe relationships between them. Operation learners acquire rules, methods and details but generally do not know how these relate to one another. Those students who have the ability to readily adapt their learning strategy to the task in hand and can use one or other, or both together where appropriate, are described as having a versatile style of learning.

Pask [1976(a)] extended his work to investigate the effects of matching and mis-matching learning material with students' learning strategies. Two versions of programmed illustration learning material were prepared, one rich in analogy (designed to suit comprehension learners), the other in a logical, sequential
presentation (more suited to operation learners). The results showed that students in the matched condition (i.e. holists with holist material and serialists with serialist material) produced much higher learning scores than those in the mis-matched condition. Although based on a small sample size this does suggest that students learn best when provided with material to suit their preferred style. If teachers adopt an extreme method of teaching (reflecting their own learning style) it may be anticipated that matching students would benefit while mis-matched students may be seriously disadvantaged. Pask's work could be usefully extended to investigate whether teachers exhibit teaching behaviour related to their own learning style and the effect of match and mis-match.

While Pask's work showed different routes taken to achieve a similar level of understanding, other researchers in Gothenburg, Sweden, found different approaches to learning resulted in different levels of understanding. In one study [Marton & Saljo, 1976] students were asked to read an academic article, taking notes if they wished, as they were to be asked questions about it afterwards. Learning approaches were explained in terms of the content and context of learning, not with reference to the characteristics of the learner. Two distinct approaches emerged, that of "deep level processing" and "surface level processing". Students adopting a deep approach intend to understand the meaning of the article, relate information to previous knowledge and past experience, and critically examine the author's arguments and conclusions. Those using a surface approach intend to identify and memorise those parts of the article considered to be relevant to the questions anticipated. It was also noted that these students were anxious about the experiment.

The deep and surface approaches to learning were further subdivided, according to the degree of activity, attention and involvement, by later work in Gothenburg [Fransson, 1977] and Lancaster [Entwistle and Robinson, 1976; Entwistle, Hanley and Ratcliffe, 1979]. Surface passive and active, and deep passive and active learning approaches describe progressive levels of understanding found by the Swedish study. The British workers using factor analysis suggested the need for
three types of deep approach but this could be seen as a further refinement of the deep passive and active approaches.

Some consistency of approach has been demonstrated when comparing reading experiments, exam performance and normal study [Svensson, 1977]. A student's approach can be influenced by the types of questions asked but it is much easier to induce a surface approach than a deep one [Marton & Saljo, 1976]. Entwistle suggests that a fact-bound syllabus and examinations may be responsible for encouraging a surface approach, enabling only a low level of understanding.

"In order to cope with overwhelming curricula, the students probably have to abandon their ambitions to understand what they read about and instead direct efforts towards passing the examinations ..."
[Entwistle, 1981 p.81]

Levels of interest and anxiety also affect the approach to learning [Fransson, 1977]. Students who feel the situation to be threatening or are not interested in the text, are more likely to adopt a surface approach. This suggests that attention should be paid to the student's own characteristics, such as level of motivation and anxiety, as well as their perception of task requirements.

Different ways of thinking affect learning and inevitably must influence the teaching process. Each opposed view of teaching (e.g. traditional versus progressive) must express, to some degree, the theorist's own preferred way of thinking. It would therefore seem helpful for teachers to be aware of their own ways of thinking as well as those of their students.

"Teaching style" has been used to signify a number of things such as teaching methods, personal style or personal philosophy. Candy defines teaching style as:

"those recurrent and habitual patterns of teaching behaviours (strategies, methods, approaches and responses) which manifest and are based upon the individual teachers' personal professional philosophy."
[Candy, 1981 pp.8-9]
The most debated type of teaching is that of the "formal" versus "informal," frequently referred to as "traditional" versus "progressive" styles. Empirical evidence is biased towards traditional teaching using traditional, psychometric research methods. Progressive theorists tend to reject these methods as they are incompatible with their philosophical stance (see Figure 1(iii)), tending to rely on observation and intuition to support their theories.

Two objective studies, one in Britain [Bennett, 1976] and the other in America [Solomon & Kendall, 1979], used cluster analysis to define the most distinctive patterns of classroom organisation with 10-11 year olds. Common to both studies was the dimension of teacher control - pupil freedom, though few teachers were placed at either extreme. Bennett showed three categories: formal, mixed, and informal teaching styles. He found that the formal environment encouraged improvement in basic skills while the informal environment improved levels of motivation and increased anxiety. It is possible that those children who showed improved motivation prefer to organise their own material in a similar way to Pask's holists. The anxious pupil may be unable to tolerate the less structured learning environment that would suggest a serialist preference. There was little evidence that either environment fostered creativity.

The American study showed that high performance resulted from controlled and disciplined classes. Conversely, low performance resulted from permissive, uncontrolled classes. The two most controlled classes produced high creativity ratings and the more supported of these showed pupils' high self esteem and quality writing. Thus the highest level of creativity was found in warm, friendly classes with moderate teacher control and pupil autonomy.

Wade [1979] re-analysed Bennett’s data in relation to motivation and anxiety personality dimensions. There were two kinds of strategy used by anxious children: approach and avoid. Approachers reduced their anxiety by increasing their work activity and so were highly motivated. Avoiders had low motivation, withdrawing from classroom activities as their defence mechanism. Formal
methods of teaching resulted in the highest scores of motivation and anxiety for
every personality type and over all ability levels. Highly motivated children do
well regardless of anxiety level. Less anxious children respond better to informal
methods of teaching than anxious children at all levels of ability. Less motivated
children with least anxiety also do better amongst bright children; those with low
motivation and low anxiety respond better to informal methods. Approachers
improve under formal methods while few children display an avoidance coping
strategy in informal classrooms. It seems that anxious children need a structured,
formal but supportive environment, while informal methods help autonomous
children who still need an ordered approach to foster creativity.

Some studies suggest that the type of teaching style reflects the teacher's notion of
the purpose of education [Bennett, 1976, Ashton et al., 1975]. "Formal" teachers'
aims focus on examination results and vocational training while "informal"
teachers foster pupils' enjoyment and self expression. Strong parallels have been
drawn between formal and informal teaching styles and cognitive styles [Leith,
1974]. Informal teachers prefer discovery methods to the heavily structured
approach used by formal teachers. This is reminiscent of Pask's holist and serialist
learning strategies. In distinguishing between field dependent and field
independent teachers, Witkin, Goodenough & Cox [1977] noted that the former
preferred discussion methods while the latter used a more structured approach.

From asking newly appointed Polytechnic teachers to explain what they meant by
teaching, Fox identified four basic theories of teaching [Fox, 1983]. (See Figure1(iv)).

Two theories, "transfer" and "shaping", he describes as simple theories, while two,
"travelling" and "growing" he suggests are developed theories. He further
identifies two different applications of the verb "teaching". One is applied to the
academic subject (e.g. I teach English/Maths/Geography) while the other is applied
to the person or learner (e.g. I teach children/managers/student teachers). He sees
transfer and travelling theories as subject focused while shaping and growing
theories are person or learner focused.
Figure 1(iv)

Four basic theories of teaching

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Simple theories</th>
<th>Developed theories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The verb &quot;teaching&quot; is applied to the academic subject. It is likely to be one with a lot of detailed facts to learn.</td>
<td>Transfer theories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The verb &quot;teaching&quot; is applied to people. The subjects are related to personal attitudes and skills.</td>
<td>Shaping theories</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[Fox, 1983 p.158]

Figure 1(v) is a summary table of the four basic theories of teaching.

Each theory of teaching implies a corresponding theory of learning. Fox suggests the simple theories of teaching are more likely to encourage a surface approach to learning. The problem of mis-match between teachers' theories of teaching and students' theories of teaching is also highlighted. Mis-match can occur when the student expects the transfer of knowledge from teacher to student in formal classes while the lecturer sees his job as helping the students to develop their own potential in experiential learning situations. Less commonly perhaps, mis-match can occur when the teacher has a simple view of teaching in that he presents the information that he expects the students to regurgitate in assignments and exams while the student has a more developed theory in that he expects to participate more actively in his own learning. The notion of match and mis-match has important implications for teacher educators.
### Summary sheet of the four basic theories of teaching

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summary sheet</th>
<th>Transfer Theory</th>
<th>Shaping Theory</th>
<th>Travelling Theory</th>
<th>Growing Theory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Verbs</strong> commonly used</td>
<td>Convey, impart, implant, imbue, give, expound, transmit, put over, propound, tell.</td>
<td>Develop, mould, demonstrate, produce, instruct, condition, prepare, direct, (give orders)</td>
<td>Lead, point the way, guide, initiate, help, show, direct (show the way).</td>
<td>Cultivate, encourage, nurture, develop, foster, enable, help, bring out.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The subject matter</strong></td>
<td>Commodity to be transferred, to fill a container.</td>
<td>Shaping tools, pattern, blueprint.</td>
<td>Terrain to be explored.</td>
<td>Experiences to be incorporated into developing personality.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The student</strong></td>
<td>Container to be filled.</td>
<td>Insert material (clay, wood, metal) to be shaped.</td>
<td>Explorer.</td>
<td>Developing personality, growing plants.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The teacher</strong></td>
<td>Pump attendant, food processor, bar maid.</td>
<td>Skilled craftsman working on raw material or selecting and assembling components.</td>
<td>Experienced and expert travelling companion. Guide, Provider of travelling aids</td>
<td>Resource provider. Gardner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Standard teaching methods</strong></td>
<td>Lectures, reading lists, duplicated notes.</td>
<td>Laboratory, workshop, practical instructions like recipes. Exercises with predictable outcomes.</td>
<td>Simulations, projects etc. Exercícis with unpredictable outcomes. Discussions, independent learning.</td>
<td>Experimental methods similar to travelling theory but less structured and more spontaneous.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Monitoring progress</strong></td>
<td>Measuring and sampling contents of vessel.</td>
<td>Checking size and shape of product.</td>
<td>Comparing notes with travelling companion</td>
<td>Listening to reflections on personal development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Explanations of failure - teachers view</strong></td>
<td>Leaky vessels, small container.</td>
<td>Flawed, faulty raw material.</td>
<td>Blinkered vision, lack of stamina. Unadventurous, lethargic.</td>
<td>Poor start, inadequately prepared, no will to develop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Explanations of failure - students view</strong></td>
<td>Poor transfer skills, poor aim.</td>
<td>Incompetent craftsman, Poor or missing blue-print.</td>
<td>Poor guides, poor equipment, too many restrictions on route.</td>
<td>Restricted diet, unsuitable food, incompetent gardener.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attitude to training</strong></td>
<td>Need simple skills of transfer.</td>
<td>Need shaping to British standard Teacher.</td>
<td>Need skills of expert guide as well as knowledge of terrain.</td>
<td>Need skills of diagnosing needs of individual plants.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[Fox, 1983 p.163]
Denicolo used Fox's method of categorising interview statements [Denicolo, 1985]. Pope & Denicolo (1986) discuss the problems inherent in handling qualitative data. They produced a table from one teacher’s interviews which showed that at different times the same teacher might be equally categorised by any of the four styles. See Figure 1(vi). This has implications for the meaningful analysis of interview data and informed the method of analysis of interview data in this research.

Figure 1(vi)

**Personal Theories of Teaching**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transfer</th>
<th>Shaping</th>
<th>Travelling</th>
<th>Growing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;break down the info into as simple units as possible&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;develop their thinking&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;passing on helpful hints&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;get enjoyment from them developing their thinking&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;getting info over&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;you need facts to build and use concepts&quot;, &quot;build respect for the subject.&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;go through it with them&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;encourage them&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;getting everyone to a certain level&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;a bad result in a practical undoes all the things you've told them&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;jolly them along&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;each needs a subtle variation of approach&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;getting the students through exams&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;provide different experiences&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;have a debate&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;different students react differently to different methods&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;disseminating info&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;you can't build without bricks so facts are important&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;it is important to form a relationship with students&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;stimulate the students into thinking&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;implant and develop understanding&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;make them think it out&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[Pope & Denicolo, 1986 p.166]
There also seem to be differences in teaching styles adopted by teachers of arts subjects and science subjects. Students reported that some university departments (e.g. science and engineering) are generally more formal than others (e.g. social science, humanities and languages) [Ramsden, 1979]. In the use of analogies the sciences draw from mathematical or mechanical models while the humanities tend to draw from personal experience. It seems that the sciences encourage a more serialist approach while the arts reflect a holist one. An alternative view would be that the serialists pursue science subjects while holists feel more at home with the arts. Witkin [1979] reported that field dependent students found the sciences uncongenial.

Hudson [1968] spoke of the 'mythology' of arts and science at secondary school level. He sees the choice between science and arts subjects as one of the adolescents' first major steps towards adult identity as well as an attempt to match their style of thinking to their private needs. There is a close interplay between subject choice, personality and cognitive style. Choice of science subject has been linked with convergent thinking and emotional inhibitors [Hudson, 1966]. Interviews with eminent scientists suggest a 'cold' relationship with parents leading to the choice of an object oriented rather than person oriented career [Roe, 1953]. This finding was reinforced by research using Catell's personality inventories [Entwistle & Duckworth, 1977]. This suggests that a student who goes into teaching may have a preferred orientation to teaching reflecting their arts or science bias.

Although preferred patterns of thinking are reflected in teaching behaviour there are other important influences that must also be considered. The thinking and behaviour of teachers are guided by a set of beliefs that are often unconscious [Clark & Yinger, 1977; Stenhouse, 1975]. However, not all teachers consistently employ practices which directly reflect their beliefs [Duffy, 1977]. Student teachers' attitudes are believed to change by reflecting those of the college staff when in college and those of the teachers when in school [Shipman, 1967]. More precisely, students were seen to enter college with a model of the teacher's role based on
school experience. During their second year they were most child centred, showing a high regard for the pupil's emotional development and finding formal teaching methods unfavourable. During their third year students "regressed" becoming more teacher centred, believed to result from the conflicting views of the student with those of the head teacher that offered employment [Finlayson & Cohen, 1967]. Indeed much of the anxiety felt by students on teaching practice may result from being assigned to supervisors, or class teachers, with different beliefs [Sorenson, 1967].

Another factor influencing student teachers is their own intellectual development during their time at college. The development of relativistic thinking is especially relevant when attempting to introduce students to alternative theoretical perspectives. Student teachers will be unable to entertain alternative viewpoints unless they have reached a certain level of intellectual development themselves. Age alone does not produce this change. Staff developers should be sensitive to helping students make the transition to relativistic thinking.

The next section examines two pertinent longitudinal studies.

1.5 Intellectual Development and Relativistic Thinking

Two longitudinal studies using open interviews describe the intellectual development of American students throughout their four years at college. Both come to similar conclusions concerning the development of relativistic thinking and as such are pertinent to this study.

The first study by Heath [1964], a clinical psychologist working as an academic counsellor at Princeton University, followed 36 male students throughout their student career. From his weekly interviews Heath discerned three personality types and an ideal type in terms of intellectual development. The personality types he described as non-committers (X), hustlers (Y) and plungers (Z).
Xs are seen as under-reactors displaying a tendency to avoid involvement taking a passive role in a conflict situation. Heath believes this preference for neutrality rather than risk was due to a fear of discovering their fantasy of invincibility and high potentiality may not be true. Ys, in contrast, thrive on activity, are aggressive, competitive and have a need to achieve. However, they appear to suffer from inner conflict with their overt behaviour countering their instinctual impulses. The Zs are seen as over-reactors living and loving in spurts and with fluctuating mood swings. They seem to be wrapped up in their own world, characteristically flitting from one idea to another, often appearing incomprehensible to others. Heath summarises the characteristics in the following table, figure 1(vii).

**Characteristics of Students at Four Model Positions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prototype</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>Y</th>
<th>Z</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Label</td>
<td>Reasonable Adventurer</td>
<td>Non-committer</td>
<td>Hustler</td>
<td>Plunger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ego functioning</td>
<td>Integrative</td>
<td>Constricted</td>
<td>Semi-constricted</td>
<td>Dilated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reactivity</td>
<td>Appropriate</td>
<td>Under-reactive</td>
<td>Counter-active</td>
<td>Over-reactive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common defense</td>
<td>Reasoning</td>
<td>Denial</td>
<td>Reaction-formation</td>
<td>Apology, Restitution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude toward instinctual self</td>
<td>Accepting</td>
<td>Unstructured</td>
<td>Rejecting</td>
<td>Alternating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Motive</td>
<td>To communicate</td>
<td>To belong</td>
<td>To be esteemed</td>
<td>To be noticed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regnant motive</td>
<td>To explore</td>
<td>To smooth over</td>
<td>To achieve</td>
<td>To create change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem</td>
<td>Frontier</td>
<td>Self expression</td>
<td>Self acceptance</td>
<td>Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impression on others</td>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>Bland</td>
<td>Aggressive</td>
<td>Scattered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sensitive</td>
<td>Friendly</td>
<td>Tough minded</td>
<td>Direct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Playful</td>
<td>Conforming</td>
<td>Cold</td>
<td>Impulsive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Compassionate</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Ambitious</td>
<td>Moody</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Characteristic utterance</td>
<td>If only, then...</td>
<td>Who me?</td>
<td>Yes, but...</td>
<td>Why not!</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[Heath, 1964 p.54]
Heath sees that each personality type moves along a developmental trajectory throughout his/her period of tertiary education towards the goal of an ideal of intellectual development. This ideal type he calls the reasonable adventurer (A). "Reasonable" in that, as a mature person, he possesses reasonable expectations and "Adventurer" in his flair for change. Heath describes this "ideal" type:

"The A is characterized by six attributes: intellectuality, close friendships, independence in value judgments, tolerance of ambiguity, breadth of interests, and sense of humor."

[Heath, 1964 p.30]

Of these attributes three are of particular interest to this study: intellectuality, independence in value judgments and tolerance of ambiguity. Heath continues:

* **Intellectuality**: In the pursuit of a problem A appears to experience an alternation of involvement and detachment. The phase of involvement is an intensive and exciting period characterized by curiosity, a narrowing of attention toward some point of interest. It is while "on the prowl" that the person takes this step toward change, makes a discovery, suddenly perceives a new relationship. This period of involvement is then followed by a period of detachment, an extensive phase, accompanied by a reduction of tension and a broadening range of perception. During this period of detachment there is greater awareness of the presence of the self. Here A settles back to reflect on the meaning of what was discovered during the involved stage. Meaning presumes the existence of a web of thought, a pattern of ideas to which the "new" element can be related. One imagines that this is the sort of mental operation that takes place in a stance often referred to as the critical attitude. Then, after this process of ramification and clarification in the extensive phase, there is an eagerness to be on the way again.

We see, therefore, in A the combination of two mental attitudes: the curious and the critical. They do not occur simultaneously but in alternation. A at times is a "believer" but at other times he is a "skeptic". The less effective personalities may show tendencies toward one attitude or the other but may not experience the full reach of either.

* **Independence in value judgments**: Another feature that is associated with A or the Reasonable Adventurer is his relative independence in the area of values. This aspect was particularly observable in small-group discussion or project "precepts." The right or wrong of a particular decision, the goodness or badness of a certain act was less often resolved by reference to external authority. A is more apt to rest...
upon the authority of his own experience. Where this is not possible, he commonly suspends judgment and finds himself playing the role of the interrogator in the discussion. As such he can ask good questions.

Differences that arise between A and others are not so much taken as a personal affront. Rather, they provide for him an occasion to reflect upon his own judgment. When a difference in judgment is found with a party whom he holds in high regard an argument is usually pursued with vigor and interest. Once I deliberately assembled seven Reasonable Adventurers for an evening's discussion. It was a memorable occasion.

_Tolerance of ambiguity:_ Life has its chaotic moments. Such occasions seem less disturbing to A. There is with him less compulsion to relegate matters into black and white. He has greater tolerance for mere shades of gray. When a basis for making a decision is not at hand he is more willing than the less effective personalities to suspend judgment.

It is tempting to account for A's tolerance for ambiguous situations by reference to his relatively stable self-image. When the self is sufficiently objectified in a realistic fashion a psychological base of operations is provided. A, then, enjoys encounters with the unknown. Because of this, perhaps, he displays less compulsion to reduce all unknowns before one acts. The Reasonable Adventurer, in short, preserves the sanctity of the unexpected.*

[Heath, 1964 p.33-34]

All students start and end their college career at different points in their proximity to the ideal. See Figure 1(viii). All are predominantly one of the three personality types that may be seen as a continuum from X to Z. Those on the XY boundary show similarities with each other as do those on the YZ boundary. These traits were stable in that only one borderline Y student was re-assigned to Z during the study. Figure 1(viii) also shows the major disciplines chosen by each student. Personality and cognitive style has already been linked with students' choice of subject specialism at secondary and tertiary level [eg. Hudson,1966, 1968, Roe, 1953, Entwistle & Duckworth,1977] (See section 1.4). Heath saw the path of intellectual development as cone-shaped converging at the apex into the ideal type. Low medial and high zones indicate the developmental route with high X,Y or Z indicating the "ideal" type. See Figure 1(bx). At this stage the personality types have more in common with each other as mature individuals of the "ideal" type, having presumably resolved their pathologies.
There are distinct similarities between Heath's plungers and Pask's holists, and between Heath's reasonable adventurer and Pask's versatile learner. This is of interest as different methods of enquiry were used. Pask, however, was not interested in the effect of personality.

The second study was carried out by Perry [1970], and concentrated on the intellectual and ethical development of 67 students at Harvard and Ratcliffe Colleges. Each student was interviewed once in each of their four years. From this data Perry observed nine positions along a dimension of intellectual and ethical development together with three conditions which affected students' progress. He summarises these as follows:

**Main line of development**

*Position 1:* The student sees the world in polar terms of we-right-good vs. other-wrong-bad. Right Answers for everything exist in the Absolute, known to Authority whose role is to mediate (teach) them. Knowledge and goodness are perceived as quantitative accretions of discrete rightnesses to be collected by hard work and obedience (paradigm: a spelling test).

*Position 2:* The student perceives diversity of opinion, and uncertainty, and accounts for them as unwarranted confusion in poorly qualified Authorities or as mere exercises set by Authority "so we can learn to find The Answer for ourselves".

*Position 3:* The student accepts diversity and uncertainty as legitimate but still temporary in areas where Authority "hasn't found The Answer yet". He supposes Authority grades him in these areas on "good expression" but remains puzzled as to standards.

*Position 4:* (a) The student perceives legitimate uncertainty (and therefore diversity of opinion) to be extensive and raises it to the status of an unstructured epistemological realm of its own in which "anyone has a right to his own opinion," a realm which he sets over against Authority's realm where right-wrong still prevails, or (b) the student discovers qualitative contextual relativistic reasoning as a special case of "what They want" within Authority's realm.

*Position 5:* The student perceives all knowledge and values (including Authority's) as contextual and relativistic and subordinates dualistic right-wrong functions to the status of a special case, in context.
Position 6: The student apprehends the necessity of orienting himself in a relativistic world through some form of personal commitment (as distinct from unquestioned or unconsidered commitment to simple belief in certainty).

Position 7: The student makes an initial commitment in some area.

Position 8: The student experiences the implications of commitment, and explores the subjective and stylistic issues of responsibility.

Position 9: The student experiences the affirmation of identity among multiple responsibilities and realizes commitment as an ongoing, unfolding activity through which he expresses his lifestyle.

Conditions of delay, deflection, and regression

Temporizing: The student delays in some position for a year, exploring its implications or explicitly hesitating to take the next step.

Escape: The student exploits the opportunity for detachment offered by the structures of positions 4 and 5 to deny responsibility through passive or opportunistic alienation.

Retreat: The student entrenches in the dualistic, absolutistic structures of positions 2 or 3.

[Perry, 1970 p.9-10]

Perry sees the students progressing from simplistic dichotomous thinking to experience a variety of possibilities and ultimately to take up a commitment that integrates personal values and self identity. The movement from dualistic thinking to relativistic thinking requires a shift in the locus of control from external to internal. Position 5 is seen as the pivotal point. It is not sufficient to recognize the multiplicity of views but the student must develop beyond this point in the ability to take up a commitment of a personal world view based on careful evaluation and personal experience. Within this commitment is the recognition that this is a personal decision and a tolerance for alternative views is maintained.
The development of relativistic reasoning at the advanced position of Perry's model shows similarities to Heath's Reasonable Adventurer. Unlike Heath, Perry does not attempt to describe the students in terms of personality types and may well have been unable to do so, given that each student was interviewed only once each year during the four years at college. Both found that students came to college at different points proximal to the ideal type and that not all had achieved this level of maturity on leaving. Perry observes:

"Our students must be considered a relatively homogeneous group in intelligence and academic ability, and yet our study reveals the wide range, in any one college year, of the ways in which they construed the nature of knowledge, the origin of values, the intentions of instructors, and their own responsibilities. The implications for the conduct of education are appalling but there they are".  

[Perry, 1970 p.215]

This must be borne in mind when addressing the issue of teacher education. While student teachers are theorising as to the intellectual development of their learners they are experiencing the process of their own intellectual development. If they have not developed the ability to think relativistically they are unable to seriously entertain and evaluate alternative theories. This more obviously applies to pre-service B.Ed. students as their formative college years are spent in professional training, but also to PGCE students who have recently completed degrees, and to in-service teachers. Simply because one has become a teacher does not qualify one to think relativistically. Staff developers should be aware of this aspect and aid the transition to relativistic thinking.

So far in this chapter we have addressed the issue of how quality in teaching is determined by the philosophical perspective on education. We have also looked at the individual, both at the predisposition to think, and therefore learn, in a preferred style and in the stages of development towards relativistic thinking. As this thesis is concerned primarily with teacher education, the next section looks at learning and change with particular reference to professional learning.
1.6 Professional Learning and Change

Much has been written within the psychological literature about learning. Most theorists treat learning as a special topic within their theoretical framework and epistemology. In contrast, the American psychologist George Kelly saw learning as so fundamental to his theory of personality that he states:

"The burden of our assumption is that learning is not a special class of psychological processes. It is not something that happens to a person on occasion; it is what makes him a person in the first place."

[Kelly, 1955, p.75]

Kelly encapsulates his theory of personality in a fundamental postulate and eleven corollaries (see Appendix A2). The fundamental postulate: "A person's processes are psychologically channelised by the way in which he anticipates events", emphasises that every individual experiences his world filtered through his own construct system. He sees his world as if through a pair of "goggles" and, as such, his perspective is unique. Kelly sees change as a product of living:

"All movement takes place as a function of some sort of change in constructs."

[Kelly, 1955, p.582]

Kelly's Experience Corollary may be seen to describe learning: "a person's construction system varies as he successively construes the replication of events". He rejects the push and pull theories, based on the view of man as the responder to stimuli or man spurred on by his needs. This is not a static model but a continuously evolving process of construing and reconstruing. He stresses the importance of the person's interaction with the environment:

"It is not what happens around him that makes a man experienced; it is the successive construing and reconstruing of what happens, as it happens, that enriches the experience of his life."

[Kelly, 1955, p.73]
Kelly's theory accounts for both similarities and individual differences. The Individuality Corollary states that: "persons differ from each other in their construction of events". The following quote illustrates this corollary:

"It could be argued that the fundamental mystery of human psychology is covered by the question 'Why is it that two people in exactly the same situation behave in different ways?' The answer is of course that they are not in the 'same' situation. Each of us sees our situation through the 'goggles' of our personal construct system. We differ from others in how we perceive and interpret a situation, what we consider important about it, what we consider its implications, the degree to which it is clear or obscure, threatening or promising, sought after or forced upon us. The situation of the two people who are behaving differently is only 'the same' from the point of view of a third person looking at it through his particular personal construct goggles."

[Bannister & Fransella, 1971 p.22]

The Commonality Corollary: "to the extent that one person employs a construction of experience which is similar to that employed by another, his processes are psychologically similar to those of the other person", is the converse of the Individuality Corollary. People are similar because they may construe in similar ways.

Personal Construct Theory incorporates the notion of hypothesis testing or reflexivity, as the basis of learning and change. Bannister & Fransella describe it thus:

"The constructions one places upon events are working hypotheses which are about to be put to the test of experience. As our anticipations are hypotheses to be successively revised in the light of the unfolding sequence of events, a construction system undergoes a progressive evolution. The constant revision of personal construct systems is a function of incoming varying validational experience."

[Bannister & Fransella, 1971 p.27]

Two models of learning and change that also stress the importance of reflexivity (i.e. Kolb, Rubin & McIntyre, 1971, and Boot & Boxer, 1979) are described here. Kolb et al conceive of learning and problem solving as a single process which is both active and passive, concrete and abstract. They put forward a model of experiential
learning which can be seen as a four stage cycle describing the model thus:

"(1) concrete experience is followed by
(2) observation and reflection which leads to
(3) the formation of abstract concepts and generalisations which lead to
(4) hypotheses to be tested in future action which in turn leads to new experiences.

There are several observations to be made about this model of the learning process. First, this learning cycle is continuously recurring in living human beings. Man continuously tests his concepts in experience and modifies them as a result of his observation of the experience. In a very important sense, all learning is relearning and all education is re-education.

Second, the direction that learning takes is governed by one's felt needs and goals. We seek experiences that are related to our goals, interpret them in the light of our goals, and form concepts and test implications of these concepts that are relevant to our felt needs and goals. The implication of this fact is that the process of learning is erratic and inefficient when objectives are not clear.

Third, since the learning process is directed by individual needs and goals, learning styles become highly individual in both direction and process. For example, a mathematician may come to place great emphasis on abstract concepts, whereas a poet may value concrete experience more highly. A manager may be primarily concerned with active application of concepts, whereas a naturalist may develop his observational skills highly. Each of us in a more personal way develops a learning style that has some weak points and strong points. We may jump into experiences but fail to observe the lessons to be derived from these experiences; we may form concepts but fail to test their validity. In some areas our objectives, and needs may be clear guides to learning; in others, we wander aimlessly."

[Kolb, Rubin & McIntyre, 1971, pp28-9]
Boot & Boxer [1979] offer a modified version of the Kolb et al model with the emphasis on reflective learning. See Figure 1(x).

They believe the major aspect of learning from experience is the process of discovering new, personal meanings rather than a change in overt behaviour. These meanings may, or may not, lead to new forms of personal action. This notion has implications for research that relies solely on interpretations of observations of overt behaviour as an indicator of change. Personal meanings can only be adequately communicated if the actors' thoughts and feelings are also expressed.

One area of psychology, namely psychotherapy, is concerned with the relationship between behaviour, thoughts and feelings and promoting change. George Kelly worked both as a psychotherapist and an educator, frequently highlighting the similarities between the two. Psychotherapists, like educators, are concerned with promoting lifelong learning and change, as the following quote suggests:
The psychotherapist keeps in mind that the changes taking place during therapy should not be the last of their kind. He is concerned with setting the stage for a continuous process of character development extending throughout the client's lifetime. Because of his broad view of the nature of mental health, he does not limit his interest to those changes which can be made evident during the course of therapy. Like the diagnostic clinician, he also is interested in paths for movement opening up long after his formal contacts with the client are concluded. 

(Kelly, 1955, p. 582)

Developmental changes and environmental changes can cause people to alter their lives but educationalists and therapists are interested in facilitating intentional change. Recent work in the area of psychotherapy has produced a transtheoretical model of intentional change which may also prove informative in the field of education.

The transtheoretical model is an integrative and comprehensive approach to the study of intentional change (Prochaska & DiClemente 1984). It takes account of change both as a result of therapeutic intervention (Prochaska, 1979) and self change (DiClemente & Prochaska, 1982). Their assumption was that therapeutic interventions could be more effective and efficient if they were compatible with how people successfully change on their own.


The precontemplation stage is characterised by the patient who is often unaware of having a problem or needing help and may be coerced into therapy by others. Prochaska & DiClemente suggest that:

"During the precontemplation stage, individuals use the change processes significantly less than do people in any other stage. Precontemplators process less information about their problem; they spend less time and energy re-evaluating themselves; they experience fewer emotional reactions to the negative aspects of their problems;
they are less open with significant others about their problems; and they do little to shift their attention or their environment in the direction of overcoming their problems."

[Prochaska & DiClemente, 1984 p.49]

During the contemplation stage the patient becomes aware of a problem existing, seeking further information and reassurance that the problem may be overcome.

The third, action, stage is where there is a change in overt behaviour and environmental conditions that affect the patient's behaviour. Action tends to be the shortest stage of change.

The fourth stage, maintenance, sees continuing change as the person strives to continue the gains of action and to prevent relapse. The maintenance stage may end in relapse or termination. Relapse occurs when maintenance strategies fail and this may represent a separate stage, or movement to another stage. Approximately 85% of people who relapse in their attempt to change a problem behaviour move into contemplation, while 15% become precontemplators. Termination occurs when the individual no longer needs to strive to prevent relapse. The model is seen much as a revolving door, as it is cyclical rather than linear with people moving in and out of stages and in and out of cycles.

From 700 outcome studies it has been demonstrated that therapy was more effective than no therapy [Smith & Glass 1977, Parloff 1979, Prochaska 1979]. However, it was not possible to identify those therapies that were effective in producing change and those that were not [Prochaska & DiClemente 1981]. Only ten independent processes of change have been identified despite there being more than 200 systems of psychotherapy [Prochaska & DiClemente, 1982]. These are: 1) consciousness raising, 2) self-reevaluation, 3) social reevaluation, 4) self liberation, 5) social liberation, 6) counter conditioning, 7) stimulus control, 8) contingency management, 9) dramatic relief, and 10) helping relationship.
Prochaska & DiClemente [1984] have identified the processes of change which appear to be dominant during the particular stages of change: these are presented in figure 1(xd) below.

**Fig. 1(xd)**

**The stages of change in which particular processes of change are emphasised the most**

- Precontemplation
- Contemplation
- Action
- Maintenance
- Consciousness raising
- Catharsis
- Choosing
- Contingency control
- Conditional stimuli

[Prochaska & DiClemente 1984, p46]

The authors state that:

"Change is a process that requires differential activity at various points in the process. This integration of the stages and processes of the stages lends definition and direction to the process of change."

[Prochaska & DiClemente, 1984 p.56]

They list the therapy systems that they believe are most conducive to facilitating each of the ten processes of change that they have identified. This is illustrated in figure 1(xd) below.
Suggested systems for processes of change

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Process of change</th>
<th>Therapy system</th>
<th>Authors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Consciousness raising</td>
<td>Psychodynamic</td>
<td>Freud, Sullivan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transactional analysis</td>
<td>Berne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Neurolinguistic programming</td>
<td>Bandler, Grinder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Self-revaluation</td>
<td>Rational-emotive therapy</td>
<td>Ellis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Personal constructs</td>
<td>Kelly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cognitive-behaviour therapy</td>
<td>Beck, Mahoney, Meichenbaum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Social reevaluation</td>
<td>Social learning theory</td>
<td>Bandura, Kanfer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Self-liberation</td>
<td>Existentialism</td>
<td>Bugental</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reality therapy</td>
<td>Glasser</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Direct decision therapy</td>
<td>Greenwald</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Social liberation</td>
<td>Systems theory</td>
<td>Haley, Watzlawick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Structural family therapy</td>
<td>Weakland, Madanes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Minuchin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Counter-conditioning</td>
<td>Behaviour therapy</td>
<td>Wolpe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Stimulus control</td>
<td>Cognitive behaviour therapy</td>
<td>Goldfried, Meichenbaum,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kanfer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sexual therapies</td>
<td>Masters &amp; Johnson, Kaplan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Contingency management</td>
<td>Behaviour modification</td>
<td>Skinner, Aylon, Azrin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Dramatic relief</td>
<td>Gestalt therapy</td>
<td>Peris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Implosive therapy</td>
<td>Stampfi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Helping relationship</td>
<td>Humanistic</td>
<td>Rogers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Existential</td>
<td>Jourard</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[Prochaska & DiClemente, 1984, p.159]
Recognition of the processes of change together with a working knowledge of the appropriate therapy systems may also be of utility to the educationalist and more especially those concerned with teaching psychology to student teachers.

So far we have looked at learning and change in general but what of professional learning more specifically? One writer who espouses a reflexive approach specifically in relation to professional learning and change is Donald Schon. He describes the characteristic mode of ordinary and practical knowledge:

"When we go about the spontaneous, intuitive performance of the actions of everyday life, we show ourselves to be knowledgeable in a special way. Often we cannot say what it is that we know. When we try to describe it we find ourselves at a loss, or we produce descriptions that are obviously inappropriate. Our knowing is ordinarily tacit, implicit in our patterns of action and in our feel for the stuff with which we are dealing. It seems right to say our knowing is in our action".  
[Schon, 1983 p 49]

He sees knowing in action as being experienced in professional as well as everyday life. In both cases thought can be turned back on action and on the implicit knowing in action. This process of reflection allows critical restructuring for further action. Schon sees this process of reflection-in-action as:

"central to the 'art' by which practitioners sometimes deal well with situations of uncertainty, instability, uniqueness, and value conflict".  
[Schon, 1983 p. 50]

Where the professionals are teachers, questions of teacher quality arise:

"Where teachers were encouraged to reflect-in-action, the meaning of 'good teaching' and 'a good classroom' would become topics of urgent institutional concern".  
[Schon, 1983 p. 335]

The question of 'good teaching' and of alternative educational perspectives have already been discussed in 1.2 and 1.3. Schon sees the need for teachers to be able to facilitate their own students' ability to be reflexive:

"A reflective teacher needs a kind of educational technology which does more than extend her capacity to administer drill and practice. Most interesting to her is an educational technology which helps students to become aware of their own intuitive understandings, to fall into
cognitive confusions and explore new directions of understanding and action".

[Schon, 1983 p 333]

It is worth reminding the reader that the term 'educational technology' has a less restricted meaning in American terminology than here in Britain where, more recently, we are specifically referring to educational hardware. Here teaching methods and techniques are also encompassed. Schon suggests that:

"Frame analysis may help practitioners to become aware of their tacit frames and thereby lead them to experience the dilemmas inherent in professional pluralism. Once practitioners notice that they actively construct the reality of their practice and become aware of the variety of frames available to them, they begin to see the need to reflect-in-action on their previously tacit frames".

[Schon 1983 p 311]

He sees the practitioner as researcher:

"When someone reflects-in-action, he becomes a researcher in the practice context. He is not dependent on the categories of established theory and technique, but constructs a new theory of the unique case."

[Schon, 1983 p 68]

To facilitate the student teacher to reflect-in-action during periods of teaching practice would require a shift from the traditional focus of assessment:

"Supervision would concern itself less with monitoring the teacher's coverage of curriculum content than with the assessment and support of the teacher's reflection in action".

[Schon, 1983 p 334]

In this period where the emphasis is on teacher quality and appraisal (1.2) the direction suggested by much of the literature on professional learning and change (such as that of Schon's reflexive practitioner) is clearly related to self reflection and personal development. The question is how to achieve this. A brief review of some of the literature pertaining to initiating change in the education of teachers follows.

Two teacher appraisal programmes have been recently developed. The first, a programme for evaluating teaching (P.E.T.), allows each individual to use the programme to improve his teaching in a way that fits his own conception of what it is to be a good teacher [Dale, 1980]. The first step was to help the teacher identify
his own conception of teaching followed by identifying strengths and weaknesses, making plans for action and evaluating the consequences of attempted improvements. This programme bears a resemblance to Boot & Boxer's (1979) model of reflexive learning and may prove to be an effective means of promoting personal reflection.

The second programme, "A Performance Review Process for Educators" (P.R.A.I.S.E) boasts efficient and reliable information from questionnaires [Common, 1984]. 'Behavioural indicators' were rated on a scale from "not at all characteristic" to "very characteristic". The teacher initiates the appraisal himself and chooses those he wishes to be appraisers. Reports are confidential although the teacher is encouraged to share in the appraisal. It is suggested that the teacher is committed as he has full participation in the goal setting. This seems to be a predominantly behavioural appraisal programme which ignores the personal perspectives of the teacher. This may bring about behavioural change but does not challenge the personal epistemology of the teacher and as such, I would suggest, is of limited value.

A number of methods or techniques have been suggested by other authors to enable students to become aware of their personal perspectives and to develop an open critical approach to their teaching.

In order to initiate change in ourselves Radley [1974] argues that we must have some notion of what we wish to be. Only when we have a goal to aim for, (the ideal self) can we enact the role of that person. We do not believe we are that person but we act out a part as if we were. If this is done in a committed way for some period of time it is possible that we may become more like this ideal than the former self. Bannister [1981] extends Radley's ideas to students qualifying as teachers:

"Thus the student who qualifies and becomes a teacher may officially in terms of pay packet and title, be 'a teacher'. Yet in Radley's terms, the person may still psychologically be 'a student' who is enacting the role of the teacher, who is putting on a teacher style and carrying out the duties of a teacher but who still, in his heart of hearts, sees himself as a student. Later there may come a point at which he becomes, in the psychological sense, a teacher."

[Bannister, 1981 p.259]
He sees self knowledge as a basis for adapting to and coping with novel situations:

"The stranger the country we are entering the more threatening the prospect becomes; the more we realise that some degree of self-change may be involved, the more we must rely upon our understanding of our own character and potential."


Warner [1971] suggests that students should keep a personal diary or 'Journal of Introspection' in which to indicate where the course content (both professional and personal aspects) touches them. Exploration of this type could be disturbing but if worked through in a sensitive, supportive and creative way it can lead to growth.

Other workers stress the use of biographies as a means of self exploration for teachers, (e.g. Butt [1985], and Butt, Raymond, McGue & Yamagishi, [1986]). Teachers within a graduate course were encouraged to develop their own personal and professional biographies by: depicting their current working reality; describing their current pedagogy and curriculum; giving an account of their reflections on their past personal and professional life as it might relate to their professional thoughts and actions; make a projection into their preferred personal and professional futures. Thus students were encouraged to develop their own personal critical appraisal.

Hunt [1985] describes his work with classroom teachers to help them become aware of their own implicit theories. A variety of facilitating methods are used including: 'identifying your own learning style'; 'how to be your own best theorist'; 'guided imagery'; and 'metaphor making'. Hunt stresses the importance of establishing a climate of trust and openness.

Clark & Floden [1985] describe a teacher preparation course concerned with the quality of the teacher's personal, practical knowledge. The course content includes an examination of learners as 'intentional, constructivist, sense-making individuals', and a dynamic view of knowledge. The surface focus of the course is
on learners and knowledge; however, the course activities encourage the
application of cognitive psychology and epistemology to promote the
understanding of one's own learning and knowledge. This approach encourages a
reflexive, analytic appreciation of teaching.

Diamond [in press] suggests an approach to in-service teachers that challenges their
personal constructs. It is based upon Kelly's Fixed Role Therapy in psychotherapy,
in which clients provided a self characterisation sketch of themselves in the third
person. The client and therapist discussed the portrait to identify constructs that
may be causing ineffective functioning. The clients would be encouraged to
recognise that they are responsible for the way they construe the world and as such
are encouraged to experiment with an alternative, although not opposite, view.
Writing out a new alternative sketch, the clients would be invited to put it into
practice by acting as if they were that new character. By playing the part the client
puts himself in the position of testing out an alternative and possibly more
adaptive view. Diamond has adapted this method as an educational procedure to
help in-service teachers to review their personal pedagogies, and his study
demonstrates that Fixed Role Treatment (F.R.T.) enables teachers to give up a
viewpoint providing they have become aware of an alternative that is personally
meaningful.

Day [1983] describes a client centred model of researcher intervention designed to
increase teachers' professional effectiveness in the classroom, to be used with
in-service teachers. He identifies five sequential stages necessary for a teacher to
achieve an increase in professional effectiveness. These he lists as follows:

1. Identification of inconsistencies within his prevailing theory of action
through self confrontation and reflection
2. Evaluation of this confrontation as a means of informing future
decision taking
3. The planning of new theories-in-use
4. The implementation of those new theories
5. Internalisation of new theories of action and further confirmation, or
return to confrontation of initial theory of action
This sequence is remarkably similar to, and supports, that of Kelly's Fixed Role Therapy and, therefore, Diamond's F.R.T. Fixed role therapy can be summarised as:

1. increased awareness of present self elicited by self characterisation sketch
2. identification of constructs that may cause ineffective functioning
3. planning an alternative (ideal self) character sketch
4. implementation to test the alternative character
5. internalisation of new characterisation or return to the drawing board

Kelly's view of the therapist would match that of Day's researcher consultant. The role of Day's researcher was not 'traditional' but 'client centred' providing the necessary support as a 'researcher-consultant'.

Day states:

"In research such as this the two main principles for intervention theory and change are that: 1. The perceived needs of the client(s) are of paramount importance; 2. The consultants' role is collaborative and co-equal, but not necessarily neutral".

[Day, 1983 p. 82]

A later study by Day [1985] reports on primary school head teachers attending a one year, part-time, non-award bearing management course, using this kind of approach. Headteachers had opted for this course as it provided opportunities for: self-reflection and confrontation; sharing work, ideas and knowledge with colleagues; and the development of critical thinking. Day recognises teachers are at varying stages of development and suggests a formula to assist developmental needs:

"Although it is evident from the testimonies received that teachers, like children, are at different stages of development and levels of maturity, and that they have different specific needs and different ways of conceptualizing these, it has been possible to identify a common thread which runs through. It would appear that developmental needs may be assisted by work which enables teachers to engage in reflection, self-confrontation and a consideration of new knowledge which confronts past and current thinking and practice. The focus for these should be both the work context and a venue removed from the work
context in which the teacher may reflect, be introduced to new and relevant critical theory which is both self-generated, generated with peers through open dialogue and generated by outside 'consultants'. There must, however, be a direct relationship between the two in the work undertaken in such environments."

[Day, 1985 p.14]

Both Day's and Diamond's approach with teachers can also be seen in terms of Prochaska & DiClemente's transtheoretical model:

1. precontemplation; not aware of problem
2. contemplation; increasing awareness of problem, seeks information and plans action
3. action; implements plans
4. maintenance; strives to maintain gains brought about by action
5. termination or relapse; internalisation of action or return to either contemplation or precontemplation.

The literature on learning and change has been heavily influenced by psychological theory. Psychology as a discipline presents formal theories or models of the nature of man. As the study of the nature of teachers and learners would seem of paramount importance on an education course the next section reviews the relationship of psychology to teacher education.

1.7 Psychology in Teacher Education

Before exploring the relationship between psychology and education as it is today we need to set the scene by reflecting for a moment on the historical development of psychology as a discipline itself in order to put current issues into perspective. Just over a century ago psychology emerged as a distinct discipline from a number of different backgrounds such as philosophy, physiology, pathology and anthropology. Each background brought with it its own set of assumptions and methodologies. From these diverse roots it seems natural that a number of different schools or perspectives developed with such fundamental differences as to the legitimate domain of the discipline of psychology. Formal definitions of "psychology" are given in most introductory texts to the subject. The authors of
one such popular A'Level and undergraduate text define psychology for their purposes as:

"The science that studies behaviour and mental processes."

[Hilgard, Atkinson & Atkinson, 1975 p.12]

These authors acknowledge that there have been various definitions throughout psychology's brief history and list definitions given by key workers that perhaps reflect the more dominant view at that time. This table is reproduced in Figure 1(xiii).

From its diverse origins it is natural that a number of schools or perspectives developed. These can be seen to fall more or less into one or the other of two main camps, which led to the development of the conflict between the dichotomy and the numerous labels, such as mechanistic vs humanistic, quantitative vs qualitative, nomothetic vs holistic, hard vs soft etc. The mechanistic branch developed from a predominantly biological/physical position that emphasises similarities rather than individual differences. Concerns are more with overt, observable behaviour than with internal cognitions and feelings. The aim is to explain the laws governing both human and animal behaviour. The humanistic branch is less easily identified as it consists of a number of differing schools loosely held together by their emphasis on the individual as an active agent, individual difference, and internal covert states such as emotions, cognitions and feelings.

This two-fold division has been noted throughout the history of psychology. In 1890 William James distinguished between the "theory of faculties" and the "theory of association" as two distinct ways of making sense of mental life. The former was seen as a "common sense" theory using the notion of a common agent, the "personal soul," and its range of abilities. The latter focused on the common elements in mental life rather than on a common agent, (the person). It was the mechanical principle of association, or habit, that linked the elements received by the senses to develop mental life. The nature of man was reactive rather than initiative of activity.
Changing definitions of psychology

"Psychology is the Science of Mental Life, both of its phenomena and of their conditions .... The phenomena are such things as we call feelings, desires, cognitions, reasonings, decisions, and the like."

William James, 1890.

"All consciousness everywhere, normal or abnormal, human or animal, is the subject matter which the psychologist attempts to describe or explain; and no definition of his science is wholly acceptable which designates more or less than just this."

James Angell, 1910.

"For the behaviourist, psychology is that division of natural science which takes human behaviour - the doings and sayings, both learned and unlearned - as its subject matter."

John B. Watson, 1919.

"As a provisional definition of psychology, we may say that its problem is the scientific study of the behaviour of living creatures in their contact with the outer world."

Kurt Koffka, 1925.

"Conceived broadly, psychology seeks to discover the general laws which explain the behaviour of living organisms. It attempts to identify, describe and classify the several types of activity of which the animal, human or other, is capable."

Arthur Gates, 1931.

"What is man? To this question psychology seeks an answer."

Edwin Boring, 1939.

"Today, psychology is most commonly defined as "the science of behaviour". Interestingly enough, however, the meaning of "behaviour" has itself expanded so that it now takes in a good bit of what was formerly dealt with as experience ... such private (subjective) processes as thinking are now dealt with as "internal behaviour"."

Norman Mann, 1951.

"Psychology is usually defined as the scientific study of behaviour. Its subject matter includes behavioural processes that are observable, such as gestures, speech, and physiological changes, and processes that can only be inferred such as thoughts and dreams."

Kenneth Clark & George Miller, 1970.

Allport later labelled these basic positions "Leibnitzian" and "Lockean" according to their philosophical stance [Allport, 1955]. The Leibnitzian perspective sees man as an active agent while the Lockean views man as essentially passive until stimulated by the environment.
Before proceeding it must be noted that this division of psychology into two camps is at best a rough one. Much of what we call psychology can be seen to fall into one side or the other, some theories do not seem to fit at all into either, and others combine aspects of both. Rejecting narrow assumptions that split psychology and psychologists into opposite camp, Hudson [1972] argues:

"...... as a cultural entity, psychology should stretch continuously - as until quite recently it did stretch, from the creative and scholarly arts on the one hand, to the established sciences on the other; and it should overlap generously with both".

[Hudson, 1972 p.157]

By the 1950s many "schools" of psychology had emerged, each with a competing claim to discovering the "truths" as to the nature of man. Each school focused on different aspects of behaviour with the tacit assumption that their findings would generalise to all other aspects. Schools evolved and developed theories and methods most suitable for the task in hand. Schools have waxed and waned becoming more or less fashionable according to the needs of the time (cultural, social, political etc).

The present state of psychology might be described in Kuhn's terms as preparadigmatic [Kuhn, 1962, 1977]. This suggests that psychologists have not yet discovered how to make the progress characteristic of the sciences. The significance of having a paradigm is that it enables progress to be made, as the majority of workers in that field share a similar framework. However, it is not clear whether psychology will become paradigmatic (being in a pre-paradigmatic state does not guarantee that becoming paradigmatic follows), and that if it does so whether this is a desirable state for psychology as a discipline. However, such a debate is beyond the scope of this thesis.

Having sketched in some of the background of psychology as a discipline, let us now look at the relationship between psychology and education. Traditionally four major disciplines (psychology, sociology, philosophy and the history of education) have formed the theoretical basis for teacher training courses. These
disciplines are not discrete entities but are interrelated and may be seen as alternative frameworks for exploring educational practice. Alternative perspectives are also offered within each discipline.

Psychology is concerned with the nature of man, in his environment. Many alternative ways of construing man, and parts of him, are offered by psychologists. Psychopedagogy is concerned not only with the psychological development of man but also with the philosophical position as to the nature of knowledge [Stones, 1979].

The parallels between psychology and education are encapsulated in the following quote:

"Like psychologists, educators also disagree on the definition of their field. For the psychologist who is attempting to understand a specific educator's view, the most central issue is likely to be the educator's philosophy of education - what he values and what he sees as the objectives of education. Next is the question of how he thinks education works or how such aims are accomplished. In short, what is his definition of education?"

[Hunt & Sullivan, 1974 p.4]

From the conception of education as a differentiated discipline last century, psychology was seen to have a special relationship in providing a foundation of empirical research to inform educational practice. Such topics as child development, learning theories, motivating intelligence and creativity, would be seen to have relevance for the practising teacher. In 1962 a report in the journal of the British Psychological Society (B.P.S.) on the teaching of psychology to student teachers stated that psychology:

"...should provide students with knowledge of the major aspects of child development and the nature and conditions of classroom learning, and with certain skills in the use of tests and other devices for assessing children..."
It should promote in students the power and interest to use the literature of research in educational psychology and an understanding of the application of its findings to the classroom.


This report refers to the content of the psychological component or subject matter of an education course but not to the presentation. However, Hudson predicted:

"And the teaching of psychology will itself become the focus of searching enquiry."

[Hudson, 1972, p.167]

On the presentation of psychology on teacher education courses Rose observes:

"Typically the question is first asked after five or six weeks of the course, and typically the course is a lecture course on the psychology of learning. The question is often a little hesitantly put, reflecting slight incredulity and perhaps mild embarrassment, but always it is, in essence, the same. How can teachers of psychology (of all people), in the presentation of their courses, so consistently ignore almost everything that research has told us about the principles of learning?"

[Rose, 1980, p.69]

Bannister decries the teaching methods of psychology departments for not putting their own psychological theories of learning, motivation, cognitive etc. into practice when teaching their own students. Arguing that psychology, as a discipline, should be reflexive, he suggests:

"In line with the reflexivity argument, students should be encouraged to interrogate their personal experience and conviction to become more aware of it, to question it in terms of psychological literature and to question psychological literature in terms of personal experience. In short, courses in psychology should start from where the student is."

[Bannister, 1982, p.73]

What changes have occurred since the BPS report that have led to the developing rift between psychology and education?
Entwistle indicates that both content and presentation of psychology to student teachers requires alternative approaches [Entwistle, 1983]. He notes that the content of such courses is mainly selected from the perspective of specialist psychologists and that it is assumed that formal presentation of the subject matter will lead to intelligent and imaginative application by the student. Entwistle suggests that a coherent set of concepts should be selected from theories and research that have direct relevance to the classroom. These then should be presented in a meaningful way and, at least in part, experientially by students, considering their own experiences of learning.

At the B.P.S. Education Section conference in September 1983, a symposium entitled "Psychology in Teacher Education" was held to allow preliminary discussion for workers in the field of psychology and education. In the opening remarks, Hazel Francis, as convener, suggested two reasons why the relationship between psychology and education should warrant special consideration at that time [Francis, 1983]. The first results from internal changes in the theory and practice of psychology, in research and development. The second reflects external changes such as in Government policy, provision of schooling and teacher training, and school populations.

Speaking at the same symposium, Margaret Sutherland pointed to both external and internal factors as responsible for recent changes [Sutherland, 1983]. The external factors are concerned with the increased interest in the 1960s in alternative disciplines and, in particular, sociology and philosophy. The introduction of the B.Ed. degree opened up a wealth of options so that some students could complete their teacher training without having studied psychology as a discipline or only as part of an integrated course. More importantly, however, are the internal factors which highlight the dissatisfaction with the content of psychology courses, such as the controversies about intelligence testing, conflicting learning theories, alternative views on child development etc. There is also a students' preoccupation with relevance to teachers in the classroom. This concern
with relevance also inevitably contributes to the choices students make when selecting education options thus avoiding those options perceived as irrelevant.

In looking at the relationship between formal psychological theory and intuitive knowledge in teaching, Tomlinson [1981] identifies two extreme viewpoints which he call "naive technology /positive professionalism" and "arrogant amateurism/ negative romanticism". The first suggests that psychology is expected to provide a handbook or manual of precise recipes for dealing with particular teaching situations. The emphasis is on the value of formally established facts and is justification for theoretically based teaching on education courses. The opposite viewpoint rejects the notion that human activity (of which teaching is one aspect) can be reduced to being studied in a systematic way that is useful. Common sense would be seen to be the only requirement for teaching, although the more extreme Romanticists would emphasise feelings and intuition. From this perspective, formal training is believed to be ineffective, so courses offer basic teaching tips and students are judged on a 'sink or swim basis' on teaching practice. Those that survive have what it takes and those that sink are weeded out as "teaching is caught not taught."

Tomlinson believes that many teachers go through a similar process of development as he describes here:

"As students they tend to start out with a mixture of technology and amateurism informing their expectations: they believe there are answers and secrets to be revealed, but they expect these to be formulated in everyday terms, preferably concrete ones amounting to classroom recipes. Rather than acquire new ways of construing what is at stake, they would like merely to have their existing concepts rearranged. Forcing their technological inclinations, they may look for a range of facts to use in teaching. But when they start teaching, they soon find that theory fails in various ways to cover practice: some of its recommendations turn out ineffective or worse; other problems it does not even mention. Sooner or later the developing teacher may turn towards the negative attitude to formal theory and findings, a change that is no doubt accelerated both by human tendencies towards self-defence and the influence of older colleagues who may have already trodden the same path. In the really unfortunate case of
arrogant amateurism, where a teacher becomes insulated from self-questioning and reflection by the assumption that ‘common sense’ is on his side, he will then have to blame all failings elsewhere: on ‘the kids’, ‘the awful resources’, ‘the boss’, and so forth - never (also) on himself, he’s doing his humble best...”

[Tomlinson, 1981 p.6]

Buchmann [1986] notes that we all, as children, observe our teachers at school and, from this experience, believe we know what their job entails:

"And every day, millions of children watch their teachers; in American schools, six hours a day, five days a week, for twelve years. "The apprenticeship of observation" [Lortie,1975] gives them a close-up, extended view of what teachers do". 

[Buchmann, 1986 p.1]

Resulting from this, she suggests that:

"The informal occupational socialisation of teachers may provide a key to most of teachers’ operating knowledge, accounting for its psychologically subjective but, in fact and tendency, collective commonsense nature".

[Buchmann, 1986 p.2]

Bigge believes that teachers’ decisions based on scientific psychological theory are more effective, stating:

"a teacher need not base his thinking on tradition and folklore. Instead, he(she) may be quite aware of the most important theories developed by professional educational psychologists, in which case his own psychological theory is likely to be quite sophisticated. The latter state of affairs is what professional psychologists interested in education of teachers are trying to induce. Teachers who are well grounded in scientific psychology, in contrast to ‘folklore psychology’, have a basis for making decisions that are much more likely to lead to effectual results in classrooms".

[Bigge, 1971 p.5]

Teachers take little notice of research findings because of the jargon used and they are not thought relevant to the classroom [Doyle & Ponder, 1977/78]. Elementary teachers in the U.S.A. spoke in child centred terms revealing a belief in the
innocence, goodness and uniqueness of childhood that was consistent with a Romanticist Position [Jackson, 1977]. There was a tendency for these teachers to reject research that was not consistent with an idiographic approach and to handle their work intuitively rather than rationally. Fenstermacher [1980] suggests that for teachers to adopt research findings they must first become aware of their own subjective beliefs about teaching which then become open for empirical investigation. A subjectively held belief becomes an objectively held belief upon empirical verification and therefore constitutes grounds for action. Disconformation opens up grounds for change. Claxton echoes these ideas and prescribes a method for promoting psychological growth:

"... (a) eliciting students' preconceptions and bringing them to the surface; (b) showing them that their values and assumptions are questionable, that plausible alternatives exist, and that their original view may be replaced or re-espoused; (c) supporting them in this enquiry, preventing them from rationalising, defending or escaping, and intimating that whether they eventually change or not, to select and create their own wardrobe of values and ideals out of the jumble-sale heap of reach-me-downs they have been living in, is a very worthwhile activity. Giving people knowledge, in this context, is not an end in itself, but a device for promoting psychological growth at the level of insight and commitment."

[Claxton, 1983, p.5]

Biggs's statement encapsulates the growing disenchantment with the relationship between psychology and education:

"Let's face it: The frustratingly long honeymoon is over."

[Biggs, 1976, p.274]

Although much is being written and spoken of the discontent with psychology in education courses, there has been a distinct lack of empirical work, which suggests that this area is ripe for exploration.

1.8 The Research Area: an Outline

To summarise the apparently disparate areas that form the basis of my exploration:
Section 1.1 described how my own experience and interest in psychology and teacher education loosely defined the research area; Section 1.2 gave the background to recent changes in the attempt to improve teacher quality; Section 1.3 described alternative educational perspectives in the western world which can account for differing educational goals; Section 1.4 showed how individuals may have a preferred way of thinking or cognitive style, and how that might affect both the way they learn and how they teach; Section 1.5 suggested that the intellectual development of the student teacher is of concern to the staff developer, as student teachers who have not developed the ability to think relativistically will not be able to entertain or evaluate alternative educational perspectives; Section 1.6 looked at learning professional learning and change; and finally, Section 1.7 explored the contribution of psychology to teacher training in that formal theories of teaching and learning are presented, which may or may not be utilised by student teachers then or later.

There are many influences that affect student teachers. The literature suggests that individuals' own experiences of thinking and learning differ and as such it is likely that those who enter the teaching profession will also view teaching differently before and after training. Student teachers are in the unique position of alternating roles between student and teacher while also studying the formal theories of the processes that they themselves are involved in. In my view they do not come to training courses 'tabula rasa' but with their own personal notions of learning and teaching reflecting their personal model of man.

The work of George Kelly [1955] suggests that these "personal constructs" are not simply changed or replaced by introducing formal theories but become so only if the person sees his own model as less useful than the alternative offered. If learning is about change, it is important to work from what student teachers bring to the classroom in addressing their personal pedagogies.

Models of conceptual change follow from psychological models of man. Such models are presented to teachers during training (both in pre-service and
in-service courses) and may be used by them then and/or later. The practical application of psychological theory in education may be seen at three levels: the psychology lecturer/teacher educator as teacher; the student teacher as learner and as teacher; and the pupil as learner. See Figure 1(xiv).

As Kelly observes:

"The training of student therapists is a fascinating task. The dynamics of interpersonal relationships - the relationships between the teacher and the student, the student and his fellow students, the student and his client, the student and the client's colleagues - weave a complicated pattern that cannot fail to challenge the psychologist. Moreover, the far-reaching social implications of the undertaking can be most satisfying, even to the most dilated personality."

[Kelly, 1955,p.1196]

Kelly’s observation on the training of student therapists could equally be applied to the training of student teachers; the relationships between the teacher educator and the student teacher, the student teacher and his fellow students, the student teacher and his pupil(s), and the student teacher and the practice school staff, "weave a complicated pattern that cannot fail to challenge
the psychologist who teaches student teachers.

This study explores the relationship between personal perspectives of teaching and learning, psychological theory and practice. Within a general framework of role perception and relationships, the following areas were explored:

a) teachers and teaching,
b) learners and learning,
c) teachers as learners,
d) psychology and education.

The following chapter traces the development of the research enquiry in selecting the appropriate methodology and describes the exploratory study.
Chapter 2

Developing the Research Enquiry
"The weight of the metaphor is not primarily interpersonal, but interpretative. Interpretations are its basic concern: interpretations, the interpretation of interpretations (both our own and other people's) and - especially in teaching - their transmission and control. In a word, the metaphor is hermeneutic. And we, all of us, are interpreters, 'hermeneuts' - creatures who pan for sense in the muddy waters of transaction, and who, if we are interested in people, collect this sense into the bundles of remembered event, belief and fantasy that constitute the human biography."

[Hudson, 1972, p.163]

This chapter describes the development of the research enquiry. This is essentially divided into three sections. The first section looks at the issues of methodology from alternative perspectives; the second section is concerned with the selection of appropriate research methods or tools; and the third describes the exploratory study prior to the main study.

2.1 Alternative Perspectives in Research

The dichotomy of the two types of viewpoint in psychology was discussed in the previous chapter (see Section 1.7). Each camp suggests a different approach and method of enquiry which are frequently described in terms of simple polarities, e.g. traditional-naturalistic, mechanistic-holistic, nomothetic-idiothetic, quantitative-qualitative, objective-subjective, hard-soft and so on. The parallels between psychology and education were discussed in the previous chapter (see Section 1.7). Educational research reflects this dichotomy as the following quote suggests:
"The educational research world is currently divided on a fundamental issue: what philosophy should inform its activities. The established, or conventional approach is based on an analogy drawn from research in the natural sciences. For that reason it is sometimes known as the scientific method; it is otherwise called the objective or experimental or reductionist approach. The naturalistic approach is based on an analogy drawn from research in anthropology, i.e. where individuals are studied in their social setting. For that reason it is sometimes called the ethnographic method; it is otherwise called the descriptive or holistic approach."

[Gilbert & Pope, 1984 p.18]

Much of educational research has followed the methods of traditional psychological research. The following quote shows dissatisfaction with this approach:

"Some 30 years ago, research in psychology became dedicated to the quest for nomothetic theory — Model building and hypothesis testing became the ruling ideal, and research problems were increasingly chosen to fit that mode. Taking stock today, I think most of us judge, theoretical progress to have been disappointing. Many are uneasy with the intellectual style of psychological research."

[Cronbach, 1975, p.116]

The Alternative research paradigms are now well documented [see for example Rist, 1977; Guba, 1978; Gilbert & Pope, 1982]. In Figure 2(ii) Gilbert & Pope summarise some of the main differences between the two paradigms in terms of method, technique and type of data collected.
Summary of main differences between the two paradigms

Fig. 2(i)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LABELS USED FOR AIMS AND STRATEGIES OF TWO PARADIGMS</th>
<th>METHOD</th>
<th>TECHNIQUE</th>
<th>TYPE OF DATA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Traditional scientific experimental reductionist</td>
<td>EXPERIMENT</td>
<td>TESTS</td>
<td>MAINLY QUANTITATIVE OFTEN NUMERICAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non traditional artistic naturalistic descriptive</td>
<td>SURVEY</td>
<td>QUESTIONNAIRE</td>
<td>MAINLY QUANTITATIVE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CASE STUDY</td>
<td>OBSERVATION</td>
<td>QUALITATIVE OR QUANTITATIVE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>INTERVIEW</td>
<td></td>
<td>QUALITATIVE OR QUANTITATIVE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

main methods or techniques used

[Gilbert & Pope, 1982, p.20]
The following table, Figure 2(ii), summarises the dichotomy between the two camps that Guba refers to as "conventional" and "naturalistic" inquiry:

**Fig.2(ii)**

Some basic differences between conventional and naturalistic inquiry

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Forms of inquiry</th>
<th>Conventional Inquiry</th>
<th>Naturalistic Inquiry</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Philosophical base</td>
<td>Logical positivism</td>
<td>Phenomenology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inquiry paradigm</td>
<td>Experimental physics</td>
<td>Ethnography; investigative journalism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose</td>
<td>Verification</td>
<td>Discovery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stance</td>
<td>Reductionist</td>
<td>Expansionist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Framework/design</td>
<td>Preordinate/fixed</td>
<td>Emergent/variable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Style</td>
<td>Intervention</td>
<td>Selection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reality-manifold</td>
<td>Singular</td>
<td>Multiple</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value structure</td>
<td>Singular</td>
<td>Pluralistic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Setting</td>
<td>Laboratory</td>
<td>Nature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Context</td>
<td>Unrelated</td>
<td>Relevant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conditions</td>
<td>Controlled</td>
<td>Invited interference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treatment</td>
<td>Stable</td>
<td>Variable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scope</td>
<td>Molecular</td>
<td>Molar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methods</td>
<td>Objective-in sense of inter-subjective agreement</td>
<td>Objective-in sense of factual/confirmable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[Guba, 1978, p.18]

Guba together with Lincoln reformulated this work which had previously been built based on three axioms. They included two further axioms that seemed to them at least equally, if not more important, than the previous three. The following table, Figure 2(iii) shows the axiomatic differences between the two paradigms.
Axiomatic Differences Between the Rationalist and Naturalistic Paradigms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paradigm</th>
<th>Subject of Axiom</th>
<th>Rationalistic</th>
<th>Naturalistic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reality</td>
<td>Single, tangible, convergent, fragmentable</td>
<td>Multiple, intangible, divergent, holistic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inquirer/respondent relationship</td>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>Interrelated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature of truth statements</td>
<td>Context-free generalisations-nomothetic statements-focus on similarities</td>
<td>Context-bound working hypothesis-idiographic statements-focus on differences</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attribution/explanation of action</td>
<td>&quot;Real&quot; causes; temporally precedent or simultaneous; manipulable, probabilistic</td>
<td>Attributional shapers; interactive (feedforward and feedback); non-manipulable, plausible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relation of values to inquiry</td>
<td>Value-free</td>
<td>Value-bound</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[Guba & Lincoln, 1982 p. 237]

Guba & Lincoln refer to the first paradigm as "rationalistic" instead of Guba's [1978] term "conventional". They are at pains to use the term "rationalistic" in preference to "scientific" that some other researchers use as they feel that the status granted to anything scientific in our culture may suggest that the second (naturalistic) paradigm is inferior.
Each of the five basic axioms have implications for the choice of paradigm for this research. The first axiom concerns the nature of reality. Those following the rationalistic paradigm hold that reality exists independent of the observer/researcher and that this will be revealed by fragmenting the research area into component parts manipulating variables in isolation from each other. The aim is for predictability and control. In contrast the naturalistic paradigm suggests multiple realities that are not independent of the observer/researcher. It takes a holistic approach avoiding fragmentation such as separating content and context in search of description and understanding rather than prediction and control. As this research is concerned with student teachers' personal perceptions (i.e. their own realities) within the educational environment, the view of the nature of reality within the second paradigm would seem more helpful.

The second axiom refers to the enquirer/respondent relationship. The rationalistic enquirer endeavours to keep a distance between himself and the respondent or "object" he is researching. The naturalistic enquirer recognises his interaction with the respondent as both an inevitable and essential process. Although such interaction can prove problematical he strives not to minimise it but to make it explicit in his reporting. This research is concerned with exploring student teachers' views on a number of issues and requires the flexibility of face to face interviewing to allow the enquirer to explore and probe together with the respondent in a relationship of mutual trust. It recognises advantages and disadvantages with such a relationship and the necessity to make this explicit. Therefore the enquirer/respondent relationship of this study falls within the second paradigm.

The third axiom concerns the nature of truth statements. Rationalistic research focuses on similarities producing generalisations or truth statements that are context free. Naturalistic researchers focus on differences, their aim is to produce an idiographic body of knowledge as the enquiry is neither "time" nor "context" free. As such generalisations are rarely possible although cautious transfer may be possible if temporal and contextual differences allow.
The fourth axiom relates to the exploration of action. The rationalistic enquirer seeks to explain every action as resulting from some precedent cause, demonstrating the fact experimentally. Naturalistic enquirers recognise that working in a multi-variant situation at best allows inferences to be made about the possible pattern of events.

Finally the fifth axiom concerns the role of values in enquiry. Rationalistic research claims to be objective in that the data are value-free in terms of researcher neutrality. In naturalistic research data is value-bound in that it is shaped by the researcher whose own values are brought to bear on defining and investigating the problem. There are also values inherent in the choice of theoretical background, the paradigm for investigation and research methods selected. Values are also inherent in any investigation of human social and/or behavioural interaction.

Guba & Lincoln's views are reflected by Smith [1983]. Smith argues that research methodology should reflect the basic epistemological position of the researcher. He focuses on three aspects: the relationship of the investigator to what is investigated, the relationship between facts and values in the process of evaluation, and what the goal of the investigation is. The table below, Figure 2(iv), attempts to summarise this:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>quantitative</th>
<th>qualitative/interpretive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>relationship investigator to investigated</td>
<td>subject-object</td>
<td>subject-subject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>relationship between facts and values</td>
<td>separate</td>
<td>inextricably mixed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>goal of investigation</td>
<td>laws</td>
<td>understanding</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[after Smith, 1983]
I find the ideas of Guba & Lincoln, and Smith pertinent to this study. My concern to work conjointly with participants, the belief that facts and values cannot be separated, and that the goal of the investigation is understanding, all suggest a qualitative/interpretive approach.

Researchers differ as to points of contact between the camps and whether there is something to be gained by mixing and matching methods. Some researchers find the tension between the two paradigms stimulating and creative, as Rist describes:

"...the fact that these two paradigms are in tension over the very most basic assumptions upon which they base their research efforts opens up the potential for a dialectic where the resolution is not an "either/or" but each answering a part of the question at hand. If each approach does provide a perspective which tends to be the mirror-opposite of the other, the creative effort becomes one of finding ways to take these partial images of reality and piece them into a new orientation or perspective."

[Rist, 1977 p.48]

He feels that much is to be gained by interchange between the two as this quote suggests:

"...many who are now working with qualitative methods are formally trained with an emphasis upon quantitative methods; thus they are in a unique position to effect a rapprochement between the two methods."

[Rist, 1980 p.10]

However, other workers would reject this possibly due to the differences in the underlying epistemological bases of the two paradigms, as the following quote suggests:

"It is difficult to imagine a naturalist at work who could be content with a 'mix-and-match' strategy, however desirable that might be from the point of view of achieving rapprochement."

[Guba & Lincoln, 1982 p.246]

One of the most important things in any enquiry is making sure that the appropriate methods are selected according to the research goals. Rist warns:
"Just as educational research has accrued some heavy costs from an overreliance on quantitative methods when they were inappropriate and unable to answer the questions at hand, so also qualitative research faces growing costs. The more reliance on the method in itself, the less it is a meaningful research tool."

[Rist, 1980 p.10]

The goals of the research indicate which research paradigm would best serve the purpose. The following quotes, which reflect my interests, would suggest that a holistic approach would prove more fruitful:

"Teachers' own descriptions of their professional behaviour rest on explicit or implicit theories of teaching."

[Edwards & Furlong 1978 p.6]

"The need to research on teaching to examine teachers' intentions and the link between intentions and behaviour, and not just behaviour alone, has been justified on several grounds. One justification is that a solely behavioural model is conceptually incomplete. It cannot account for predictable variations in teachers' behaviour arising from differences in their goals, judgements and decisions."

[Shavelson & Stern, 1981 p.455]

A number of researchers believe that a theory in the social sciences is likely to prove more useful if it has been inductively generated. This is of particular interest to this study as the intention is to seek understanding of student teachers' views of the way they see their world. The following quote from Glaser & Strauss emphasises the difference between grounded theory and logico-deductive theory:

"In contrasting grounded theory with logico-deductive theory and discussing and assessing their relative merits in ability to fit and work (predict, explain, and be relevant), we have taken the position that the adequacy of a theory for sociology today cannot be divorced from the process by which it is generated. Thus one canon for judging the usefulness of a theory is how it was generated - and we suggest that it is likely to be a better theory to the degree that it has been inductively developed from social research. We also believe that other canons for assessing a theory, such as logical consistency, clarity, parsimony, density, scope, integration, as well as its fit and its ability to work, are
also significantly dependent on how the theory was generated. They are not, as some theorists of a logico-deductive persuasion would claim, completely independent of the processes of generation. This notion of independence too often ends up being taken as a license to generate theory from any source - happenstance, fantasy, dream life, common sense, or conjecture - and then dress it up as a bit of logical deduction.

Probably we need to emphasize here what we shall discuss later more explicitly. Generating a theory from data means that most hypotheses and concepts not only come from the data, but are systematically worked out in relation to the data during the course of the research. Generating a theory involves a process of research. By contrast, the source of certain ideas, or even "models", can come from sources other than the data. The biographies of scientists are replete with stories of occasional flashes of insight, of seminal ideas, garnered from sources outside the data. But the generation of theory from such insights must then be brought into relation to the data, or there is great danger that theory and empirical world will mismatch."


However attractive the notion of grounded theory appears it runs counter to a constructivist position which holds that no-one including the researcher is theory-free. Our personal theories may not be explicit but still affect our thoughts, beliefs and actions and are of course subject to as many reconstructions as our inventiveness will allow.

Traditionalists criticise the new paradigm on the concepts of reliability and validity. Some new paradigm workers reject the concepts of internal and external validity, reliability and objectivity as inappropriate within the naturalistic framework suggesting that other concepts such as credibility, transferability, dependability, and confirmability are more apt. [Guba & Lincoln, 1982]. These criteria, they suggest:

"...assure the consumer of such research that any and all appropriate steps have been taken to assure that data from human sources and contests are meaningful, trackable, verifiable, and grounded in the real-life situations from which they were derived."

[Guba & Lincoln, 1982 p.250]

Pope & Denicolo [1986] describe the dilemma experienced by researchers of intuitive theories who may be forced to choose between traditional tabulation,
tidiness and inappropriate application on the one hand and authenticity, complexity and possible lack of dissemination and utility on the other. Figure 2(v) below illustrates the two possible routes which:

"...may in fact converge if the researcher during the analysis phase retreats in the face of certain obstacles. For example if one is concerned with wide dissemination of one's results and that these are perceived as having practical utility one might feel that full portrayal of the complexity of events is inappropriate. Often the pressurised practitioner looks to tidy tabulation in traditional form for immediate application to our own context."

[Pope & Denicolo, 1986 p.161]

Fig. 2(v)

**CHOICE OF APPROACH**

- **Quantitative**
  - Tradition
  - Tabulation
  - Tidiness
  - Inappropriate application?

- **Intuitive Theories**?
  - Design
  - Data Collection
  - Analysis
  - Retreat

- **Qualitative**
  - Authenticity
  - Complexity
  - Lack of dissemination
  - Lack of utility?

*Main source of concern

Two possible routes in the investigation of intuitive theories

(Pope & Denicolo, 1986 p.160)
Since the conception of this project there has been a recent upsurge in research from a "teacher thinking" perspective constituting what may now be thought of as an "invisible college". The year 1983 saw the formation of an international group, the "International Study Association on Teacher Thinking" (ISSAT), that came together for the first symposium on "teacher thinking", under the title "Teacher Thinking: a new perspective on persistent problems in education", and the symposium proceedings were later published [Halkes & Olson, Eds., 1983] This provided a formal channel for communication for a number of educational workers who were concerned with questions related to teachers' thoughts, feelings and beliefs that were not readily investigated by a traditional approach.

More recently, Pope conducted a survey requesting heads of departments of education in all U.K. Universities to reply giving a short description of current research interests in teachers' thinking in their department (Pope, 1985). From the nineteen Universities that replied, six general areas of interest have been identified. The first area revolves round philosophical issues concerned with professionalism and epistemology. The second group focuses on teacher training, and how raising the awareness of their own perceptions may affect practice, especially in in-service courses. The third group is concerned with the methodological issues of research, some using an ethnographic approach. The fourth group concentrates on how modes of teacher thinking affect student learning. Teachers' perceptions of the curriculum and curriculum innovations is the area of interest for the fifth group. The last area of focus is concerned with how implicit or explicit learning theories may influence the teacher's teaching strategy which in turn have implications for teacher training. A further survey is in progress at present to extend this work [Day & Pope, 1986].

Within a qualitative framework the "teacher thinking" perspective may have several approaches. My personal epistemology and methodological stance is such that the ideas of psychologist George Kelly (1955) have proved a useful framework for my research. Kelly described his philosophical position behind his theory of Personal Construct Psychology as Constructive Alternativism. This suggests that
people understand themselves and their world, and anticipate future events by constructing tentative models which they evaluate against personal criteria. Kelly describes it thus:

"The assumption is that whatever the nature may be, or howsoever the quest for truth will turn out in the end, the events we face today are subject to as great a variety of constructions as our wits will enable us to contrive. This is not to say that one construction is not as good as any other, nor is it to deny that at some infinite point in time human vision will behold reality to the outmost reaches of existence. But it does remind us that all our present perceptions are open to question and reconsideration and it does broadly suggest that even the most obvious occurrences of everyday life might appear utterly transformed if we were inventive enough to construe them differently."  

[Kelly, 1970 p.1]

Kelly contrasts his views with those of Accumulative Fragmentalism, that is the notion that knowledge is a growing collection of substantial facts, and rejects an absolutist view of truth or Realist position. His approach is based on the metaphor "man-the-scientist", as he invited us to view persons as if they were like a scientist in going about their everyday business. We each construe our own reality, testing out one set of constructions which we may discard in favour of another should they fail to adequately anticipate events. In order to understand and communicate with another person it is essential to be aware of the person's personal theories or "personal constructs". In research such as this where we wish to investigate teachers' thoughts it is therefore necessary to ask them. The following quote reminds us that we each have our own framework or set of assumptions, formal or informal, with which we view the world:

"Ideally, like the anthropologist, the psychologist and sociologist also try to grasp the lives other people lead, not merely intuitively but by reference to some explicit model or theory or set of distinctions."  

[Hudson, 1972 p.151]

The next section introduces the research methods selected for this study.
2.2 Research Methods

Research can be seen as a form of human enquiry and educational research as a formal instance of people trying to understand people and processes within institutional settings. Within a constructivist framework, an ethnographic approach, which emphasises experimenting conjointly with people rather than on them, forms the background for this study. This section reviews the research methods used in this study under the headings; interviews, observations and document analysis.

2.2.1 The Interview

Teachers' effectiveness is judged on diverse criteria, but a neglected area that might prove fruitful would be the investigation of the personal goals that teachers and pupils have, [Morrison & MacIntyre, 1969] The object of this study was to explore student teachers' personal perspectives on teaching and learning.

Can teachers' personal perspectives be elicited by interviews? Schon suggests not:

"I begin with the assumption that competent practitioners usually know more than they can say. They exhibit a kind of knowing-in-practice, most of which is tacit".

[Schon, 1983,p.viii]

Argyris & Schon (1974) differentiate between 'espoused theory' and 'theory-in-use':

"When someone is asked how he would behave under certain circumstances, the answer he usually gives is his espoused theory of action for that particular situation. This is the theory of action to which he gives allegiance and which, upon request, he communicates to others. However, the theory that actually governs his actions is his theory-in-use, which may or may not be compatible with his espoused theory; furthermore, the individual may or may not be aware of the incompatibility of the two theories".

[Argyris & Schon, 1974 pp. 6 & 7]
To discover a person's theory-in-use they suggest:

"We must construct his theory-in-use from observations of his behaviour. In this sense, constructs of theories-in-use are like scientific hypotheses, the constructs may be inaccurate representations of the behaviour they claim to describe".  

[Argyris & Schon, 1974 p. 7]

Constructing a theory-in-use from observation alone is also fraught with difficulty. If we are to accept the Kellyan view (see chapter1.6) that each person constructs his own reality filtered through his personal construct system then any observation reveals as much about the observer as of the observed. This does not mean that it is a futile exercise for one person to try to understand another but that the researcher must be aware of their own "goggles" when trying to make sense of another person's world. For instance, contrast a Freudian interpretation with a Skinnerian interpretation of some observed behaviour. The theoretical framework of the observer helps to form the goggles by which the observer selects what to attend to and what meaning to attribute to the observed action. Observation alone is unlikely to reveal the intention behind the action. Hence both the interview and observation were chosen as the main research tools, as:

"The need for research on teaching to examine teachers' intentions and the link between intentions and behaviour and not just behaviour alone has been justified on several grounds. One justification is that a solely behavioural model is conceptually incomplete. It cannot account for predictable variations in teachers' behaviour arising from differences in their goals, judgements and decisions."

[Shavelson & Stern, 1981 p.455]

There have been attempts to develop checklists based on a conceptual analysis of philosophical stances to measure a teacher's epistemological position [Ross, 1970]. Lack of consistency between checklists and questionnaires may be due to the restrictions imposed by the mutual exclusivity of categories used in the instruments [Young, 1981]. Young suggests that an ethnographic approach may prove more successful in describing personal epistemologies.
The advantages of the use of interviews as opposed to questionnaires are pointed out by Selzit [1959]. He emphasizes the ability of the interview format, in that questions can be repeated and rephrased so that the respondent can understand the meaning of particular questions.

Cohen & Manion [1980] suggest that the literature on the interview as a research tool may take one of three perspectives which reflects the philosophy of the researcher. The first view sees the interview as a direct transfer of information from the interviewee to the interviewer. The second sees the interview as an interpersonal transaction having a bias which must be recognized and controlled. The third perspective sees the interview as an encounter which shares many features of everyday life and as such is valid without imposing controls. As observations alone are not able to provide the information about others' beliefs, intentions etc. behind the actions, interviews have to be of the kind that allow the interviewees to explore their own perspectives.

Marton [1978] describes what he sees as the first and second order of perspective. His views are of particular relevance to this study. The first order of perspective is as it appears to the external observer and as such may be described using a rationalistic approach. The second order of perspective describes events as they appear to the actor himself/herself and are best explored using a naturalistic approach. This study is concerned with how student teachers perceive their world, therefore my interpretation rests on their interpretation of their own perceptions. If we are concerned with understanding and meaning, respondents' own accounts of events should be used as scientific data [Harre & Secord, 1972].

There are significant differences between the quantitative and qualitative approaches to the interview. Mostyn [1985] describes what she sees to be the major differences between the two approaches in the following table. Figure 2(v).

While in agreement with this generally, I cannot agree with Mostyn concerning the length of interviews in qualitative research as necessarily having to take more
than one hour to "get beyond the superficial", or that incentives are usually given. Getting beyond the superficial can be achieved in a number of ways. This study concentrated on developing relationships between the participants and researcher as considerable time was spent in the research environment, not just in the interview room. Participants whose views are sought and valued find the experience of participating in itself rewarding and do not necessarily seek further incentives. These are some of the advantages of an ethnographic approach.

Figure 2(v)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quantitative Research</th>
<th>Qualitative Research</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Samples:</strong> Large, hundreds or thousands.</td>
<td><strong>Small,</strong> typically less than 100.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interview Length:</strong> Short, less than an hour, to avoid respondent &quot;wear-out,&quot; since usually short answer and multiple-choice are the only techniques used. Also respondents are unpaid.</td>
<td>Long, more than an hour, to allow the interviewer to get beyond the superficial with a variety of research approaches. Respondents are usually given an incentive for their cooperation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Questioning:</strong> Follows a set format and is the same for each respondent.</td>
<td>Follows respondents' reactions to various stimuli within a general framework.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Objectives:</strong> A checking exercise, how many, where and when; e.g., a refinement of existing data.</td>
<td>A learning exercise; what are all the feelings associated with X? e.g., an expansion of existing data.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Analysis:</strong> Statistical.</td>
<td>Content analysis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Report:</strong> Based on statistical summaries and correlations written for the purpose of furthering understanding about the research subject; e.g., what is going on?</td>
<td>Based on theories of motivation written for the purpose of understanding the attitudes and behaviour of respondents vis-a-vis the research subject; e.g., why is this going on?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reliability and Validity:</strong> Can always be determined, providing time and resources are available.</td>
<td>Can rarely be determined, due to the subjective nature of the research material and the one-off nature of most projects.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[Mostyn, 1985 p. 117]
To encourage and validate a concern for truth and reduce subjectivity in interview data. Elliot & Adelman (1975) suggest seven principles to minimise interviewer accountability. These are that the interviewer:

a) indicates his belief that the interviewee is able to give an honest account of his actions,

b) asks questions that demonstrate a willingness to increase his own understanding,

c) avoids utterances that might elicit a biased interpretation,

d) avoids imposing his own interpretations on the interviewee,

e) avoids indicating approval or disapproval throughout the interview,

f) allows the interviewee values to determine his account,

g) respects the integrity of the interview content by allowing the interviewee complete control over others' access to the interview data.

I endeavoured to follow these principles to minimise interviewer accountability throughout the study.

2.2.2 Observations

The purpose of the observations were to illuminate the student teacher's environment to provide a holistic perspective that would otherwise be missing if only interviews were undertaken. Highly structured observations such as the interactionist analyses of Flanders or Bales were rejected as being too restrictive and inappropriate for the task in hand, (for a critique of the limitations of these methods see, for instance, Hamilton & Delmont, 1974). The following description of a naturalistic observation approach appealed:

"... maximises the inquirer's ability to group motives, beliefs, concerns, and the like;

... allows the inquirer to see the world as his subjects see it, to live in their time frames to capture the phenomenon in and on its own terms, and to group the culture in its own natural, ongoing environment;
... provides the inquirer with access to the emotional reactions of the group introspectively - that is in a real sense it permits the observer to use himself as a data source;

... allows the observer to build on tacit knowledge, both his own and that of members of the group.*


I was already aware of the notion that, running concurrently with the formal curriculum there is an informal curriculum [Snyder, 1971]. Hudson points to the potency of the unspoken:

"My suspicion, though, is that every generation of students is susceptible to its teacher's presuppositions, and that their presuppositions are potent just to the extent that they are unspoken. It is the assumptions, prejudices and implicit metaphors that are the true burden of what passes between teacher and taught. Facts, skills, are in comparison ephemeral, in the sciences especially, but in the arts as well. They are also identifiable and rejectable. What the teacher spells out, the pupil can question. What he assumes, especially from a position of unchallenged legitimacy, his pupils will tend to swallow whole and unawares."

[Hudson, 1972 p.43]

Not only are these potent communications taking place in the classroom, but also schools, colleges, universities and the departments within these institutions may be seen to have an ethos which dictates certain acceptable behaviour and is a backcloth for the staff and student/pupil interaction [Parlett, 1977]. This ethos Parlett & Dearden call the "learning milieu "which they suggest is:

" ______ the social psychological and material environment in which students and teachers work together. The learning milieu represents a network or nexus of cultural, social, institutional, and psychological variables. These act in complicated ways to produce, in each class or course, a unique pattern of circumstances, pressures, customs, opinions and work styles which suffuse the teaching and learning that occur there ... Acknowledging the diversity and complexity of learning milieux is an essential pre-requisite for the serious study of educational programs."

[Parlett & Dearden, 1977 p.15]
As I wished to develop a "feel" for each course it seemed a more holistic approach to observation was appropriate for my goals. For classroom observations I needed to define my approach more clearly. It was hoped to structure at least part of the classroom observations using the data from the students' first interviews. College class observations were to initially start as basically unstructured and some structure or order would be developed as deemed appropriate as the research developed. For school class observations, Walker & Adelman [1975], provided some useful tips. The question of being a participant or non-participant observer resolved itself in the classes I observed. I neither wanted to sit at the back out of the way nor take a front seat, but to occupy a 'natural' place in the class. In formal classes such as lectures it did not present a problem as there was little staff / student interaction. In a more informal setting I was occasionally addressed by staff or students as a participant and invited to join in group work or other such activity. In that way I did not actively seek to contribute but responded at the invitation of others.

Not all observation would take place in a classroom but also in informal settings such as over coffee, lunch, in the corridor, library or wherever chance meetings occurred. All such experiences were expected to provide a rich source of information to contribute to my understanding of the learning milieu.

2.2.3 Documentation

To supplement the interview and observation data it was decided to gain as full a picture as possible by obtaining any available documentation. This could be information about the college, the department, the course, the psychology component, handouts, timetables or whatever was available in the written mode. This would provide supplementary information for a more holistic view.

The next section describes the exploratory study.
2.3 The Exploratory Study

Prior to embarking on the main study an exploratory study was undertaken to sharpen the focus of the research area, pilot the research tools and generally ascertain the feasibility of the project. This section is divided into eight parts describing the process of the exploratory study in order of sequence.

The first and most critical stage of any fieldwork is negotiating access into the Institution in which you wish to conduct the research.

2.3.1 Negotiating Access to Institutions

Initially five Institutions (four Colleges of Higher Education and a Polytechnic) within reasonable travelling distance were approached to discuss with staff members the possibility of their participation in the exploratory and/or main study. As my area of special interest was in the Psychology component of Education courses my target member of staff (the one I would be working with most closely) would be the lecturer/tutor in Psychology.

Two main approaches to access were undertaken. One I refer to as the "top down" approach while the other, and more successful one as far as I was concerned, was the "bottom up" approach. The "top down" method involved contacting the most senior member of the Institution, such as the Principal or the Dean, by letter explaining that I was a research student, describing my area of research interest and requesting research facilities. (See Appendix B1). Eventually I would be put in touch with the target staff member but often through Heads of Department or Faculties where, rather like Chinese whispers, the purpose of my contacting them had become unclear. The "bottom up" approach depends on correctly identifying the target member of staff and arranging an informal meeting to discuss the research and ascertain their interest in participating. (See Appendix B2). Often such a meeting can be arranged by a mutual colleague or friend in Education and such a network extends from this Institute to Educators in many Institutions and it
would seem prudent to take advantage of this natural resource. Having gained the interest and willingness to participate of the target staff member, the approach to receive the "blessing" from the higher orders is partially internal and often conducted informally via the Head of Department through to the Principal. The advantage of this "bottom up" approach is that the initial discussion of the work is with the member of staff that you will be working with most closely and they can decide whether to participate or not without pressure from senior colleagues. Indeed the disadvantage of the "top down" approach is that the target staff member may feel obliged or pressured into accepting or even suspect that the researcher may be spying and reporting back to senior colleagues. Without mutual trust and respect an ethnographic study, such as this, will not flourish.

One College was selected for the exploratory study.

2.3.2 The College and Course

The exploratory study was conducted at Earlsworth College (College A), a modern college of Higher Education on the outskirts of a large town. Of the five colleges I had approached Earlsworth offered a different B.Ed. Degree structure in the Education component to the others. Most offered compulsory units of the three disciplines of Psychology, Sociology and Philosophy of Education as well as options such as the History of Education, Curriculum Studies and so on. This college offered the student a choice of one of these options to be studied in depth throughout the course. Thus it was possible to omit the study of psychology, sociology or philosophy altogether from the educational studies unless that option were selected. "The Psychology of Education" was one option offered and as the area of particular interest for this study was in the psychology component of Education courses it was decided to conduct a small number of interviews with final year B.Ed. students who had opted for this choice.
2.3.3 The Participants

Student participants were recruited in the third term of their final year after their final exams and shortly before leaving college. All participants were volunteers responding to a request made by me after a class meeting. See Figure 2(vi). Following these interviews it was decided to also interview some second year B.Ed. students prior to their major teaching practice, and a teacher who had recently completed a Dip.Ed. in-service course and had returned to teaching.

Figure 2(vi)

EXPLORATORY STUDY, PARTICIPANT DETAILS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COLLEGE</th>
<th>COURSE</th>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>NUMBER OF VOLUNTEERS</th>
<th>I.D.</th>
<th>SEX</th>
<th>AGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>B.Ed.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>30+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>30+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>21-30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>21-30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>21-30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>21-30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>B.Ed.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>21-30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>18-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>18-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Dip.Ed.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>30+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.3.4 The Interviews

The aims of this exploratory part of the study were:

a) to explore the research area with final year student teachers and to identify key issues;

b) to explore interview techniques to encourage students to reflect on their own thoughts and feelings;

c) to refine the focused interview schedule;

d) to ascertain the feasibility of conducting the main study.

The main problem in arranging interviews was securing a private place in which to conduct them. Staff from the department were unable to offer help in this matter complaining that space was at a premium and that they were unable to find extra space when they wanted it. Having no support from the staff in this area I discussed the problem with the student volunteers when we were arranging a time and place to meet. They suggested that we could sit outside in the grounds, weather permitting, but I felt it would not really be private enough and it would also cause problems with recording the interviews on cassette tape. They then suggested using a student locker room that was used infrequently and then only by other students. We agreed to meet there; although not ideal circumstances, they were the best available. Six fourth year students were interviewed in three interview sessions. Students 1, 2 and 3 were interviewed together as a group, 4 and 5 together as a pair and number 6 individually. Interviews followed the focused format (see Appendices B 4, 5 & 6). All interviews were tape-recorded with the students' permission. Tapes were later transcribed verbatim. These were analysed by re-reading several times and recording emerging issues.
23.5 Findings

Of the six participants, four had identified their teaching practice as being of significance to them within their four year course. The other two students had identified their final year dissertation, a project on a topic of their own choice within psychology, as being of most significance.

All the students had found their study of psychology relevant but had commented that this was only in retrospect and that they had been unable to relate to it during their teaching practice experience. The following extracts from the interview with students 4 and 5 illustrate this.

5 400 ...but somehow this year (fourth) I can look back at the first two years work and see things, but in the first two years I think it almost half went over my head, I mean I passed my exams, did the essays but I don't know whether I really...

4 407 It was interesting but you couldn't see the relevance of it perhaps.

5 406 But now after being in school the first two years work seemed so much relevant, I think I must have drawn on it at some instances in the school something must have, you know, sort of, oh yes, we did that in the first year psychology.

These comments were made in retrospect having been exposed to psychological theory both prior to and after a period of teaching practice. This led to two further formulations:

a) How do student teachers perceive the relevance of psychology—
   (i) prior to their first period of teaching practice;
   (ii) after that period of teaching practice.

b) How do in-service teachers perceive the relevance of psychology during a period of seconded study having been experienced class teachers.
2.3.6 Further Interviews

From these results it was decided to include four further interviews as part of the exploratory study, three with second year B.Ed. students prior to teaching practice and one with a Dip. Ed. in-service teacher.

The three second year B.Ed. students, also at Earlsworth College, were recruited to this part of the study at the end of the second year. See Figure 2(vi). At this college all teaching practice takes place during the third year. A similar focused interview schedule to the fourth year B.Ed. was prepared. (See Appendix B5). All participants were interviewed individually but otherwise the procedure took the same format as previously described. Tape recordings were transcribed verbatim and analysed.

The one Dip.Ed. in-service teacher who was recruited had completed the one-year's seconded course at Bourne College (College B) the previous year and had returned to teaching. See Figure 2(vi). A focused interview schedule was prepared similar to the previous ones but modified appropriately for an experienced teacher having recently attended an in-service course (see Appendix B6). The interview took place at the school after school hours, was tape recorded, transcribed, and analysed like previous interviews.

Prior to the interview the full day had been spent as a participant observer in the classroom. This observation was a useful experience for formulating classroom observations during the main study.

These further interviews acted as a baseline for preparing the interview schedules for the main study.
2.3.7 Developments

The main study was developed from the findings of the exploratory study in which the following points emerged:

a) Teaching practice is identified as a critical period for pre-service student teachers, therefore it would be useful to elicit students' perceptions both before and after the first teaching practice.

b) Observations of teaching practice classes would be useful to give a more holistic picture of the student teacher as well as to allow the researcher to experience the range of classrooms to which student teachers are assigned.

c) As teaching experience is important it would be useful to include a group of in-service teachers during a period of secondment on an education course. As for the pre-service students, interviews would be at the beginning and end of the academic year.

d) The focused interview is a useful and flexible way to explore students' thoughts, beliefs and feelings.

e) The focused interview was refined as a result of the exploratory study and it is necessary to maintain this as a flexible instrument, developing changes when deemed appropriate by the interviewer.

f) Although group interviews were useful in exploring an area, the difficulty in transcribing tapes (especially in identifying voices and frequent mixed talk) is too problematic to persevere, and for this study at least individual interviews would best serve the purpose.

g) Interviews should not exceed 50 minutes on average. This time proved sufficient for the depth of interview required, while severe timetable constraints with the added complication of split sites mean that students rarely have longer than one hour to spare. Additionally, intensive interviewing is often exhausting for both interviewer and interviewee with little to be gained from prolonging the period.
2.3.8 Research Questions

The aim of the study was to explore student teachers' personal perspectives of teaching and learning, both at college and at school, with particular reference to the study of psychology. The framing research questions were:

i) What kind of issues concern student teachers when considering the processes of teaching and learning both at college and at school?

ii) Does the student teacher's perception of the teacher's role change over time:
   a) following a period of teaching practice for pre-service students?
   b) following a period of college study for in-service students?

iii) How do student teachers perceive the psychology component of the course and how does this change over time:
   a) following a period of teaching practice for pre-service students?
   b) following a period of college study for in-service students?

iv) What are the individual student teachers views as to the nature of knowledge and processes of teaching and learning?

v) Do student teachers on pre-service courses and in-service courses differ in their views on the nature of knowledge and the processes of teaching and learning?

vi) What are the implications of the research findings for:
   a) the teaching and learning of psychology?
   b) further research?

The following chapter describes the main study.
Chapter 3

The Main Study
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The Main Study

"... the psychologist should envisage his work as a process wherein one person becomes acquainted with others."

[Hudson, 1972 p.162]

3.0 The Main Study

The main study was shaped by the experience of the exploratory study. Taking into account the constraints of time, resources (both personal and financial), and access, the main study developed into a case study of four groups of student teachers, two pre-service and two in-service, attending four different education courses at two institutions, over the period of one academic year.

3.1 The Colleges, Courses and the Learning Milieux

Participant colleges were selected from those approached prior to the commencement of the exploratory study. The criteria for selection resulted from the experience gained in the initial study and were as follows:

a) Key staff members were willing to participate in the study and willing to supply course documentation, timetables etc.

b) I was granted relatively free access to observe college classes/lectures/seminars etc.

c) It was agreed, at least in principle, that teaching practice visits with pre-service students could be arranged, subject to approval by students and school staff.
Four of the five colleges fitted the criteria and selection was finally made on consideration of a number of physical aspects including travelling distance, multi-split-sites (making contact with students almost impossible), time-tabling constraints, and teaching practice occurring in either the first or third term which prevented interviewing either before or after this period.

The two colleges selected were Bourne College of Higher Education (College B) and Queensbury Polytechnic (College C). Contact was maintained with the other colleges to enable the case study to be seen in perspective.

Situated within the city boundary, Bourne was one of a group of colleges that offered both pre-service and in-service education courses as well as B.A. and B.Sc. degrees. Here the Dip. Ed. in-service course participated in the study as it was administered and taught solely at Bourne College. Initially it had been hoped to include a pre-service course from this group of colleges but the problem of multi-site timetabling made this impossible in practice.

Queensbury Polytechnic was also a split site campus, with two sites, the larger main site being within a city boundary while the smaller building (Queensbury Annex) which housed the Education departments, was situated some miles away in a village location. Three courses from this Polytechnic participated in the study, one in-service course B.Ed. (B.Ed.I-S) and two pre-service courses, B.Ed.Yr.2 and P.G.C.E. The B.Ed.I-S and PGCE courses were administered and taught at the annex under the Department of Educational Development which was also responsible for a number of other specialist teacher courses.

Also based at the annex was the Department of Education that was responsible for all undergraduate teaching in Education offering modules for B.A. and B.Sc. degrees as well as professional teacher training towards the B.Ed. degree. Although B.Ed. students were based within this department they were required to study one other academic subject of their choice to degree level within the modular structure. Most lectures and seminars for both Education and the option subjects
were taught at the main site. Lectures were often attended by fifty to one hundred students and tended to be somewhat traditional in style and rather impersonal. Many B.Ed. students identified with the departments of subject choice rather than Education and this was reflected in their friendship groups. However, prior to the first teaching practice in the second year, professional studies, together with some seminars and tutorials were held at the annex. A half-hourly bus service ferried students between sites.

Each course had its own structure and learning milieu. Course details are summarised in Figure 3(i)

Figure 3(i)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Primary education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pre-service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course type</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualification</td>
<td>B.Ed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-requisites</td>
<td>Degree: 3yrs f.t.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hons.: 4yrs f.t.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course duration</td>
<td>1 year f.t.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Degree: 0 level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Maths &amp; English)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching practice</td>
<td>Year 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Term 2-5 wks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Year 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Term 1-10wks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupil age range</td>
<td>4 - 13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4 - 13

4 - 13

4 - 13

4 - 13
The B.Ed. route offered a three year full time modular course for the B.Ed. degree (CNNA) with the option of an extra year full time for the Honours degree. The fourth year includes a research study as a significant part of the course. Students follow the professional and academic study of education together with one other subject of their choice throughout their course. Teaching practice takes the form of five weeks during the second year and a full term during the third. Students can opt for either nursery/first, (3-9), or junior/middle, (7-14).

The course is taught by lectures, seminars and tutorials with a strong emphasis on practical work often with children in college or school. Assessment, the prospectus suggests, emphasises the importance of course work and practical teaching. In practice most modular courses spanned a term and terminated in a written exam. Most students sat two or three exams at the end of each term.

Before the second term of the second year, many B.Ed. students identified more with their option department than with the Department of Education. However, during the first five weeks of the second term, prior to the five week teaching practice, the compulsory Professional Educational Studies were held at the annex in smaller groups. This tighter timetabling enabled student teachers more peer involvement with other trainee teachers than had previously occurred, which together with their shared interest and/or anxiety of the forthcoming teaching practice promoted peer group support not previously observed.

The general impression of the learning milieu of the B.Ed. students was that they appeared somewhat fragmented as a group. They rarely identified with the Department of Education but with the department of their subject choice. Many felt the Department of Education was impersonal and that they were not known to the staff but this was often put down to the physical constraints of a modular structure course aggravated by split sites rather than an unwillingness on the part of the lecturers.
The other pre-service course, the PGCE, was run by its own course tutor, being administered and taught completely at the annex. Students elect to follow a course with a bias either to the First school or junior/Middle school. The former emphasises the needs of a class teacher to teach across the curriculum while the latter introduces an element of more specialised teaching. In this year roughly one third chose First school and two thirds Junior/Middle school. The students were divided into three groups (one First school and two Junior/Middle school) in which they remained throughout the year for most class teaching. Weekly lectures were held where the three groups came together but as there was only a total of forty students in the year these were considerably smaller than the lectures attended by the B.Ed. and Education students. Students returned to groups for the accompanying seminars. The PGCE course offered a structured 9 'til 5 set timetable 4 days a week with the choice of one specialist option. One day per week was spent on school visits. Students generally formed friendship groups within the course, especially within their smaller groups, but tended to have little contact with staff or students outside the course.

The course prospectus suggested that both traditional and more experiential methods of teaching are to be found in modern primary schools and work with children is considered a vital element of professional training. School contact took the form of a day attachment throughout the first term and the whole of the second term spent in teaching practice. Course assessment consisted of regularly submitted assignments together with a project. There were no formal examinations.

Unlike the learning milieu of the B.Ed. students, the PGCE students appeared to present a cohesive group with a strong identity of being postgraduates involved in teacher training. Friendship groups were apparent with peers and they generally saw the staff as friendly, helpful and approachable.

The B.Ed. and B.Ed. Hons for qualified teachers (CNAA) was administered and mostly taught at the annex under the direction of the course tutor. The course
could be taken part-time over three of four years or on a one year full-time followed by one year part-time. The participants in this study were recruited from the one year full-time course.

The course offers the opportunity to qualified teachers, who have already a teacher training qualification together with at least two years teaching experience, to upgrade their qualifications to degree level in line with recent recommendations for graduate entry into teaching. The core of the course consists of a study of the theory and practice of curriculum in school, and the importance of language across the curriculum, together with a study of human behaviour and characteristics relating to children's learning. Relevant modules could also be selected from other academic subjects offered on the Modular Course and these were taught at the main site.

The course prospectus emphasises the value of the students' contribution having had previous teaching experience and teaching qualifications. It also encourages the sharing of experience and ideas through peer group interaction. Eleven students were seconded onto the course during the fieldwork year. Teaching took the form of lectures and seminars held in classrooms with students sitting facing one another behind three sides of a rectangle of tables. Students frequently contributed to classes, often discussing points with one another. The students and staff had coffee together, between classes, in the staff coffee area and frequently lunched together. They showed group cohesion identifying with one another and the lecturers as fellow professionals. There was evidence of closer friendship groups within the larger group but this did not cause fragmentation of the group as a whole. During the year the students managed to negotiate for and acquire a common room for the use of professionals using the Polytechnic. When they were not in classes they would tend to congregate in this room. The main impression of this group was in sharing ideas in peer group discussion both in class and especially out of class.
The fourth group, Dip.Ed., was based at Bourne College and organised jointly by two course tutors who also provided much of the teaching. At the beginning of the year students were presented with a course handbook containing timetables, contents of the course and topics with references for both basic and further reading. Some lectures were given but teaching was predominantly by seminar and the object of the handbook was that students were informed and adequately prepared to contribute, to ensure the success of the seminar as a learning vehicle. Classes took place in a seminar room with comfortable armchair seating arranged in a circle. Formal teaching took place on three mornings a week and the rest of the time was devoted to private study. During the morning’s teaching the students had coffee together, made by themselves in a nearby kitchen, and would sometimes lunch together after class. However, the rest of the time was spent in following their own pursuits and many preferred whenever possible to work at home. The course tutors were part-time members of staff so were rarely around at times other than the morning classes and this tended to be an influencing factor on students choosing not to stay at college outside class hours. Students found the staff friendly, helpful and approachable but indicated that they would like to have had more contact out of class hours.

The group consisted of fourteen students, a quarter of whom were head teachers. I detected a slight rift in the group which appeared to be due to resentment of a few exceptionally vocal students dominating seminars with particular reference to junior children with whom they were concerned, and neglecting the needs of the majority of other students who worked in primary education and were perhaps less vocal.

3.2 The Psychology Component

Details of the psychology component of each course were obtained through collecting available documentation, informal talks with staff and students, and college class observations. This section is concerned with the structure and content of the psychological component of each course that was mainly supplied from
documentation. As the availability of such documentation varied from course to course the resulting detail given below varies in its completeness.

The psychology component of the three courses (B.Ed.Yr.2, PGCE and B.Ed.I-S) at Queensbury Polytechnic was taught by the same lecturer in psychology. However, the three courses varied in their structure and content.

Although this study is concerned with pre-service B.Ed. students during their second year, it is necessary to look at the structure of the whole three or four year course in relation to the psychology taught during that time. The course follows a modular structure divided into two stages. Stage one consists of three compulsory education modules to be taken in the first year. Stage two consists of three compulsory educational modules and a number of options available through the second and third years. A number of options and a compulsory dissertation comprise the fourth year for students completing an Honours Degree. Of the first stage modules one compulsory module provides an introduction to the theoretical study of philosophy, psychology and sociology of education, and one is a psychological module on child development.

During stage two there is a further compulsory module on the theoretical perspectives on education, an option on developmental psychology and a choice of either of two triple, psychologically orientated modules, on individual differences or social psychology. A number of alternative options are offered and are either discipline based (e.g. philosophical, sociological) or interdisciplinary (such as "children with special needs" and language and cognition in children). Some modules may incorporate a psychological perspective but may not be predominantly psychological. In the B.Ed. course at this Polytechnic some predominantly psychological modules were compulsory.

In contrast to the B.Ed. the PGCE course was only for one year and one term of that period was spent on teaching practice. The two terms spent in college were highly structured with compulsory classes and offered a choice of one option. The
options were mostly subject based (e.g. Expressive Arts, Humanities, Mathematics etc.) except for one, "children with special needs", which took an interdisciplinary approach to various topics.

One compulsory course offered theoretical perspectives on Education and it was within this that a number of lectures and seminars were presented with a psychological orientation. This was the only psychology PGCE students were exposed to. There were no exams for this course as assessment took the form of continuous assessment of course work.

The B.Ed.I-S course followed a modular structure of which a compulsory two term, double module entitled "Children Learning" was the most psychologically orientated. The teaching of this double module consisted of twenty hours of lectures, thirty hours of seminars and two hours of tutorials. The lectures were used to present theoretical material. Seminars took two forms: the first during the first term were used for practical sessions for further investigations of theoretical material and the devising of tests, while the second, during the following term, were "student led" where students were required to draw on their own experiences in the light of a selected area of theory.

Assessment was 50% examination and 50% course work. The two hour examination was on theoretical aspects of the course. Course work assessment was divided into a seminar presentation plus school based assignments (30%), and an essay (20%).

The Dip.Ed. course was divided into a number of compulsory components including curriculum, philosophy, sociology, psychology and language. On commencement of the course students were presented with a handbook and timetable detailing each topic and recommended reading for each component for each of the three years. Although some lectures were given the course was mainly taught through seminars and the handbook was prepared to ensure the students had adequate information and time to prepare for these.
The psychology component was further divided into the areas of developmental psychology, and personality and social psychology. The most time was spent on development psychology where the topics included: socialisation; teacher expectations; stages of cognitive development; teaching styles; constructs of self. Assessment was by exam and dissertation. One lecturer taught developmental psychology and another personality and social psychology and covered fifteen seminar sessions in total.

3.3 The Fieldwork Schedule

Negotiating access to institutions and the exploratory study took place during the third term of my first research year. From this the fieldwork schedule for the main study was drawn up. It was planned to complete this fieldwork during the second academic year.

Term one would be spent in recruiting participants to the study and completing the first interviews. Interview tapes were transcribed throughout terms one and two. Whenever possible I undertook college class observations to become a familiar figure to the students and staff so that we could chat informally, and to gain impressions of the learning milieu of each course. Towards the end of the first term negotiation of access into schools for teaching practice visits was started and continued into the term.

The second term was spent in completing negotiations with schools for teaching practice visits, planning these observation visits, then actually completing them.

Term three consisted of developing the second interview schedule from the first interview transcripts and contacting and interviewing all participants. Interview tapes were transcribed through well into the third year. College class observations which had been postponed in term two were resumed to promote informal contact with staff and students again.
Figure 3(ii) outlines the fieldwork schedule showing the number of participants on each course involved at each stage.

**Fig. 3(ii)**

The Fieldwork Schedule, showing number of participants at each stage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fieldwork year</th>
<th>Pre-service course</th>
<th>In-service course</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B.Ed. yr. 2</td>
<td>PGCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term 1 First Interviews</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term 2 T.P. Observation</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term 3 Second Interviews</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.4 The Participants

Students were recruited on a voluntary basis from each of the four courses at the beginning of the academic year. I arranged with the appropriate member of staff to join them for one of their time-tabled classes where I was introduced to the group and time was allocated for me to talk with them. I introduced myself as a postgraduate student carrying out a study of student teachers' own views on aspects of teaching and learning. I also explained that the interview would take about three-quarters of an hour, that it was completely confidential and that in no way was the project connected with the college. I took names and contact points from those who wished to participate and arranged to meet with them after another class to sort out convenient dates and times for their appointments. It was
interesting to note that the number of students who kept their appointments ranged from 40% on the B.Ed. pre-service course through to 90% on the in-service courses. Consequently the pre-service participants required a fair amount of chasing up to arrange further appointments and in the case of the B.Ed. pre-service students a second appeal for participants. Finally fifty-one student volunteers participated in the study and participant details are given in the following figures 3(iii) and 3(iv) Anonymity is preserved by allocating students ID numbers and, in the case studies, fictitious names.

Figure 3(iii)

### IN-SERVICE PARTICIPANTS DETAILS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COLLEGE</th>
<th>COURSE</th>
<th>NUMBER OF VOLUNTEERS</th>
<th>% OF YEAR</th>
<th>I.D.</th>
<th>SEX</th>
<th>AGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>B.Ed.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>40-44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>302</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>35-39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>303</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>30-34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>304</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>25-29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>305</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>40-44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>306</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>25-29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>307</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>30-34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>308</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>40-44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>309</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>30-34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>310</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>35-39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Dip.Ed.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>35-39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>402</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>35-39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>403</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>30-34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>404</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>30-34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>405</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>40-44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>406</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>45-49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>407</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>45-49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Pre-Service Participant Details

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Number of Volunteers</th>
<th>% of Year</th>
<th>I.D.</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>B.Ed. yr.2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>20-24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>102</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>20-24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>103</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>20-24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>104</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>20-24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>105</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>20-24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>106</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>20-24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>107</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>20-24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>108</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>20-24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>109</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>20-24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>110</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>20-24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>111</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>20-24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>112</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>20-24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>113</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>20-24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>114</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>20-24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>115</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>20-24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>116</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>18-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>117</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>30-34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>118</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>18-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>PGCE</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>20-24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>202</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>20-24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>203</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>20-24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>204</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>20-24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>205</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>20-24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>206</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>20-24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>207</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>20-24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>208</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>20-24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>209</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>20-24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>210</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>20-24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>211</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>20-24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>212</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>20-24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>213</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>20-24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>214</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>20-24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>215</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>30-34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>216</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>20-24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
One must always be cautious in drawing conclusions from a biased sample, say of volunteers. However, it is worth noting that a significant proportion of students participated from each group, 40% of PGCE, 41% of B.Ed.Yr.2, 50% of Dip.Ed. and 91% of B.Ed.I-S. Each student completed both interviews so there were no drop-outs between the first and second interviews. Because of these percentages it was decided to comment on student groups, by course and by course type, as well as individuals.

3.5 College Class Observations

The aims of the college class observations were:

a) to become familiar with the group as a whole;
b) to sample classes that students experienced;
c) to contribute to my understanding the learning milieu;
d) to develop further rapport with the participants as a means of informal contact with non-participants.

Negotiation of access to observe college classes had initially been agreed with course tutors and individual staff members concerned with psychology components of each course which had been a pre-requisite requirement for inclusion in the main study. In practice, class observations progressed as planned during the first two or three weeks' recruiting phase of the study. However, priority had to be given to conducting interviews whenever students were available, so observation became somewhat spasmodic. By this time I had encountered other staff members on the course who took an interest in the study and offered access to their classes. I took advantage of their offers when time permitted, broadening my experience of the students' formal learning environment.
Developing rapport with the participants on an informal basis was an integral part of the research design. It was hoped to convey that they as individuals were valued as participants throughout the year and to encourage their continuing participation in the study. It was also essential to build up trust with the pre-service students to enable them to feel comfortable with my visiting them on teaching practice, a time that proves stressful with many students.

Class observations involved varying degrees of participation depending on the staff member and type of class, for example non-participant in the lecture, to participant in classes where group tasks were assigned and I was invited to join a group.

During class observations I was not aware of non-volunteers avoiding contact with me. Some actually sought contact with me either within the class situation or outside on a chance meeting. Later in the year some explained why they had not volunteered, usually because of time constraints of varying kinds or anxiety as to how they felt they were coping with the class. A few even offered to participate "now that things were better" or "after the exams" if that would be helpful.

3.6 The First Interviews

The choice of focused interviews as an appropriate research tool for this study was discussed in the previous chapter. Two similar interview schedules (one for pre-service and one for in-service students) were designed from the experience of the exploratory study (see Appendices C1 and C2). These were identical except for the opening question. Pre-service students were asked why they chose to take an education course which, probed if necessary, gives a background of why they chose teaching. In-service students were asked for a brief history of how they came into teaching which, probed if necessary, gives a brief biography. This provided, even at this cursory level, an extra dimension to give a more holistic perspective.
I also incorporated Kelly's [1955] notion of dichotomous constructs into the interview to encourage students to expand on certain issues. Kelly suggests it is more useful to see constructs as having two poles rather than one. This does not mean that constructs are bipolar and not unipolar, but only that it might be more useful to think of them as if they are. I therefore provided the bipolar construct of 'good' and 'bad' to help clarify the student's position when discussing the teacher, teacher educator's and pupil's roles.

Interviews were conducted in a number of different places mostly on-site. Whenever possible it was intended to secure a place that would be private, relatively quiet and unlikely to be interrupted during the interview period. The Head of the Department of Education was most helpful in allowing me the use of a technician's room during the hours the part-time technician was not working.

Prior to commencing the interview each student was asked to complete a record card requesting general demographic information (see Appendix C3). Permission to record the interview on cassette tape was obtained and all students consented. Confidentiality was assured. Notes were also taken throughout the interview which proved especially useful in two cases of faulty tapes. Because of the nature of the interview no "standard instructions" were given as in traditional psychometric research. The gist of the preamble to the interviewee included the following points:

a) the interview was about various aspects of teaching and learning;
b) I was interested in their own views, thoughts and feelings;
c) there were no right answers.

The interview schedule was used as a guide so wording was not strictly adhered to. Questions were repeated, re-phrased or broken down when they appeared to cause difficulty. Responses were often probed and clarification sought where necessary. Occasionally interviews were interrupted by someone entering the room. During these periods the interview was halted, the recorder switched off until the intruder
left, then I reminded the interviewee of the question and of the response they had been making up to the point of interruption (this was where notetaking was of particular advantage), offering to replay that part of the interview to stimulate recall. The interview finished by inviting students to add any comments that they wished to make. Some took full advantage of this opportunity.

On completion of the first interview all students were asked if they would be willing to participate in a follow-up interview during the third term. All were willing. Additionally all pre-service students (B.Ed.Yr.2 and PGCE) were asked if they might be willing to allow me to visit them during their teaching practice. No students were unwilling although some voiced reservations. We agreed for me to contact them during their teaching practice period to arrange a visit if they wished or to decline at that point. Interview tapes were transcribed verbatim.

3.7 Teaching Practice Visits/Observations

The aims of the teaching practice observations were:

a) to experience the variety of schools and classrooms that student teachers are assigned to;

b) to observe the student teachers and pupil interaction;

c) to test out a check list of teacher and class/pupil characteristics derived from the first interviews.

The teaching practice observations phase of the study became a viable proposition through the positive response of the student participants. A major concern, prior to the study commencing, had been to avoid additional stress on the students during teaching practice, itself often a stressful period of the course. Encouraged by the students' support the next stage was to negotiate access to the schools concerned. The Head of Department of the B.Ed. course and course tutor of the PGCE course were consulted on this matter and in both cases required access to be negotiated through the Polytechnic. Each approached the task in the manner that
they thought most appropriate considering their established relationship with the teaching practice schools. With the B.Ed. students a letter was circulated to all teaching practice schools informing them of my involvement in research with the department and that part of the study was to include visiting a number of students on teaching practice. The head teacher was asked to contact the department if they did not agree to such a visit or required further information. If we did not hear from them we would assume all was well and I would contact them in due course to confirm a date for the visit. None of these schools objected. The PGCE course tutor required a list of all participants so that each school involved could be contacted. I then had to contact each participant to ask their permission to release their name to the course tutor as that had not been part of my contract with them (see Appendix C4). Some students did not agree to this and therefore were excluded from the teaching practice visit.

Those that did agree had letters sent to their teaching practice schools requesting that they contact the department to register their approval before I could contact them directly. Two of these schools refused access.

Once access was granted a timetable of school visits was prepared. Teaching practice supervisors and tutors were contacted to avoid a clash of visits. All participants were then contacted to confirm dates and time of visits and to confirm that they still wished to participate in this phase of the study. The PGCE group were required to spend a day at the Polytechnic during school half-term and a space was time-tabled for my meeting up with them. I felt direct contact enabled any uncertainties to be discussed and to provide reassurances where necessary. Unfortunately I was unable to meet up with the B.Ed. students as I had planned, due to a change of time-table of which I was not informed. I was left with no alternative but to contact them by letter (see appendix C5). Timetabling was altered as necessary and all involved notified of any changes. Finally head teachers of schools involved were contacted by telephone about one week before the impending visit to confirm date and time and to ascertain whether they wished me to see them during this time. During this phase there was an acute awareness
of the responsibility to the Polytechnic to maintain the good relationships already established with these schools.

Each visit lasted for half a day. I arrived before the class started to see the head teacher and/or class teacher if they wished and, more importantly, to spend a few minutes with the student to create a relaxed rapport before the class commenced. During the half day observation I positioned myself as unobtrusively as possible but where I could observe whatever was going on. Where there was considerable movement in the class or various group activities, I moved around and joined groups as appropriate. Throughout the period observation notes were recorded in a reporter’s notebook. A rough plan view of the classroom was sketched showing seating arrangements of pupils and teacher. Information about the school (e.g. type and location) and class (e.g. age, year, number and sex of pupils etc) was recorded. A teacher-pupil activity time schedule was kept throughout the period. (see examples Appendix H1, I1, J1). Notes were made on aspects of teacher-pupil interaction (see Appendix C6) and the teacher-pupil/class characteristics checklist completed. (see Appendix C7). This had been prepared from the first interviews, abstracting teachers’ and pupils’ characteristics. It was intended to test out this instrument to see if it were possible to observe these in the classroom situation.

At the end of the morning or afternoon period, after the pupils had left the classroom, time was spent with the student teachers if they wanted to talk. All were thanked for allowing the visit. Class teachers and/or head teachers were seen before leaving only at their request but students and class observations were not discussed.

Notes were written up as soon as possible after the observation and in any case on the same day. Examples of observations are given for the case studies in Chapters 8, 9 and 10 in Appendices GI, H1 and I1.
3.8 The Second Interviews

The purpose of the second interview was to explore students' views on teaching and learning and their perception of influences on these views since experiencing either a first period of teaching practice for pre-service students or a period of academic study for in-service students.

Accordingly two similar interview schedules were prepared. Pre-service students were asked to comment on the usefulness of their degree subject (PGCE) or academic subject (B.Ed.) while in-service students were asked to comment on their experience of being a student. (see Appendices C8 and C9). A focus on exploring relationships between teaching, learning and knowledge had developed from the first interviews.

The second interview followed the same procedure as the first. Prior to starting, changes of address were noted on the record cards, especially contact addresses (usually parents) for PGCE students who would be leaving at the end of term.

A similar preamble was used as in the first interview and students were reminded that I was interested in their own views, thoughts and feelings and that there were no right answers. As before, the interview schedule was used as a guide and not strictly adhered to. All interviews were audio taped with permission and notes were taken throughout.

On completion of the interview the research was discussed and all questions were answered as fully as possible. This was similar to a de-briefing session following psychometric research except that it was not necessary to reveal the "true" purpose of the study as it had not been concealed in the first place. The aim of this session was to ensure that students did not depart with any anxieties and were comfortable with their contribution to the research.
3.9 Documentation

Throughout the entire period of fieldwork all available documentation was collected to supplement the observation and interview data. Documentation included College prospectus, course outlines, course rationale, handbooks, timetables, handouts, and anything else in the written mode. There was no consistency in the amount or type of documentation that was made available to me.

3.10 Data Analysis

As this study focuses on student teachers' personal perspectives on teaching and learning it was necessary to question the students about their beliefs. Observations can only report on overt behaviour and not on the actor's own thoughts, beliefs and intentions. Often these are inferred from action by researchers using their own frames of reference as described by Marton [1978] as his "first order perspective". As my interpretations are based on the students' own interpretation of how they see their world they are of the second order perspective [Marton, 1978].

The main analysis, therefore, focused on the interview data. All interviewees were tape recorded and transcribed verbatim. Little is written on the problems of transcribing, however, Watts, Harrison & Gilbert [1982] provided a useful introduction to the area and my own method of transcription was developed after consideration of this work.

The aim of the transcription was to reproduce in print what was actually said at the interview as faithfully as possible. The spoken word of conversation can appear rather odd and disjointed when written, as we often repeat ourselves, start saying one thing then change direction part way through, and display many other conversational traits that we edit out of the written word.
From listening to the conversation it was evident that most speech naturally occurred in phrases rather than in sentences and so it was recorded in the written mode. Inaudible or indecipherable speech was marked by (?). Pauses were indicated by length of silence from '.' for a short pause to '.....' for a longer pause to '(long pause)' for long pauses. Other sounds such as laughter, coughs, yawns etc were indicated within brackets e.g. '(laughs)'. Eye contact and body language were not systematically recorded but obviously these things were observed as part of the social interaction of the interview and created impressions on the interviewer that were carried through to enrich the analysis. It is unrealistic to believe that sensory impressions do not in some way permeate the process of data analysis and interpretation of data.

Tapes were transcribed and checked for accuracy. Transcripts were read and re-read for meaning. As a number of issues emerged, transcripts were re-read with these in mind. The data was re-visited until some coherent way of categorising the data became fairly consistent. Giorgi [1975] describes this systematic interrogation of the data as the researcher transforming the meaning of the everyday naive language of the subject into the language of psychological science.

During the initial stages of interviewing I was struck by the individual differences between the students in their personality and manner, as well as what they reported and how they reported it. However, as the year progressed I became aware of a number of recurring themes relating to the issues we were discussing. These areas of concern, or 'foci', became my base line units with which to describe the students' thinking in this study. Although these foci were shared by a number of students they differed widely as to the numbers and permutations of foci that they held on any one issue. These differences were further intensified by the strength of feeling and order of importance of each focus for each student. However, no attempt was made to record this aspect in a systematic way and therefore this is not within the scope of the study.
I have found the notion of 'focus' helpful in trying to understand and describe teacher thinking. The term 'focus' was chosen to convey a particular aspect upon which attention was concentrated. Students may hold a single focus or multiple foci on a given subject, thus their perspectives may be narrow or broad. Students are similar in the foci they have in common and differ in the combination and number they hold.

I acknowledge that the foci described in this thesis were arrived at from interrogation of the interview data and as such are my interpretation of the data. I also recognise that from a constructivist viewpoint, there are an infinite number of ways of construing the world. However, I have attempted to give as full and honest an account of the data as possible, balancing the tension that arises between the necessary reduction of unwieldy amounts of qualitative data and the desire to adequately reflect the complexities and idiosyncrasies of the actor's perspective.

In an attempt to reduce researcher bias I supplied a number of colleagues in the department with focus descriptions together with a sample of sections of transcripts, asking them to identify examples of focus they might observe in the data. The "judges" commentaries were considered prior to the final analysis. Extensive quotes have been included in the thesis as exemplars of each focus to allow the reader to see how I came to these conclusions. Whilst I accept that readers may offer alternative interpretations from the data that has been presented here, may I remind the reader that, as active researcher, I have had the benefit of access to the research material in its totality, together with the privilege of participating in it first hand as sole interviewer and observer, and this has also informed my conclusions. Hull describes this privileged position:

"Research workers construct what Stenhouse refers to as a 'second record' of understandings during their time in the field and so may be in a privileged position as analysts to be able to interpret what appears 'on the record' of the transcripts in the light of their accumulated knowledge of participants' meaning systems. The corollary to this privilege however, is that these black market understandings put fieldworkers/analysts in a rather more powerful position than researchers should perhaps aspire to, since their interpreters are not
accountable to what is available to others as ‘project data’ but contingent on understandings unique to their participants in the live situation from which the data are distilled”.

[Hull, 1984, p.8]

Hull sought to present passages in his research transcripts that illustrated what he interpreted retrospectively to have been interviewees’ intended meanings at the time. In this way:

"The 'corpus' of data . . . was thus refined to extracts which were accorded the status of 'evidence' by their use as supportive or illustrative material. But they were evidence in support of interpretations rooted in the black market of my own private understanding in the unpublishable 'second record', not in the 'documents of the case'".

[Hull, 1984, p.9]

Data is presented in two ways, one in a summary form and the other in the form of individual case studies.

The following chapters, Chapters 4, 5, 6, and 7, present the summarised data under the following headings:

a) teachers and teaching

b) learners and learning

c) teachers as learners

d) psychology and teacher education.

It is summarised in terms of:

a) the four groups or courses (B.Ed.Yr.2, PGCE, B.Ed.I-S, and Dip. Ed.)

b) the two types of courses (pre-service and in-service).

Chapters 8, 9, 10, and 11 present individual case studies illustrative of selected students’ personal perspectives as follows:

a) a predominantly Cultural Transmission perspective

b) a predominantly Romanticist perspective

c) a predominantly Progressive perspective

d) a multi-faceted perspective.
Chapter 4

The Teacher and Teaching
CHAPTER 4

The Teacher and Teaching

"Out of all these findings and connections comes the conviction that teaching is not a conscious controlled and objective "performance", but rather that it is a subjective activity, and thus an expression of "self"; that it is a behavioural manifestation of that complicated and deeply interconnected pattern of beliefs, values, assumptions, experiences, attitudes and insights which might otherwise be called the "person". If this is accepted, it becomes relatively meaningless to attempt to separate out the act of teaching from the teacher. Ironically, this is precisely the sort of divorce which conventional teacher education has attempted to force onto teaching. What is more, it is now possible to view all the variables cited here as different aspects of the same entity - the person."

[Candy, 1981, p.12]

Introduction

The research findings are presented in two ways. The first is given in a summary form essentially grouping students into their four courses (B.Ed.Yr.2, PGCE, B.Ed.1-S and Dip.Ed.), and into two course types (pre-service and in-service). Chapters 4, 5, 6, and 7 cover the summary form. The following chapters, 8, 9, 10, and 11 are presented in the form of case studies of individual students chosen to illustrate the individuality of the person's personal perspective.

The four summary chapters present the summarised research findings under four main headings. Chapter 4 looks specifically at the teacher (both at school and at college) and teaching. Chapter 5 concentrates on the learner (both school pupil and student teacher) and learning. The sixth chapter looks at teachers as learners both in the college environment and in school, and explores the relationship between theory and practice. The seventh chapter is concerned with psychology and teacher education, summarising student teachers' expectations of psychology and the relevance they actually perceived.
4.0 The Teacher and Teaching

This chapter looks at teachers and teaching where the following questions were addressed:

- How does the student teacher perceive the role of the teacher?
- Does his view of the teacher's role change:
  a) over a period of teaching practice for pre-service student teachers?
  b) over a period of study for in-service students?
- Are there differences between the view of themselves as teachers and that of the college lecturer/tutor as teacher?

The chapter is divided into four sections. The first looks at the student's perception of "the teacher"; the second looks at how this changes over the academic year; the third part focuses on the teacher educator while the fourth compares perceptions of the teacher and teacher educator's roles.

4.1 The Teacher

This section describing the student teacher's perceptions of "the teacher" is presented in three parts. Firstly, teacher foci are described, secondly the data is summarised, and thirdly general observations are made.

4.1.1 Teacher Foci

From the interview transcripts on teachers and teaching, five main foci emerged relating to student teachers' views of their role as teacher. The foci have been named as follows:

a) teacher focus
b) learner focus
c) content focus
d) relationship focus

e) control focus.

These foci are not mutually exclusive and any participating student may have alluded to a number of them, and students varied in their combination of foci.

Foci descriptions follow:

a) Teacher Focused

These statements relate to the personal qualities, personality, and activity of the "teacher" or "teaching" as well as to the classroom "atmosphere" or "environment", as it is considered that the teacher's role is to "provide" or "create" these. Words frequently used are provides/provider, interested/interesting, educate/educator, advise/advisor/advising, director/directing, teaching, giving etc. The focus of these statements is with the teacher and teaching and often implies that the teacher is doing something to or for the learner, that the locus of control is with the teacher.

Examples from transcripts:

106  A068  ... provide these activities for the children and to structure them ... um ... as guidelines of learning.

B.Ed.Yr.2

115  A080  ... and I think even teaching could be brought earlier into the child's life when they are more open to suggestions because they do go through a phase when they are very young wanting to know things. I think you can plug in as much as possible then, save a lot of trouble later on.

B.Ed.Yr.2

115  A096  ... extremely important the teacher should have a very good sense of humour.

B.Ed.Yr.2
provider of stability - providing an environment in which it is possible to stimulate the minds of children, as a guider, guiding children to perhaps goals that I can see but they can't just yet.  
PGCE

... give them some idea of the rules that go on in the world.  
PGCE

I think you've got to equip children to deal with and make the best of society that they are likely to live in.  
B.Ed.I-S

I see my role as providing all the kinds of experiences and opportunities for a child to grow in all kinds of areas.  
Dip.Ed.

b) Learner Focus
Statements included in this focus suggest that the learner is of primary concern to the teacher and that the teacher's behaviour is dependent upon or altered by the needs of the individual. The locus of control is with the learner. Statements of a more personal nature concerning the teacher-learner relationship or counselling are not included under this heading but under the heading "relationship". Single words rarely encapsulate this meaning.

Examples from transcripts:

if a child brought something in, I'd be inclined to work from that or an activity that they might talk about.  
B.Ed.Yr:2

as a teacher I think you've really got to look out for any sign of, you know, the way the child is thinking ... I think you should apply different strategies to different children.  
B.Ed.Yr:2
being able to give the children freedom, and looking into things for themselves ... be prepared for a number of alternatives so that you can pick out the things they've said and use them as much as possible.

PGCE

A037 ... I suppose as a facilitator to allow each child to do the things that are appropriate according to his stage of development ... to individualise things.

PGCE

A020 ... acting as a catalyst at times, and generally you know facilitating what, what the children need and relating that to some sort of curriculum background.

B.Ed.I-S

A066 ... we assess what we have done together, that's the teacher and the children ... also the teacher learns as he's going on.

Dip.Ed.

c) Content Focus

All statements concerning "content" such as subject, knowledge, information, skills, the three 'R's etc. These may be combined with an adjective describing the teacher's behaviour in relation to the content, e.g. imparting knowledge, teaching subjects and giving skills.

Examples from transcripts:

A036 ... Give the basic knowledge that's needed for everyday living ... the basic skills, reading, writing.

B.Ed.Yr.2

A054 ... as a direct imparter of information because I think that some things can only be learnt and taken in by being told or educated by another, by a person who is experienced at that other thing.

PGCE
305 A016 - Well, imparting to the children some knowledge they need for that year, every class that comes through.
   B.Ed.I-S

402 A045 ... one of my roles is to make sure that the basic skills are there so that the rest of this excitement of education can proceed.
   Dip.Ed.

403 A056 ... but where I can bring knowledge of a wider range to it whereas the child's only got his own specific knowledge. I can bring wider experiences.
   Dip.Ed.

d) Relationship Focus

Statements here are of a more personal nature than in the other foci suggesting a pastoral or counselling role or the importance of developing a relationship between teacher and learner. Adjectives frequently used are: sympathetic, respect, liking, concerned, caring etc.

Examples from transcripts:

101 A065 ... and I think the most important quality is, of course are liking children and respecting them as individuals.
   B.Ed.Yr.2

214 A070 ... have a good relationship with the children so they can trust you.
   PGCE

305 A018 - Somebody who cares about the children, I think is the main thing because if you care about the children everything else follows on. If you care about their feelings and the things they learn you, automatically you produce work for them that's right for them ...
   B.Ed. I-S

406 A062 ... an empathy, a feeling for children, er, and children return this and between them some sort of chemistry happens and you get a very sound learning environment.
   Dip.Ed.
e) Control Focus

All statements alluding to control or discipline.

Examples from transcripts:

108 A050 ... the teacher is there if the children are excited by something as well as learning they are going to ... the discipline problem is much less I think.

B.Ed.Yr2

206 A054 ... I suppose it is within that provisional stable environment will come such things as discipline and control .. which are different things...

A058 ... a good teacher will provide boundaries within which children know that they can or can't do something.

PGCE

303 A072 ....the tools 'to do' the job really were good discipline (?) having a certain amount of administrative skill all that sort of thing.

B.Ed.I-S

407 A056 ... discipline is obviously vital to learning ... discipline rather through the relationship with the child than in, than in an imposed discipline

Dip.Ed.

4.1.2 Summarising the Data

Frequency tables were constructed to record the type of statements each student teacher made, on each course. Each type of statement was only recorded once, as careful reading of the transcripts had shown that emphasis could not be determined by the number of times that a focus statement was made, therefore any ideas of a tally count were discarded. The frequency tables therefore show the number of students on each course who made statements for each focus. (see Appendices D1, 2 and 3.)

Two frequency summary tables were prepared to show the percentage of students on each course who made statements within a given focus. Figure 4(i) shows the
percentage in each focus for each course (i.e. B.Ed.Yr.2, PGCE, B.Ed.I-S and Dip.Ed.), and Figure 4(ii) shows the percentage in each focus for each course type (i.e. pre-service and in-service).

From the frequency summary tables two rank order tables were prepared to give some perspective to the order in which these foci lie in relation to each other. This is based on the number of students who made such comments, not the number of statements made. Figure 4(iii) shows the differences by course, and Figure 4(iv) shows the differences by course type.

4.1.3 General Observations

The highest percentage of students in all of the four courses made teacher focused statements. However, on the B.Ed.I-S course the same percentage of students also made learner and relationship focused statements suggesting a more child centred approach. In both the pre-service groups learner and relationship focuses were ranked either second or third. However the Dip.Ed. students differed in that they were the only group who had a high percentage concerned with content foci, ranked second, with learner statements ranked third. One would expect with a high percentage of students concerned with teacher and content issues that this group might be less child centred and more traditional in its approach.

The two pre-service groups are similar in their views of the teacher while the two in-service groups are less so. When comparing course types both pre-service groups made the highest percentage of teacher focused statements. Also, more were concerned with learner and relationship focuses than content and control. In-service students made more types of statements concerning teacher issues than did pre-service students. These results are revisited in section 4.2 when looking at perceptions of the teacher's role over time and section 4.3 when comparing the teacher's and teacher educator's roles.
### FREQUENCY SUMMARY TABLE

**By course - the teachers role, first interview**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Type</th>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Learner</th>
<th>Content</th>
<th>Relationship</th>
<th>Control</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B.Ed. yr. 2 T=18</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGCE T=16</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.Ed. I-S T=10</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dip.Ed. T=7</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GT=51</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

### FREQUENCY SUMMARY TABLE

**By course type - the teachers role, first interview**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Type</th>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Learner</th>
<th>Content</th>
<th>Relationship</th>
<th>Control</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-S T=34</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-S T=17</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### RANK ORDER SUMMARY TABLE

By course - teachers role, first interview

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Learner</th>
<th>Content</th>
<th>Relationship</th>
<th>Control</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B.Ed. yr 2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGCE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2=</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.Ed. I-S</td>
<td>1=</td>
<td>1=</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1=</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dip.Ed.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### RANK ORDER SUMMARY TABLE

By course type - teachers role, first interview

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Type</th>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Learner</th>
<th>Content</th>
<th>Relationship</th>
<th>Control</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-service</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-service</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.2 Perception of the Teacher's Role and Change over Time

The students' views of the teacher's role were elicited both at the beginning and at the end of an academic year. The data from the first interview has been summarised in the previous section (4.1.2). This section presents the data from the second interview in three parts, firstly describing teacher foci; secondly summarising the data, and thirdly making general observations.

4.2.1 Teacher Foci

The five main foci that emerged from the first interview transcripts were seen in the follow-up interview, and their descriptions have been given earlier. However, it was also necessary to add a sixth focus under the heading of "other", which is described as follows:

(f) Other
The 'other' focus is for statements that cannot be accommodated in any of the five foci previously described under 'teacher foci'.

Example from transcript:

310 B002 - Er .. one thing that has, I suppose, come across my mind this year, is .. I'm quite keen to establish closer links with training institutions, particularly this one, and I think the teacher can have, perhaps a more active role in the helping to train initial training students. Um .. one thing I've always been very interested in is the .. links between home and school. And I think the role of the teacher has got to extend .. more into the children's homes .. and give the parents a positive role in the education of their children. They are two things in particular that I've thought a great deal about through this year.

B.Ed.I-S
4.2.2 Summarising the Data

Frequency tables were constructed to record the types of statement made for each course following the same criteria as for the ‘teacher’ foci given previously in Section 4.1.2. (see Appendices D4,5 and 6.)

Two frequency summary tables were prepared to show the percentage of students on each course who made statements within a given focus. Figure 4(v) shows the percentage in each focus for each course, and Figure 4(vi) shows the percentage in each focus for each course type.

From the frequency summary tables two rank order tables were prepared to give some perspective to the order in which these foci lie in relation to each other. Figure 4(vii) shows the differences by course, and Figure 4(viii) shows the differences by course type.

Frequency summary tables 4(i) and 4(v) are combined in Figure 4(ix) to show the comparison of teacher’s role over time by course. Frequency summary tables 4(ii) and 4(vi) are similarly combined in Figure 4(x) to show the comparison of teacher’s role over time by course type.

A further two rank order tables were prepared. Rank order tables 4(iii) and 4(vii) were combined in Figure 4(xi) to show the comparison of the teacher’s role over time by course. Rank order tables 4(iv) and 4(viii) were similarly combined in Figure 4(xii) for course type.
### FREQUENCY SUMMARY TABLE  
By course - the teachers role, second interview

#### Fig. 4(v)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Learner</th>
<th>Content</th>
<th>Relationship</th>
<th>Control</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B.Ed. yr.2. T=18</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGCE T=16</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.Ed. I-S T=10</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dip.Ed. T=7</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GT=51</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### FREQUENCY SUMMARY TABLE  
By course type - the teachers role, second interview

#### Fig. 4(vi)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Type</th>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Learner</th>
<th>Content</th>
<th>Relationship</th>
<th>Control</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-S T=34</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-S T=17</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### RANK ORDER SUMMARY TABLE
By course - teachers role, second interview

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Type</th>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Learner</th>
<th>Content</th>
<th>Relationship</th>
<th>Control</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B.Ed. yr. 2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGCE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3=</td>
<td>3=</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.Ed. I-S</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3=</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3=</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dip. Ed.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### RANK ORDER SUMMARY TABLE
By course type - teachers role, second interview

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Type</th>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Learner</th>
<th>Content</th>
<th>Relationship</th>
<th>Control</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-S</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-S</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### FREQUENCY SUMMARY TABLE
By course - Comparing teachers role over time

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Learner</th>
<th>Content</th>
<th>Relationship</th>
<th>Control</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.Ed.yr.2</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T = 18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGCE</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T = 16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.Ed. I-S</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T = 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dip.Ed.</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T = 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GT = 51</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### FREQUENCY SUMMARY TABLE
By course type - Comparing Teachers role over time

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Type</th>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Learner</th>
<th>Content</th>
<th>Relationship</th>
<th>Control</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-S</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T = 34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-S</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T = 17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### RANK ORDER SUMMARY TABLE

#### By course comparing teachers' role over time

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Learner</th>
<th>Content</th>
<th>Relationship</th>
<th>Control</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.Ed.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yr. 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGCE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.Ed.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3=</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dip. Ed.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### RANK ORDER SUMMARY TABLE

#### By course type comparing teachers' role over time

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course type</th>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Learner</th>
<th>Content</th>
<th>Relationship</th>
<th>Control</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-S</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-S</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.2.3 General Observations

This section comments on observations made under the headings of the six foci, followed by highlighting four points of interest.

a) Teacher Focus
There was an increase in the number of students who made 'teacher focused' statements during the second interview in each of the four courses. There was little difference between the pre-service and in-service groups in that both had similar increases in this area.

b) Learner Focus
There was a decrease in the number of students who made 'learner focused' statements during the second interview. The B.Ed.I-S group had the highest percentage of students who made such statements during the first interview and the lowest percentage during the second interview, indicating the greatest change in this direction. As all courses purport to be child-centred, this and the previous result (increase in students making 'teacher focused' statements) is of considerable interest and will be discussed further in the final chapter. More in-service students than pre-service students made 'learner focused' statements during the first interview.

Less than one quarter of each group had made such statements in the second interview. As stated above, there was an overall decrease; however, the greatest decrease trend was seen in the in-service group. As this group was away from classroom practice and exposed to in-service training during this period, this is also of interest.

c) Content Focus
The number of students making 'content focused' statements increased in the second interview on three of the four courses (B.Ed.Yr.2, PGCE and B.Ed.I-S). The fourth course, Dip.Ed, is of considerable interest as it had the highest percentage of
students make such comments during the first interview, whereas not one made such a statement during the second interview. Given that one might expect some correlation between 'content focus' and 'teacher focus' as being epistemologically linked in some way, this result is surprising, as all Dip.Ed. students made teacher focused statements in the second interview.

More in-service than pre-service students made content focused statements during the first interview. An almost equal number of pre-service and in-service students made such comments during the second interview. This indicates an increase in the number of pre-service students and a decrease in the number of in-service students commenting on content. However, as already pointed out in the previous section, the two in-service courses showed quite different trends, the B.Ed.I-S showing an increase while the Dip.Ed. showed a significant decrease. This suggests that differences may be more usefully interpreted between courses than types of courses.

d) Control Focus
More students on the pre-service (B.Ed.Yr.2 and PGCE) courses than on the other in-service courses made comments in this focus during the first interview. In three of the four courses there was a decrease in the number of students who made such statements (B.Ed.Yr.2, B.Ed.I-S, Dip.Ed.) in the second interview. No in-service students expressed concern with control issues. The PGCE course saw an increase in students making control focused statements. The converse was true of the other pre-service group (B.Ed.Yr.2).

e) Relationship Focus
All courses saw a decrease in the number of students who commented on relationships in the second interview. The largest decrease was seen in the B.Ed.I-S course, which echoes the 'learner focused' decrease mentioned earlier. These two foci may be seen to be the most child-centred components and is therefore of interest. There was a slight decrease in the number of pre-service students making relationship focused comments and a significant decrease in
in-service students during the second interview. These trends will be discussed in the final chapter.

f) Other

Only one student (B.Ed.I-S) during the second interview made a significantly different statement as to the teacher’s role that could not be accommodated within the existing frameworks.

Four observations are of particular note from this comparison of the change in the students’ perception of the teacher’s role over the academic year. The most striking observation regarding the rank order tables is that on all courses more students made ‘teacher’ focused statements than any other area of focus.

The second observation relates to ‘learner’ and ‘relationship’ focuses ranking high in the first interview and showing a marked trend to a lower ranking in the second interview. As ‘learner’ and ‘relationship’ focuses may be seen to be indicative of a child centred approach the trend away from this after a period of teaching practice for pre-service students or after a period of seconded study for in-service students is of considerable interest especially as all courses purport to have a child centred bias.

The third observation concerns the ‘content’ focus which shifts from a low ranking from the first interview to a higher ranking on all but one course. The exception is the Dip.Ed. I-S course where content has a high ranking in the first and was not ranked in the second interviews.

Finally, the fourth area of interest concerns the ‘control’ focus. Since experiencing teaching practice, more PGCE students expressed concern with issues of control than during the first interview. The converse was true of the B.Ed.Yr.2 students.

These observations are discussed more fully in the discussion chapters. However, at this stage it is worth reminding the reader of the tentative nature of organising
and reducing qualitative data. The rank order tables are not considered to be an attempt to objectify and quantify qualitative data but rather to try to convey to the reader in a concise way a flavour of perspective, relationships and trends.

4.3 The Teacher Educator

This section is divided into three parts. The first describes the foci that emerged from students talking about their teachers at college, the second is concerned with summarising the data, and the third gives general observations.

4.3.1 Teacher Educator Foci

From the interview transcripts six main foci emerged concerning students' views of the teacher educator as teacher. The foci are as follows:

a) teacher focus,
b) learner focus,
c) content focus,
d) relationship focus,
e) training focus,
f) model focus.

These foci are not mutually exclusive and students may have alluded to any number and combination of them.

The first four foci relate directly to the foci of the same name from the 'teacher' data. Focus descriptions follow:

a) Teacher Focus

The description for this focus is the same as for the Teacher focused teacher focus (see 4.1.2a)
Examples from transcripts:

118 A017 - They're just giving you the basic outline, because that's what they're supposed to provide, everything you need for the course.

B.Ed.Yr2

216 A021 - as a guider. Someone who, er... helps us learn and as a teacher. Um I believe in the lecture as the best way of getting information across.

PGCE

305 A010 - Mm. Difficult to answer (?) open (Pause). In the light of a teacher I suppose.

A012 - Well he's there to help me to gain the B.Ed. by showing me what's necessary to do to get the B.Ed. (Pause) I can't think of any other reason for their existence actually (Both laugh). He's purely there as a tool for me to use really. I suppose that's the (?) He's there to help me, and I'm there to listen to him in the role of the teacher. He knows, I don't (laughs).

B.Ed.I-S

405 A024 - Er (sigh) I see mainly, I, I, I, I look on them as guides, um, people who will guide my reading, guide my dissertation and help me to clarify my faults, mm, I think that's how I look on them mm -

Dip.Ed.

b) Learner Focus

The description for this focus is the same as for the Learner focused teacher focus (see 4.1,2b).

Examples from transcripts:

110 A022 - A good one's (lecturer) someone where you feel you're not embarrassed to ask questions and repeatedly if you don't understand as well (?) the first time .

B.Ed.Yr2

107 A014 - somebody who can ask all, apart from teach, teaching you the things that he knows that you don't that you should know, also asks you what you wish to know. Realises from your position what problems you're having, so that um... he can do something about that that'll make you happier.

B.Ed.Yr2
A024 - Well, I think a good lecturer has got insight into the type of things that a student wants. Um... and he doesn't know that really unless he, he asks the sort of things that a student wants, which reps should really, I mean we've got three reps and they should... sort of tell them I suppose.

PGCE

A012 - Er it's, it's very different from what I'm used to. They expect a great deal more participation than I found on my initial teaching course. Um... and this seems to be...er... the sort of emphasis, the interplay between what people are talking about. They don't set themselves up as knowing everything. They see us as... as knowing something about the subject. Perhaps in some cases, more than they do. And therefore they, they tend to rely on us for the sort of the practical side and we rely on them for the sort of theoretical side. So I think it's very much on a, a, a, much more personal level than what I'd experienced before. But I, I must admit I did find it very off-putting at first because I'm not a... I find it difficult to speak in group situations, particularly when you've got some very articulate people.

B.Ed.I-S

A027 ... and can lead the discussion and can also be aware of various points that the members of the group are expressing and be able to draw... them in, because it's so easy to get... completely away from the subject you're discussing...

Dip.Ed.

c) Content Focus

The description for this focus is the same as for the Content focused teacher focus (see section 4.1.2c).

Examples from transcripts:

A008 - (a good lecturer) Um... one who really likes his subject.

B.Ed.Yr2

A019 - Er... they have their places because they... they have got information to impart, knowledge to impart.

PGCE

A024 - Well I'd like... I think the lecturer ought to... er... know what he's about. It ought... for me it ought to be relevant to school and... they ought to have sound criteria for judging any work they're going to assess, which I think is lacking in many cases.

B.Ed.I-S
401 A034 - Um ... I see them on the theoretical, I see us on the theoretical side as a group, as very barren ... with a, although not in so much in the case of the heads, so we've really come here to find out partly, to keep abreast with all the changes that are happening, in other words, a lot of the stuff that, ... er, say the Cockcroft Report, the Bullock was mentioned this morning. I've never even heard of ... let alone read, you know, I've just never heard the names before. So a lot of it's to come out of teaching and get abreast with some of the theoretical side which is, of course, what they're totally abreast with, ... (sigh) and ... perhaps to go back to how I answered before ... to see here, to, well they'll obviously be guiding us in how we re-think things, it's really out ... um, what would be the thing. It would be like a ... a wall you keep bashing your head against, but takes some bricks out at the same time, do you understand? Sorry, it's not a very good way of putting it, but um er, I'm not obviously they're totally divorced from it, in the same as we're totally divorced from the ... theoretical side ... but as we, you know, it's the kind of the mixing, and I get some ideas and er I see that perhaps as the main way. It's not a very good description, but still......

Dip.Ed.

d) Relationship Focus

The description for this focus is the same as for the Relationship focused teacher focus (see section 4.1.2d).

Examples from transcripts:

107 A072 - On the other hand ... how they are as a person and how they react to you is very important as well, because it's ... like at school you had no choice. If you didn't get on with a teacher ... that was tough. You had to keep going, just purely for the subject ... but it's a very difficult thing to do. If you don't like somebody or you have clashed ... um it sets a certain imbalance and you don't learn as well. So I think part of their ... of their job also incorporates good relationships with the students. I think it's important to have that. Of course it works both ways, especially on their side, for us as well.

B.Ed.Yr.2

213 A020 - Um ... I think a good one (Lecturer) is someone ... who cares about the students and who is prepared to ... spend time with them and ... um ... Here they seem to want to help and spend a lot of time on the course.

PGCE
A009 - Very much in a supportive role. Um, I've found them to be very helpful. Um. Totally different from what it was when I was a student, where they were my Gods, you know. and what they said was gospel.

B.Ed.I-S

A024 - Well I mean, it's very, it's very different here because when, obviously when we were at college or university or wherever people trained, um, you were there all the time .. and, your tutors became interested in you as people, as you became interested in them as people, and, because we're not here all the time of course, we don't have that sort of er, relationship, which is a shame, um, .. you know, I, I would love to talk to, to all three of our lecturers and ask them you know, how they got into teaching, how long they've done this, how long they've done that, and, the variety of their experience, I'd like the time to do that um, and listen to them on that, you know, but there isn't time for that sort of thing.

Dip.Ed.

e) Training Focus

Statements included in this focus relate specifically to the teacher trainer's role as teaching student teachers how to teach.

Examples from transcripts:

101 A002 - And the professional lecturer who is really I suppose trying to teach you how to teach others.

B.Ed.Yr2

206 A014 - But I think perhaps .. their, their most vital, vital part would be, um, to me I, I see is when I'm on teaching practice .. being able to give me very direct ... guidance there and then.

PGCE

303 A024 - It ought, for me it ought to be relevant to school.

B.Ed.I-S

401 A038 - The other thing is to give me the other side of teaching, you know, the methods etc.

Dip.Ed.
f) Model Focus

Statements included in this focus suggest that the teacher educator should be showing how to teach by acting as an exemplar. Their behaviour should reflect what they are suggesting in theory as good practice. Comments include those praising teacher educators who model this or decrying those who do not. In some way the "teacher educator as model" could be seen as part of the "training" focus but it seemed sufficiently distinct and of interest to keep separate.

Examples from transcripts:

110 A014 - I think the lecturers are... they're giving us a good idea of how... the way they talk to us, in the maths, in the language sessions, gives us a good idea of how we should talk to the children. They use us... they talk to us as if we're the children, really. Some people, some of the students don't like it, but I think we can pick up easily... we're gaining more through that, a lot through that.

B.Ed.Yr2

201 A024 - I find the ones that lecture about the best way to teach children and don't do it the way they're suggesting the way you should be doing it, is very frustrating. I mean the times here we've been sat down here for an hour and a half just listening to somebody speaking and they've been speaking about the best way to, you know, have child centred learning and fair enough children are sort of different tolerance levels to us, and so it should be more child centred. But we sort we also have, sort of attention span limits. I mean there are a few that lecture like that and then will receive feedback. But at the end of an hour and a half we just don't want to give any feedback, you are so tired of listening anyway.

PGCE

303 A022 - Well I see them as er... rather didactic, which seems to be a contradiction to the, the ideas that they are trying to put over which irritates me quite a lot at times. Um... I find them rather vague about what they're doing... where... they're really expecting us to be quite precise about the way we're tackling things.

B.Ed.I-S

404 A038 - Um... from what they said in the, at the very beginning is that they were basing the course on seminar sessions rather than lectures... from that, I would have seen their role as... us doing the reading and then discussing what we'd read and then somehow pulling it together and... I suppose guiding it along what they felt to be appropriate
channels. I suppose in a way they're talking about child centred education and from very early I thought what they should be trying to do and maybe they are trying to do, is practice... (door open/close) (LOK) to see... if the, if they're talking about child centred education to... approach the thing in a way that, would be practising what they're preaching, in a way... sort of pulling the thing together, guiding it in the way that we were taking it, but at the same time pulling it to the way that they felt it should be going... for our best interests... so the way it does go (sigh) I think... some sessions are very much like that... some sessions are, I think they don't guide it enough, perhaps we're left too much to our own devices... but I would see them sort of drawing on their own experience... to help us to see... the relevance of what we've read... and, sort of, our own... joint experiences somehow, I don't know if that's very clear, but...

Dip.Ed.

4.3.2 Summarising the Data

In the same way as for the 'teacher' data frequency tables were constructed to record the types of statement made for each course following the same criteria as for the 'teacher' foci given previously in 4.1.2 (See Appendices D7, 8 and 9).

Two frequency summary tables were prepared to show the percentage of students on each course who made statements within a given focus. Figure 4(xii) shows the percentage in each focus for each course, and Figure 4(xiv) shows the percentage in each focus for each course type.

From the frequency summary tables two rank order tables were prepared to give some perspective as to the order in which these foci lie in relation to one another. Figure 4(xv) shows the differences by course, and Figure 4(xvi) shows the differences by course type.
### FREQUENCY SUMMARY TABLE

By course - teacher educators role

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Type</th>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Learner</th>
<th>Content</th>
<th>Relationship</th>
<th>Training</th>
<th>Model</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B.Ed.yr.2</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T=18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGCE</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T=16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.Ed.</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T=10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dip.Ed.</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T=7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GT=51</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Type</th>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Learner</th>
<th>Content</th>
<th>Relationship</th>
<th>Training</th>
<th>Model</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-S</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T=34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-S</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T=17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### RANK ORDER SUMMARY TABLE  
By course - teacher educators role

![Table](image)

### RANK ORDER SUMMARY TABLE  
By course type - teacher educators role

![Table](image)
4.3.3 General Observations

The majority of B.Ed.Yr.2 students used teacher focused and relationship focused statements. Almost as many made learner focused comments. Approximately one third were concerned with issues concerning content and training, and few viewed the teacher educator as exemplar.

Most PGCE students were concerned with ‘teacher’, ‘learner’ and ‘trainer’ issues, in that order. Half mentioned ‘relationships’. Just over one third were concerned with ‘content’, while slightly less saw the teacher educator as ‘model’. All but one of the B.Ed.I-S students were concerned with ‘learner focused’. Over half made teacher focused statements. Less than half were concerned with ‘content’, ‘relationships’ and the teacher educator as ‘model’. Only one saw his teacher educators in a ‘training’ role.

All Dip.Ed. I-S students commented on ‘teacher focused’ issues. Slightly more than half were concerned with ‘content’, while slightly less than half appeared to be ‘learner’ focused. The remaining focus of ‘relationship’, ‘trainer’ and ‘model’ focuses concerned few Dip.Ed. students.

4.4 Comparison of the Teacher and the Teacher Educator’s Roles.

The question addressed was:

- Are there differences between student teachers’ perceptions of the role of the teacher and that of the teacher educator?

The students’ views of the teacher and teaching have been summarised in section 4.12 from interview A, and their views of the teacher educator are summarised in the previous section, 4.3.2.
Four foci emerged from the data that were common to both the teacher and the teacher educator as teacher. One teacher focus and two teacher educator foci did not have equivalents. This section will make comparisons of the findings in two parts, firstly commonality of foci for teachers and teacher educators, and secondly un-shared foci for teachers and teacher educators.

### 4.4.1 Commonality of Foci

The four foci that emerged from both the teacher and teacher educator data were:

a) teacher focus,  
b) learner focus,  
c) content focus,  
d) relationship focus.

Focus descriptions have been given in the previous sections 4.1.2 and 4.3.1. Two frequency summary tables 4(i) and 4(xii) are combined in Figure 4(xvi) to show the comparison of the teacher's and teacher educator's role over the four foci by course. Frequency summary tables 4(ii) and 4(xiv) are similarly combined in Figure 4(xviii) to show the comparison by course type.

A further two rank order tables were prepared. Rank order tables 4(iii) and 4(xv) were combined in Figure 4(xx) to show the comparison of the teacher's and teacher educator's role over the four foci by course. Rank order tables 4(iv) and 4(xvi) were similarly combined in Figure 4(xx) for course type.

Observations are made here under the focus heading:

a) Teacher Focus

On all but one course the majority of students saw the role of both the teacher and teacher educator as having a 'teacher' focus. The B.Ed.I-S group was the exception where their focus was ranked third for the teacher and second for the teacher educator.
### FREQUENCY SUMMARY TABLE
By course - Comparing Teachers (T) and Teacher Educators (TE) roles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Learner</th>
<th>Content</th>
<th>Relationship</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B.Ed. Yr. 2</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T=18</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGCE</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T=16</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.Ed. 1-S</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T=10</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dip.Ed.</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T=7</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GT=51</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>63</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### FREQUENCY SUMMARY TABLE
By course type - comparing Teachers (T) and Teacher Educators (TE) roles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Type</th>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Learner</th>
<th>Content</th>
<th>Relationship</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-S</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T=34</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-S</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T=17</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RANK ORDER SUMMARY TABLE
By course - comparison of teachers (T) and teacher educators (IE) role

### Focus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Type</th>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Learner</th>
<th>Content</th>
<th>Relationship</th>
<th>Control</th>
<th>Training</th>
<th>Model</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T</td>
<td>IE</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.Ed. yr.2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1-3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2-1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGCE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2-4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.Ed. I-S</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2-1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1-4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dip. Ed.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1-3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4-4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

RANK ORDER SUMMARY TABLE
By course type - comparison of teacher (T) and teacher educators (TE) role

### Focus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Type</th>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Learner</th>
<th>Content</th>
<th>Relationship</th>
<th>Control</th>
<th>Training</th>
<th>Model</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T</td>
<td>IE</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-S</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1-3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2-2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-S</td>
<td>1-1</td>
<td>2-4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4-5</td>
<td>5-6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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b) Learner Focus
The majority of the B.Ed.I-S group used learner focus statements when describing both the teacher's and teacher trainer's role. (The learner focused statements were ranked first equal with relationship focus statements on the teacher's role only, thus suggesting a learner centred approach). A high proportion of PGCE students commented on learner focused statements for both the teacher's and teacher educator's role. This was ranked second in both cases. Learner focused foci for both teachers and teacher educators were ranked in third place by both the B.Ed.Yr.2 and Dip.Ed.

c) Content Focus
More Dip.Ed. students referred to content in relation to both the teacher's and teacher educator's role than any of the other courses. Both were ranked second although more students had commented on content in relation to the teacher's role. An equal number of students commented on content in both the teacher's and teacher educator's roles in two of the other groups, in descending order of percentage, were the B.Ed.I-S and PGCE groups. However, despite the percentages being equal, the rank orders are different for teachers and teacher educators. Teachers are ranked higher than teacher educators in content on the PGCE course but the reverse is true on the B.Ed.I-S. A third of the B.Ed.Yr.2 group saw content as the teacher's concern and slightly more saw it as being the concern of the teacher educator.

d) Relationship Focus
Most B.Ed.Yr.2 students saw the 'relationship' focus as important to the teacher educator's role (ranked joint first with teacher focused). Slightly fewer saw this as important in the teacher's role and thus it was ranked second. Most B.Ed.I-S students commented on relationships in the teacher's role (ranking joint first with learner focus) while few mentioned relationships in the role of the teacher educator. More PGCE students mentioned relationships when discussing the teacher's role (ranked joint second with learner focused) than the teacher educator's role (ranked fourth). Over half the Dip.Ed. students mentioned
relationships when discussing the teacher's role but only one mentioned this area in relation to teacher educators. The pre-service group as a whole showed the most consistency in the match of ranking of teachers and teacher trainers over each focus. The only match of the in-service group was in the teacher focused focus ranked first.

4.4.2 Unshared Foci

One focus emerged from the teacher's role descriptions that was not found in that of the teacher educators. This was described as "control focused", described in section 4.1.1e. Some student teachers were concerned with issues of control in the classroom, with fewer in-service students than pre-service students focusing on this area. None of the students saw control as an issue for the teacher educator.

Two foci emerged from the teacher educators' data but not from the teacher's role descriptions. These were 'training' and 'model' foci described in sections 4.3.1e and 4.3.1f.

The teacher educator as trainer (specifically teaching students how to teach) and as model (exemplar) are foci that might be expected to emerge from an exploration of the teacher educator's role but not of the teacher's role. The two foci are closely linked relating to vocational training but were sufficiently discrete to remain separate. More pre-service than in-service students were concerned with training but the converse was true of modelling.

4.4.3 General Observations

The most striking observation when comparing the students' perceptions of the teacher's and teacher educator's role is that in all but one course the majority of students see both as 'teacher focused'. The exception was the B.Ed.I-S course where both teacher and teacher educator's roles were seen as 'learner focused' by the majority of students (with learner focused and relationship focused ranking first equal for the teacher's role).
As a group the PGCE students tended to see the roles of the teacher and teacher educator as most alike. Fewer B.Ed.Yr.2 students saw the teacher's role as learner and relationship focused than as teacher educator's role.

The B.Ed.I-S group only differed significantly concerning the relationship focus where most saw this as an area of concern for the teacher but not the teacher educator. The Dip.Ed. group differed on two foci. Significantly more saw the role of the teacher as being learner and relationship focused than the role of the teacher educator.

The pre-service students tended to view the teacher's and teacher educator's role as being generally similar. The in-service students tended to see the similarity only on teacher and content foci while learner and relationship foci are more the concern of teachers than teacher educators.

The next chapter focuses on the learner and learning.
Chapter 5

The Learner and Learning
CHAPTER 5

The Learner and Learning

"It appears logical to study the learning process of the student before we determine how we shall teach him".

[ Pittenger & Gooding, 1971, p.7]

5.0 The Learner and Learning

This chapter looks at learners and learning where the following questions are addressed:

- How does the student teacher perceive the role of the learner?
- Are there differences between their views of themselves as learners and that of their pupils as learners?

The chapter is divided into three parts. The first looks at the student as learner; the second focuses on the pupil; and the third compares the student's views of the student's and pupil's roles.

5.1 The Student

This section is divided into three parts. The first describes student foci that emerged from the transcripts; the second summarises the data; and the third makes general observations.

5.1.1 Student Foci

Seven main foci emerged from student teachers' views of themselves as learners. The foci are named as follows:
a) teacher focus,
b) learner focus,
c) content focus,
d) personal focus,
e) social focus,
f) goal focus,
g) training focus.

Students may have alluded to any number or combination of foci and therefore a student cannot be said to be a "teacher focused" learner unless s/he makes no other statements from other foci. Focus descriptions follow:

a) Teacher Focus
This focus consists of statements suggesting that the teacher educator plays the dominant part in the teacher-learner relationship. The learner's role is seen as passive rather than active. The responses may have been given in relation to what the teacher is doing rather than what the learner is doing. Statements concerning classroom atmosphere or environment are included in this section where it may be seen that this is provided or created by the teacher.

Examples from transcripts:

103 A040 - I think it's quite ridiculous the work that is, is expected of us. Um .. but again I don't know how they'd get away from it, because we do need to be assessed for three modules, plus we need to do our teacher practice. But it .. it's um .. well it's too much.

B.Ed.Yr:2

209 A028 - Well .. well, I don't think I'm a very good student, because (laughs) I need pushing. I'm the sort of person who needs a bit of encouragement and also feedback from work, pretty quickly after I've handed it in, otherwise if I do the next piece of work before handing it in it sort of starts going downhill until I get a mark saying, you know, "Not particularly good, not very good" on top of it.

PGCE
407  A036 - (Pause) I'd never have this chance again, I didn't appreciate it when I was eighteen, so I see my role really, in a way is, it to just make every conceivable ... take everything I can from it.

Dip.Ed.

b) Learner Focus

This category consists of statements that the learner is seen to play an active part in their own learning process and in the learning environment.

Examples from transcripts:

110  A038 - (Pause) Er ... turning up to most lectures I suppose. I have been quite good this year (laughs) I think it's a good idea to because you can't just copy of someone else's notes. You don't get as much from it. You just ... er ... try to, just try to think out problems first before you're going to them.

A040 - Well just anything you like. If you want to have help taking a Maths lesson, if you try and think what you'd do first before you go and see the lecturer and just expect him to tell you or discuss it.

B.Ed.Yr2

211  A016 - Um I feel quite different from .. as being a student at University. Because it's much more serious, the work. And I feel much more as though .. um .. you know it's .. it's .. it's real work I suppose. And everything I do I'm doing now, I'm doing it for myself, for my own good. I'm not doing it so I get a nice mark from the tutor which you tended to fall into with my University work, especially as my work at University was continuous assessment, and everyone was very mark conscious. It doesn't seem to be like that here, you know. The more you do, the better it is for your own good but it doesn't really matter to anyone else. You've got more responsibility to yourself I suppose.

PGCE

304  A026 - Yes (laughter) Well I suppose to look at all the research that has been done and to see .. well to learn all about it and see .. um maybe if there are any problems or areas that might have loopholes or flaws in and to .. to really I suppose to think about things rather than just taking people's facts and opinions for granted. Work things out for myself and question my own teaching and thoughts as to why I'm doing it and is it the best way. Things like that.

B.Ed.I-S

404  A046 - Oh. (laughs) ... I think .. I think I've got experiences that I can bring to the group that .. are different to everybody else's, I think everybody has that .. your own .. experiences and the .. values that you put on them, make everyone's impression different and each person's impression is valid .. to help everybody else to .. clarify their own
position ... I see myself as a member of a group with something to
contribute ... to the group and also some, a lot, a lot to learn from other
people's points of view, be they, they the tutors but, or other students ...
and I think I'm here to ... um .. to learn for myself and to, clarify for
myself but also .. by .. bringing what I know to it, to help other people ...
to clarify their own positions, their own ideas, whatever ...

Dip.Ed.

c) Content Focus

All statements relating to the acquisition or transmission of content e.g. subjects,
knowledge, skills etc are included under this heading.

Examples from transcripts:

102 A022 - (Laughter) Um ... uh. Well obviously you're here to gain the
maximum knowledge and ... take advantage of the sort of the three
years that you're here to sort of .. to build up, you know, knowledge and
things. Especially the .. the teaching and B.Ed. degree. But sort of pack a
lot of information in, because a lot of the teachers say, "oh, you won't
get a chance once you're actually working to do, sort of research and
things into different subjects." (Pause).

B.Ed.Yr.2

207 A039 - ...and to discover things that I hadn't thought about before,
because I thought I knew quite a lot about children before, as I guess a
lot of people do. But you learn a lot more when you .. through
controlled interaction with the children. Um .. you know things like
doing those score sheets, observation sheets, things like that. So to
learn things that I .. I haven't learnt and to unlearn some of the things
I'd thought I'd learnt correctly. Um .. OK?

PGCE

302 A074 - Well I, I, think it goes against, in a way, my, the way I see
education. I don't see education as just knowledge, but um .. in a way I
think that's, that's what I'm looking for here, you know, because er ..
for a number of reasons. One, to um .. improve my practice as a teacher
and to hopefully give me a deeper insight into you know what you're
teaching and why you're teaching. When you're in something like a
primary school, and I imagine a secondary school is similar, there's so
many things going on. You're so involved with the nuts and bolts of it,
that um .. you seldom have time to sit back and really reflect on what
you're doing. And it's those two things I think, the sort of knowledge
that will um help the practice and the time to reflect on what you're
doing and to really analyse much more deeply um... I think that's it really.

B.Ed.I-S

406 A028 - and I think I want to look at the theory, I mean I, I've been carrying out all these tasks and I think making a reasonable job of it, but I want to look at the... theory, which lies behind um, what I've been doing all these years, because I, really when you're in the job, you haven't got the time to look at it although I've always been interested, and very aware there's a lot more to it, and I've questioned lots of things but I haven't had time to follow it through, the things that perhaps you've been, thoughts you've been incubating (laughing for a, a long period of time and, and really taking them out and looking at them.

Dip.Ed.

d) Personal Focus

This focus contains all statements referring to personal development or growth. It includes references to personality and/or character but not those concerning social intercourse or relationships which are encompassed within the social development focused focus. Academic development would not be included here but under the heading 'Content focus'.

Examples from transcripts:

107 A022 - I suppose there are other reasons for... being at college. I think it's a good experience for people to have. Although, I add quickly, I do think it's a good idea for people to... have work experience before they go into college.

So in one way I feel lucky to be here, um (coughs) and I know that really it's up to me to make the most of it. It's an opportunity that not everyone gets especially now. It's getting more and more difficult. Therefore I have a duty to myself and other people to... to try and benefit from it.

B.Ed.Yr.2

201 A034 - Um... it's very much a personal learning experience I think. And, and sort of because the way the course is orientated, sort of, learning a lot about myself as well and what I'm capable of and I'm not capable of.

PGCE
Very much as I was saying before, to increase me as a person, and to find out a bit more about me, um a bit more about my drive. Um ... in all levels, you know, just from chatting to people over coffee, um, extends me, you know, finding out about other people and how they think of teaching, and not just teaching all sorts of aspects of life.

B.Ed.I-S

e) Social Focus

All statements where students are seen to have a social aspect to their role. Relationships can be between the learner and any other person or group of people e.g. teacher, peers etc.

Examples from transcripts:

113  A044 - Oh, and to have fun (laughs).

A046 - No, the social side of it is quite good, I think in most places like polys and universities and you don't just come there to learn, I mean you're there for the good social time ... get away from home (laughs) and things like that.

B.Ed.Yr.2

202  A027 - Yeah, yeah. You get extra things thrown in of course. I mean the fact that you are involved in a student environment and in a student world is obviously going to affect your attitudes.

PGCE

f) Goal Focus

This focus includes statements that emphasise extrinsic motivators in the form of goals or incentives in education.

Examples from transcripts:

105  A057 - I suppose the main thing that most people want is a degree at the end of it.

B.Ed.Yr.2

305  A074 - I'm here purely to ... with the end in sight of getting a B.Ed. and as a student ... my role is to attend the lectures and to learn all I can with the end in view of getting a B.Ed.

B.Ed.I-S
g) Training Focus
This focus encompasses all statements referring to a vocation or training for a specific job or career.

Examples from transcripts:

107  A022 - I'm here to learn to do a job that I, I would like to do basically. Um .. that's the first reason for doing it.
      B.Ed.Yr2

305  A025 - Well I suppose basically we are training teachers rather than students in a way. That's, that's what I'm saying. It's different because we're training for a profession. We're actually training to do something eventually. So you know, probably better to say training teachers than students perhaps.
      B.Ed.I-S

5.1.2 Summarising the Data

Frequency tables were constructed to record the types of statement made for each course following the same criteria as for the 'teacher' focl given previously in 4.1.2. (See Appendices E1,2 and 3).

Two frequency summary tables were prepared to show the percentage of students on each course who made statements within a given focus. Figure 5(i) shows the percentage in each focus for each course and Figure 5(ii) shows the percentage in each focus for each course type.

From the frequency summary tables two rank order tables were prepared to give some perspective as to the order in which these focl lie in relation to one another. This is based on the number of students who made such comments, not the number of statements made. Figure 5(iii) shows the differences by course, and Figure 5(iv) shows the differences by course type.
### FREQUENCY SUMMARY TABLE

#### By course - the student as learner

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Type</th>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Learner</th>
<th>Content</th>
<th>Personal</th>
<th>Social</th>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Training</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B.Ed. yr.2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGCE</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.Ed. I-S</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dip.Ed.</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GT=51</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### FREQUENCY SUMMARY TABLE

#### By course type - the student as learner

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Type</th>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Learner</th>
<th>Content</th>
<th>Personal</th>
<th>Social</th>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Training</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-S</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-S</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### RANK ORDER SUMMARY TABLE

#### By course - the student as learner

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Learner</th>
<th>Content</th>
<th>Personal</th>
<th>Social</th>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Training</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B.Ed. yr.2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGCE</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.Ed. I-S</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dip.Ed.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### RANK ORDER SUMMARY TABLE

#### By course type - the student as learner

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Type</th>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Learner</th>
<th>Content</th>
<th>Personal</th>
<th>Social</th>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Training</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-S</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-S</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.1.3 General Observations

Two-thirds of B.Ed.Yr.2 students saw themselves as students training for a career in teaching. Almost as many saw the social aspects of being a student as important. Less than one-third of this group saw themselves as learner focused or concerned with content. Few commented on the teacher focused aspects or on personal development or goals.

Three quarters of the PGCE students saw their role as a student as specifically training to be a teacher. Only one-quarter spoke of a teacher focus, less were concerned with content, their social development or their autonomy as learners. Only one was concerned with personal development, and none spoke of goals.

The B.Ed.I-S group used statements from only four foci. The majority made comments interpreted as learner focused, suggesting that the group may be seen as 'learner centred'. Only one-third of this group were concerned with content. Personal development and goals were each mentioned once. No-one from this group mentioned social development, vocational aspects or saw themselves as teacher focused students.

The Dip.Ed. group also only used statements from four foci. As for the B.Ed.I-S group the majority saw themselves as learner focused. Unlike the B.Ed.I-S, half were also teacher focused. Just over one-quarter were concerned with content and one mentioned goals. No-one from this group seemed concerned with personal, social or training issues.

Pre-service students see their role as student primarily being concerned with training for a career and then the social aspects. Most in-service students emphasise the autonomy of the student as learner.
5.2 The Pupil

This section looks at the pupil as learner and is divided into three parts. The first describes the pupil foci that emerged from the transcripts; the second summarises the data, and the third makes general observations.

5.2.1 Pupil Foci

Six main foci emerged from the interviews from the students' views of the pupil's role. The foci are named as follows:

a) teacher focus,

b) learner focus,

c) content focus,

d) personal focus,

e) social focus,

f) goal focus.

All the foci that emerged were directly related to the foci describing the student's role. The seventh focus from the student's role, training focused, did not emerge from the pupil data. Focus descriptions follow:

a) Teacher Focus

The description for this focus is as for the teacher focused student focus. (see 5.1.1a).

Examples from transcripts:

107 A048 - Um ... the ones I suppose you want to see are enthusiastic to learn what you're trying to teach them. And that seem fairly receptive. After all that's the easiest way to get home something if the child is interested. If they're not interested then they won't listen anyway.

B.Ed.Yr2
A054 - I don't know how much you expect from the child or how much you expect yourself to induce in the child, I mean obviously I'd like him to be willing to learn and, and willing to co-operate. Um... and willing to, to have a go at things he doesn't like. I mean, I don't like science and maths, but if I'm willing to teach it, I expect him to be willing to learn it, or try.

PGCE

A062 - Well (sighs) a bit of a mixed one really because I think... he's got no option about being there, you know, he he's not a consumer by choice very often. so... although you're asking me about the role of the pupil, I think in a sense it's my job, or our job within the school to make him want to be there, but I don't think he personally has to feel that way to start with or even (laughs), you know, I mean it's not his fault if he doesn't feel that way, it's ours... um, but I do think the role of the pupil when he is there (laughs) is to take advantage of what's offered, um, and to work (laughs) and to get on with it, and to er... to really use the options.

Dip.Ed.

b) Learner Focus

The description of this focus is the same as for the learner focused student focus (see 5.1.1.b).

Examples from transcripts:

104 A072 - I think there needs to be a certain amount of co-operation from the pupils before anything can be done. I think it's no good trying to teach a child who does everything opposite to how you want him to do it. Um (pause) I think the lesson should be both the teacher and the child together. The teacher and the children. It shouldn't be the teacher teaching the children, and the children just taking it in. They've both got to be part of the lesson. So it's more a joint education really (laughs) (coughs). They teach you things in the classroom.

B.Ed.Yr.2

210 A044 - Um... I think that they, they have a part... they have to be, regard themselves as active learners. I mean I think children... too often they, they, they because of, of past teaching, they regard themselves as, as sort of the other side of the information. You've got the information giver, which, who is the teacher and they regard themselves as the receivers. And I think children have got to realise that they, they have more exciting roles to play than just being the receiver. Um... and working in unison with, with, with the teacher. And using using the teacher, if
you like as a resource. I think they should maybe realise that, that they can actually use the teacher um.. not just for, for, you know not just for getting information, but also for throwing ideas at and getting make, getting suggestions from the teacher.

PGCE

A054 - I think they have a right to enjoy school life ..and I think um .. no matter what sort of child they are um .. they've got a right to say what they think and they have a right to expect their thoughts to be given the same importance as other children, other people, other adults.

B.Ed.I-S

A127 - Well I don't see it as a passive role at all. I think the child should be involved in their learning .. um be responsible to a certain extent of what they gain .. or be aware that they have got the choice (laughs) um.

A129 .. Limited choice though it may be because it depends very much on what the teacher wants .. them to do, to know, but to be given the thought that they have, had got some choice (laughs)...

A131 ..And that they are in a way a little bit responsible for what they do and how they do it.

A133 .. 'cos I think that's the important, 'cos that's how you, you do become a learner, by doing, you don't er .. don't just sort of sit back and you're given the information and then you're (laughs) automatically a learner, I feel that.

A135 - You should, you know, participation is, is important.

Dip.Ed.

c) Content Focus

This focus description follows that of the content focused student foci (see 5.1.1c).

Examples from transcripts.

A072 - And then of course we come back down to the academic side of it (laughs) which I always seem to fall down on, because since I've been here I'm not really sure what education is (laughing) and I find that I'm constantly being um .. I'm constantly .. thinking about my own views and my own .. attitudes towards education, because I think you grow up with a very narrow .. er .. attitude which .. if you, if you don't talk to
anybody else outside the same educative background as yourself, if you, if you just stay with people that you’ve, you grew up with, went to school with um.. it’s very easy to not to see beyond what your parents have encouraged you to believe. Um ... so I, that, that’s not answering the question. All I’m saying is that I’m not really sure what education is now (laughing). Um but obviously the child in school is there for an education. Um ... and I think that all the other aspects I’ve talked about come into that, but on top of that there is the academic part which is important because of the world as it stands today. But whether the material is right is, is in a completely different field if you see what I mean.

B.Ed.Yr.2

202 A066 (Pause) Oh that’s another difficult one (laughs). Well they are there to learn basically, and when you’re talking about young children they are there to learn to read and write basically. But there’s a lot more to it than that really.

PGCE

308 A070 - Well they’re obviously ... (sighs) I mean theory would have it that they are there so that when they leave school they’ve got a good set of basic skills to explore the world around them.

B.Ed.I-S

401 A110 - I see the pupil as at school ... well it does come down to what education is isn’t it, er, to learn, to prepare himself for the next stage, very much.

A118 .. So in other words if I give the child a, I mean I think it’s very much the importance, a primary school doesn’t insist that the child can read or, give that child a reading skill, skills, has failed with that child and the secondary school of course can’t do much with that child until he’s got that.

Dip.Ed.

d) Personally Focus
This focus description is as for the personal focused student focus (see 5.1.1.d).

Examples from transcripts:

105 A102 - But I think they should learn to enjoy things too, you know, music especially, and dance, but music and drama and things like that I think are really important for personal development (coughs).

B.Ed.Yr.2
to be educated in every sense of the word. I mean not just academically, I mean socially and physically, mentally, spiritually everything. To educate them. But I mean as I say, in all, in all areas, especially I mean socially is as important as academically. Extremely. To make them feel that as an individual they matter, they count. Umm .. to make them secure in themselves. But at the same time to make them realise that they live in a society where a certain amount of rules and discipline and conformity is required. And that doesn't necessarily impinge on their individuality at all. If they're secure in their individuality. Umm .. and to develop any particular umm .. academic or non-academic interest that they have. If they have anything specially talented. I mean try and get them interested in a in a wide range of things as much as possible. So that they'll benefit in the future and they'll be able to, you know, organise their own leisure time as much as .. and they'll want to do it themselves without having to be told "Go and read that book".

Um (laughs) Obviously you're acquiring knowledge .. but knowledge about yourself, about .. I mean I can, can sort of relate this to myself .. I mean I'm trying to put myself in the child's position again. But it's just this acquisition of knowledge about yourself, about your environment and everything you do. (Pause).

Um ... to enjoy school, and I suppose it's a bit overworked, but fulfil himself .. to a certain extent, you know, as much as possible .. in every form .. and .. very much included in the social aspects of school

The description for this focus is the same as that for the social focused student focus (see 5.1.1.e).

Examples from transcripts:

Um ... (sighs) .. well school is is the first .. institution that they meet .. and it's the first weaning process, isn't it, away from the home and family. So I feel that it, it does serve the job of um .. getting them used to other people, um .. to the rules and routines both overt and covert which operate in society as a whole (Pause). I think it's there to widen and to broaden their horizons because I feel that homelife, valid and important as it is, cannot really provide them with enough stimulative material .. to prepare for life. And then of course all these
sort of things have got qualifiers, because prepare them for life and school is life I mean it's... um... very important for their personal development, their social development, um, learning how to behave towards other people, and I feel that if the teacher can... foster er... a good relationship between the children, and with, with members of staff, so that they can talk to adults which I think is something that, ... I certainly grew up with an inbuilt dread of talking to grown ups, and I think that's terrible, I really do. And I do feel it's changing because children talk to me as they talk to their friends, and I like that. I think that's important, and it makes me feel that they would talk to their headmaster and they'd talk to policemen, um... and I think this is a good thing.

B.Ed.Yr.2

205 A054 - Role of the pupil? I don't know. Um... well I think what he must realise is he's part of the community and adjust his behaviour accordingly. Then he must realise that sometimes it's a good idea to... to. er... to lay aside his own whims, so that things can run smoothly and we have a sort of better atmosphere.

PGCE

310 A088 - As part of a small community, I like to see them like that. I like to see all the people who are involved in the school from Governors, caretakers - you name it - all being part of the same community. (Coughs) And the children, children at the centre of that community. (Pause).

B.Ed.I-S

407 A062 - and... to see his role as part of the whole community, er... in terms of... his, I don't know, his learning that you have to share and you have to... you know, you've got to be quiet to let somebody else work and you don't wreck somebody else's model. I mean, even at that mundane level I think his role is to become... um... a part of the community.

Dip.Ed.

f) Goal Focus

The focus description is the same as that given for the goal focused student focus. (see 5.1.1f).

Examples from transcripts:

308 A070 - Well they're obviously... (sighs) I mean theory would have it that they are there so that when they leave school they've got a good set of basic skills to explore the world around them and they've got some
idea of what they're most interested in, or best at with regard to following it up in some sort of employment (pause) don't know (sighs)...

B.Ed.I-S

401 A110 - Well the pupil obviously sees he, himself at school to learn and he sees a job at the end of it and so I would have thought that's fairly straightforward there. Er I see the pupil as at school. Well it does come down to what education is isn't it, er, to, to learn, to prepare himself for the next stage, very much.

Dip.Ed.

5.2.2 Summarising the Data

As with the 'student' data, frequency tables were constructed to record the types of statement made for each course following the same criteria as for the 'teacher' foci given previously in 5.1.2. (See Appendices E4, 5 and 6).

Two frequency summary tables were prepared to show the percentage of students on each course who made statements within a given focus. Figure 5(v) shows the percentages in each focus for each course and Figure 5(vi) shows the percentage in each focus for each course type.

From the frequency summary tables two rank order tables were prepared to give some perspective as to the order in which these foci lie in relation to one another. Figure 5(vii) shows the differences by course and Figure 5(viii) shows the differences by course type.
## FREQUENCY SUMMARY TABLE
**By course - the pupil as learner**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Learner</th>
<th>Content</th>
<th>Personal</th>
<th>Social</th>
<th>Goal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B.Ed. yr. 2 T=1.8</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGCE T=1.6</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.Ed. I-S T=1.0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dip.Ed. T=7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GT=51</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## FREQUENCY SUMMARY TABLE
**By course type - the pupil as learner**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Learner</th>
<th>Content</th>
<th>Personal</th>
<th>Social</th>
<th>Goal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-S T=34</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-S T=17</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### RANK ORDER SUMMARY TABLE
By course - the pupil as learner

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Learner</th>
<th>Content</th>
<th>Personal</th>
<th>Social</th>
<th>Goal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B.Ed. yr.2.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGCE</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3=</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3=</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.Ed. I-S</td>
<td>5=</td>
<td>2=</td>
<td>2=</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dip.Ed.</td>
<td>5=</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3=</td>
<td>3=</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5=</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### RANK ORDER SUMMARY TABLE
By course type - the pupil as learner

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course type</th>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Learner</th>
<th>Content</th>
<th>Personal</th>
<th>Social</th>
<th>Goal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-S</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-S</td>
<td>5=</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5=</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.2.3 General Observations

Most B.Ed.Yr.2 students seemed to view the social development of the pupil as important. Little more than half were concerned with content while half were learner focused. One-third saw the pupil's role as teacher focused and few commented on personal development. No one in this group spoke of goals in relation to the pupil.

The majority of the PGCE group echoed the views of the B.Ed.Yr.2 group in their emphasis on social development. Similarly, the focus ranked second in order of the number of students who commented was content focused, like the B.Ed. group. One-quarter of the students spoke of personal development and autonomy of the learner. A few saw the pupil as teacher focused. No one in this group spoke of goals in relation to the pupil.

Half of the B.Ed.I-S students were concerned with social development. Slightly fewer made statements that were learner focused and content focused. Approximately one-third spoke of personal development. The combination of learner, personal and social development would suggest a child centred approach. Few B.Ed.I-S students were concerned with teacher focused and goal focused issues.

The majority of the Dip.Ed. students saw the pupil as learner focused, while over half were concerned with social development. This combination would suggest a child centred approach. Just under one-third of this group spoke of personal development and content. Few were concerned with goals or teacher focused issues.

5.3 Comparison of the Student's and Pupil's Roles

The students' views of the student as learner have been summarised in section 5.1, and their views of the pupil as learner have been summarised above in 5.2. Six foci emerged from the data that were common to both the student and pupil. The
seventh focus, 'training focus' emerged from the student data only. This section will present the observations in two parts. The first looks at commonality of foci for students and pupils and the second looks at unshared foci.

5.3.1 Commonality of Foci

The six foci that emerged from both the student and pupil data were:

a) teacher focus,
b) learner focus,
c) content focus,
d) personal focus,
e) social focus,
f) goal focus.

Focus descriptions have been given in previous sections 5.1.1 and 5.2.1. Frequency summary tables Figure 5(i) and 5(v) are combined in Figure 5(ix) to show the comparison of the student's and pupil's role by course. Frequency summary tables 5(ii) and 5(vi) are similarly combined in Figure 5(x) to show the comparison by course type.

A further two rank order tables were prepared. Rank order tables 5(iii) and 5(vii) were combined in Figure 5(xi) to show the comparison of the student's and pupil's role by course. Rank order tables 5(iv) and 5(viii) were similarly combined in Figure 5(xii) for course type. Observations are made here under the focus headings.

a) Teacher Focus
Less than one-quarter of students in total made statements in this focus both in the student's and pupil's role. The main area of interest was the difference between the two in-service courses. Nearly half the Dip.Ed. group made teacher focused statements when discussing the student's role while no such statements were
### FREQUENCY TABLE

By course - Comparison of the Students (S) and Pupils (P) roles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Type</th>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Learner</th>
<th>Content</th>
<th>Personal</th>
<th>Social</th>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Training</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S P</td>
<td>S P</td>
<td>S P</td>
<td>S P</td>
<td>S P</td>
<td>S P</td>
<td>S P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.Ed yr.2. T=18</td>
<td>11 33</td>
<td>33 50</td>
<td>33 56</td>
<td>11 17</td>
<td>61 72</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGCE T=16</td>
<td>25 19</td>
<td>19 25</td>
<td>19 63</td>
<td>6 25</td>
<td>19 76</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.Ed I-S T=10</td>
<td>- 10</td>
<td>90 40</td>
<td>30 40</td>
<td>10 30</td>
<td>- 50</td>
<td>10 10</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dip.Ed T=7</td>
<td>43 14</td>
<td>86 86</td>
<td>29 29</td>
<td>- 29</td>
<td>- 57</td>
<td>14 14</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GT=51</td>
<td>18 22</td>
<td>47 45</td>
<td>2 51</td>
<td>8 24</td>
<td>27 67</td>
<td>14 14</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### FREQUENCY SUMMARY TABLE

By course type - Comparison of Students (S) and Pupils (P) roles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Type</th>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Learner</th>
<th>Content</th>
<th>Personal</th>
<th>Social</th>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Training</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S P</td>
<td>S P</td>
<td>S P</td>
<td>S P</td>
<td>S P</td>
<td>S P</td>
<td>S P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-S T=34</td>
<td>18 26</td>
<td>26 38</td>
<td>26 59</td>
<td>9 21</td>
<td>41 74</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-S T=17</td>
<td>18 12</td>
<td>88 59</td>
<td>29 35</td>
<td>6 29</td>
<td>- 53</td>
<td>12 12</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### RANK ORDER SUMMARY TABLE

**By course - comparison of students (S) and pupils (P) roles**

#### Course

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Type</th>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Learner</th>
<th>Content</th>
<th>Personal</th>
<th>Social</th>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Training</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-S</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-S</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
made by the B.Ed.I-S group. This is the converse of what you might expect, as the B.Ed.I-S group were mostly taught in the traditional didactic style while the Dip.Ed. group were taught by seminar and discussion.

(b) Learner Focus
Most of the two in-service groups commented on the learner focused area with both the pupil and student ranking first. Autonomy of the learner is therefore considered to be part of both the pupil's and student's role by most in-service students. Although both ranked first, considerably fewer B.Ed.I-S students commented on the pupil in this focus than the student. This focus was ranked third for students and pupils by both the pre-service courses.

c) Content Focus
Approximately one-third of both in-service groups made content focused comments for both students and pupils, therefore showing little difference. Significantly more pre-service students made content related statements concerning pupils than made content related statements concerning students. This suggests that more pre-service students are concerned with content within pupil learning. Concerns seem to be with acquiring basic skills such as reading, writing and numeracy.

(d) Personal Focus
Less than one-third of the students overall mentioned personal development as relating to the pupil's role and fewer still considered this area in relation to the student. There was little difference between courses or between course types.

e) Social Focus
The majority of students commented on social aspects of the pupil's role: approximately half the in-service students and three-quarters of the pre-service students. Many B.Ed.Yr.2 students also saw the social aspects as being an important part of the student role. Few PGCE students saw this as part of their role as student. No in-service students saw social aspects as part of their student role.
f) Goal Focus
Few students mentioned goals as part of either the student's or pupil's roles. Approximately one-quarter of B.Ed. students mentioned goals as part of the student's role.

5.3.2 Unshared Foci

One focus described in section 5.1.1g, training focus, emerged from the data relating to the student but not the pupil. The majority (approximately three-quarters) of the pre-service students saw the training aspects as part of their student role and it was the focus most mentioned by this group. In contrast, no in-service students saw this as part of their student role.

This difference could be anticipated as one would expect pre-service students to take an education course with the aim of obtaining employment as a teacher. The in-service teachers were all in secure employment in teaching being seconded for their period of study. It would not be expected that they would see their role as student as having a training component, but may instead contain an element of goal focus e.g. to gain promotion, an increase in pay or qualification status.

The next chapter looks at teachers as learners.
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Teachers as Learners
CHAPTER 6

Teachers as Learners

"Following the medium is the message or you learn what you do theme, it is obvious that teacher education must have prospective teachers do as students, what they as teachers must help their students, in turn, to do."

[Postman and Weingartner 1971, p. 138]

6.0 Teachers as Learners

This chapter looks at teachers as learners both at college and at school where the following questions were addressed:

- How do student teachers view the teacher educator as teacher and themselves as learners at college?

- How do student teachers view themselves as teacher and the pupil as learner at school?

- Is there match or mis-match between students' perspectives and the ethos of the teaching practice schools in which they are placed?

- How does the student teacher account for his/her understanding of teaching and learning?

The chapter looks at teachers as learners, and is divided into five parts: the first looks at the teacher educator and student at college; the second at the college learning milieu; the third at the teacher and pupil in school; the fourth reports on teaching practice visits/observations; and the fifth explores professional "know how".
6.1 The Teacher Educator's and Student's Roles

This section is divided into two parts. The first looks at the commonality of foci between teacher educator and student and the second looks at unshared foci. The students' views of the teacher educator as teacher have been summarised in 4.3.2. Their views of themselves as learners have been summarised in 5.12.

Four foci emerged from the data that were common to both the teacher trainer and student learner. Two teacher trainer and three student learner foci did not have equivalents. This section will make comparisons of the findings in two parts: 6.1.1 shows the commonality of foci for teacher educators and student learners in college; and 6.1.2 shows the unshared foci.

6.1.1 Commonality of Foci

The four foci that emerged shared by both the teacher educator and student learner data were:

a) teacher focus,
b) learner focus,
c) content focus,
d) training focus.

Focus descriptions have been given in previous sections (see 4.3.1 and 5.1.1). Two frequency summary tables were prepared to show the percentage of students on each course who made statements within a given focus. Figure 6(i) shows the percentage in each focus for each course, and Figure 6(ii) shows the percentage in each focus for each course type.

From the frequency summary tables two rank order tables were prepared to give some perspective as to the order in which these foci lie in relation to one another. Figure 6(iii) shows the differences by course, and Figure 6(iv) shows the differences by course type.
### FREQUENCY SUMMARY TABLE

**By course - comparison of Teacher Educators (TE) and Students (S) role**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Type</th>
<th>Teacher (T)</th>
<th>Learner (L)</th>
<th>Content (C)</th>
<th>Training (E)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>B.Ed. yr. 2</strong></td>
<td>78</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PGCE</strong></td>
<td>69</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B.Ed. I-S</strong></td>
<td>60</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dip.Ed.</strong></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GT</strong></td>
<td>75</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### FREQUENCY SUMMARY TABLE

**By course type - comparison of teacher educators (TE) and student learners (S) roles at college**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Type</th>
<th>Teacher (T)</th>
<th>Learner (L)</th>
<th>Content (C)</th>
<th>Training (E)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-S</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-S</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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## RANK ORDER TABLE

**Fig. 6(iii)**
By course - comparing teacher educators (TE) and students (S) roles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Learner</th>
<th>Content</th>
<th>Training</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TE S</td>
<td>TE S</td>
<td>TE S</td>
<td>TE S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.Ed. yr.2</td>
<td>1 4</td>
<td>2 2-</td>
<td>3 2-</td>
<td>4 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGCE</td>
<td>1 2</td>
<td>2 3-</td>
<td>4 3-</td>
<td>3 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.Ed. I-S</td>
<td>2 -</td>
<td>1 1</td>
<td>3 2</td>
<td>4 -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dip.Ed.</td>
<td>1 2</td>
<td>3 1</td>
<td>2 3</td>
<td>4 -</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## RANK ORDER TABLE

**Fig. 6(iv)**
By course type - comparing teacher educators (TE) and students (S) roles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course type</th>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Learner</th>
<th>Content</th>
<th>Training</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TE S</td>
<td>TE S</td>
<td>TE S</td>
<td>TE S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-S</td>
<td>1 4</td>
<td>2 2-</td>
<td>4 2-</td>
<td>3 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-S</td>
<td>1 3</td>
<td>2 1</td>
<td>3 2</td>
<td>4 -</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.1.2 General Observations of Commonality

General observations are made under the headings of the shared foci.

a) Teacher Focus
The majority of student teachers saw the teacher trainer’s role as teacher focused. However, this was not reflected in the student’s role. Few saw their role as a student as teacher focused. The main difference in courses were between the in-service groups where nearly half the Dip.Ed. students saw themselves as teacher focused but no B.Ed.I-S students mentioned this area. As the B.Ed.I-S group were taught in a traditional mould while the tuition on the Dip.Ed. course was less formal, this is a surprising result. We will pick up on this again in the discussion chapter.

b) Learner Focus
A large number of students saw the teacher trainer’s role as having a learner focus except for the Dip.Ed. group where less than half mentioned this. Most of this group, however, saw the student as learner focused, showing a mis-match between learner centred students and teacher educators not so. The B.Ed. group were consistent as the majority of them saw both teacher trainer and student as learner focused. The two pre-service groups showed the opposite mis-match to the Dip.Ed. group where few saw themselves as learner focused but many saw the teacher educator’s role as such.

c) Content Focus
More in-service students (both B.Ed.I-S and Dip.Ed.) saw the teacher educator as having a content focus than did the pre-service groups (B.Ed.Yr.2 and PGCE). In all groups fewer students saw their role as content focused than they did the teacher educator’s role.

d) Training Focus
The majority of pre-service students saw their role as training focused. Almost as
many PGCE students also saw the teacher educator's role as training focused showing match between their views of themselves and their teachers as regards the training focus. Fewer B.Ed.Yr.2 students saw their teacher trainers as training focused thus suggesting mis-match as they saw themselves as students as training focused.

Few in-service students saw the teacher educator's role as training focused and none saw the student's role as such. This may have been anticipated from these groups who were already qualified teachers. Reasons for doing the course were varied, but were not undertaken for training to become teachers.

6.1.3 Unshared Foci

Two teacher trainer and three student learner foci emerged that were not shared.

The two teacher trainer foci that emerged were:

a) relationship focus,
b) model focus.

The three student foci that emerged were:

c) personal focus,
d) goal focus,
e) social focus.

6.1.4 General Observations

General observations are made under the heading of the unshared foci.

a) Relationship Focus

References to relationships between teacher trainers and the students were only mentioned as part of the teacher's role and not the students'. Teachers were seen
to be in control of the relationships, initiating, fostering, encouraging. A parental, pastoral type of relationship was described with concern for the students' wellbeing rather than a relationship of equality, a partnership or peer relationship. It is not surprising then that the majority of B.Ed.Yr.2 students spoke of this aspect of the teacher trainer's role as they were the youngest of the groups, many of whom were recent school leavers and away from home for the first time. Half the PGCE group mentioned relationships, and as this group were only slightly older and living away from home this may also have been expected. Few in-service students were concerned with this area.

b) Model Focus
Modelling was an issue that only came up when students spoke of the teacher trainers in that they should be showing by example "do as I do" not "do as I tell you". Students were critical of teacher trainers who did the latter.

In some ways the "teacher trainer as model" may be seen as part of the training focus but peculiar to the teacher educator not the student, whereas the training focus can be part of the teacher educator's or student's role.

c) Personal Focus
This focus' encompassing areas of personal development or growth, was only given in relation to the student role. It always seems to be the learners who "grow" and "develop", not the teachers. Perhaps the teachers are seen to have already grown and developed to the limit, whatever that is.

d) Goal Focus
Goals in this focus refer to extrinsic motivators which were mentioned by the students when discussing the students' role. These kinds of statements were not made when talking about the teacher educator, suggesting that the teacher educator's role is not seen in terms of extrinsic motivators. Neither was the school teacher's role seen in this light.
e) Social Focus

The social aspects of being a student were only commented on by the pre-service students. Few PGCE students mentioned this, but over half the B.Ed.Yr.2 group did. It seems more of an area of concern for the youngest group who themselves have only recently left school. Social development was not seen as part of the teacher educator’s role.

6.2 The College Learning Milieu

Observations of both the college and school classrooms, and the informal observations greatly contributed to my making sense of the students' perspectives.

The informal observations that took place in and around the departments, canteen and other communal areas provided a useful backdrop to the interviews. General chat about departmental communications, staff-student relationships, friendship groups, anxieties over teaching practice, assignments, assessments, exams, living accommodation and so on all helped to paint a picture of student teacher life for each group. Every group shared different characteristics, as has been indicated in Chapter 3 section 1, and I expand upon this here.

The B.Ed.Yr.2 students remained the least cohesive as a group. Up until the second term of the second year they identified with the departments of their subject choice which were based at the main site where most teaching took place. During this second term, the first five weeks were mostly spent at the annex where the education teaching took place in class situations. The second five weeks were spent out on teaching practice. Students only had a five week period of concentrated educational studies at the annex during which some friendship groups formed between B.Ed. students, and also support groups over the teaching practice period. While at the annex, the education department itself failed to form a focus for students. The department consisted of a corridor, with a departmental office and lecturer/tutors' rooms leading off from either side. There was no informal seating area, no access to coffee or any other comforts that might entice
students to congregate where they could get to know fellow students and meet the staff informally. They generally remained isolated making a few friends within their class but having little exchange with those students in other years.

The PGCE students had a strong identity of being post graduates. The year was divided into three groups in which they attended classes and friendship groups developed mainly out of these smaller groups. They were entirely based on campus, spending four days a week in classes and the fifth day on school visits. The timetable was so structured that they mostly shared lunch and coffee breaks. Like the B.Ed.Yr.2 group, their department offered no facility for an informal meeting place to promote staff and student interaction. Students tended to congregate in the Students Union. PGCE students felt less alienated from the staff because of regular class contact, and remaining at the annex, staff were sought out fairly easily if required.

The B.Ed.I-S students appeared the most cohesive group of the four. There were only eleven members and most classes were compulsory so that lunch and breaks were shared. As staff shared in these breaks and lunch, there was a great deal of discussion during these periods, often continuing from the previous class. During the year the group obtained a common room for professionals visiting the college, but it was almost exclusively used by themselves and the part-time B.Ed.I-S students who attended two evenings a week. The group appeared to value discussion with their peers as an integral part of their course. Only one member remained apart from the group.

The first three groups were part of the same institution, although on split sites, and it was not too difficult to arrange to spend time with each one. However, the fourth course, the Dip.Ed., was at another institution some considerable distance from the first, and as such my visits were less frequent than I would have wished. The Dip.Ed. group had only fourteen members and differed from the other three groups both in the time spent in formal classes and in the structure of those classes. Formal teaching was restricted to only three mornings a week, the rest of
the time was for private study. Classes were mainly seminars and were held in a room with easy chairs arranged in a circle. Coffee breaks were taken with students making their own coffee in a nearby kitchen and often the staff member would join them. Some students would have lunch together. Students did not see much of one another outside the three half days as most preferred to work at home. Students indicated they would prefer more informal contact time both with staff and with students. In class the group seemed to be divided into two segments: one group consisted of a few extremely vocal students that tended to dominate seminars with reference to Junior children, while the majority felt that the course was supposed to focus on primary education and that as such their needs were not being met.

As can be seen from the above description, each course had quite a different learning milieu which must contribute to the individual’s perspectives.

6.3 The Teacher’s and Pupil’s Role

This section is divided into two parts. The first looks at the commonality of foci between teacher’s and pupil’s roles at school and the second looks at unshared foci. The students' views of the teacher and teaching from the first interview has been summarised in 4.1.2 and their views of the pupil summarised in 5.2.2.

Three foci emerged from the data that were common to both the teacher and the pupil as learner. Two teacher foci and three learner foci did not have equivalents. This section will make comparisons of the findings in two parts:
- commonality of foci for teachers and learners in school;
- unshared foci for teachers and learners in school.

6.3.1 Commonality of Foci

The three foci that emerged shared by both the teacher and the pupil as learner data were:
a) teacher focus,
b) learner focus,

c) content focus.

Foci descriptions have been given in the previous sections (see 4.1.2 and 5.2.1).
Two frequency summary tables (Figure 4(i) and Figure 5(v)) are combined in Figure 6(v) to show the comparison of the teacher's and pupil's role by course.
Frequency summary tables Figure 4(ii) and Figure 5(vi) are similarly combined in Figure 6(vi) to show the comparison by course type.

A further two rank order tables were prepared. Rank order tables Figure 4(iii) and Figure 5(vii) were combined in Figure 6(vii) to show the comparison of the teacher's and pupil's role by course. Rank order tables Figure 4(iv) and Figure 5(viii) were similarly combined in Figure 6(viii) for course type.

a) Teacher Focus
The majority of students on all courses saw the teacher's role as having a teacher focus. Only a small number of students saw the learner's role as having a teacher focus. It therefore seems that there is a mismatch between the students' views of the teacher and learner in terms of teacher focus.

b) Learner Focus
The majority of students on the Dip.Ed. course saw both the teacher and learner as learner focused. This shows compatibility in terms of learner focus. Half the students of the B.Ed.Yr.2 course also saw both the teacher and learner as learner focused. This also shows compatibility in terms of learner focus. In the other two groups (PGCE and Dip.Ed.), a high number of students saw the teacher's role as learner focused but only a small number saw the learner as learner focused. This shows mismatch between teacher and learner roles.
### FREQUENCY SUMMARY TABLE

**Fig. 6(v)**

*By course - Comparison of teachers (T) and pupils (P) roles at school*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Learner</th>
<th>Content</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.Ed.yr.2</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGCE</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.Ed. Y-S</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dip.Ed.</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GT-51</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### FREQUENCY SUMMARY TABLE

**Fig. 6(vi)**

*By course type - Comparison of teachers (T) and pupils (P) roles at school*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Type</th>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Learner</th>
<th>Content</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-S</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-S</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### RANK ORDER TABLE
By course - comparison of teachers (T) and pupils (P) role at school

**Course** | **Teacher** | **Learner** | **Content**
--- | --- | --- | ---
| T | P | T | P | T | P |

| B.Ed. yr.2 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 1 |
| PGCE | 1 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 1 |
| B.Ed. I-S | 2 | 3 | 1 | 1= | 3 | 1= |
| Dip.Ed. | 1= | 3 | 2= | 1 | 2= | 2 |

### RANK ORDER TABLE
By course type - comparison of teachers (T) and pupils (P) role at school

**Course** | **Teacher** | **Learner** | **Content**
--- | --- | --- | ---
| T | P | T | P | T | P |

| Pre-S | 1 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 |
| In-S | 1= | 3 | 1= | 1 | 3 | 2 |
c) Content focus
More students from the two in-service groups (B.Ed.I-S and Dip.Ed.) saw the teacher as content focused than saw the learner as concerned with content. The opposite seems true of the pre-service groups in that fewer seem to perceive the teacher's role as concerning content whereas more see learners to be content focused.

6.3.2 Unshared Foci

Two teacher foci and three learner foci emerged that were not shared. The two teacher foci were:

a) control focus,
b) relationship focus.

The three learner foci that emerged were:
c) personal focus,
d) social focus,
e) goal focus.

a) Control Focus
Concern for control and discipline was expressed as part of the teacher's role and not part of the pupil's. This would have been anticipated as would the fact that more pre-service students were concerned with this area than in-service students.

b) Relationship Focus
Statements concerning relationships between teachers and pupils were only made as part of the teacher's role and not the pupil's. Teachers were seen to be the initiators and responsible for pastoral care and the pupils' welfare. More than half the students on each course spoke of the teacher's role being concerned with relationships the greatest percentage of students being in the B.Ed.I-S group.
c) Personal Focus

Personal development was considered to be part of the learner's role and not part of the teacher's role. However not many students spoke of this area and there was little difference between courses or between course types.

d) Social Focus

The majority of students saw social development as an integral part of the pupil's role. The child was seen to be developing his or her self socially in its social interaction with its peers and teacher.

e) Goal Focus

Only a few in-service students spoke of pupils having goals as part of their role such as obtaining employment. Pre-service students did not seem concerned with this area.

This section has summarised what the students verbalised during the first interview. The following section generally describes the teaching practice observations.

6.4 Teaching Practice Observations

The teaching practice observations were of value in experiencing the similarities and differences between the schools. I sampled a total of twenty-one classes in eighteen different schools over the period of the teaching practice term. The classes ranged from the traditional to the progressive though the majority were somewhere in between.

The most traditional class I observed had the desks arranged in pairs in rows facing the teacher's desk at the front. Pupils had been allocated a specific place for the entire year. Class teaching was the predominant method used, with the teacher at the front of the class and the pupils in their seats. The time-table was divided into
subjects. Movement in the classroom was restricted to queuing up for attention at the teacher's desk.

In contrast, the most progressive school I visited, the children sat in friendship groups that changed from time to time. Tables were arranged so four or six children could sit together. Little class teaching took place and most work was topic work with pupils working individually or in a group on a chosen project. Movement was unrestricted including access to an open-plan resources area outside the classroom.

The other classes lay between these two extremes. I was also interested to note some anomalies. One such anomaly was the classroom seating arranged in groups yet children were not permitted to talk or work together. Other classes alternated between a traditional or progressive stance depending on the activities that were time-tabled.

Students often commented either during the visit or afterwards, when back at college, how they felt constrained and obliged to follow the example set by the class teacher even though it did not reflect their own beliefs. From informal discussion with students and staff there appeared to be no attempt to match up students' personal epistemologies and pedagogies with the schools and classes in which they were placed.

Having observed a number of teaching practice classes I encouraged the students to verbalise their views on how they knew about teaching and learning. The next section explores the students' perspectives on professional "know how".

6.5 Professional "Know How"

This section looks at professional training in relation to "knowing how". The questions addressed here were:
How does the student teacher know how:
   a) someone learns.
   b) to teach

This section is divided into two parts, the first concerned with knowing how someone learns and the second with knowing how to teach.

6.5.1 Knowing How Someone learns

This section presents the results in three parts. The first describes the foci that emerged from the transcripts, the second summarises the data, and the third gives general observations.

6.5.1.1 Foci

Four foci emerged from responses student teachers made describing how they know how someone learned. They are as follows:

a) intrinsic/perceptive
b) extrinsic/theoretical
c) intrinsic/introspective
d) unable to say.

With the exception of focus (d) these foci are not mutually exclusive and students may have made statements from one or any combination of them. Focus (d) refers only to those who were not able to say how someone learns. Focus descriptions follow:

a) Intrinsic/Perceptive
This focus describes all statements made that knowing how someone learns may come from experience, observation, common sense, trial and error or intuition, whether conscious or subconscious.
Examples from transcripts:

105  B105 - So you can't really, you can't go through someone's thinking process. You can try and define them by watching what, any sort of um visual. I mean by if just by observing and watching what they're doing, you can sort of obviously say, well you can try and interpret their thinking processes, but you never, actually can see exactly how they've arrived at...

B112 - I mean it's sort of using your intuition really and your common sense -

B.Ed.Yr.2

208  B032 - You don't other than the fact that you've got, you've got to perhaps evaluate their response to particular techniques you use for learning, say for example does a person respond better to reading and written work, or do they respond better to diagrams and picture form or whatever -

I think you've got to try and be superhuman and be sensitive to every (laughs) individual I think...

PGCE

201  B031 - Only by watching them work I think -- and um I was amazed then where I, I asked a child what are you doing and how did you do it and you know how did you start and how did you think of doing it, and I was amazed at how some of the children thought...

You really need to get down to each individual sort of child's level. Find out how they learn, because I do think it's very different which is why standing up and teaching a class from the blackboard doesn't reach everybody because obviously they... all learn very differently. I mean even sort of my friends and myself, we all work in a very different way and have just come to learn that that's the way we can best study. I'm sure it's the same for children even at a younger age.

PGCE

403  B147 - Oh dear! I don't (pause) (tut) well I suppose you could observe their behaviour... and you could listen to... um listen to them and then that might um... give you some indication as to how they were learning...

Dip.Ed.
b) Extrinsic/Theoretical

This focus included all references to theory, formal teaching literature and research regardless as to whether the student believed it was useful or not.

Examples from transcripts:

103 B176 - I think you have to be aware of... of knowing your children um because I'm sure people learn in different ways, and no one theory of learning will... will actually tell you your children are going to... learn... how your children are going to learn.

B180 - Yes it is important... I mean it seems logical that it's important, um... because a lot of teachers... I think a lot of progress has come from that... um that kind of research... and books by people like John Holt, "How Children Fail", "How Children", what's the other one, "How Children Win", I suppose, "How Children Learn", learn are very helpful. But then I prefer books like that, than written in the language of um... the language of Chomskyists and people like him (laughs) I think I've learnt much more from books like that than writing an essay on learning theories.

B.Ed.Yr.2

202 B052 - Well you've got to look at individual children and I suppose base your assumptions on what you've seen already, and also base your work on psychology, psychology... I suppose and what other people have said about children learning -

PGCE

303 B044 - Well there are various theories that er... suggest different ways in which new information is incorporated into um... a child's existing knowledge. But they are theories, I don't think er... any body knows, I mean they're useful things to have at the back of your mind, but...

B.Ed.LS

401 B077 - How do I know how someone learns? Again I don't know that for certain, er... well that that's where the Piaget could well come in... again if I take this on board, which seems quite probable to a certain extent um... it's all the Piaget of course, the child's the active learner isn't he, and the teacher is merely guiding him to it... the situation... so... yeah, again this is a thing where I've got to sort out how I feel about this and how I'm going to bring it into the classroom, but it seems quite a... a realistic thesis doesn't it, um to me anyway, that a, a child... if you can get the child into a state where he's well, I think, he's dis, dis, disequilibrium he calls it, the child's going to be motivated to teach himself or to learn for himself by accommodating something now that's... that would be perhaps a way I would, when I go back into
teaching, I'd like to try and work on that kind of theory system or somehow, but I'm not sure.

Dip.Ed.

c) Intrinsic/introspective

This focus includes all students' statements concerning their reflection on their own learning which they may find useful to illuminate how their pupils learn, or may suggest that it is only one way of learning and that their pupils may learn differently.

Examples from transcripts:

103 B176 - There are certain methods, certain topics that um .. are learned and if, if it's done in a different way to another way it seems to be better .. for example .. oh for example a short thing of revising for an examination. I know that I learn better if I'm actively involved in learning in in writing in, in .. reiterating in carrying on .. um .. repeating the exercise that actually .. making an essay, whereas if I'm just reading through the notes passively I know that I'm not going to learn as much .. that's proven in itself (laughs) hundreds of times over.

B.Ed.Yr2

207 B054 - I think it's based heavily on your own experience as a child. Um .. then probably even more so as your own experience as a student because that's what you can relate to because it's the closest .. um .. you know. I know for example that I learn a lot better if I'm enjoying what I'm doing, um .. and I tried to use that principle as much as I could in teaching practice.

PGCE

309 B056 - But I mean how somebody learns something is I mean you can tell how you, you learn something yourself, but whether another person does it in the same way is very, very difficult to assess I think. I wouldn't be prepared to say that there's a set way that anyone learnt anything.

B.Ed.I-S

404 B052 - (Long pause) I suppose .. realising how I learned .. I don't learn by being told .. so (laughing) why should anybody else? Um .. and that's that's always been my .. thinking that .. I really resent being told how to do things myself, I'd rather be given hints and suggestions
perhaps to try it this way or and then it sticks much better when I've found out for myself how to do something ... and because I know I'm like that, that I think I assume other people are as well, and there again that's backed up by the reading this year, ... I suppose it's brought me to the same conclusion that people learn better through their own through their own interests, their own experiences whatever, with guidance, than being told ... how to do things (Long Pause).

Dip.Ed.

e) Unable to say

Only three students were unable to say how they knew how someone learned. They were not the only ones who actually did not know, but they were unable to make suggestions as to how one might know.

6.5.1.2 Summarising the Data

Frequency tables were constructed to record the type of statements each student teacher made for each course (see Appendices F 1, 2 and 3).

Two frequency summary tables were prepared to show percentage of students on each course who made statements within a given focus. Figure 6(ix) shows the percentage in each focus for each course, and Figure 6(x) shows the percentage in each focus for each course type.

6.5.1.3 General Observations

More students felt they would know how someone learned by intuition or experience than any other way. Two-thirds of pre-service students believed they would know by "intuition", one-third from "theory", less than one-quarter from "introspection" and a few were unable to say. There was little difference between the B.Ed.Yr.2 and PGCE groups. A similar order was seen for the B.Ed.I-S group where nearly three-quarters saw "knowing how" someone learns as being "intuitive", half as being informed by theory and only one student mentioned reflecting on how they learnt as being useful. No one from this group was unable to say. The Dip.Ed. group were different in their responses in that their comments
### FREQUENCY SUMMARY TABLE
By course - How students know how people learn

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Intrinsic perceptive</th>
<th>Extrinsic theoretical</th>
<th>Intrinsic introspection</th>
<th>Unable to say</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B.Ed. yr. 2.</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T=17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGCE</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T=16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.Ed. I-S</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T=10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dip.Ed.</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T=7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GT=50</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### FREQUENCY SUMMARY TABLE
By course type - How students know how people learn

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course type</th>
<th>Intrinsic perceptive</th>
<th>Extrinsic theoretical</th>
<th>Intrinsic introspection</th>
<th>Unable to say</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Service</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T=33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-Service</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T=17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
were evenly distributed between 'intuitive' and 'introspective' foci, just under half to each. Just one student mentioned theory and no students were unable to say.

6.5.2 Knowing How to Teach

This section presents the results in three parts. The first describes the foci that emerged from the transcripts, the second summarises the data, and the third gives general observations.

6.5.2.1 Foci

Four foci emerged from responses student teachers made describing how they knew how to teach. They are as follows:

a) intrinsic/perceptive
b) extrinsic/theoretical
c) extrinsic/role model
d) unable to say.

With the exception of focus (d), these foci are not mutually exclusive and students may have made statements from one or any combination of them. Focus (d) is descriptive of statements of uncertainty and by definition students' statements could not be assigned to the other foci as well as to this one. Focus descriptions follow:

a) Intrinsic/Perceptive

This focus contains all references to knowing how to teach as resulting from experience, intuition, feedback, having an inborn ability, personal epistemology or similar. These areas are categorised together as they are seen to be intrinsic in nature and influenced by perceptions that the student teacher may or may not be aware of.
Examples from transcripts:

115  B084 - I reckon you, you can't learn to teach I think you can either explain things or you can't.

B086 - Um. Well if I was to go into a classroom and told them exactly what I wanted them to do ... um ... if they don't understand something I will sit for example in maths, I would sit next to that person and tell different to her/him, different ways of doing it. Only through my own experience not through what the book says, but how I think it's, it should be done. Well you just can't keep making reference to books the whole time, it's got to come of your head.

B.Ed.Yr2

209  B046 - And then you find out about how the children learn and what's um sort of what's best for them. Not every child's the same. You might get a group of children who learn in one way and a group in another way, or individuals. And um then you have to vary your methods of teaching according to the children and abilities. So it's really sort of trial and error to begin with and I think with every class you get it's always trial and error at the start until you find out the best way to teach those particular children.

PGCE

303  B032 - (Pause) I'd think to be able to give you a more definite answer than "intuitively" but I, I find I can't really, but a necessary part of being able to teach is having a relationship with the learner. I think the ... essence of being able to teach is relationships.

B034 - You can either relate or you can't.

B036 - Well I suppose it's ... it's (intuition) partly innate and partly the result of our multitude of our experiences over the years. I think you get better at it, (pause) provided you don't get old.

B.Ed.I-S

403  B033 - I don't know. (Laughs) Um ...mm I don't know I've never really thought about that ... Um ... ooh how to teach ... I think it's to do with how you perceive teaching, because if you view that teaching as you have a store of knowledge and it's your job to impart the facts A or B or whatever to the children or the students then you would perceive teaching in that way but if you view teaching as helping children or your students to reach their full potential and to acquire the knowledge that you want to teach them to acquire the knowledge and make it their own and develop, develop it on their own terms then your role then teaching ... um you know you're helping them more to acquire this knowledge you're not sort of giving them the facts and saying
"Right you've got to go and memorise them", you're discussing with them and helping them to try and make those facts and that knowledge their own so (?) and so therefore they can use what you're trying to show them or teach them.

Dip.Ed.

b) Extrinsic/Theoretical

All references to theory, methods etc whether taught at college, from books or in any formal context were included in this focus.

Examples from transcripts:

108 B054 - I suppose you can say, well what about the theory that we've been doing ... it's got, it's got, a place I suppose, it's bound to influence ... how ... you know whether you know how you can teach but it didn't really um ... play a major part in er certainly in my case.

B.Ed.Yr.2

203 B049 - And hopefully you are continually getting new ideas as well from discussing with other members of staff and from .. reading books and papers and .. um courses we hope (laughs) ...

PGCE

301 B048 - I think with teaching when, you are actually setting out to plan what you're doing and organise a teaching experience, you ... are aware (clears throat) of psychological ways in which children learn, and therefore you, you capitalise on those in order to achieve your end. This, this can happen without setting out to teach them something, but if you're consciously setting out um ... with a specific objective, then you consider the best ways in which this objective can be achieved. And so (clears throat) and I don't say it's a conscious process at all but you, you do capitalise on psychological theories as to how children will learn certain things.

B.Ed.I-S

404 B044 - and then adding this year .. the depth and wealth of reading that we've done, .. that's the theory, putting those two together .. and sort of mixing them up and coming up with their own conclusion almost. I'm sure we've all gone away from this course with different ideas about how it should be done (laughs).

B046 - Because we've all brought a different experience to it to start with, so the mixture for everyone is different .. and attitudes, it's all bound up in your own experience, I think not just teaching experience,
but general experience ... that makes you what you are, and you bring what you are to the theory, and somebody else's books and what have you ... and each thing you read or each thing you hear adds a little bit to what you are and changes you a little bit ...

B048 - Er ... yeah I think, I think those sort of things all go together, and what comes out is not ... knowing how to teach but it goes inside you so it comes out as instinct, almost although because you've got now, I've got the sort of theory behind it, it's not just ungrounded instinct ... it's it's knowing ... OK there's, there's this and this that I've read they're experts in the field they've researched it ... and this is what they're saying is best and it seems to fit with what ... I think as well ... or if I put what I've read with what I think, I come up with something in between which seems appropriate (long pause) and I suppose the my going back to my initial training ... that sowed the initial seeds of how to teach on which I've developed since (long pause).

Dip.Ed.

c) Extrinsic/Role Model

Statements made within this focus suggest that teachers act as role models. This may be the teachers that students had experienced at school, college lecturers and tutors or class teachers on teaching practice. In some way they are acting as exemplars although not all suggest that they are always examples par excellence.

Examples from transcripts:

115 B040 - I suppose you base it on a lot of what you've seen other teachers do, your experience of teachers at school and obviously ... you think of ... you remember the ones ... you didn't like and you remember the ones you did like ... and the ones you learnt a lot from ... and you try you probably try and base yourself on the teachers you thought were good during your school years and that probably goes for the lecturers as well here.

B.Ed.Yr.2

210 B042 - Some of it was derived from what I was taught at school, and what I and how I was taught at school, which was not particularly good, and I sort of got a bit of a shock at the end of the term, because I'd suddenly realised that I'd been doing something which I didn't like doing or, or some things which I didn't like doing em.
B044 - Mm ... there are certain people you think are ... good or bad and that sort
of interest you. I think that's, that, that is quite a big influence as well.

PGCE

405 B042 - and then we use other people as models ... and then, if you're
successful ... you develop within that model which you've chosen ...

Dip.Ed.

d) Unable to Say

Only two students were unable to say how they know how to teach. They spoke of
how to teach, teaching and learning but not how they knew how to teach.

6.5.2.2 Summarising the Data

Frequency tables were constructed to record the types of statement each student
made for each course (see Appendices F4, 5 and 6).

Two frequency summary tables were prepared to show the percentage of students
on each course who made statements within a given focus. Figure 6(xi) shows the
percentage in each focus for each course, and Figure 6(xii) shows the percentage in
each focus for each course type.

6.5.2.3 General Observations

The majority of students felt they knew how to teach intuitively or by experience,
in fact all the in-service students believed this. Approximately one-third of the
two pre-service groups saw role models as contributing to knowing how to teach
but only one Dip.Ed. in-service student did so. Approximately one-third of
students interviewed in three of the courses (B.Ed.Yr.2, B.Ed.I-S and Dip.Ed.) saw
theory as contributing while few of the fourth group (PGCE) did so. Only two
students, one from each of the pre-service groups, were unable to say how they
knew how to teach.
### FREQUENCY SUMMARY TABLE

**By course - How student teachers know how to teach**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Intrinsic perceptive</th>
<th>Extrinsic theoretical</th>
<th>Extrinsic role model</th>
<th>Unable to say</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B.Ed. yr. 2 T=17</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FGCE T=16</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.Ed. 1-S T=10</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dip.Ed. T=7</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GT=50</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### FREQUENCY SUMMARY TABLE

**By course type - How student teachers know how to teach**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course type</th>
<th>Intrinsic perceptive</th>
<th>Extrinsic theoretical</th>
<th>Extrinsic role model</th>
<th>Unable to say</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-S T=13</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-S T=17</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As theory and practice are obviously important issues in teaching and learning the next chapter looks at one specific discipline, psychology, and the students perception of its relevance to teacher education.
Chapter 7

Psychology and Teacher Education
CHAPTER 7

Psychology and Teacher Education

"... the psychological theorist faces an interesting problem. He must write a theory about people and what they produce. His own theory is a human production, and hence it too would need to be accounted for. Any psychological theory is therefore somewhat reflexive; it must also account for itself as a product of psychological processes. Thus if the theory is to account for the way in which a man turns, it should also account for the way in which its author turned when he wrote it."


7.0 Psychology and Teacher Education

This chapter looks at psychology and teacher education where the following questions were addressed:

- What are student teachers' expectations of the relevance of psychology to teaching and learning?
- Are these expectations met?
- Are there practical suggestions that can be offered to the teacher educator concerning the teaching of psychology to student teachers?

The chapter is divided into four parts. The first looks at students' expectations of the contribution of psychology; the second at the perceived relevance of psychology, the third compares the expectations with the perceived relevance, and the fourth reports on the psychology class observations.
7.1 Expectations of Psychology

This section is divided into three parts. The first describes the categories that emerged from the data; the second summarises the data and the third makes general observations.

7.1.1 Categories

From the interview transcripts three categories adequately describe the student teachers' expectations of the contribution of psychology to the understanding of teaching and learning,

a) some relevance,
b) no relevance,
c) unsure.

These categories are mutually exclusive and category descriptions and examples follow:

a) Some Relevance

Students making statements in this category suggested that psychology may have a contribution to make towards the understanding of teaching and learning. Many respondents were vague or unable to specify any particular areas that they felt might be useful. Some went on, often with prompting, to suggest areas they thought could be particularly useful.

Examples from transcripts:

116 A114 - ...by understanding people, how a child develops even though it's on broad, like Piaget... We talk about Piaget... his broad stages. You know that they're not exactly that way but by using a framework like that it does help you become aware of individuals, to be aware of what's needed in the classroom and (?) resources etc.

B.Ed.Yr.2
I think there's a common-sense aspect of teaching which is something which we probably pick up from our own school experiences and T.P. - and I think that psychology can actually try and dispel some false ideas and maybe reinforce the fact that, or make clearer the commonsense that is valid. Um and in doing so making making the job of teaching... you, you can actually work out better ways and more accurate ways of of doing a good teaching job.

Well that's a difficult one. At this stage I'm not really sure. I think er... the view I tend to have really is a kind of simplistic one. Um... and much of the psychology I have been recently exposed to kind of confirms me in those sort of fairly simple views of it. Um... like the most important thing for children learning I think is their motivation. And er... you know that's... that's the only kind of psychological in inverted commas term that I'd use. Um... at the moment, because er at the sort of, you know in the sort of chalk faced terms, that's what matters is... is um is how motivated children are. Um you know how much they want to do whatever it is. And I think that's the most important thing. Um... I would hope that um the psychology on this course would help me to refine that and er and build on it. Um (Pause) And I think with that kind of theoretical background... I would hope it would give me a kind of deeper insight into those kind of simple things like, like motivation and er... you know I talked a lot about the children's needs and um... I would hope that more... a deeper sort of encounter with the theory would give me perhaps a better insight... And you know that would help me hopefully to be, to be a better practitioner.

Students in this category did not think that psychology might have a contribution to make towards the understanding of teaching and learning.

Examples from transcripts:

Well the psychology we do doesn't contribute at all - It's just... well, it's just useless, just theories that um... are learnt for an exam and... it's not even theories half the time. I don't even know what it is. It's just a succession of names with experiments after them. I know... "It's" too high up for me.

I don't know if I've missed out or whether I haven't chosen the right modules, but I mean from what I can gather the Psychology we've...
done so far is just a waste of time. I don't remember any of it. (Both laugh). Not that I'm negative. I'm not negative. I just don't remember a thing. Did the exam, came out, remembered it for eight hours and done... well, you know, just not there at all. And all the theory seemed well above what you're doing somehow, you know. There's all these theories that you read about and you think "Yes, fair enough, that's his point of view," but it seems well above the actual level of the classroom somehow. It just isn't there.

B.Ed.Yr2

109  A122 - Um I can't really remember actually what we did in the educational psychology. Well, child development and things I suppose and um... er... whether learning was hereditary and um... whether you had, you know, whether you were born with certain knowledge, or it was all learned.

A124 - I don't think, I think it's relevant to the course.

B.Ed.Yr2

111  A153 - I'd like to see more connection to education system, that they show us what is important for a teacher to know that sort of thing about the child. They don't really connect the two. I think the two are in isolation... But there again it might all become clearer when we actually see children. We can't think about it now, that's the problem really of this course it's theoretical for a long time and then with the kids you think "Ah".

B.Ed.Yr2

c) Unsure

This group were unable to say whether the study of psychology would be useful or not.

Examples from transcripts:

214  A114 - I think you've got to be able (sighs) I think you've got to have, I was going to say you've got to have an understanding of children, but maybe that brings in psychology when you say that. You've certainly got to be very sensitive to towards them if they do have problems, to be able to sort of (?) pick up their moods and everything. Especially if they just develop, they don't start off with them. Um... but maybe that's more experience than psychology, I don't know. Um... thinking the teacher I did observation with, I mean I don't, she told me she didn't do psychology but she's certainly very aware of what children are having off days and, and when there is something going on... And I think that's simply because she's been with them for so long. Yes, probably... mm...(?)..

PGCE
A100 - (Pause) Well it's interesting to learn, about the different ways that er... people have found that individuals learn... in... er... but, but there's not a lot there really. There's not a lot that's of any great import and I don't think that anything I've covered in the Psychology since we've been here would modify my behaviour in the classroom. It might influence me a little in the way in which I prepared work for individual children...

I think through developing a good relationship with a pupil you would automatically understand the best way in which they could learn.

B.Ed.I-S

A044 - very little in as much as I think a lot of it is intuitive in people, how people learn and it just needs bringing out... it's gained an academic credence and it doesn't want to let go of this and part of that is being remote from normal people. So yes I think there is a place but I wouldn't like to overestimate it really.

B.Ed.I-S

7.1.2 Summarising the Data

Frequency tables were constructed to record the types of statement made for each course (see Appendices G 1, 2 and 3).

Two frequency summary tables were prepared to show the percentage of students on each course who made statements within a given category. Figure 7(i) shows the percentage in each category for each course, and Figure 7(ii) shows the percentage in each category for each course type.

7.1.3 General Observations

There was a tendency for the majority of students on three of the four courses to have a positive expectation as to the contribution psychological theory would make. The exception was the B.Ed.I-S course where approximately two-thirds were unsure and one-third had positive expectations.
### FREQUENCY SUMMARY TABLE

**Fig. 7(i)**

By course type - student teachers' expectations of the contribution of psychology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Type</th>
<th>Some relevance</th>
<th>No relevance</th>
<th>Unsure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B.Ed. yr. 2 T=18</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGCE T=16</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.Ed. I-S T=8</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dip.Ed. I-S T=7</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GT=49</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### FREQUENCY SUMMARY TABLE

**Fig. 7(ii)**

By course type - student teachers' expectations of the contribution of psychology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Type</th>
<th>Some relevance</th>
<th>No relevance</th>
<th>Unsure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Service T=34</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-Service T=15</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Only the B.Ed.Yr.2 students expressed any negative expectations and this was very much a minority view.

### 7.2 Perceived Relevance of Psychology

This section is divided into three parts. The first describes the categories derived from the transcripts; the second summarises the data, and the third makes general observations.

#### 7.2.1 Categories

In the same way as for the expectations of psychology data, three categories emerged:

- a) some relevance,
- b) no relevance,
- c) unsure.

These categories are mutually exclusive and map onto the categories given in the previous section. Category descriptions follow:

- a) Some Relevance
  This category embraces a positive attitude towards the psychology component of the course. Some students may have indicated specific aspects or topics within the course that were specifically useful. Others may have given a positive response but been unable to pinpoint any particular area or topic, feeling it may have helped in a non-specific way. It is important to be aware that students perceiving some relevance may also have reservations and that they are not necessarily supportive of psychology as a whole.

Examples from transcripts:
117  B017 - ...there's some parts of it that I can see fit in with my life and the way I felt when I was a child ... there's always some meaning behind why they (children) act the way they do - it's all clicked in my head - that it's all interconnected.

B.Ed.Yr.2

105  B034 - I never really thought about it consciously, I don't think. Yes I suppose it did. I found they just needed a lot of affection. So I think all the psychology helped really in the end, I mean it's not really possible to say one aspect in particular.

B.Ed.Yr.2

213  B050 - I think it does help with children with behaviour problems or learning difficulties. I think it helps to understand problems they are having and also the friendships.

PGCE

301  B020 - the most valuable part was the student presented seminars ... they'd chosen quite practical aspects which if they weren't of immediate interest were within the realms of teaching rather than theory.

B.Ed.I-S

b) No Relevance

Students placed within this category did not perceive any relevance to teaching and learning of the psychology component of their course.

Examples from the transcripts:

108  B036 - Ah no (laughs) it's all forgotten er very much um up in the air and um sort of revise for the exam. I actually er you see you know you have in that module, what we do, we had Sociology, Psychology and whatever the ee I don't know what .. Philosophy, that's right. Well most of us kind of revised two out of three (laughs) I actually revised on the psychology but I can't remember a word of it and it means nothing whatsoever (laughs) unfortunately. I wish, I wish it did (laughs). I suppose I can remember a few of the names, but er, you know it was all about .. what I can remember is of the monkey experiments.

B.Ed.Yr.2

111  B056 - I can remember things. Skinner and um you know Skinner's box and um the lecture we had about these cats with their eyes turned
upsidedown and how it disorientated them but I don't really; I didn't see much relevance in that. I'm a bit sceptical about psychologists I suppose. It's a bad, bad thing to say (laughs).

B058 - Well the psychology they give us here is not really related, it's not learning, not related to learning and we did things like learning theory and so on.

B.Ed.Yr.2

212  B032 - I find it very difficult 'cos it's full of psychological jargon. It just confuses and baffles me so I can't say because I just don't relate it at all. I suppose there must have been points talking about behaviour, assessing children, deviancy and labelling but it's very remote and it would be stupid of me to say well I found X number of parts helpful because just don't know the first thing about it properly.

PGCE

c) Unsure

Statements placed in this category were unable to say whether they had found the psychology component useful or not. Students suggested that although they were not consciously aware of its' relevance, it may be subconscious.

Examples from transcripts:

113  B039 - I can't really think of any direct relevance but I'm sure that knowing all I have learnt .. they must have some use in the actual teaching I can't think of any situation.

B.Ed.Yr.2

114  B067 - Well I don't think so consciously, I mean subconsciously I might have thought about it but I think on my own knowledge which is quite basic psychology ... the only thing I can actually remember of psychology on doing the theory, things such as monkeys and things like that .. I can't really remember that much about it to be able to relate it.

B.Ed.Yr.2

307  B054 - I suppose some of the theories of how children learn may have indirectly fed into my subconsciousness and I may use some of them .. but, no, I wouldn't say that I got a lot of immediately useful things for the classroom out of it, but there maybe things that I've adopted but not consciously so.

B.Ed.I-S
7.2.2 Summarising the Data

Frequency tables were constructed to record each type of statement that each student teacher made for each course (See Appendices G 4, 5 and 6). Each type of statement was only recorded once for each student. Categories were mutually exclusive.

Two frequency summary tables were prepared to show the percentage of students on each course who made statements within a given category. Figure 7(iii) shows the percentage in each category for each course, and Figure 7(iv) shows the percentage in each category for each course type.

7.2.3 General Observations

The majority of in-service students perceived at least some aspect of the psychological component as useful. No one from these groups saw no relevance and only one student seemed unsure.

In contrast, the students in the pre-service groups seem split between finding some relevance and no relevance. Slightly more PGCE students saw no relevance than some relevance while the converse was true of the B.Ed.Yr.2 group. Few B.Ed.Yr.2 students and no PGCE students were unsure.

The contrast between the pre-service and in-service groups is of interest in that the former have been exposed to theory prior to a period of teaching experience while the converse is true of the latter.

It is also worth remembering that students who had found some aspects of psychology useful may not have found it useful overall and many also complained about the way it was presented.
**FREQUENCY SUMMARY TABLE**  
*Fig. 7(iii)*  
By course - Students perceived relevance of the contribution of the psychology component

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Some relevance</th>
<th>No relevance</th>
<th>Unsure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B.Ed. yr. 2</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGCE</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.Ed. T-S</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dip.Ed.</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GT=51</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FREQUENCY SUMMARY TABLE**  
*Fig. 7(iv)*  
By course type - Students perceived relevance of the contribution of the psychology component

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Type</th>
<th>Some relevance</th>
<th>No relevance</th>
<th>Unsure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Service</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-Service</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7.3 Comparison of Students Expectations with Perceived Relevance

Are student teachers' expectations of the relevance of psychology to teaching and learning met?

7.3.1 Categories

The students' views of their expectations of the contribution of psychology have been summarised in section 7.1.2 and their perceived views summarised in section 7.2.2. The three categories that emerged from each are common to both and are as follows:

a) some relevance
b) no relevance
c) unsure.

7.3.2 Summarising the Data

Category descriptions have been given in previous sections (see 7.1.1 and 7.2.1). Two frequency summary tables Figure 7(i) and Figure 7(iii) are combined in Figure 7(v) to show the comparison of students' expectations with their perceived relevance by course. Frequency summary tables 7(ii) and 7(iv) are similarly combined in Figure 7(vi) to show the comparison by course type.

7.3.3 General Observations

The Dip.Ed. students' positive expectations were met with positive perceived relevance but this was the only group where this was the case. The expectations of the other in-service group (B.Ed.I-S) were split between seeing some relevance and being unsure. However, the majority perceived some relevance showing a shift away from having had low expectations.
### FREQUENCY SUMMARY TABLE

**By Course** - Comparison of students expectations (E) with perceived (P) relevance of the psychology component

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Some relevance</th>
<th>No relevance</th>
<th>Unsure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.Ed. yr. 2</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T=18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGCE</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T=16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.Ed. I-S</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T=8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dip.Ed.</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T=7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GT=49</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### FREQUENCY SUMMARY TABLE

**By course type** - Comparison of students expectations with perceived relevance of psychology component

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Type</th>
<th>Some Relevance</th>
<th>No relevance</th>
<th>Unsure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Service</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T=34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-Service</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>94</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T=15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Most pre-service students had had positive expectations but fewer had perceived some relevance during the teaching practice. Approximately half of the pre-service students perceived no relevance by the end of the year.

Few students on any course were unsure of the perceived relevance, showing a drop in uncertainty from their expectations.

The difference between the Dip.Ed. group and the other three courses is of particular interest as this course was run in a more progressive manner compared with the traditional style of the other courses.

7.3.4 Individuals' Perceptions

Finally, it was of interest to see if it were possible to predict from the students' expectations the likely direction of change (e.g., do students with negative expectations fail to develop positive expectations). For this purpose a table of individual students' responses comparing their expectations with their perceived relevance was constructed (see Figure 7(vii)).

All three students who had negative expectations remained negative at the end of the year. Approximately three-quarters of the students who had positive expectations also had positive perceptions at the second interview, the other quarter becoming negative. Only one student of the ten who were unsure as to their expectations of psychology at the first interview remained unsure at the second. The other 'unsure' students were divided between positive and negative perceptions. From this data it seems that positive expectations are more likely to result in positive perceptions and negative expectations in negative perceptions. However, those who start off unsure are unlikely to remain so but become either positive or negative in their views. This observation is offered as a possible factor in predicting direction of change, but with the caution necessary from such a small sample.
Comparison of individuals' expectations with perceptions of the relevance of psychology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expected relevance</th>
<th>Perceived relevance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>some</td>
<td>101 202 302 401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>102 203 304 402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>104 204 309 403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>105 208 404</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>107 213 405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>116 215 406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>117 216 407</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unsure</td>
<td>106 214 301 303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>308 310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>115 205 207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>307</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Having looked at the students' perceptions in relation to their expectations of the psychology component of their course, the next section describes the psychology class observations.

7.4 Psychology Class Observations

College class observations were mainly of the psychology component of each course, although I also observed other classes to help gain perspective. Details of the psychology component of each course, duration and content, has been given in Chapter 3.2. The psychology component of all three courses at Queensbury Polytechnic was taught by the same lecturer in psychology. Each course varied in their structure and content (see Chapter 3.1).
The B.Ed.Yr.2 students had the largest number of hours of psychology. The teaching was traditional, mostly in the form of lectures in large lecture theatres with more than fifty students. The lecturer would rapidly read from copious notes, occasionally showing an overhead transparency or writing something on the board. Practically the only student-teacher interaction that took place was when students would ask him to repeat something, usually the name of a psychologist that was almost unpronounceable. The hour was packed with information of numerous experiments, dates and names, and most students scribbled furiously throughout that time.

From a course on theoretical perspectives the PGCE group spent approximately six sessions on lectures followed by seminars that were devoted to the study of psychology. Lectures took a similar format to those of the B.Ed.Yr.2 course but there was more exchange between the lecturer and the students who asked questions freely. The seminars were in smaller groups of up to a dozen students. They took place in a classroom sitting behind tables in a rectangular formation. One student each week was to prepare and present a topic to the group, then it was to be discussed. From the classes I observed little reading was done by the others not presenting in the group. The lecturer was skilful at promoting discussion by questioning and making controversial statements that others challenged. However, almost all the talk was lecturer-student not student-student.

The B.Ed.I-S group had all classes in a classroom whether they were lectures or seminars. The psychology lectures consisted of the students sitting round three sides of a rectangle of tables, the lecturer behind the fourth side. As before he would read from copious notes but there was much more lecturer-student and student-student interaction. This group of students were very verbal and often referred to their school experience. Seminars were student-led which meant a student prepared a topic for presentation. Unlike the PGCE group, the students showed much interest and participated easily.
The Dip.Ed. course was taught mainly by seminar and the psychology component was no exception. Students were expected to have done a minimal amount of reading and one student presented the topic. A few of the students were particularly verbal and would tend to monopolise the discussion between them whatever the topic.

The psychology learning milieu differed from group to group which reflected aspects of the psychology teacher, the group and the setting. This will be picked up again in the final chapter.
Preamble to the Case Studies

The next section of this thesis, chapters 8, 9, 10 and 11, present case studies of individual students. Allowing students to 'speak for themselves' I quote liberally from their interviews. It may assist the reader if I explain the notation used when quoting from students' interview transcripts.

Firstly interviews were transcribed verbatim and sections of these are reported fully here, i.e. they have not been "tidied up" for presentation, removing the 'ums', 'ahs', pauses etc. Where speech was inaudible or undistinguishable it is indicated by a '(?)'. Other items in brackets are self explanatory eg '(laughs)'. Pauses were indicated by a series of dots (...) increasing in number with the length of the pause, to '(pause)' and for a long silence, '(long pause)'. As dots (...) have been used to represent pauses, a dash (-) has been used to represent omissions from the presented quotes.

Quotes are preceded by a single letter (A or B), a 3 digit number and a single letter (I or other).

Eg

\[ \text{A 029 I.} \]

interview speaker

speech order

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>029</th>
<th>I</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>= first interview</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>= second interview</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chapter 8

Case study 1: Steve

A portrait of a predominantly Cultural Transmission perspective
CHAPTER 8

Case study 1: Steve
A portrait of a predominantly Cultural Transmission perspective
(PGCE No. 216)

"Education implies teaching. Teaching implies knowledge. Knowledge is truth. The truth is everywhere the same. Hence, education should be everywhere the same".

[Hutchins 1936, p.66]

8.1 The First Interview

Steve was in his early 20's having just completed his first degree in Psychology. He describes the factors that motivated him to take up a PGCE course.

A 005 S: Um .. parts of the course were on development of children and education, and I enjoyed that the most. Before I went to university I taught my nieces quite a bit. And I've always liked working with children.

This reply doesn't give much away although on first appearance one might suspect that Steve had a child-centred approach. However, further light was shed on this area later in the interview when Steve was discussing differences between adult and children learners.

A 083 S: Oh, yes um..an adult would probably be doing a course which was um..peripheral to his needs. Um perhaps to expand his knowledge in a certain area. A child is learning the the fundamentals. If it was necessary to teach an adult the fundamentals, then you could treat him like a child.

A 084 I: Can I ask you if you consider yourself um.. the course that you are doing to be peripheral to your needs?

A 085 S: Um yes, I I think well I like to think that I'm very adaptable and very mobile occupationally. I'm pursuing this line, not through any sort of vocational reason. I haven't been one of these people who
always wanted to be a teacher from five onwards. And I'm an opportunist too. I think that this is the best use of my time at the present time. Given everything, including the economic situation. Um, I've probably adapted to want to do this sort of thing. But had I been in another occupation at this time, I would probably have preferred it to teaching.

A 086 I: (Pause) Did you consider any other occupation by the way?

A 087 S: Oh yes. I, I've considered em all sorts of higher management courses. Had I been accepted I might not be here. (Laughs).

A 088 I: Mmm. So you have an interest in in that area?

A 089 S: Yes, certainly. Yes.

A 090 I: Yeah. Had you gone on one of those courses, would you have considered it to be peripheral to your needs?

A 091 S: Yes. Yes. (Laughter both).

It is obvious from this conversation that "working with children" was not a first choice.

As for choosing the age range to work with, he considered his capabilities, particularly in relation to discipline and control, together with future career prospects and "plumped for" the 7-13 junior middle school.

A 007 S: Um I think it's the best age range because I have been, well I've seen people in further education who are disheartened by the bad discipline, and it's very difficult to keep control. I don't know if I would be capable of keeping control, so I'm playing safe and I know this age range well from experience. So I've plumped for 7-13 which is not too young and not too old.

He felt that experience of this age range would allow most movement in teaching both younger and older pupils and in further education which appears to be his long term aim.

He describes the teacher educator's role together with the teaching methods he feels are most effective.
A 021 S: To impart information ... as a guider. Someone who er... helps us to
learn. And as a teacher. Um I believe in the lecture as the best way
of getting information across.

A 023 S: I believe that the lecture is the best way, and the tutorials are the best
way of consolidating what you've learnt in the lecture. (Pause)

In describing his view of the differences between the "good" and "bad" lecturer we
see his view of the "good" teacher educator as the authority figure.

A 025 S: Um.. the bad lecturer I would say is someone who., starts off by
saying he wants it to be a new sort of lecture, usually he is
experimenting himself. And then goes on to. try to make us
contribute um.. which may be a good thing in itself. But it usually
means that he hasn't got enough background himself to to talk for
an hour. And the the good lecturer I'd say is someone who um
doesn't know the subject necessarily, but certainly has enough notes
... and enough experience of talking about what he's um talking
about to answer just about every type of question quickly, and
without having to delay the answer.

Any method of involving students in their own learning other than the formal
lecture or seminar is seen to be covering up a weakness in subject knowledge by
the lecturer.

Does he feel all questions have answers?

A 027 S: Most of the questions asked in lecture situations have no answers.
(Both laugh) Um but most questions have a multitude, so... Um it's
important for the lecturer to actually give a a. crisp concise answer
which encompasses the fact that there are not specific answers.
(laughs) Um. a sort of um synopsis or summary of the field. It's no
good answering each question by saying "There are no answers"
Because that's already taken. And the question was asked hoping
for... um some insight, some light to be shed on the problem.
That's why I ask a question.

Although he appears to recognise that most questions do not have answers he
demands that answers are indeed given and by the teacher who is the expert.

What if the lecturer turns the tables and asks him?
A 031 S: Um well I appreciate that that's probably done a lot to encourage my thinking. But um you've got to be careful. Some lecturers will do it er to defend, well to, to hide their faults.

Again he sees this as an exercise and does not appear to think that he has a valid contribution to make. Worse still, not answering questions or asking for the student's contribution is seen as covering up weaknesses again and evidence of a bad teacher.

Steve's view of the teacher educator is both teacher and content focused. Steve's views of his role as a student at college are compatible with those of the lecturer. He shows three focuses teaching; content and training.

A 035 S: To complete the course, and become a teacher who is very flexible and knowledgeable about the actual practice of teaching. (Pause) So that I, I wouldn't be surprised or shocked by the first job that I get.

He also goes on to mention appraisal.

A 037 S: Um well by successfully completing the course, um. I'm assuming that the course supervisors are giving me the certificate knowing that I've got the knowledge necessary to be a teacher. So I've complete faith in them. If they set down criteria for passing, and I meet that criteria, I'm quite confident that I've been a successful student.

This confirms his view of the lecturers as experts, but what about self appraisal?

A 039 S: Um if I failed the Certificate, I wouldn't question the fact that I'd failed it. Um... you've got to really have a bit of faith in the course. Um... so that by seeing as it's a continually assessed course, by keeping my head above water now, I know that I'm actually being a good teacher, or learning to be a good teacher.

He neither questions the staff nor the content of the course nor the methods of assessment. His approach to learning is consistent with his role.

A 045 S: Um, I think, you can't really learn without guidance from a professional, who knows how to teach. And that goes for all age ranges, I don't believe in the sort of um Count of Monte Cristo type
learning where you've left him alone in his cell for 20 years and he came out an educated man. I think it's a professional structured field. Which is continually changing because of research.

This confirms that the teacher "knows" and the knowledge is transferred to the learner. The reference to research suggests that he views teaching as a "science" not a "craft" or an "art", consistent with Tomlinson's [1981] naive technology/positive professionalism viewpoint (1.7).

He believes he learns from reading and lectures.

A 047 S: Um.. reading I suppose (Laughs). Being given er.. you see when when you are on a course you are given things to read that you wouldn't otherwise read. And um. you're also given the motivation to read them to a depth you wouldn't otherwise have bothered about. And then when you talk, it doesn't necessarily have to be a tutorial, but when you talk to other people on the course, you consolidate what you've taken in, by reading. Um. I think the lecture situation is a bit like shorthand reading. Because most of my reading anyway is um.. the sort of general textbooks on the subject. For instance Educational Psychology which is a mass of thick .. there's hundreds of them going round.

He makes notes in the lectures but not when reading.

A 059 S: Yes. You don't actually think very deeply in a lecture. But when you read you can think very deeply.

A 060 I: Right. (Pause) So would you say that you needed to both attend the lecture and to read?

A 061 S: Yes, the lecture being more important. I just think that I know that I could actually pass most educational courses without reading providing that the lecturer was somebody who.. who... who was the sort of lecturer who was a good one. He talked a lot. Um. I think that could be a fault of the exam system, because the, throwing back at the lecturer what he's given to you is the quickest way of getting to the point as far as he's concerned.

He sees the lecturer as a surrogate thinker who has filleted the reading and selected the relevant information, therefore reading anything else is a waste of time. The exam system confirms his observations that he has to date been successful. If all he does is regurgitate the lecturer's notes, what about his own ideas?
A 063 S: Oh, there's always room for those. Um, you don't really have to think to put your own ideas down, because an opportunity, as you're composing your first draft of your essay for example, your own ideas will fight to get the the most amount of space. And um, you really do have to struggle to keep them out, rather than put them in.

His views on how others learn come from the course.

A 065 S: Um well I'd go along with what I've been taught this term. I've learnt for the first time that children will not take in what you tell them, they'll take in what they see, and talking to them will help them to consolidate what they've seen. (Pause) But if you've just talked out of context, then they wouldn't learn anything. (Pause) That's entitled "Experiential Learning" by Mr M (Laughs).

A 066 I: And would you agree with that from your own experience with children?

A 067 S: Yes I've um, taught or tried to teach certain concepts and, the blank face that I can see in front of me, I'll understand now why it's blank.

A 068 I: At the time, though, what did you think?

A 069 S: Well we all are stereotyped when it comes to teaching. When we actually get into a situation, I think it's very true that teachers teach as they have been taught. And it takes a very professional attitude to implement the theory. I'm sure I'll be able to but at first, I shall be like the stereotype of my teacher and when I first taught my nieces I just sort of, took on their role of what I saw a teacher should be like. And it was really my teacher's, exactly the same.

A 070 I: Does that surprise you?

A 071 S: Um, well I hadn't learnt anything about teaching theory, so it doesn't surprise me now to know...

He recognises the influence of role models from previous experience, i.e. when he was a pupil, but stresses that the true professional is one that implements the theory. This theme runs through this interview.

He further differentiates between experience and learning by "worthwhile experience", that is formalised by teaching.
A 079 S: You get experience. Reading is just one experience. You get experience also by observing. Um, you don't actually know what it is, teaching sort of labels what your experiences are. And I think the difference between someone who is educated and someone who isn't educated is not in the amount of experience they've had um, but in the amount of worthwhile experience experience which um they've labelled and stored away in their minds so that recall will be quick and appropriate.

Steve's view of the teacher at school is consistent with the Cultural Transmission model:

A 093 S: Well, it changed so much it'll probably be different when I get there. The role of any professional is to implement the latest techniques, the latest policies that research has shown to be the best ways of teaching. So when I get into the classroom, I have got to be extremely flexible. I should take in what the situation is in the class. So I've got to know what specific type of children and what are their specific needs and I've got to relate that to the curriculum which the Headmaster will insist that I use, to my own ideas and beliefs and morals and also to the the theory of what is appropriate to be taught. And being a professional I've got to have no um, personal um .. influences. I've got to teach because it is theoretically the best .. things in the best way of teaching them.

A 094 I: Supposing various people um that you admired in the profession had different viewpoints of what was the best way to teach, what, how would it affect you?

A 095 S: Oh it would put me in a dilemma, especially if I thought both had grounds of being right. Yes um .. I'd probably avoid that situation. I probably would, I probably would sense that one of the people I thought to be worth admiring, I'd sense that he was differing from the rest, so he would go down in my estimation.

A 096 I: Are you then assuming that there would be several people who worked in a similar way and one person who was different?

A 097 S: There could be. I I don't know any major differences between my tutors. All the differences I think are minor, otherwise they wouldn't be working together.

A 098 I: What about in classes you've been into. How have you got on observing people teaching there?

A 099 S: I've seen pretty lousy teachers. (Both laugh) Um .. but as I said being professionals they um .. they could be um loyally
implementing what the Head has told them to implement. And um as long as they were doing it professionally, I would also realise that they were flexible and given a better Headmaster would be better teachers. But if I thought for a moment that good or bad, they were rigid, and for instance people with strong personalities tend to be at first glance terrific teachers, but if they are not flexible then they are not professional. And I wouldn't um admire them so much. Um. I'm thinking now of some teachers which have been teaching the same year, the same age range um for years and years and years, and have become very good at it. But they .. they are not really professionals, because they can't leave that situation and still be good teachers. So they are sort of chained to a specific age range and with it a specific school with a specific structure and a specific curriculum.

This discussion illuminates much of Steve's thinking about teaching and serves to form a basis for understanding problems that cropped up on teaching practice the following term. He sees research as informing practice but seems unaware of conflicting theories or philosophies. As with the teacher educator, he sees the head teacher as being the figure of authority, giver of the curriculum and on a plane above the teacher. Teachers can only be as good as the head teacher he works under. What they display in practice is only what is required of them by their head and is not personal.

It is interesting that Steve does not observe differences in orientation between teachers or tutors or theoretical viewpoints. His comment that he would probably avoid that situation (see A 095) may also indicate that subconsciously he may not allow himself to perceive such differences, therefore avoiding cognitive conflict. It is surprising that his degree course in psychology did not challenge his views that there were correct theories and that all research is right. He may of course have "avoided" the situation by allowing his mentors to choose the correct and valid theories to disclose in their lectures from their knowledgeable position. Perhaps the psychology course only presented one theoretical perspective to its undergraduates, e.g. that of the traditional experimental school, so there was no conflict introduced.
Also in this dialogue the personal meaning of the words "professional" and "flexible" become apparent. Being "professional" for Steve is to set aside any personal influences and to teach in the way that is theoretically best. Being "flexible" is the ability to take on board whatever is theoretically best and to implement it.

He illustrates his views by describing the difference between a "good" and "bad" teacher.

A 109 S: A good teacher is someone who is very sensitive to changes, be they from geography, moving to a different school, or from a different curriculum, or a different background to the children - they might be middle class or working class. All have to be factors which you have to take into account. So a good teacher is very sensitive. And a bad teacher is someone who isn't aware that teaching has to change. (Pause)

The good teacher was seen to be so by the pupils and parents with the strongest viewpoint being followed. What about his personal views?

A 116 I: And is there any stage which you would feel, that you were doing something that was benefiting the children and other people may not perceive that, that you would want to push your own... ideas.

A 117 S: Yes. Only the teacher's the sort of the, the front line person in in this. And sometimes the teacher sees benefits which he knows um... to be er good. And he will want to pursue them. And I I will pursue them as long as I am sure. But I would have great respect for the majority opinion. But I do realise that a lot of research into education is undertaken by teachers. They are the best source of information on the subject. And they are probably the most capable people of um... going ahead. Making progress. So if I saw myself as being one of these people, I probably ask for promotion first off (Both laugh) and I'd probably go into research. I wouldn't stay in the classroom being the best teacher. If I found I was being highly successful, using methods which I myself thought of I would go into research and try and... spread them throughout the profession.

A 118 I: Would would you leave teaching in that case or would you take on the function of a um... a teacher/researcher?
A 119 S: I could be either. I would be quite happy to leave teaching to research into education. Because although that's indirect it's still a way of benefiting the children.

The first part of quote A117 Steve shows a glimmer of self directiveness but follows it up with showing respect for the majority opinion. However, he rationalises his position by recognising that educational research was undertaken by teachers, that they are probably the most capable people for making progress and that he may see himself as being one of these people i.e. he has promoted himself to expert and authority figure.

Is Steve's view of the teacher congruent with his view of the role of pupil?

A 123 S: To learn. (Laughs) Um ... well it's difficult, it's not, really especially at Primary School level, it's not really important what specific things he's learning. But he's learning how to learn. He's learning how to be curious and how to develop a sort of an educated mind. I don't expect to turn out 32, or whatever identical, well-identified educated children. There will be individual differences and it's those which are important, because ... If there was a genius in my class, I don't want to be the one responsible for thwarting his future development, you see. And for the low, under-achievers I want to feel that I've done something to change that situation for them. Now that means that I've got to be very open as to what they're learning. Because a very specific curriculum would inhibit some of their talents, some of their motivations. So I wouldn't have any preference to what I taught subject-wise. If it happened that they all wanted to go into Archeology, they were budding archeologists, then it's my job to present the experiences and give them the initial introductory talks on the subject.

Although content is important in his learning it is not so for the primary school pupil. Learning is seen as a process but no indication is given of learners being responsible in full or part for their learning. The overall feel is that of a teacher focus.

Individual differences are mentioned for the first time. This area is probed.

A 124 I: OK ... Um ... just going back to what you said about genius and low achievers. Um ... that you don't want to thwart the genius or a
genius and you want to help the low-achievers, how do you think you can best accomplish, what sort of approach might you have to accomplish those two things?

A 125 S: Um it would depend in what sort of class I was working in. I would accept the overall way of, that the school was structured. If it was a streamed school, then I would still be sensitive but not so sensitive to the fact that there were differences within the class. Because some of that work would have been done for me. Um... but whatever school I was in I would um be wary that there are children going off at a tangent to each other in different fields. And a bit like respecting the views of parents, teachers and researchers, I'd respect the views of all the children. But respect most the consensus view of the children.

He suggests that he would be constrained by the type of school he worked in but would most respect the consensus view of the children i.e. the majority, not the minority. He describes a "good" pupil.

A 129 S: A good pupil is someone who tries hard, has motivation and thinks. It's more important that he's um considerate and has all the attributes of um an honest good citizen... If I could get those over to him, I think I've created an atmosphere in which being an accepted member of society, he can go about his life gaining education as he goes old. Having got that out of the way, I'd concentrate on his education per se. Um... which would be the specific details.

A 130 I: The subject matter...?

A 131 S: Yes. But that comes second.

The first statement, "tries hard, has motivation and thinks" may be seen as personal attributes of the learner. However, Steve emphasises as important the attributes of an "honest, good citizen" and being an "accepted member of society", another example of cultural transmission. He seems to view this as a discrete entity to be conveyed once and for all as he states, "having got that out of the way". He then considers content, or subject matter of secondary importance in contrast to his earlier statement (see A123) where he said that it wasn't important what specific things they learnt.
Having readily described a "good" pupil, what about a "bad" one?

A 133 S: Um .... Mm. Well, no pupil's really bad. They're just ... um difficult. (Both laugh) There's always reasons why they're difficult.

A 134 I: Such as?

A 135 S: Most of the time it's not the pupil's fault. It's the parents or um - perhaps. I don't believe in personality clashes, but it can be that children um - unconsciously encourage ostracisation and I would again go to the source of the problem and try to iron it out. I believe in this democracy lark of protecting the rights of minorities and in the classroom situation one pupil who sits. It's more important for me to stop one pupil from being ostracised than to move the whole class, make them all progress a little. I think I'd rather be a teacher who solved the problem within the class so that if the whole class then went on to another teacher, its problems would be solved. So all bad pupils in the class for whatever reason, I'd hope to end those problems by the end of the year. That would be my goal. Probably be my ulcers and heart attack as well (Both laugh).

A 136 I: Right. So do you see that if there is um - for instance a badly behaved ... um pupil in a class, and somehow you get to the bottom of the problem, then that's alright for the rest of your year. Do you think when they move on to another class, that there could be a recurrence of that problem or new problems could come up. Or...

A 137 S: Actually there probably won't be any solutions to some problems. Um .. you cannot sort of, end er .. or or help a pupil of .. um .. a a son of a mother who's divorced or father who's divorced. You can only try. Um .. if you if you are open minded and ... you show by example what what a good citizen's like. I think um .. you've done quite a lot. Some some pupils will for whatever reason go through prison. And you must accept that there are people like that. You just have to work within that framework.

It was not unusual for students to be able to give descriptions of a "good" pupil easily but be unable or unwilling to describe what would be a "bad" pupil for them. Steve was no exception in describing a "bad" pupil with the caveat of why they were so. The converse was not true in that students did not offer suggestions or reasons why pupils might be "good".

Steve appears to work through some of his ideas of reasons why pupils may be
difficult. He starts by stating that he does not believe in personality clashes but then suggests that some pupils may encourage ostracisation. He then states his belief in protecting the rights of the minority preventing a pupil being ostracised rather than the whole class progressing. This is in contrast to his earlier statement (see A 125) where he would respect most the consensus view of the children. His goal would be to resolve problems but on further probing he admitted that home or social problems outside the classroom may be unsolvable. "Badness" is socially derived while "goodness" is probably innate.

On the contribution of psychology to teaching and learning Steve sees that there are many learning theories that must affect your teaching and that a lot of progress has been made in research. He adds:

A 156 S: Um it would be good if all teachers were graduates in psychology I'm certain. Um .. because we should all be open minded about what teaching is ... and realise that it's not the fact that a teacher has a content of knowledge which he um .. um hammers into the heads of these pupils. And um .. psychology also allows teachers to appreciate that so many .. the the multi-dimensional aspects of all individuals. Personality theories and things like that. (Pause)

Steve sees psychology (especially as a psychology graduate) as being relevant, as it allows the teacher to appreciate the multi-dimensional aspects of all individuals. He specifically mentions as an example personality theories. However, this is not echoed through the interview and individual differences do not appear of importance to him. His reference to, "we should be open minded about what teaching is", is of interest as our conversation gave me the impression that there was a right way to teach which was informed by research and experts. He decries the model that, "a teacher has a content of knowledge which he hammers into the heads of these pupils". Content plays a part in the teacher educator's role and that of the college student for Steve but is not seen as important for primary pupils. For Steve the "teacher focus" is important for both school teacher and school pupil and as such remains consistent between teacher and pupil expectations.
In terms of Perry's nine developmental stages through which students move during their university career [Perry, 1968, 1975] Steve may be seen to remain firmly in Position One. He sees his world in polar terms. Right answers are known by Authority whose role it is to mediate them. Knowledge is gained by hard work and obedience to authority.

A glimmer of Position Two is seen (see A 025) where he accounts for uncertainty by seeing those authorities as poorly qualified or merely as providing an exercise to encourage thinking (see A 031).

8.2 Teaching Practice

Teaching practice takes place in the second term on the PGCE course. Steve was placed at a County Middle School for boys and girls aged 8-12 years. The school held approximately three-hundred and fifty pupils divided into twelve classes, each year having three mixed ability classes with their own class teacher.

Steve was assigned one of the first forms, a group of twenty-four 8-9 year olds with equal numbers of boys and girls. The first and second year classes were accommodated in the "Lower Area" of the purpose built school. This was an open plan teaching space well provided with books, equipment and sinks, with six classrooms leading off from this area. Children were regularly encouraged to work individually or in small groups in the resources area.

On making the appointment to visit the school the head teacher had requested that I meet with him before going to observe the class. It became apparent at our meeting that he favoured an integrated day approach working around a project topic, and was concerned about the student's ability in class especially in relationships and in utilising his own ideas. He felt that Steve would not be able to cope in a normal class as his class was particularly good and easy. Discipline, the head teacher felt, came from the relationship of the teacher with the children.
which allowed the teacher to set work at the appropriate level. He also felt that there were inadequate selection criteria for the PGCE courses and there should be more school involvement, with school visits and practice in the first term so that 'unsuitable' students would be filtered out at an early stage.

Steve's classroom was bright and cheerful. Two walls held displays of pictures and pupils' work. Tables were grouped together so that four children sat together facing one another in pairs. Groups consisted of both boys and girls. It was not known whether pupils were placed or sat in friendship groups.

The morning was divided into two sessions, "Language" before break and "Measurement" after break. Both sessions followed the same format. Steve handed out worksheets and writing books and pupils sat at their desks working individually. There was little noise or movement in the class and Steve frequently discouraged both. Pupils sought attention for help by raising their hands or queueing by Steve's side. Steve did not attend to pupils other than those seeking attention or misbehaving. Before break two pupils were asked to collect in the work and pupils were instructed to put on their outdoor shoes and to leave for the playground, table by table.

Pupils returned from break, changed their shoes and returned to their tables. This session took the same format as the Language one. Steve handed out worksheets and work books. Talk and movement were restricted as before with the exception of three pupils who, each working individually, had the task of measuring a number of pupils in the class. At the end of the class Steve instructed the class to put things away. Having done this they "sat up straight", waiting to be allowed to leave for lunch.

During the morning break the class teacher took me to the staffroom for coffee while Steve was preparing some work. He echoed the head teacher's concern that Steve did not produce his own ideas but expects to be told what to do. He had expected that having a student would be challenging, producing new ideas and
enthusiasm and even arguments about what he was doing, and he felt somewhat disappointed.

8.3 The Second Interview

This interview took place in the final term, after teaching practice. How did Steve now see the role of the teacher?

B 002 S: I think the teacher should be very flexible, I think I said this before. The teaching practice that I was in, showed that the children each had different problems and you had to cope with the children as individuals. Um ... I found that it was best if a teacher didn't have set goals for the class. Instead to try try and just make each individual in the class work as hard as possible. That is to say encourage them, don't threaten them. (Both laugh).

The emphasis for Steve has moved from "the class" to the individual's needs. The aims of the school stressed the recognition and provision of the needs of the individual child as creating the most advantageous learning environment.

In the first interview Steve's construct of "flexible" (see A093 and A099) referred to the ability of the teacher to implement the will of the head teacher. Although he still generally continues to believe this there is some allowance for the teacher's own views as he continues:

B 002 S: (cont) Um ... I think that it's up to the headmaster to have the longterm views and to meet the teachers frequently to discuss the objectives for each ... umm each lesson. Well actually the headmaster shouldn't intervene that much but, what I'm saying is that it's not for the teacher to have these goals. That that's for the school to have and it's for the teacher to adapt the goals to the class and if the class is not meeting those goals then no responsibility should be on the teacher. Because the teacher's first responsibility is to the children, and that might not correspond to the goals of the school.

B 003 I: So it's ultimately up to the headmaster umm. and the aims and goals of the school?
B 004 S: Oh yes. I wouldn’t disagree. I mean you’d discuss with the headmaster. But umm.. it’s his school and you can’t be a headmaster and a teacher. So if you’re going to disagree with him, you’re really.. saying that you can do his job. (Pause)

He falls back onto the head teacher as the figure of authority. What about his head teacher on teaching practice?

B 005 I: Mmm. Did you agree with your headmaster?

B 006 S: Well it’s umm .. He’s a nice man personally and er .. I didn’t see myself em wanting to disagree. Umm .. I didn’t. I mean .. his was an integrated day, very progressive type school .. umm personally I prefer more traditional schools. But it. I didn’t disagree with the headmaster once. I said to him, explain what you want, and he did, and I said, right I’ll do my best .. to do it that way.

B 007 I: But if you were given a totally free hand to do what you wanted .. you were indicating you’d prefer something a bit more formal.

B 008 S: Oh yes.

This conversation illustrates the problem of mismatch between staff and students when personal epistemologies conflict. The head teacher had voiced his concern that Steve was not using his own initiative and ideas. This was echoed by the class teacher who not only expected lots of ideas and enthusiasm but also arguments about what he was doing so that it would be challenging. Steve’s concern was to carry out the wishes of those in authority and not to air his own ideas and views or to appear critical of those in authority. Neither side seemed aware that, unaddressed, their personal epistemologies may remain a barrier to understanding and change nor, to my knowledge, did college staff address this issue.

Having recognised his teaching practice school as progressive and his own preference for something more formal, Steve goes on to describe what he now saw as his own approach to teaching.

B 010 S: Uhu. I would umm .. I’m more confident now. I know what I can bring into teaching. Whereas before .. I thought of umm .. that I would have problems. But what I can see .. what I’ve got, what
talents I've got and ... I would use those so that ... umm whatever the school wanted me to be ... I know what I'm strong, what subjects I'm strong in, and what, ... what number of children I can teach well at one time. How I should structure lessons and so forth. So umm ... yes I'm more confident.

He goes on to illustrate his approach to teaching by describing what sort of lesson plans he would do:

B 012 S: Umm ... assuming I had an average class of thirty five children. The um subjects ... I, I still think that you shouldn't integrate subjects. So that the children should be doing Geography ... Maths, English and not some ... mish-mash.

B 013 I: You shouldn't you said?

B 014 S: You should, I think subjects ... should be clearly, you could, should explain to the children very clearly. We are going to do mathematics this morning. This is what mathematics is. Because umm ... we're teaching them things ... that they're going to need to pass exams. I don't believe exams will ever be abolished ... and that's our duty to them. Umm ... so the subjects, I would, I would split the day up into subjects and I would have, they would have ... work for each subject. So that at the end of the year they'd probably have six or seven different piles of work. Umm ... informally, that is to say, registration time, playtime, ... I would talk to the children and discuss the connections between the subjects, ... But I think the children are quite capable of drawing the connections themselves.

Steve clearly sees content being divided into discrete subjects to be taught as such and rejects an interdisciplinary approach. This is consistent with his traditional view of education that sees knowledge as "nuggets of truth" to be handed down. It is also consistent with the view of teaching "things that they're going to need to pass exams". The belief that "children are quite capable of drawing the connections themselves" explains why Steve would only discuss the connections between subjects informally and that it would not be seen to be part of the curriculum.

His earlier reference to the importance of the individual (see B 002) seems to conflict with his views of the solidarity of the class and the idea of "labelling" children, which is to accept their different capabilities.
B 014 S: (cont) U... organising the children I would start all lessons with a sort of speech to the whole class. So that they all see themselves as starting off from the same starting line for each lesson. Er... because I think that you shouldn't umm... label children and... one way of labelling children would be to say, I want these children here to do this work and you to do that work. Cos no matter how you try to hide it... they will see themselves as not good enough for that work. Cos you didn't let them try it... and... stage two of a lesson, say after half an hour, would be... I would have prepared... umm... different small sets of work, so that children would break up into groups to do it. But initially starting off with all the children together, I think that's very important. It gives the class a sense of... solidarity I think... and that allows the children to have pride in their class and then display work and so forth is taken more seriously. Because they see themselves as contributing to the fame of the class... and not as sort of individuals happening who just happen to be working together. So I think the class is a very important unit of the school.

B 015 I: When they break up into their... or groups in your stage two... um... are they actually working individually or in a group together?

B 016 S: Oh sometimes one sometimes the other. Mostly individually I hope. The umm... modern view of education... puts a lot of emphasis on... verbal interaction between children. But I think that comes naturally, there's no need to emphasise it. Umm... so making an artificial lesson where they have to... umm... for example you might say to them... I want you to discuss how you would solve this problem. Better to say, solve this problem and I'm going to let you talk. They will discuss it then.

B 017 I: So you're happy for the children to talk at some...

B 018 S: Yes, but I'd want them to realise that... I would expect work from an individual. His name signed at the end of it. Not work from a group. Because that would allow the strong members of the group to do it, and the weak members to just stand watching.

If the teacher's requirement of the learner is to produce an individual piece of work and to pass exams etc, then the "hidden curriculum" suggests that co-operation and discussion are not rewarded regardless of what the teacher is actually saying. Steve does not see "weak" members as being able to contribute or being able to learn from working with "strong" members.
Steve saw his teaching as having been influenced by the teaching practice head teacher and class teacher and by his supervisors from college. He gained confidence from the head teacher who was very positive and never criticised negatively and by example had influenced his attitude to children. His class teacher influenced him in class discipline.

B 029 S: (cont) The small things to say in the class - to keep control. Umm you, you really only learn discipline by - copying people who can keep discipline. There's no theory to learn, you just have to get the knack. So she influenced me in that area. With regard to theory them .. my two supervisors .. they influenced me there.

B 030 I: How did they do that?

B 031 S: Well all I learnt with regard to the theory of education I had to apply somehow, and they showed me how to do it, quite simply, only in the area that I had time for in T.P. But er I'm sure I can extrapolate on to other theories and learn how to put those into practice. Really they just showed me that theory can be put into practice.

Steve goes on to give an example:

B 033 S: Oh yes. Yes the idea of - umm teaching number, teaching mathematics to children. The the theory at first, looks like its err; umm well it looks quite complicated. The idea of the concepts being - make sure that the concepts are in the children's head first. Like the concept of place value. I actually taught that to my class. Umm - I initially thought just plenty of practice and the concept will - emerge. The modern theory is that you know you have to be more sensitive to the feedback from the children. You don't blindly just give them exercises. You do it - stage by stage. So I look back at the theory, saw the - each stage. The final stage being - the understanding of the concept, and I did a lesson on each stage and I had to be patient not to - move on to the next stage, knowing that it has to sink in. And that patience I was taught by my supervisors. So that's how they influenced me.

B 034 I: And did you, did you find that it worked?

B 035 S: Oh yes. (Both laugh) I hope it did. You, you can never tell really. Because it was an integrated school the umm - there was no teaching of the children. They didn't look any brighter at the end. (Laughs) But I suppose they must have been.
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Steve shows uncertainty whether the pupils may have benefited, as, being an integrated school, there were no test results that would prove it. He seemed uncertain that being sensitive to the feedback from the children was an objective measure in itself.

"Concepts" are seen as things that are taught stage by stage allowing them to "sink in" to the children's heads between lessons. Steve does not see the child as taking an active part in their learning.

He echoed these ideas again when we went on to discuss the usefulness of psychology on teaching practice.

B043 S: Umm .... yes er psychology you know since I've done it all .. err before and it sort of underlines all .. everything I do. Yes I think it's an essential part of the course and umm it's quite enjoyable .. and I think it was very useful on teaching practice.

B046 I: Can you give me some examples of the umm . areas in psychology that you that you felt were particularly useful. From either what you did in your degree or from here.

B047 S: Yes umm .. I can't really give specifics, cos as I said it was a sort of underlying understanding of children that it provided. Umm .... well .. I went into a class of concrete operational children, you know and .... it .. since I was only teaching one age group. Umm .. I just swotted up .. everything I should expect from a concrete operational child and just .. made a mental note .. not to .. not expect too much from this child with regard to understanding of concepts. That's all .. it's just um an understanding of the child I was working with, and I was working with the same .. type of children for a whole term. So it it just, towards the end of the em T.P. I didn't need to keep sort of .. reminding myself about the type of child I was teaching.

Steve does not appear to question that all the children were at the concrete operational stage. He does not mention that this was a Piagetian notion or that this view had its' critics, or that there were alternative views of cognitive development. That they were "concrete operational children" was seen to be a fact and his experience on teaching practice did not appear to challenge this view.
An interesting aspect of Steve's view is that although he sees the child as being "concrete" operational, he does not speak of the child as actively manipulating his environment but as being a passive receiver. Sometimes, however, there seem to be contradictions. For instance, when discussing the relationship teaching had to learning, Steve had the following to say:

B 055 S: Well umm ... I ... I think it it's it's umm it directs learning. Learning will sometimes be in . It's a natural thing learning. It happens all the time, whether you want it to or not. But the speed with which you learn something and the direction your learning takes . umm is not always best. So teaching directs your learning. Its as a, as a directing influence. It doesn't have to be too hot on the imparting of knowledge... it can be as ignorant about what it teaches as the learner. But it knows what we want to find out. So it directs the learner ... into the right direction. You don't have to be ... all knowledgeable to be a teacher ... .

Here learning is seen as a natural thing that happens all the time and one might assume the learning played an active part. As teaching directs the learner into the "right" direction, it is assumed that left to their own devices learners may go in the "wrong" direction. Subject matter is not seen to be something that the teacher passes down to his learners but rather directs the learner towards. On probing further Steve also sees people as having a natural disinclination to learn:

B 056 I: From what you've said ..em .. you've said learning's natural and it happens all the time .. umm are you actually saying you can have learning without teaching?

B 057 S: Yes. Oh yes.

B 058 I: Um. OK. And can you have teaching without learning?

B 059 S: Oh yes (both laugh). What you're actually doing is umm ... it's ... it's like umm ... you're reinforcing the natural um disinclination that exists with regard to learning. Sometimes .. people would rather that they just .. didn't learn. Although learning is natural in some areas .. people no matter how exposed they are to it, will not learn it. Because they they don't want to. They're disinclined to learn it. And you could re reinforce this disinclination by presenting them this .. knowledge in a type of environment that is .. umm .. boring and .. all that things like that.
From the last two passages we can see that Steve believes that people have both a
natural inclination and a natural disinclination to learn. Although "learning is
something that happens all the time, whether you want it to or not", also "in some
areas people no matter how exposed they are to it will not learn it".

If teaching is seen as "directing learning," how does one know how to teach?

B 061 S: I think you can sense the response of the children, there's
immediate feedback. As I say you're only directing so you don't
really need to umm carry the children through the lesson. You
just need to provide input here and there, to ensure that the
learning process of the children carries on smoothly. And you can
tell when the children stop or slow down and that's when you
know that you're going about this the wrong way and you have to re-think how to teach.

Steve's view of the learner is like that of a machine. The machine needs "feeding"
regularly to run smoothly, and slowing down or stopping is a sign something is
wrong. Similarly the learner is seen as requiring regular input to ensure the
learning process of the children carries on smoothly and if the children stop or
slow down there is something wrong with the teaching.

It is interesting that Steve now has an "intuitive" or "experiential" view of how to
teach in responding to the feedback from the child as in the pre-teaching practice
interview he had emphasised, "I've got to teach because it is theoretically the best
things in the best way of teaching them", (see A 093). Earlier in this interview he
spoke of "swotting up everything I should expect from a concrete operational
child", (see B047) which shows a strong theoretical orientation.

How does he know how someone learns?

B 065 S: Umm well you assume they're learning. But you can tell when
they're enjoying working through an exercise and you can tell
when they're enjoying reading, and talking about things. And you
just assume that having made an eloquent speech on the
subject, the child has learnt it....
The assumption that, "having made an eloquent speech on the subject the child has learnt it" runs counter to Steve's earlier comments on the "natural disinclination to learn", (see B059). I press him further.

B 066 I: But how do you know how they learn?

B 067 S: Ummm ...

B 068 I: Rather than they have learnt.

B 069 S: You.. know that they .. well, well you can test them to know if they have learnt. Umm .. umm .. I don't think it really matters .. if you do know how they learn or not. Umm ...

B 070 I: Why not?

B 071 S: Well ----- your job is to direct as I said. As a teacher you must provide the input. Get the children .. the information they want. Show them how to find it and .. give them examples of .. what you expect them to do, in order to answer exercises and so forth. Umm .. and .. I think you'd be hard put to find an instance where a teacher did all that and the children still didn't learn. So you you can just say that .. they do learn. I, I .. we may not know how. I I myself .. you know .. well .. I wouldn't really be able to answer that question I don't think. Perhaps a few of my learned colleagues .. but I couldn't (laughs).

He has repeated the importance of "directing" and "providing input" and expectations of the children to learn as a result.

So does it matter, knowing how someone learns?

B 071 S: No it doesn't er you test them at the end of the day if you're unsure ... and I think .. as long as you find that .. they meet the required .. standards. You don't really need to worry about how they learn. Cos they've so many .. different .. views on this, and so many different ways of teaching. Umm .. you really shouldn't put all your money on to one .. theory.

B 072 I: Mmm. What about putting your money on all the theories? (Laughs)

B 073 S: Well you really ought to just put your money on the child .. and, and .. if you find that no way can you .. impart information successfully to them. that is there is no way that they can learn then you'd better start
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swotting up some new theories. (Laughs) Find out what else you could do.

Here Steve recognises that there are different views on learning and different ways of teaching but rejects adhering to any one theory. However, earlier in this interview he describes his class of "concrete operational children" (see B047) using Piaget's theory of cognitive development. Although not attributing these ideas to Piaget it was recognised as an aspect of psychological theory. It is of interest that if learning failed the remedy would be "swotting up some new theories to find out what else to do". (see B073)

Further discussion revealed that those who had not grasped a concept would not have finished the work and therefore would not be able to go onto the next stage.

**B 073 S:** (cont) ..... As you prepare a lesson, you prepare extended work and you prepare umm reinforcing work to allow . a child to reach the concept stage by stage. Now . you may . you may find that the child who is not quite able to understand the concept so easily. He will not have finished the . work. Will not have covered the ground by the end of the lesson. And really school it's only a few hours in the day. You really ought to provide out of school time for that child. Or at least give him exercises, let the parents in on it and . allow the child to cover the ground out of school time. Because as I say . come the next lesson, you don't want him to be doing different work to the others. You sort of start anew ..... 

The difference for Steve is quantitative not qualitative. The amount of work and repetition is important, there is no question of finding a different approach or method of explanation. "Bright" children need less practice, less "bright" children need more.

Steve further illustrates these ideas in describing what teaching and learning have to do with the way knowledge develops in a child.

**B 076 S:** Umm ... That's difficult. The way knowledge develops in a child . umm . what I'm . what I'd understand by that . is . how a child . makes . structures in his brain. How he umm . puts everything
into a pigeon-hole and relates all the different parts of his knowledge umm... so that he understands, he doesn't just store things like a computer. He understands what information he has managed to retain. Now teaching will allow the child to practise recalling all these bits of information and will show if the child has successfully understood what he's learnt. So in that way it really tests whether he has got umm... an understanding of what he's stored, and if he hasn't got an understanding of it... it will provide him through working through the exercises, with an understanding. Now learning is the storing of this information... and it's not necessarily the understanding of it as well. Because you can learn things parrot fashion. You can teach things parrot fashion. But a proper lesson would be... teaching a child to store and recall appropriate information to solve appropriate problems. So it just ensures, a good teacher will ensure that the knowledge is stored in correct structures. Not just randomly.

B 077 L: How would they know which was the correct structure?

B 078 S: Well if they've... successfully solved the problem. Then, then then you know that it's stored... and can be recalled at the right circumstances.

Steve has a structuralist approach to the storing of knowledge. Learning is the storing of information which may or may not be understood. Good teaching ensures that the information retained is understood and can be recalled appropriately for problem solving. This view is consistent with Steve's overall traditional approach to teaching and learning.

8.4 Comments

Over the year Steve's personal epistemology has remained fairly consistently within the Cultural Transmission model despite his teaching practice placement at a progressively oriented school and the emphasis of the PGCE course being child-centred.

Although he had felt his teaching had been most influenced by the teaching practice school's head teacher and class teacher and the college supervisors these
had effected minor changes in pedagogy. He had modelled certain aspects of behaviour he had perceived as desirable e.g. not criticising negatively, what to say in class to keep discipline, and following a stage by stage approach to concept development. However these techniques did not challenge his personal perspectives.

Steve may be seen to encompass a realist philosophy in that he sees things fairly clearly in black or white, good or bad, true or false. There is a best way of teaching; e.g. "... because it is theoretically the best way of teaching them" (see A 093), and opposing viewpoints cannot both be acceptable e.g. "...it would put me in a dilemma especially if I thought both had grounds of being right." (see A 095)

The teacher educator's role is seen as that of an imparter of information. He is a little ambivalent about this information and sees him as one "who doesn't know the subject necessarily, but certainly has enough notes ... and enough experience of talking about what he's talking about ... to answer just about every type of question quickly, and without having to delay the answer." For someone to be able to do this he would have to "know" the subject as an expert. This same ambivalence is displayed in his view of the teacher. As a student teacher he will receive the certificate "knowing that I've got the knowledge necessary to be a teacher" (see A 037), whereas talking of teaching later, he says "It doesn't have to be too hot on the imparting of knowledge, it can be as ignorant about what it teaches as the learner, but it knows what we want to find out so it directs the learner into the right direction. You don't have to be all knowledgeable to be a teacher" (see B 055). However, he sees the teacher as expert, "you can't really learn without guidance from a professional who knows how to teach" (see A 045).

Steve sees the learner as essentially passive. For the student teacher at college, attending lectures is important as, "I think that could be the fault of the exam system because the throwing back at the lecturer what he's given you is the quickest way to the point as far as he's concerned" (See A 061). This is echoed of the pupil at school, "...we're teaching things that they're going to need to pass
exams. I don't believe that exams will ever be abolished and that's our duty to them" (see B 074) . Exams may be seen as an extrinsic motivator and would be consist with a Cultural Transmission approach.

On first glance Steve's references to a Piagetian model of development would seem at odds to the Cultural Transmission model and more in keeping with a Progressivist approach. However, on closer inspection it was apparent that the Piagetian jargon of "concept development" and "concrete operational children" was being used, yet there was no indication of the learner interacting with his environment, of stimulation promoting cognitive conflict, or of experiential problem solving situations. Learning for Steve takes place when a concept has been grasped and this is achieved by repetitive exercises, the brighter ones getting it with less repetition than the less bright. This view is more in keeping with a behaviourist approach and is in keeping with the Cultural Transmission model.

The teaching practice observation confirmed Steve's preference for a formal approach to teaching. He was concerned with the level of noise and movement in the class and kept both to a minimum. Pupils were given attention only if seated with hands raised or in the designated queue. The class teacher usually worked in a less formal way, with pupils moving from classroom to resources area as they felt they needed to, and they were generally self directed within an integrated day.

Of all the students I interviewed Steve seemed to be the most traditional in his approach, and of all the schools I visited on teaching practice perhaps the one Steve was placed at might be considered the most progressive in its approach. There was no evidence that college tutors or supervisors either recognised this or facilitated it.

There is little evidence of a shift in Steve's position as might be described by Perry's developmental stages over the year. He still appears to remain at position one with some recognition of position two.
Seen in Kellyan terms Steve may be seen to indulge in tight construing. Producing creative ideas depends on being able to loosen the connection between constructs and realigning them in an unusual way, then tightening them to enable evaluation. Hudson's "convergent thinker" is someone who shows a distinct preference for construing tightly. [Hudson, 1966]. It does not mean that he is unable to loosen his construing, simply that he has found that tight construing has been more consistently validated by those he admires. This observation shows that simply placing a student on a practice with a contrasting epistemological stance to his own will not enable the student to shift position. Teacher educators must be able to help their students to facilitate change and this is discussed in the final chapter.
Chapter 9

Case study 2: Jane

A portrait of a predominantly Romanticist perspective
"Rousseau suggests that no great harm to the child or to society will result if the child grows with little adult supervision and direction. The child will become increasingly fit to live in the world, not by virtue of ceaseless vigilance on the part of his governors, but because nature has endowed him with an order of development that ensures his healthy growth. More than that, the typical interventions of parents and teachers mar and distort the natural succession of the changes of childhood; the child that man raises is almost certain to be inferior to the child that nature raises." 

[Kessen, 1965, p.74]

9.1 The First Interview

Jane was a 20 year old who had come to Queensbury Polytechnic, having left a university political course during the first year. She describes why she changed to a teaching course.

A004 J: Um ... well I started off in Hampden University doing a very political course, um .. and I, I, really knew it wasn't me after a term, for no particular reason, other than I just knew that it wasn't for me. So I left and, um .. everyone's always told me "You should be a teacher, you should be a teacher" because I'm fairly natural with children, and I always thought "Right that's why I'm not going to be a teacher. I'm not going to be a teacher." Because everyone always said "Be a teacher." So I thought I won't do that. So after, after, this sort of rest of that year after the first term of Hampden I had a lot of time to think and I really realised that that was exactly what I wanted to do, and it had just been purely rebellion that had been telling me not to. So um .. I don't know, I feel really relaxed with children, I know I can cope with them, um. I'm never short of ways to deal with them and things to do with them and ... For a start, I don't want to teach my whole life, I think that's just something I can do, so I'll start there.
She goes on to say why she chose the Junior Middle age range (9 - 13).

A010 J: Junior Middle. Er... I guess I have had more experience with, I've got enormous numbers of cousins and I've done nannying and all sorts of things. I guess nice experiences with children really who aren't you know too small. I like to be able to talk to them and relate to them as people. They and I... I guess I... you feel easier with slightly older children er... you can do more. I suppose more interested in, in children after they've developed their personalities a bit, than the very very beginning where you've got... where it is a sort of nursery type situation and you've got... you're coping with all the things like... um... you know, just house training them in a way in the beginning, aren't you. Just to react socially with each other. Um... I'm interested really I suppose in children who have already developed a bit. (Pause) Er... and who are used to the idea of being in school...

She has a positive attitude towards her chosen age group and a negative attitude towards those younger and older.

A011 J: Yeh. Would you have wanted to have done secondary?

A012 J: No. Not at all. I've always absolutely loathed the idea of doing a secondary... I don't know why. I think it's um... it's partly I know how ghastly I was in secondary school. I was really horrible, really rebellious, and I gave my teachers a hell of a time, hell of a time. And um... plus because I've always thought I couldn't have coped with me, if I'd been faced with me, and I wouldn't like to try.

Her choice is informed both by her experience with children and reflection of herself as a child.

In describing the teacher educator's role Jane perceives a difference between the way they are and the way they wish to be seen:

A016 J: (Pause) Um... well I know they like the ideas that, that um... that they are all very approachable and that you go to them with your problems, um... and that's how they'd like to be seen. But I don't think it is actually how, how very many students see them. I mean we see them basically as that they are the academic side of your college life, and um... you keep them very separate and from the rest of your life. I do. I think most people do, and er... although I guess they'd like to be more personally involved, you tend to have so
many other personal involvements and relationships and things with everyone else you're involved with at college that the lecturer is very much a lecturer and you know, ... who stays in er lecture time. I guess as an educator's someone who tells you things you can write down in notes and gets you through your degree. There are some lecturers actually, no that's not entirely true, that you are more friendly with and who are personally involved and you know that if you needed some help with um ... your course was going wrong or you could go and, and they'd battle for you, and ... they'd ... it's nice some lecturers care, ... but um you get the feeling that a lot of lecturers are really ... they sort of give you all this bumph about, "Well you'd like to feel that you could ring us if you had a problem and things," but I mean you'd never dream of it. You can usually tell if people are genuine in wanting to be ... you know, in saying that "You can come to me" and ... in the big lecture classes the idea of some bloke sitting at the front and saying "Well you know, I'd like to say that any of you can come to me". It's such an impersonal situation that ...

She separates the "academic" from the "relationship" role and is cynical of lecturers offering help but not meaning it. She shows a preference for a friendly caring relationship with lecturers that are personally involved.

In describing the difference between a "good" and "bad" teacher educator she divides this into two areas, "academically" and "personally":

A020 J: (Pause) Academically, I suppose, someone who knows their stuff and is clear and precise and puts it in a way that, that you can take it. It doesn't confound you as jargon and things that ... and ... and put things in a very complicated, impressive way which you really can't make head nor tail of. Some of them can be simple and precise and interest you in what they are saying. Who's interested themselves in what they're saying to interest you. Um ... I think, you know, academically, personally, I suppose ... well everyone's got different ideas of who they personally like, and who they personally don't like of the lecturer as a person. You know, if there's this massive great lecture theatre full of people, he's just a little bod stood at the front, whereas if there's just a couple of you, he's a person.

A021 I: Yeh. And so a bad lecturer for you would be what?

A022 J: Well, someone who's who isn't particularly um ... clear, who's sort of, who puts a lot of ... I find a lot of people, a lot of lecturers are so academic about their subjects that they talk about them in a way that that is just um just leaves you bemused and puzzled rather than,
any the wiser. I um I don't know, when they rattle on with masses of jargon. I think it's really important actually in learning with whatever age group that um that you're not presented with er jargon, because that just puts you right off the track, and you can't even concentrate on on listening. As soon as you get jargon you switch off, I find. So I suppose a bad lecturer is someone who, who's full of his own importance and he's got all the correct words and who flashes them at you all the time, and who hasn't got any idea of whether you're scribbling away and you can't keep up, and who isn't noticing that you're looking puzzled and you know, I suppose someone who's got no idea of how his material is being received.

She does not really see herself as a student, as the academic side is only one sphere of her life:

A024 J: ...Er I guess as a student, I mean, it kind of entails coming into your lectures and being interested in what's going on in the Poly. But I mean I suppose I'm not very, I mean I'm quite, I am quite interested in the course I'm in, because I'm really interested in education and why and the whats and the wherefores. And the curriculums, and all the effects that that school has on children. I am interested in that so I guess as a student I am interested in my course. But apart from that I don't really feel like a student.

Her emphasis on interest runs through both the teacher educator and student role and is repeated as critical in both her own and others' approach to learning:

A026 J: God knows. I find it very very difficult to learn if I'm not interested and motivated. And I think that the most, most important thing in teaching is to, is to um to present things in a way that makes your listeners interested and want to learn. Because if they're not interested, well if I'm not interested my mind goes blank, and I just switch off and I find it very difficult to focus. I mean. Er I suppose that I find it very difficult to learn anything if I'm not interested in it. Um do you mean what is my approach to studying or...?

A027 I: To learning anything really. I mean you're obviously learning things all the time.

A028 J: I think they do tend to be things that you are interested in. I mean, people are my main, main interest and I learn all the time from everything people say to me, because I really focus in and I'm really interested and I want to listen and I want to think about it afterwards. And er I guess um I rate the learning and learning about relationships and people a lot more than I rate learning in a
lecture situation ... in some ways. Er ... I think, yeh, the only thing about the way I learn is um ... is that I'm very unconscientious and I am very slapdash and I am bad at organising myself. and ... and my learning is very much, although I think it's going to have to change really, is very much that I remember what I'm interested in. And if I'm interested in a lecture and I'm interested in what I'm writing then I'll read about it and I'll think about it, but if I'm not interested then I can read and think and and take notes and it just doesn't go in at all. (Pause)

How do other individuals learn?

A030 J: I don't know, it's difficult to know how anyone else learns, other than yourself. (Pause) I guess I think that the interest factor is something that is, is um ... very very important to to everyone. I mean most people find it very difficult to sit and take in information that they really find completely uninteresting and unstimulating, and most people, I would think, learn a lot more effectively if er, if their ... interest is sparked off. Er ... because I've taught ... um I guess I've taught kind of music to children and lots of music with ... and done lots of musical activities and things with children and they always seem to um ... take in and receive and be able to ... and they let you know they've learnt when, when you seem to have them having fun and ... I think you've got to want to learn and enjoy learning to learn. I don't think you can learn much just, you know, if you're being made to sit down and write out this or write out that and you know, if you're bored and ... Another thing is that learning ... should be as far as possible, I guess, an enjoyable idea rather than a chore. And I think that too many kids and too many people regard learning as a bind, rather than just a follow up of things they are interested in. I guess that's because at school you are made to do an awful lot of things that you just find totally dull and totally irrelevant.

Jane's view that learning should be interesting and fun is consistent with the way she sees her role as a teacher and forthcoming teaching practice.

A034 J: I can't wait, I really am looking forward to it, I really am. Er, "role" ..... friend, er somebody who is interested in them, in their personalities and in their backgrounds, in their ... I don't know someone who will watch over and care for them as well as, I guess, educate them. (Pause) I want, I want, things I want to ... when I'm a teacher I want my class to enjoy the idea of coming into school every day, I don't want to, I don't want them to be sat being bored and thinking "Isn't she an old dragon" and "I hate doing this" and ...
don't know, I guess I want it to be as lively as possible. I love being with kids, and I can make them enjoy things (Pause). I guess, I'm really interested in all the ideas of background and the effects that childhood has on the rest of your life anyway. Because I've done a lot of looking at the effects that my childhood has had on the rest of my life and I, and I suppose um, it would be fascinating to watch, to watch lots of other little lives in the beginnings of ... I mean, I suppose you're an educator basically, but there's a lot more besides.

Jane seems to be highly motivated by her own experiences, both positive and negative, as a learner. She reflects on her own experiences when describing what for her are the differences between a good and a bad teacher:

A036 J: ... Good teachers, for me, are ... are the ones who have been able to have a laugh, who haven't minded everything getting riotous and noisy and moving around. Who haven't been frightened by the idea of people being individuals, and children saying things when they want to say things and who have really let you enjoy learning and enjoy education and enjoy what you are doing and enjoy each other. Um ... I had a fabulous teacher in my fourth year junior school,... I always think that a bad teacher is someone who has got to stand at the front and scream and who finds any noise terribly frightening and who thinks that the ideal class is a nice, quiet, heads down class. That's not my ideal idea of a class at all. I'd rather have my children busily involved and walking round and doing lots of things and, and ... don't know. Silent classes, with heads bent. Lots of teachers seem to think that's the kind of class they want to have when their headmaster walks in or something. Busily working, not conferring ... Boring...

Jane's thoughts on her approach to teaching were consistent with her emphasis on interpersonal relationships, interest and fun.

A038 J: Great. I'm really looking forward to it. Lots of people seem to be really frightened by the idea of it, and .. "Oh my God, faced with a load of children. What will I say to them?" I just love it. I just love the thought of being with them, and er ... don't know I guess a lot of talking, and a lot of listening. I'm really interested in all this personality shaping thing, you see, so I guess I'll be very interested in ... in looking at them all individually as people, ... and er ... I really I, I'm just looking forward to it being a kind of fun experience with, with um lots of interesting new relationships, and ... I mean it doesn't intimidate me the thought of having loads of children in front of me at all. I think "Well great." All those people to get to know. (Pause)
The emphasis on the pupil’s role is on personal and social development. Academic achievement was an added bonus if you were born with that ability.

A048 J: To develop, grow, achieve ... er to enjoy what they are doing. (Pause) I, I just, you know, just to grow and enjoy growing and explore and discover. To be allowed to explore and discover in their own ways. (Pause) I mean there's so much you learn other than other than er history and English and things, about relating to people and ... socially and ... I don't know, I'd like, I mean it's all about developing and growing and being allowed to, being given the stimulus but being allowed to grow in your own way, rather than being pushed or ... forced, or made to feel that you got to be like everyone else. I don't know, I suppose it's about learning to be you and about learning to be an individual I suppose. Also you've got to come out with a few things like O'Levels and things if possible. And if you're, if you're lucky enough to have been born with a brain that can do that then great. I was. But if not there's a lot of other, there's a lot of other benefits and things you can learn on the way up.

She rejects classifying pupils as bad.

A050 J: ...if they are difficult, it's just a reflection of what life has done to them, always I think. No-one's difficult when they are born.

A052 J: No I don't hold with classifying people as bad pupils, because so much bloomin' damage, you suffer for ever through being classified as difficult. And good, 'good' in inverted commas is something I've never wanted to be, and I wouldn't particularly enjoy any children who were good. Good is just someone who is happy and whole and contented and who is enjoying themselves and enjoying education, relating satisfactorily to other pupils and teachers, and learning well and ... growing well. (Pause) It's not someone who's quiet and sits in the corner and does as they're told. Individual, someone who is an individual and is learning to like themselves as an individual, that's a good pupil. I think.

Jane sees different types of knowledge, academic, social and personal.

A056 J: What do I think knowledge is?! Er ... (Pause) God, I don't know. There's all sorts of different types of knowledge aren't there. I mean there's knowledge like, two plus two is four, and you know, 1066 and things like that. That's the kind of academic knowledge. And there's social knowledge, and er ... knowledge of yourself. (Pause) Awareness, ... I don't know, I don't know whether knowledge is things that you know or things that you're open to knowing.
She sees the development of knowledge as needing a basis on which to build.

A058 J: (Long Pause) I guess it develops, it goes step by step that one error thing registers and... and stays in your mind and you add things to it, and you add things to it. If you haven't got the first basic steps registered, then however much you pile in on top of it, it just goes through it like quicksand.

How did Jane see that psychology would contribute to her understanding of teacher and learning?

A062 J: Oh, it's brilliant. It's the most important thing. Important important important thing. To understand how, how and what makes a person react and, I wish some people had bloomin' taken a bit more psychological approach to me at times, it's vital to understand how and why and what's going on in someone's brain. It's just, it's just em, essential before you, before you try and teach them anything. I mean... I don't know. It's just going to be the most important thing in my, in my um, approach to teaching I think. It's the people and the brains and the personalities and the Why and the What's made them how they are. Because um, in knowing, you know, what kind of things have produced what kind of reactions and why they're reacting in certain ways, um surely you have to alter your approach in um... teaching each child really. I mean each child needs a... needs a different kind of... approach I suppose which would be difficult in a huge classroom. (Pause) But in being aware of the kinds of things, ways children are affected by things, and the kinds of ways children react to things psychologically, I would have thought was the most fundamental essential in teaching. It will be for me. It's the most interesting side for me. (Pause).

Jane had high expectations of psychology as being the most fundamental essential to inform her teaching. She believes that a deeper understanding of human nature will enable her to approach each individual to meet his needs. These views are consistent with her view of the importance of the teacher learner relationship.

In terms of Perry's developmental stages it is not possible to place Jane's views as fitting into any of the nine positions. Her approach to teaching seems to be atheoretical, reflective and intuitive which might be seen to be an arrogant amateurism/negative romanticism viewpoint [Tomlinson, 1981]. (1.7). She
recognises different types of knowledge, academic, social and personal but acts intuitively from feeling and experience.

Jane's views most closely fit Pope & Keen's description of the Romanticist Educational Ideology where the emphasis is child focused, stressing feelings and experience. The learner is born naturally "good" and will continue to develop that way unless repressed along the way. The teacher is permissive, unrestricted and non-directive providing a conflict free, child-centred pedagogic environment.

9.2 Teaching Practice

The first teaching practice takes place during the second half of the second term of the second year for B.Ed. students.

Jane's placement was at a County Primary and Junior School situated in a village location. The main building was Victorian and a number of terrapins' had been added to accommodate the growing population of children over recent years. The class Jane took was housed in one of these temporary buildings. Her class consisted of twenty-five unstreamed eight to nine year olds (fifteen girls and ten boys). Tables were arranged in groups mostly seating four children. There were a number of cupboards and shelves around the room and the whole back wall was displaying children's work.

On the morning of my visit Jane's class was taking an active part in the morning assembly. It was wet outside so the pupils came into the classroom on arrival, rather than remaining in the playground to wait for the morning bell. As each pupil arrived Jane greeted him in a friendly manner asking questions or making comments, and gathers together the pupils playing an active part in assembly. Some appear to be rather nervous and Jane encourages them and makes them laugh. The assembly goes smoothly with Jane playing the piano. After assembly she praises the children for a good performance. On return to the classroom she
writes the morning's spellings on the board for the children to copy. The rest of the morning is divided into Topic work before break and Art after break. Topic work starts with a question and answer session; Jane records responses on the blackboard and often asks pupils to contribute who have not raised their hands. The rest of the time before break pupils spend on their own work and Jane goes round the tables helping them individually. Just before break the class teacher returns to the class instructing the pupils about wet break routine and remains to supervise the class over this period.

After break the pupils are instructed to collect the art material and start work on a class collage of underwater creatures. There is a fair amount of movement both around and in and out of the classroom (the nearest sink is outside) and a lot of chattering and excitement. Most pupils manage to finish their piece of work before lunch. Jane goes round the tables helping and encouraging the pupils. At the end of the morning the pupils are encouraged to clear up the mess, then sit up straight at their desks before being allowed to leave for lunch.

Jane seemed to be very relaxed with the children, often putting her arm round them when talking with them or giving them a cuddle. There was a fair amount of movement and noise during class activities but not during periods when Jane was talking to the class. She effectively gained attention by raising her voice or hitting the desk with a ruler. She praised pupils frequently and appeared genuinely encouraging.

9.3 The Second Interview

This interview took place in the third term of the second year of the B.Ed. course. How did Jane now see the role of the teacher since teaching practice?

BO02 J: Um well, my really whole thing was was as, as a friend ... yeah I mean I wanted to be a friend and that's what I
was really, I mean possibly pos WHERE to the point where .. I wasn't really nearly as interested in the teaching as the er ... as the relationships I was building up ... you know, in some times I mean I a lot of ways I felt that the teaching got in the way of what I really wanted to do which was be with them ... um role of the teacher ... yeah I still think it's important to be, to be friends ... and to be able to, to be able to put yourself on a wavelength with them ... um ... find interesting things for them to do ... You know I suppose you know obviously you've got to succeed educationally as well ... but I think that you do that by being .. a friend far more successfully than you would otherwise (Pause).

Jane's views of the teacher's role still emphasises the importance of the relationship and interest as well as having fun. She feels that educational success is built on those foundations, as she describes her approach to teaching.

B004 J: Um ... to make things as fun as possible and to ... to know the kids themselves and and what they're about as much as possible to sort of have a good insight as what kind of work is suitable for them and what kind of things are going to stimulate them into ... into their best and motivate them ... I mean I think your your choice of of teaching material ... you know is bound to be far ... more suitable if you know what the kids themselves are about, who they are, and what they feel and ... what they need. (Pause)

She felt that she was particularly influenced by her personal experience of being a learner at school.

B006 J: Umm ..... partly my own experiences at school, in fact very largely my own experiences at school, which were bad .....um ... well I mean I'm particularly interested in the in the er difficult children and in schools far more you know I'm obviously mm interested full, ... over the, with them all but I mean my, I'm particularly concerned for the difficult ones 'cos I was and I ... and I suffered very much at the you know for being labelled, and for being treated as difficult and therefore becoming difficult because that was how I was expected to be (pause) well I you know, I mean I, I, felt at that point that I ... I mean I know now that what I needed was someone to say "You know you're really great, and its OK and we see lots of good about you" and, and that's how I feel about those children, I want to, I want to make them feel really good about themselves and ... that's I suppose that's really influenced the way, way I want - the relationship I want to have with kids it's not I don't want to have one where I'm in a position of authority or .. or someone that
they're scared of or... I don't want to have that kind of a role at all. (Pause) Yes I guess my experience at school was probably very important ... and the things that I felt had... had failed in the way I've been treated and the way lots of people are treated and you know are very... important in the things I we..., the places I wanted to succeed...

During teaching practice she had come to the realisation that working as a teacher placed restrictions on what was expected of her by others which would prevent her from goals.

B010 J: I think it's, I mean I don't think children are aware always of what they need, they're aware of... of hurt and pain and therefore aggression and fear and, and you're just overwhelmed by all these hostile feelings and you don't know why they're there at the time... and that's you know... that's so sad and it's so awful for the kid concerned that you... ... I dunno, I really want, I mean I feel as though that's the area I want to work in now, having done teaching practice I realise I don't want to be a teacher in fact at all, I want to work with - delinquents, and difficult teenagers.

B012 J: ...and emotionally disturbed kids.

B016 J: ...but it's not I don't, I mean I've realised that education isn't particularly what I'm interested in - it's them and that education, I chose education and teaching basically because that was the most obvious thing to do to have contact with kids... but I think the role that you're put in as a teacher actually defeats in many ways defeats the.... I mean it it puts you in a position where you're not able perhaps to, to put enough... put as much as you want into that side of things, because you have to meet educational aims, and objectives and things. (Pause)

She is unhappy about the course seeing it as too theoretical and unrelated to practice.

B020 J: No. I'm really disillusioned with the course,

B021 I: Why is that?

B022 J: Because it's all... it's basically not what I want, it's, it's er... it's very theoretical....... but it's all so I mean terribly all the philosophers and the you know the people who, the great people who say this and the great people who say that, I and it's all so high falutin' and so nothing to do with being in a classroom with a whole class of
children and what you do with them and how you deal with them and I mean it's a load of rubbish basically, all that, I mean it's just not practical at all.

B023 I: ...And you'd like to see it practical?

B024 J: Yeah well I mean like what, what is the purpose of knowing all these theories and things and and then what you do you swot up a few for the exams scribble them down, and then forget them I mean and what's the use of that, you're not, there's nothing lasting about that.

During the first interview Jane expressed having high expectations of the psychology component of the course and had seen it as being a relevant discipline. Had it met with her expectations?

B030 J: No, it was way over our heads you see, way over, it was just that you know lecturers were absolutely name after name was rushed at you, and you were scribbling away, trying to get these names and dates down, I mean it wasn't as if you could sit and absorb anything that could mean something to you personally and you could remember and apply or anything like that, it was a question of eight-billion names being fired at you and scribbling away desperately trying to get them down so you could recite them in the exam, you know (voices in background).

B031 I: So you found no relevance at all to the classroom?

B032 J: No, you see I don't think you can be taught those things, I think you go into a classroom and it's all about, how, how you ... how you relate, how the kids relate to you and ... and you can't be taught that ... I just don't think you can be taught it....... I don't know, I don't think its I mean doing, doing the psychology part of education in, in college has done zilch for me, zilcho - fact worse it's made me feel you know, that, that they're not getting to the heart of of minds at all, just getting into the ... you know bogged down with theory (pause) I mean I guess psychology in other places, I mean, relationships and things are all to do with psychology aren't they? (Pause)

Her disappointment at psychology not being of practical relevance was obvious. She is critical of the way in which it was taught as well as what was taught. The course offered nothing to her in the way of understanding interpersonal
relationships. Although she feels that relationships may not be able to be taught she still seeks confirmation that this may be a legitimate aspect of psychology although omitted from the education course.

We move on to talk about how she sees the relationship between teaching and learning.

B062 J: Well you have to be in a position though before I mean, I dunno, you have to be able to learn you have to be in a position where you are able to learn and to to be able to learn successfully you have to be feeling .. good about yourself and stable and safe in the in the situation, ... so ... well to teach in a school again, I mean your class has got to feel safe to be able to learn.............. but I mean learning isn't necessarily linked with teaching .. at all, I mean learning is about living isn't it really?

B063 I: So what's the difference between learning that's not linked with teaching, and learning that is?

B064 J: (Pause) Well, learning that's linked with teaching is a matter of someone saying "I want you to know these things, these things are essential for you to know, here they are, take them in" and learning that's not to do with teaching is is just ab absorbing that's and feelings and people and er situations .. and everything around you.

Jane sees learning can take place without teaching and sees it as about living. Teaching suggests imposing what the teacher sees as essential onto the learner, and/or creating a favourable pedagogic environment.

How does she know how to teach?

B070 J: How do you know how to teach (Pause). Well I guess there are basic techniques that, that you're supposed to be, you know, that you're taught and you know methods of, of um presenting information, methods of I mean those kind of things and apart from that I think you, ... it, it's just a matter of going and doing it and finding out how to do it yourself ..........(Pause). I mean with me I think I knew how I was going to be beforehand and I think I was how I thought I was going to be ..........

B071 I: So, ... you'd already decided that um that was the way you wanted to teach, would anything have changed your mind?
B072 J: If it hadn't worked.

B073 I: And what would, what does "worked" mean for you?

B074 J: Say the kids hadn't related to me, hadn't got close to me, I'd felt them resenting me ... then I would regard it ... my method as not working, I'd have put in fact, I wouldn't have changed, I'd have given up, 'cos it would have meant that ... I would have had to change me to suit the role and I wasn't willing to do that ... so I would have realised that it wasn't the right thing for me.

Although Jane mentions basic techniques and methods of presenting information it is apparent from our conversation that these are a secondary concern. Jane's primary concern was in building relationships through being herself and that was her teaching method. Her experience on teaching practice served to confirm that it was right for her.

How did she know how someone learns?

B078 J: (Sighs) .... I guess trial and error in many ways I mean each child learns differently I suppose ... I think the main thing, though, is to make them want and willing to learn ... and once they're willing to ... to try for you and to ... and they're motivated to ... to learn ... then I guess it's a case of ... trial, trial of things and seeing what's most successful.

B079 I: And how would you measure what was successful?

B080 J: (Sighs) ... By ... by how much the child enjoyed doing it, by his level of ... achievement and success ... at reaching the ... the aims that I'd had ... or maybe even reaching aims that he'd had. (Pause)

She recognises that individuals may have different ways of learning but falls back on the child's motivation, enjoyment and level of achievement, aims which may be set by the teacher or the learner himself. These views are also reflected when discussing what teaching and learning has to do with knowledge development.

B092 J: (Pause) I guess teaching does, yeah, I mean if the child's had good
experience of being taught and good experiences and success at learning in, in a school situation and ... has good feelings about teachers, good feelings about the idea of being at school, I guess that, that makes his ....... his er ... likelihood to to develop knowledge ... effectively more likely, ... but if he's got thoroughly bad feelings about the whole ... concept of learning and schools and teachers and grown ups etcetera etcetera I guess he's gonna .... avoid learning and knowledge and ... like the plague. (Pause)

As in the first interview she sees different types of knowledge.

B102 J: Well I mean I think you get to know about things by experiencing them ... if knowing about something is I mean there are things, I suppose, a different type of knowledge where you know about things cos you've been told about them and you, you know that they've happened because (yawns) you're told that they've happened. (Pause)

Again interest is an important motivator.

B106 J: Well you absorb things that you're told if you want to and they're interesting to you I think, far more far more effectively than if you're bored and you don't want to know and you don't like the person who's telling you. (Pause)

9.4 Comments

Between the first and the second interview Jane's personal perspectives on teaching and learning have remained within the Romanticist Educational Ideology described by Pope & Keen [1981]. Her emphasis is on the relationship between the teacher and learner to provide the child with a conflict free, permissive environment in which learning can take place. Emotions, feelings and experience are stressed, rather than cognitive development. Because of this emphasis Jane's views are not accommodated by a cognitive model such as Perry's nine developmental stages of cognitive and ethical development [Perry 1968, 1972]. (1.5)
The school at which Jane was placed was more formal and restrictive than she was comfortable with. Jane's teaching practice only served to support her previously held views but also made her aware of others' expectations of the teacher's role with which she would be required to conform if she joined the teaching profession. She now sees teaching as too restrictive to her aims and is seeking an occupational outlet where she can work with children in the way she sees is personally valuable.
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"... how peculiar it is that so many American and Soviet psychologists, citizens of great nations, which intend to change the world, have produced learning theory that reduces knowledge to a passive copy of external reality, whereas human thought always transforms or transcends reality. To present an adequate notion of learning one first must explain how the subject manages to construct and invent not merely how he repeats and copies". [Piaget, 1970, p.714]

10.1 The First Interview

Mary was a 19 year old B.Ed. student taking Anthropology as her second subject. She describes her determination to teach, despite opposition from careers advisors, one parent, and poor exam results.

A 004 M: I always wanted to teach since I was three. (Laughs) I used to have my dolls in front of me, and I used to say "Now that's your Maths work." I was put off the idea at the age of about 13 to 16, "No you can't do that. You've no job." Went to a careers advice and came out being a Social Worker.

A 005 I: Were you put off by the Careers people?

A 006 M: Yes. Very, very much put off, and put off by my father as well. My mother's always worked. My father's against it. Um .. I did very badly in my O'Levels, um .. and I thought that was it anyway. But I still carried on to A'Levels, got two .. um .. everything fell into place....

Why did she choose the junior middle age group?
A 018 M: Umm ... I like all ages, but the five year olds I can see myself playing with and five year olds because without the ... without the knowledge I suppose that they ... it's too basic. It sounds ... I mean its harder to teach, I think it is, Nursery Firsts. And I just don't think I could use the language, um ... maybe I haven't got the patience either which is, you know, "Let's do your shoelace up, Johnny." I don't think I could do that.

A 020 M: Bit bad attitude, I know, but ... the 7-13 year olds I seem to be able to talk to them as human beings. And also with the 5 year olds I couldn't, you know, talk to them on my level and they know, know what you're talking about. And they teach me things as well which I'm finding out already. (Laughs)

She felt that her second subject, Anthropology, did not qualify as a subject taught at secondary level.

How does she see the role of the teacher educator at college?

A 028 M: They're here to help you as a person to um ... find out things. They're here to give advice. I see them ... I don't see them here to give you facts and figures. I mean I can go to a book and get that. And I ... I find them more interesting if they sort of, sort of say "Why do ..." discussion groups. "Why do you think that?" making you think more about your own ideas as well as others'. And you accepting others'. In fact they do that quite well.

A 029 I: Right. Um for you what would be the difference between a good and a bad lecturer/tutor?

A 030 M: Um a bad lecturer/tutor is a person who I see coming into the room, sits down, opens his file, reads it off, full stop. Loads and loads of facts. You can't get it down. It's too much ... and you just ... you just give up I think. I think, you know, that's it. A good lecturer is a person who comes in, has a bit of a chat, not too much, just says, you know, "Right everyone's ready" you know. "We're going to do this." Explains briefly the four stages or however many stages of what you are going to do. The introduction, and then you know, you write that down, so you know exactly what you are doing. And then "If you want any questions please stop me or afterwards." And you put the hand up I know, but I mean, I like that idea. When you can interrupt someone talking, and that's a good lecturer, very good lecturer.

She differentiates between the lecturer and tutor at college.
A 036 M: A personal tutor is a person who looks after you, you know, sort of welfare, and keeps an eye on your grades and makes sure you're OK and if you have any problems.

So do different people have different functions?

A 040 M: Yes ... but I mean a lecturer is a person who will take over that role as well in a way. "If you, if you don't understand it please come to me," you know, "and we'll talk it over." That's what I think should happen. I don't think they should be two distinct, two groups, because you end up having known so many people, who do I go to with this problem?

Mary sees the teacher educator's role as having teacher, learner and relationship foci.

How does she see her role as a student, what is she here for?

A 050 M: What am I here for? (Pause) Ahh.. to gain the necessary - this sounds like I'm reading from a textbook - to gain the necessary um experience I know I need, before I become a teacher, if I ever become a teacher. Um.. to gain knowledge, and to realise that knowledge isn't always that's it - fact, you know. You can be um.. interpreted in many ways. Not to rely on one thing and that's it. And to understand, and mix with people and to understand people, generally and to have experience. I think that's very important.

Her student role has content, training and social foci. She had previously indicated that she did not look to the lecturer for subject matter as this was available from literature. She has also suggested that knowledge can be interpreted in many ways. She expands on this when we talk about her approach to learning.

A 052 M: Very hard. (Laughs) I find I have to really really work whatever I do and to learn. If I'm given reading lists in lectures, I don't go straight to the library and read them up, I try and read as much as I can. Try and read further than what the lecturers say if I can, um... and I've got a reputation for being very cool, er working hard ....? "creeping" is the word I suppose. Um.. no, I really do. I take a long time to work something out. I don't .. if I've got an essay to hand in in week six, some people leave it until week five, but I do it in Week 1. I have to, to get it sorted out. I can't work under pressure.
A 056 M: Um... I think you... you can't just learn by reading. I mean that's the mistake I made in my O'Levels. You can't... I mean you learn by other people, talking to people, what they... you know... "Oh that's rubbish, what," you know," that book says". And I went "Oh," you know, "why do you say that?". You know. I thought it was gospel until I came here. Everything was gospel in a book. That was it, you know? book, that was it. But now I'm beginning to realise that, you know, you can sort of read a book or an article and think, "No, that's wrong. I don't agree with that." But accept it as a view. And I think that's the important in life, let alone just teaching. A lot of people don't do that. I must admit I don't all the time, but...

A 057 I: So, so you read and you talk and discuss.

A 058 M: And try and do... if I... it depends on what I'm reading, but if I try especially if I'm doing sort of round reading, ideal stages of children, try and approach it with, with people I know, you know, my brother, ten year olds, I try and approach some things that they say to him, or if I go into school, try and... sort of fit the...

A 059 I: So you look for examples in real life?

A 060 M: Yes. Yes. I like examples in books and I like, you know, if they give you an example I like to try not to work out exactly but try and work it out. I do not like too theoretical books. (Laughs) The link, I think between theory and practice.

Since attending college Mary had discovered that not everything written in literature was a fact but were interpretations. The realisation resulted from discussions with peers at college. She may personally disagree with an article but would accept it as a view.

Mary shows an active approach to learning in which she tries to link theory to practice experientially. She sees children as learning experientially, and adults as learning more from the media.

A 062 M: Um... children especially I think need to learn by experience. need to. I mean they have to be... I don't believe in, sort of giving them set work etc. Let them have um... lots of material apparatus and... I know it sounds very, I mean ideal, I mean. That is the ideal, to let them experiment with a problem. "Why is this doing this?" Then you can go into the theory if necessary. Until they ask the questions, I don't think a teacher should necessarily impose the theories. I'm
not saying it works all the time, but that is the idea. I think adults learn a lot from the media, um ... too much from the media. Um ... 

A 064 M: Er ... television. Very much so. Anti-television. And children do too ... which sometimes is a good thing, sometimes is bad. Um ... newspapers they learn from, but sometimes I think adults realise that the newspapers are biased but not so much with television. I think television you know the television stations etc. all their views and what they say.

Mary's concern about learning from the media is that people may not be aware that what is being reported is from a biased viewpoint and is only one interpretation.

We go on to discuss the teacher's role:

A 070 M: Um ... to extend the child's um ... own knowledge that they've got. To put in knowledge. When I say "to put in" I don't mean literally, but you know, to try and give as much ... atmosphere ... I think it very important the atmosphere of the classroom. The way the teacher makes it. Not necessarily all friendly, "Hello, how are you". But to make the atmosphere so the child knows where they stand in that classroom. The child knows who the teacher is but they also know they can go to her if they need her. Um ... if they've got extra work they want to do. Or if they want help, advice etc. I see the role of the teacher to ... to keep putting in different things, not to keep, you know, to keep different stimuli and different subjects not necessarily to do the Maths first and the English next. Just not routine, to keep changing ... I think. (Laughs) I might change it after teaching practice. Ask me again. (Laughs)

Can she describe what she means by "atmosphere"?

A 072 M: Um, yes. The way (?) when you enter a classroom, the child enters the classroom, they know ... it's all nice, it's colourful, it's um inviting. They want to go in that classroom. They want to sit down at their desk, because the desks, you know the surroundings is the way it's laid out is inviting. They're not going to be sat and they know they're not going to sit over there on their own, which happens in some classrooms. Um ... they know that they can either sit with their friends if they're allowed to, they know that sometimes they, OK they, they know they have to sit somewhere else if necessary. They know they can reach a book if they want one. They know where the books are. They know ... um if they want some materials for art they can just go and get them, and things like
that. They just know what they can have and what's, what's available.

Mary's view of the teacher's role is both teacher and content focused. She describes the difference between a good and a bad teacher.

A 078 M: Um... a good teacher is a person who is aware of all their individual needs. I mean they... in every classroom you've got the slower ones and the brighter ones. A person who prepares enough work for the people who are bright enough to carry on and not just to say, "Oh, um... you've finished. Get back to that book over there and have a look at some books." Which happens. Or um... to the slower ones, "Haven't you finished yet? Hurry up." You realise that some people need time, not to make the slower ones feel as though they are slow. Not to make them feel... I don't know um... isolated or backward...

A 080 M: Um... a bad teacher is one who... might either set all the same work for everybody and expects... not necessarily expects it all done at the same time, but you know not expecting it to be done at the same level either, but just expects the same work. Hardly any resources is bad. To accept the day to day routine, not just day to day... term to term - "Oh this term it's got to be this topic." Um... to have to sort of be 'carefree'... not carefree attitude, to have the um... "Oh well it's this again" attitude. To have "Oh I don't really enjoy dance, so we don't do it" attitude. They've got to be aware that the child might enjoy it and to not have personal opinions to include everything. Which is again is ideal, I mean of course you've got personal opinions, but try not to let them shadow what we teach.

Her own approach to teaching reflects these ideas although she recognises them as idealistic and subject to change through the teaching practice experience.

A 082 M: Very hard. I think that's very hard to answer because I mean again, it's... everything I'm saying is ideal because without having experienced teaching practice fully, it's very difficult to say. And I expect I'll change by the time I've finished the teaching practice. Um... my approach will be to, so that the children know that I am the teacher and they are the pupils. But on the other hand they know I can be a helper in other worries outside school if necessary. They can approach me. I want to be known as an approachable teacher if you see what I mean. I want them to know that if they want materials to ask for them, and I'd try and get hold of them. I think resources are so important. Um... if they want help um... I want them to know that their work is not going to be marked and
forgotten, that they can see me I hope, I don't expect I could do it, but I mean, hope to see them individually so they know what... their work, explain, and comment on it. Um as I say I'd I'd hope they know where they stand and I know where, you know they know where I stand... mainly. To provide enough interest as well hopefully... Hopefully. (Laughs)

Like many other students, Mary finds it difficult to describe the role of the pupil rather than the role of the teacher.

A 086 M: Um... a school should be so inviting that they want to be there. I mean if the atmosphere's creative the child will want to be there. When a child comes home and says "Oh mummy, I've done." you know, "this and that and the other. I want to go back again and see what else I can do." you know, that's... because of a good teacher. And a good role of the pupil is to... of course I mean learn, because I don't think... that's the only way he can learn. But to enjoy being with other people to, to experience the social side, I think is very important. I think... you know that's a way through, all the way through education which you don't experience. Sometimes in work you're sort of isolated you don't meet other people. But in education you're going to meet everybody I think from the slower people to the people who end going to be big Prime Minister maybe, you never know. (Laughs) I think that's important. Um... and to know that they are going to be valued for what who they are and what they are. That's important, very important.

For Mary the pupil's role is both learner and social focused. This is not consistent with her view of the teacher's role that she saw as teacher and content focused. The learner focus of the pupil becomes clearer as she describes what for her would be the difference between a 'good' and a 'bad' pupil.

A 090 M: Um... that's hard again, because a good pupil... is a person not saying "Yes Miss. No Miss. I do everything you say Miss." Because I don't think that is a good pupil. A person who is aware that... who objects to my... what I say sometimes, who criticises me constructively, um... (Laughs) who understands who and what do does their work... religiously, but does their work, um... if they've got any queries comes to me. Don't just do it and thinks, "I've done it for Miss. There you are Miss, this is your work." But if they've got problems, "Oh I don't understand this. Why are we doing this?" To say that and so I know where I... to know where each other stands as I say. And then a bad pupil. A bad pupil of course is a person... who causes disruption etc. But they again why are they
causing disruptions? It might be on your part so you have to look again through what you’ve done. Um .. a bad pupil is a person who is obstinate, who will not do something. Not necessarily if you make him do something, but just had no interest in anything. I mean that is very difficult. In what you do .. what does a teacher do then? Um .. you know, sometimes it could be impossible.

A 091 i: If um .. somebody doesn't want to do anything, um .. do you see it as the teacher's job to do something about that, or ..?

A 092 M: Yes I do, very much so. Instead of just leaving them and saying "Oh, you won't get much work out of him. But just set him the same stuff." To sort of ask him "What are you interested in?" Take him aside and maybe ask him you know, "What's your interests?" He must have something he likes doing, it might be even football, but he could .. he might look him .. back to the Middle Ages how it all started with the pig's bladder, or .. he might get interested that way and start being really interested in another subject. Or if he's interested in sex you can work round English round that. Give him sentences to fill in or .. anything that is up to his level. Just to get that .. then he'll realise that he knows that you are interested in what he wants to do as well. I'm not saying everything should be geared to their interests. I realise that can't be so. In some cases you need to start it off that way.

Mary is indicating that the good pupil is not simply compliant but will sometimes challenge the teacher, and will work for himself. A bad pupil for Mary is one who is disruptive or obstinate although she recognises there may be a reason suggesting the home life or the teacher. She suggests how she as a teacher might tackle a disinterested pupil.

She describes her personal view of knowledge:

A 094 M: (Pause) Knowledge is .. experience (Laughs) (?) It's experience. Um .. I don't think knowledge is .. a body of facts. I don't think that is true. I think knowledge is um .. when .. you've experienced different things, different things in life, um .. different people, attitudes, values, beliefs even though you if don't accept them. That is knowledge. When you are aware of other people's views and do not discard them.

For Mary knowledge is personal and relativistic with an acceptance of alternative views and commitment to her own. She sees knowledge as developing from
social experience and resources and although subjects can be done for their own sake, all bodies of knowledge are related.

A 096 M: From the social side like when they meet people and um .. get to know people and talk to people. Or through books. I think books are useful to help them to see likes and perspectives and things. Um .. media again. Everything really. (Laughs) When they sort of intermingle with everything around.

A 098 M: Um .. I think that knowledge can be experienced for its own sake, in the fact that it .. if I have got interpreted right, like you can say, just dance for its own sake, or maths for its own sake. And I can also see it intermingling, you know, intermingling. Um .. I think it's necessary to do things for its own sake, and not because you can intermingle them. Very necessary.

A 105 I: Or can you do dance totally separate? (Laughs)

A 106 M: No, no you can't. No you have to experience other things before you can do dance. I mean you can't just play someone .. and say "Right do dance. Off you go." I mean they have to be, um .. yes it is related in that way. I think every subject then is related if you're talking like that, yes. All bodies of knowledge are related.

Mary felt that psychology would contribute to her understanding of teaching and learning by suggesting alternative frameworks in which people could be understood.

A 114 M: By understanding people. How a child develops, even though it's on broad .. like Piaget - we talk about Piaget - his broad, um .. stages. You know that they're not exactly that way. But by unders .. by using a framework like that it does help you to um .. say be aware of individuals, to be .. aware of what's needed in the classroom and (?) resources etc. Um .. psychology .. it helps you to .. it's very hard because I've .. um .. you know, just by understanding others and views on different things like the child is an empty vessel .. before they come into school. They don't know anything. You know compared with someone who thinks that the child knows quite a lot before they come into school. In fact know more when they come into school, and when they actually get in there they .. like you should be utilising .. um .. which I agree with. (Pause) I think cos I'm um .. oh I'm tongue-tied now.. (pause). I think mainly it just helps for us to understand the stages that the children reach, to understand how they .. arrive .. their ideas are formed. Whether they are formed. How long they can understand things
for. Do they understand the concepts that you are using? Do you understand the concepts you are using?

Mary's view of psychology illustrates her views on knowledge. She shows an understanding of alternative perspectives and shows a personal commitment to one view. This acknowledgement of alternative viewpoints was also described in her approach to learning where she actively attempted to relate theory to practice. One would expect that her commitment lay with theories that she could readily observe in practice.

At the end of the interview I invite the students to add any comments.

A 116 M: (Laughs) Well um .. I think it's very difficult to say what you .. mean when you're sort of in this situation. Very difficult. When you said that last question about psychology, um .. if I'd sort of gone away and thought about it, I might come back with some more sensible answers (laughs) That's it.

Many students commented either within the interview or "off the record", that they had found the questions thought provoking and much more difficult to respond to than they would have imagined.

In terms of Perry's [1970] development model Mary is probably nearest to position 6 or 7. She perceives knowledge as relativistic but has her own view which is backed by her observations (see A 058) but perhaps also from belief (see A 114).

Within Pope & Keen's [1981] educational ideology she most fits the description of the Progressivist perspective. She sees learning as resulting from the learner interacting with the environment both for herself and the pupil at school, but she sees a difference between the teacher and teacher educator's role. The role of the teacher educator has teacher, learner and relationship foci which would be consistent with her views of learning. However, she sees the teacher as being teacher and content focused which is not consistent with her views of children learning.
Mary's teaching practice placement was at a county primary school in a village location. The original school building was old but had been considerably extended by a modern brick extension and some building work was still taking place.

I visited Mary during her third week of teaching practice. Before going into the classroom Mary introduced me to the head teacher who was most welcoming and said I was to feel free to go around the school and visit classrooms as I wished. He enjoyed having visitors in the school.

Mary's afternoon was divided into two sessions, Maths before break and Games after break. For Maths Mary was working with a group of children whom she took from the main classroom into another room. There were seven 9-10 year olds, three girls and four boys. The children sat along one side of a long table and Mary sat at the opposite side with the chalk board behind her which she used from time to time. Mary starts the class by reminding them what they had done last time, they are working on scale using the plan of the local church they had recently visited with this project in mind. She draws on the pupils to supply the measurements and compromises where there is disagreement. Mary uses questions to check the pupils' understanding of what is required and sets them to work. One boy does not understand what to do and Mary works with him then walks round checking the other children's work. A couple of minutes before the break, Mary instructs the pupils to put their work away and shows them how to play a rhythm game. She starts as leader then as they catch on she chooses a pupil to lead the game.

After break Mary and another student teacher take games with twenty-five girls aged 8-11 years old. The girls return from break and change into their gym clothes. Mary organises some pupils to fetch equipment then works through a warming up routine with the girls. Mary and the other student work together instructing the
pupils on a team game which they run through, then work in pairs, catching. Halfway through the hour's class Mary takes half the girls into the school hall to play a team game followed by individual, then pairs work. The last quarter hour is spent outside again playing netball. Mary takes a position in one team, as there were an odd number of pupils, as well as acting as referee. The other student and half the pupils move into the hall having just played netball. The pupils are instructed to put away equipment and change.

Throughout both classes Mary seemed very much in control, talked quietly and appeared at ease both in the small group and at games. She appeared friendly and interested in the pupils' contributions.

My observations suggested she was both teacher and learner focused.

10.3 Second Interview

Since her teaching practice last term, how does Mary now see the role of the teacher?

B 002 M: Ummm ... the role of the teacher? I think mainly to be there. see what I mean ... the child knowing, that they can turn to you at any time they want to ... umm ... if you are doing, umm some work that you've got to do marking some books and you'll stop to talk to that child, you know they're foremost in their mind, more than um anything else in your mind ... um acting as a guidance I think I said last time. Umm ... role of the teacher is to help to supervise, I mean when I say, I don't think the role of teacher is to stand in front of the classroom and teach, necessarily, I think it's more geared to you have to sort of stand in front of the classroom sometimes, but let the children follow their ideas up. So you sort of do the basics and there's one child might turn round, which they do, and say, "Can I do such and such?" and follow it through, and that's what you should be trying to provide. I don't, it's very difficult with the whole class, but you've just got to be aware and sensitive, very, to all the children. I wouldn't say to all their needs etc etc, but just be sensitive to them, and their requirements, and not let the ...
who are slower feel as though they're being um... singled out for instance, I mean like don't sort of prepare, I learnt this preparing work cards, especially for that child because he has reading difficulties and he felt so .. isolated at one time so, things like that, you've just got to be sensitive .. and be aware, and help .. I think.

I was not clear whether Mary was using the word 'guidance' in a teacher focused or learner focused way. She explained what she meant:

B 004 M: Umm ... what I mean by guidance is if you say not say set a problem, but a problem arises just as you're working out, and the children are sorting it out, make their own group and sort it out, and you sort of go around to make sure .. they're all .. understanding the problem .. understand what they're meant to be doing. Make sure that no-one's been left on the side, because no-one wants to work with them, sort of thing which hope it doesn't happen. Umm guiding them, if they want to work on their own, guiding to work on their own. Umm .. not to necessarily to say like .. what you, you know, what's the first step, but to .. let them tell you, work out their problems, and if they are wrong, don't sort of tell them that's gonna be wrong. They can actually do it and just guide them, the fact that, you say well it was wrong, but why do you think it was wrong, you know sort of guide them like that, it's questions really, to question technique a discussion which I think is a major thing and I don't think too many teachers do 'cos of time.

Mary's meaning for 'guidance' was a learner focused one, but she also perceives a teacher focus as in supervision. This shows a shift in focus as prior to teaching practice she had a teacher and content focus. She did not seem concerned with content this time.

She reflects on how she feels her views have changed as she talks about her approach to teaching now.

B 008 M: Umm .. before TP I felt myself being I wanted to go there and stand in front of a class and tell them something, but now um I feel .. that .. you use .. use problems as they arise, I mean if you're doing .. you're doing something on the scale we use the classroom, try and use things .. which arise. But they wanted to do the classroom, and you let them follow it through, but offer help, keep going round, to keep moving around, don't just sit still and at a desk, keep moving around and look as though you're interested, and be interested, I
mean be interested, don't look, be interested, and umm... the children will then feel at ease with you, and call you over if they want any help, that's what I hope I try and achieve.

Mary had perceived a shift with less emphasis on the teacher and more on the learner. She felt a number of people had influenced her approach in different ways: her fellow student teachers, her tutor, the class teacher and her pupils.

B 018 M: Um ... (sighs) I think a lot of ... friends influence you some people say that peers really influence you and you think you .. you tell them you're doing and they might say, "Oh no, you can't do it that way", and just talking to them has influenced your decision either they .. stand more by them .. or change them, sometimes, sometimes for the worse, you change them and then realise they don't work for you. You try and ... emulate your friends sometimes you think .. "Oh they did such and such," and that's how you try and approach it, and it just doesn't work .. um ...

B 020 M: I think the tutors are very good here, my tutor was very good, she umm .. is very helpful, and she influenced me in a fact that she offered ... a lot of encouragement .. and never said "That's pathetic, hopeless" or anything. She always sort of said "That's a good idea, but could you have done.." you know, so you always felt as though, you know, your, your effect was recognised, which is very good and ..Umm .. my teacher influenced me in a way, because the way she taught .. I felt I wouldn't teach (laughs) umm .. no just looking at .. no she's a good teacher looking at her, but .. you could tell because of years of experience she was just relying on"What shall I do now?" at the last minute, and I found that very hard, I thought, do I meant to do that or .. you know .. there's me preparing everything and she just couldn't see the sense in preparing lessons ... there's no point ...Umm .. who else .. the children influence me .. a lot and I think .. different children .. sort of give you different approaches .. umm the children in the school I was in .. they've very inquiring minds and they always to do things and .. and they really wanted to sort of follow things up..

She also felt that some work done at college had also influenced her.

B 022 M: ...sounds silly but I think a lot of the things that we did in college .. does did influence me, come back to me .. umm I'm not saying that I sat down and thought of um ... oh Piaget said that you know, you know you see a child struggling and you think of umm .. what someone said .. in a lecture and you .. I think that helped me become
sensitive. Before I mean like a child, you thought "Oh crumbs he's lazy" or something, and you realise he wasn't.

B 025 I: Was it anything in, in particular in the courses umm .. that affected you?

B 026 J: I think mainly generally but .. as I say it's say silly to say that Piaget "Oh well he said that child (?) ability" but they did, and I kept thinking, I could just see it I could see the theory was coming into practice and they all said it. I thought "Oh yeah, yeah I've heard that before." But it does, it really does. I'm not saying everything I've learnt .. I've utilised, but .. I did come things did come to my mind and .. at this stage I found it very rewarding that way actually. Began to see things in more light.

B 027 I: So umm .. you drew on some of the psychology component?

B 028 M: Yeah I think I did I think .. in a way that was the main one and sociology sort of thing sort of, the backgrounds of children, .. I found very .. you know .. realistic you .. believe in them more, you know you always say "And there's the home disadvantage of this" You sort of take it all down but you just you just see it. You see all the problems of the children in your class, you can't .. understand it, and also .. sort of emotional disturbances of some of the children .. things like that .. just sort of came to light .. and I just understood some of the workings and .. sort of loss of concentration and things like this .. (laughs) it's so true. But, but I don't know as I say, it just made things so more realistic and .. they I think that's the main thing of teaching practice. I sort of found out.

She had particularly focused on the psychology and to a lesser extent the sociology components. Again she seemed to be actively relating theory to practice in the way that she had spoken of in her approach to learning during the first interview (see A 058 and A 060). Mary seemed to have been able to observe children and situations in the classroom and relate some of the theoretical work and thought that it was useful in that she felt it enhanced her understanding. As we go on to talk about what teaching has to do with learning Mary seems unhappy with the term "teaching":

B 038 M: I think it has, 'cos teaching .. I don't like that term teaching .. because I don't know why it may give the impression that teaching means .. standing up in front of a class .. ummm .. if teaching you mean sort of .. telling them things individually or groups and that and things
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like that. I mean it has a lot because it. A child knows that someone else is able to help them, not necessarily a teacher. Maybe some other children and that is just as much teaching as a teacher teaching (laughs). Um, things like discussion group or something and a child does something that child rather than a teacher say "Oh little Johnny says" because you know no-one has heard it. It's Johnny. Johnny would you say it again. A lot of that isn't made use of. The teachers take over, and I think that is really bad. I mean, a child will do a piece of work or something and you sort of say "very good" and everyone looks at Johnny's work, instead of Johnny going round showing them if they want to. Umm that's why I think sometimes lot. I believe in displays, but only if the children have been part of it. Children have to be part of all teaching, and sometimes, umm, teaching's done, I feel, without the children actually learning, because the teacher takes it away from them, they've done it, they've done their work. The teacher mounts it and puts it up. Umm you know labels it etc, so I must admit I label myself, but I did ask if any children wanted to label it, and because that my children were used not to, they didn't at that time. But other work they did. Umm what other relationship, er, learning is sort of continuous so teaching has to be continuous. You can't just say, teach and that is it, and I think sometimes that is um. I haven't actually experienced it but sometimes teaching is um sort of given over, as though that's it, that is all there is to know, and I mean when I was at school I remember, teacher told me something and I thought that's it, she, she knows and that's all there is. There's no umm, sort of umm, extras or etc so I sort of didn't know that I could sort of delve deeper. I think a teacher should always leave things open. Teaching should always be open, and teaching should always be just left. Everything should be shown to the child, and the child be made to make his own mind up. It sounds really sort of child centred. I don't mean that, sounds too much like that.

She confirms that she now has a learner focus and is aware that children need experience in being actively involved or they may not be able to participate fully as in the example she gave of labelling their work. Mary is also suggesting that teaching should be open and not biased which would be congruent with her view of relative knowledge.

I then asked Mary how she knows how to teach.
B 042 M: I don't know .. I think you just .. oh it's difficult how do you know umm .. you know to teach is to um .. as I say offer guidance and just, just just follow things through to just .. give the child .. the things that you want them to know .. which are central .. and to build on each individual .. their abilities and needs and .. abilities, we'll get off the needs, abilities (laughs) .. umm .. and build on them and to help them to see what they want from their learning 'cos I think .. a child a lot of children go to school thinking "Oh I've got to go to school", and that is terrible. A child should go to school thinking "Oh what am I going to learn today?" you know "What else can I learn?" and that is an .. awful atmosphere that's in some schools .. that they've got well I'm here and I've got to .. You've got to make, promote it, so they want to learn so after .. teaching more formal teaching and learning .. they can go off if they want to. I think that's more important .. and learning umm .. shouldn't be confined to the classroom. Everybody should you know learning in all different situations. I think it's very important as well .. Especially parents I think.

B 043 I: What do you mean "especially parents"?

B 044 M: Umm .. a lot of teaching should be done by the parents .. in brackets .. to help the sort of relationship. If you tea, .. if your parents, .. you go home and say you know, "Mum" you know, "I learnt about this, but I'd like to know more" and they say "Yes love another time" or .. you need a parent to not necessarily stop and just do it, but show interest and make their child realise that that is what they want for them. And even then in themselves that helps the child realise it carries on .. a life long process.

Mary, like many of the students, found it difficult to say how she knew how to teach and spoke rather how to teach. However, in this discourse Mary introduced the idea of extending "teaching" into the home with parents showing an interest to help the child realise that learning is a lifelong process, not just something done in school.

When asked how they know how someone learned many students replied as if the question was "how do you know when someone learns". Mary was no exception. I restate the question emphasising the "how".

B 047 I: How do you know how they learn?

B 049 I: Rather than that they are learning.
B 050 M: (Sighs)... don’t know...(Laughs) ... you know they they .. how they’re learning .. because .. umm they’ve been .. it’s very difficult umm .. I suppose because you’ve been through it and you know that .. how it sounds silly to say .. you know that how you are learning you know that umm .. you err are going through the process .. (sighs) I suppose that’s where theory comes in again because .. you believe it because someone’s told you that they are learning and that’s how they’re learning you know this is how they learn fullstop. But to me, it’s like inbuilt you just .. know, (laughs) Hope .. maybe it’s hope .. maybe I’m hoping they are (laughs) and that’s how they are.

B 051 I: When you say it’s inbuilt ... it’s always been there? (Laughs)

B 052 M: Yeah. No, no I don’t think learning is always there no I don’t no, no, no. I think learning has to .. is not .. inbuilt into you, you’re an empty vessel umm I think that’s true and I think learning then “how”, I don’t (sighs) oh an empty vessel needing to be filled up, but how I don’t know. Just building on experiences building on their own life .. thing. When I say their own experiences as I say I don’t mean .. Oh look there’s a leaf let’s build on that. I mean they sort of build around .. things that they know. You can’t learn until .. you’ve experienced something I don’t think. Like when you umm .. read a story, build it onto your, build it on to your own experience makes that story more realistic. You believe, you know, I think, oh, you can believe in that situation and .. you know experience (?) and I think that is very true, you have to build on things you already know. If you don’t already know them, well then it’s very difficult. That’s why sometimes .. I think, it is why learning is slow .. and I think is has to be, you can’t rush learning.

Mary sees an extrinsic/theoretical focus as well as intrinsic/perceptual and intrinsic/introspective foci. Extrinsically, theory informs us how people learn while intrinsically Mary introspects on how she learns and also feels that it’s “inbuilt”. While working through what she means by “inbuilt” she appears to contradict views she held in the first interview. Here she states that she believes in “the empty vessel needing to be filled up” model (see B 052) whereas in the first interview she believed children knew quite a lot when they come into school and contrasted that with the empty vessel model (see A 114). Here she may be interpreted as having a personal perspective of the “empty vessel” theory which sees the child as an empty vessel to be filled at birth but once it has gained
knowledge by the time s/he starts school that this model no longer applies and the teacher should build on it.

Mary goes on to say what she sees teaching and learning has to do with the development of knowledge.

B 056 M: Teaching and learning to do knowledge in a child ... the knowledge of a child is umm ... based on what you actually teach and also what you will teach ... and what you have taught umm, all the tenses, and the learning a child does ... is through his knowledge, I don't mean is it necessary to know to learn but ... if you do know something then it helps maybe to know how to do something ... rather than to know ... and so rather than knowledge in the fact that I know this, I know that, umm .. which I ... I don't necessarily see that knowledge that is I know how to .. is learning more to me I don't if that's right but to me it's more learning.

Mary feels there is a difference between knowing a fact and knowing how to do something and that they are both learned but in a different way. Knowing how to do something is seen to be learned by doing by imitation or investigation and self directed, whereas facts are derived from someone or something else e.g. a book.

What has teaching to do with this?

B 063 M: ...the teacher should sort of show a child that there are two kinds of knowledge in a way, not necessarily that "there are two kinds", but without the child knowledge that ... this child has to ... know how to do things, but also needs to know why and what and are fact things are well, the factual things. That sometimes they can interact sometimes they don't ... it's mostly they do.

B 064 I: So the "two kinds of knowledge" as you put it ... err interact in some way?

B 065 M: Yeah. I feel they do because if you're knowing ... knowing how to do something you usually utilise it by knowing ... a fact or knowing something.

Mary appears to see two kinds of knowledge, one more personal gained through experience and the other more factual gained through other people or things, e.g.
books) and that these interact. The teacher is seen as promoting both types. These views of knowledge are similar to those expressed during the first interview although she seemed to find more difficulty expressing herself this time. Here she does not speak of knowledge being relative or alternative views as she had done previously, however the focus of the question was relating knowledge development to teaching and learning and this may well have accounted for these differences.

To complete the interview Mary added her final comment:

B 075 M: Umm not really (laughs) .. I find it very difficult I think to umm .. explain what I mean I know that. I know I think I know what I'm talking about until I try er to work it out. I think, I think a lot of people feel that, sort of think oh yes honestly I'm umm you know, learning is this and then you just begin to think about it and it makes you realise that .. maybe you're not as clear cut as you think it is, and maybe you're not thinking as deep as you know you should be .. umm. Too surface for that......

10.4 Comments

Mary's comments show how difficult it is for students to make explicit their personal perceptions of teaching and learning and that when they are encouraged to do so they become aware of inconsistencies and issues that they have not consciously addressed. In itself this is a valuable exercise. Several students had found it so helpful that they suggested that it might be included in their course.

Since teaching practice Mary sees the teacher's role as both teacher and learner focused. This shows a shift from both teacher and content focused prior to teaching practice. Her concerns are with the learner rather than content. This shift would now be consistent with her views of the learner and learning expressed in the first interview, which have been echoed throughout the second interview.
It is perhaps less clear from this second interview as to which of Perry’s positions Mary’s views would be closest to at this stage in her college career. She also appears to hold a view now that might be considered opposite to one she had expressed previously (see A114 and B052) agreeing with the “empty vessel” analogy in the latter, apparently rejecting it in the former. However, as mentioned earlier, this might not be a change of direction but may be viewed in terms of Kellyan fragmentation corollary (Kelly, 1955) Mary may see that children are “empty vessels to be filled” at birth but not so when starting school. Viewed in a logical way this would not make sense but from a Kellyan perspective the “inconsistency” might be explained by introducing the notion of the range of convenience. In this case the range of convenience for applying the “empty vessel” theory was only at birth and not at school starting age.

Mary’s shift from teacher and content focus to teacher and learner focuses of the teacher’s role over the year shows consistency with her view of the pupil as learner. This is in keeping with the Progressivist view of the teacher from Pope and Keen’s Progressivist Educational Ideology (Pope & Keen, 1981). Teaching practice observation confirmed Mary was both teacher and learner focused and is congruent with her Progressivist views.
Chapter 11

Case study 4: Penelope

A portrait of a Multi-Faceted perspective
"It is natural that in the early development of the relevant sciences the applied users, the technologists, will tend to be eclectic, picking up a plausible idea here and there, and using it somewhat inventively in the practical situation".

[Hilgard and Bower, 1966, p265]

11.1 The First Interview

Penelope was in her mid-thirties, having gained her Cert.Ed. some thirteen years ago and was now teaching five to six year olds at a city primary school. She had intended to go to University but had not attained the required 'A' level grades, so had taken teacher training as a second option, coming into teaching more by default than by design.

Penelope chose primary rather than secondary because she had no main subject and primary was much more general, and she was content with this age group. She describes why she decided to take this course.

A 026 P: .... must have been six or seven years ago, ... I started thinking, well it's time ... to take a look at what I'm doing ... to sort of boost the theory ... in a way ... sort of reflection on what I've been doing, and to clarify ... the instinctive things that I was doing ... without really knowing why I was doing, apart from general feed out from heads and other members of staff ...

In describing the role of the teacher educator she feels some tension between her expectations and the experience.

A 038 P. Um ... from what they said in the, at the very beginning, is that they were basing the course on seminar sessions rather than lectures ..
from that, I would have seen their role as us doing the reading and then discussing what we'd read and then somehow pulling it together and I suppose guiding it along what they felt to be appropriate channels. I suppose in a way they're talking about child centred education and from very early I thought what they should be trying to do and maybe they are trying to do, is practice. (door open/close) to see if the, if they're talking about child centred education to approach the thing in a way that, would be practising what they're preaching, in a way, sort of pulling the thing together, guiding it in the way that we were taking it, but at the same time pulling it to the way that they felt it should be going. for our best interests so the way it does go (sighs) I think some sessions are very much like that. some sessions are, I think they don't guide it enough, perhaps we're left too much to our own devices but I would see them sort of drawing on their own experience to help us to see the relevance of what we've read and sort of, our own joint experiences somehow, I don't know if that's very clear, but ... 

She sees the lecturer's role as teacher focused and model focused. Her emphasis on being guided and pulled in the way that was in their best interests suggests the locus of control is with the lecturer. Her view of her role as a student is at variance with this.

A 046 P: Oh. (laughs) I think I've got experiences that I can bring to the group that are different to everybody else's. I think everybody has that. your own experiences and the values that you put on them, make everyone's impression different and each person's impression is valid to help everybody else to clarify their own position. I see myself as a member of a group with something to contribute to the group and also some, a lot, a lot to learn from other people's points of view, be the, they the tutors but, or other students and I think I'm here to um to learn for myself and to, clarify for myself but also by, bringing what I know to it, to help other people to clarify their own positions, their own ideas, whatever ...

The student's role here is learner focused with the student taking an active part in her learning and sharing with her peer group. Yet she felt the tutor's role to be directive. She describes her approach to learning.

A 052 P: ...Through listening I think, through listening to what other people have to say and then weighing that in my own mind against that I know from my own practice and then maybe
throwing out something different to see what reaction it gets. I'm, I'm more of a listener I sort of take things in and then chew them over and maybe two or three days later I've got reaction... but to do the reading to relate back to my practical experience, to listen to other people's reactions and somehow to put the whole lot together and hopefully you've learnt something from it.

She actively relates theory to practice and spends time considering the issues before making up her mind. She thinks that adults may learn in a similar way to herself but that children differ in that they act physically on their environment to evaluate the response.

A054 P: ..... I would like to think that they learn in the same sort of way, by by listening, by looking, by testing what they, think maybe in a practical way by try it and see, may be by comments, and the way we do it here is by putting out suggestions to see what sort of reaction we get. I think perhaps at a young child's level it's more by trying something physically, to see what happens, or what reaction he gets...

She describes how she sees her role as a teacher.

A056 P. ..... very much not standing in front of a group and telling them this is the way to do it by and there again, my, ideas are, judges by my experiences, with young children, where I think you you watch what they do and help them, you work with them to help them through to the end that you can see I think they, they perhaps they can't see the end product, the distant aim, whereas the teacher hopefully has got some idea of where things should be going and by working with the child, on the child's interests you help him along the lines that you want him to go to, that you will best help him to get towards the goals that you've set or that have been set. But I don't, I don't think it can ever be right to say right, we're going to do this today and this is how we're going to do it and you stand there and do it, I think it's got to be a working together relationship towards whatever it is but where I can bring knowledge of a wider range to it whereas the child's only got his own specific knowledge I can bring wider experiences, to it, so I can see where what he's doing fits into the overall, whereas what he's doing is relevant to him. I can relate that to something further and sort of work with him towards it.

She rejects the notion of formal teaching and emphasises helping the child working on his own interests. The child is active in his own learning and this
learner focus is supplemented by a content focus in which the teacher can bring a wider range of knowledge to the situation. She debates the issue of a good or bad teacher.

A060 P. I think there's good and bad in every teacher, I don't think every, anybody's ever ideal ... but I think, I think a bad teacher to me would be one that stood in front of a class of children and spouted forth on whatever it was that was the subject for the day or whatever, ... and allowed no divergence in the children ... or at the same time had no direction a teacher who ... had no idea where the children were going, or didn't know how to get them to go along the right line, I think equally that would be a bad teacher, I think you've got to know, where you're going, and you've got to know, a range of ways of getting there, and you've got to be able to apply ... the appropriate thing, at the appropriate time ... I think a bad teacher is someone who can't do that or doesn't know where they're going in the first place ...

A061. I: And someone who ... who can do that, is a good teacher?

A062. P: Yes, I think so ... I think, I think there's something about having ... thought out the aims in the first place, if you, if your aims were completely wrong ... and that's very much a sort of value judgement thing, but ... if somehow you've got the wrong end of the stick to start with (laughs), ... I suppose you could still be a good teacher, ... if you, even though you'd ... no you wouldn't be ... (laughs) ... no I don't think you could be, because if you got the overall thing wrong ... that's part of the teaching ... is to establish where you go, so if that's wrong then you couldn't be a good teacher, yes ....

Students thinking aloud helps the interviewer to understand some of the issues behind a statement. In Penelope's case the educational aims are of importance, you have to know where you're going before you can work out how to get there.

In describing her own approach to teaching Penelope introduces the idea of "outside pressures" that are brought to bear on the teacher in the classroom.

A064. P: Not what I'd like it to be ... not always ... but as I say, I don't think anyone's perfect, I ... would like to be able to work ... to have, I would like to have a very clear pattern ... of where I thought, we should be going, ... and to be able to work with children on an
individual basis ... through the various stages ... towards an overall set of aims ... across the board I don't, I really don't think ... with young children there should be any ... subject differentiation or whatever ... but I think that's a bit idealistic because of all the, outside pressures that there are ... and the way that I do work is partly involved like that, but also more structured because of, because of the outside pressures ... I feel obliged to ... make sure that everybody's done some writing ... regularly, and things like that, though it may, I may not always feel that it's actually appropriate for that child at that moment ... to write about whatever it but because I know he hasn't done any writing for the last couple of days, I feel obliged to say, well I'm sorry, but I want you to come and do it now (laughs) ... though that would go totally against what I would really like to be doing ... and I'd really like to be able to work ... from the child ... to take his interests, ... and develop ... them with my own, with my own knowledge of ... of where things lead, ... and what the possibilities for development are ... and, and to work with him along his lines, but my knowledge isn't wide enough to do that, and and there aren't enough hours in that day, let alone anything else, to do that, but that's ideally what I'd like to do ... but as I say there are so many outside pressures and you can only do so much in that day (laughs) ...

The constraints of her limited knowledge, time and outside pressures force her to compromise on her ideals.

Penelope's view of the pupil's role has a number of foci.

A066: Ah, to, to, to learn, to ... but not just to learn facts or to learn to read ... but to learn ... to be a person, to learn to relate to other people ... um ... to learn ... socially, as well as learn, um, ... not academically, but skills and thinks like that, but also to share his experience, with other people, so that they can learn, I think the whole thing should be a joint experience from which individuals learn ... but and I believe that there's a lot that I can learn from the children that I work with, that I'm not, I'm learning too, by following along ... with them and by following their interest, and I think, oh well, I never knew that, I've never done that before ... that, they can teach others, ... by sharing their experiences, if we listen to them ... (Pause)

This description suggests that she sees the pupil's role as multi-faceted having learner, content, personal and social foci, and confirms her earlier suggestions that the teacher is not dominant in the classroom (A056).
As to the notion of a "good" or "bad" pupil Penelope considers the issue.

A068 P: ...(Pause) That's very difficult ... because I think they ... in a way are what we make them ... and ... little children certainly live up to the expectations that we put on them they seem to ... gear their own way of working according to what we ask of them but I think a bad pupil ... I, I dunno I wonder if that at such an early age there is such a thing I think they are what we make them ... and if they're not, fulfilling our expectations for them, ... then its very easy to say that they're bad pupils, but maybe it's because ... there's something wrong with our expectations ... and what we're asking for them, of them ... and it would be very easy to say well a bad pupil's the one that ... that won't settle down, that won't listen, but I don't think that's necessarily a bad pupil, I think maybe he's not settling down, not listening because he's not interested ... and that if we're working with his interests ... and helping him to learn how to develop these interests, then those sort of things wouldn't wouldn't exist ... I don't I, I don't see that you can really have a bad pupil, because the, ... they're what we make them, ...

She concludes:

A074 P: There can't be bad pupils, it's more because of bad teachers that they don't succeed, ... the same if they're seeming to be good pupils, maybe we've hit the right approach for that child, and so he is performing well, in the set up that we've provided, ... that it's, it's not ... the pupil that's the good or bad, they're what we make of them, ... I think that's ...

Penelope describes her view of knowledge:

A076. P: (Laughs) Well, ... oh dear (laughs) ... (Pause) it encompasses facts, understanding um, appreciation of, ... er ... (Pause) somehow the ability to ... to look at something, to assess it to, ... formulate some sort of conclusions about it ... to appreciate it in many ways, to be able to ... accept it or reject it ... a, across a huge range of ... of ... across the whole spectrum that all little bits of, of knowledge um, little facts, your understanding of them, and the ability to relate them together ... all that sort of thing somehow goes together to make up knowledge ...

Knowledge for her can be facts but it is also personal and open to acceptance or rejection and to change. I probe further:
A.079. I: mm ... yes. Do you see it then as um a continuum ...?

A. 080. P: ... Er, oh, yes, I think it's always, I think it's something that goes on and on throughout life that you never achieve ... the ultimate knowledge I think its something that (laughs), that you're always, ... reviewing ... things that you know, and changing them, developing them ... by other experiences, that, that one experience can completely change something ... you might say oh I know about such and such and ... and say what you think about it but then a completely different experience can change your view completely, so your knowledge, I suppose, changes ... by the things that you learn that come to it.

In using the statement, "you never achieve the ultimate knowledge", Penelope seems to be rejecting the realist viewpoint as views may change in the light of experience. This would be consistent with a constructivist approach.

I then move on to ask her if the study of psychology might be useful for understanding teaching and learning.

A.096. P: Yeh, I think, I think if through psychology you, learn about the way the human mind develops ... then ... that, would clarify a great deal, the way I'd like to teach, because I would be much more secure of the stages through which the children have to, have to go ... to get to wherever I was hoping for I, I'd be much more aware of the ... many different stages ... and how they think, how, how they tick ... so that I'd know what I was looking for when I was working with a child, that I'd be aware of where he was in his development, and from that I'd know that before he could do something in the distance, he'd got to do something nearer to him ... and I'm at the moment I'm sure I'm very hazy about the developmental stages, and, so I think from the psychology here I'm hoping to learn a lot about, how children's minds develop ... really, so to help the way that I'd like to teach ...

She has positive expectations of the contribution of psychology specifically related to the area of developmental stages which she feels could be usefully applied in the classroom.

At the end of the interview I invite Penelope to add any comments and she reflects on our discussion.
A100 P: When, I think they're very... difficult sort of questions to... to try and actually say what I think about this or... what do I think knowledge is (laughs) I mean that's just... incredibly difficult to answer... off the top of my head, but as I say I might well think about it later and think 'oh, that's, that's not, no I'm sure it is what I think, but its very much, there's no depth to it all, that's just come about straight away.

A101 I: Mm. Do you think it's been useful?

A102 P: ...Yes, I think it probably has, 'cos I think, I feel those questions has, as tying together, I can see the tie in... there... and as I was answering I thought, now how does... the, hang on that relates directly back to what you were saying about, um, a pupil and, um, relationships, ... not relationships but as a teacher's role the pupils role... and the knowledge being divided into separate boxes, I thought if I'm thinking of the, a child centred approach... then to say that knowledge is divided into separate boxes, the two just, there's no way they can go together, I don't think... I mean it's not to, 'til I'd heard all the questions that you (laughs) I think now, they, they tie together though.

A104 P: Mm. (Pause) I think, I think they all overlap as well... and that, you can't... that they must overlap there must be an overlap in the sort of thinking... that goes towards them, otherwise there's something wildly wrong with the way I'm thinking (laughs)

And finally comments:

A106 P: It's very interesting.

Penelope had found the interview stimulating and felt that it, had given her food for thought. She felt she would continue to reflect on the issues which would help her to clarify her ideas.

11.2 The Second Interview

The second interview starts by Penelope describing what she now sees to be the role of the teacher.
Um ... As an observer of what the children are doing I think, um ... to analyse what they're doing in the light of ... I suppose, child development, and to be able to look at ... what a child's doing ... in a ... situation assess his level of development and work out what would be the next appropriate step ... for him ... as well as sort of providing um ... an environment in which he can develop, in which there are opportunities for him to work ... to be stimulated, to follow his interests ... that sort of thing ... but I think the teacher is more of ... someone who should work ... alongside a child work with him ... rather than ... teach him - talk at him, tell him things, to draw the child out ... through his own interests through his own thinking and through knowing what is appropriate ... for him (pause) yeah I think ... as well as the sort of general organisation, but ... for the teacher-child relationship I think that's the ... to work with ... with the ... with the child (pause).

And what is the general organisation you just referred to?

I suppose you'd call it "classroom management" ... er ... are to think that just the ... making sure that, that everybody is ... is there ... where they should be (laughs) er ... very basic things that ... there is enough ... interesting material for everybody to be involved with something ... that interests them ... so that ... so that the atmosphere is such that the teacher can work with one child for quite some time, well, when I say quite some time, I suppose a good stretch of minutes, not just thirty seconds ... can be really involved with one child and know that everybody else is busy ... and ... you're not having to constantly jump up and down every two minutes to ... see to other people ... (clock chimes) ...
... sort of what's appropriate for him to be looking at next ... and making sure that, the appropriate materials are there (pause).

However, she still has reservations about her ability to put it into practice!

B 007 L: How, how do you know where a child is developmentally?

B 008 P: By watching what he's doing and sort of assessing by observation, by listening to him, ... and ... really watching what he's doing, observing him and ... through knowledge that I hope I'm going to find that I've now got (laughs) about the child development, to be able to ... look at him and see, well he's doing that ... so it would be appropriate for him now to be ... looking at it in such and such a way it would be a development for him, but I don't know, I don't know how good my knowledge of child development is, whether that will work, whether I'm knowledgeable enough to be able to look at what somebody's doing and say, "O.K. he can do that, he's at such and such a stage, ... it would be appropriate for him to do such and such next" - I don't know until I get into it whether I'll be able to do that -

She felt that the greatest influence on her teaching had been the head teacher of the school she currently taught at. He was a very dynamic character who influences the whole school.

B 016 P: ... but the atmosphere that he ... creates in a place, has has brought me round to doing things in the way I do, without any theoretical background as to why, it's must almost an instinctive ... this seems to be right ... this year's given me the the background, now I know it's right (pause)....

At college she had found the reading useful for providing this theory, (curriculum theory in particular) and had also found her dissertation both interesting and useful.

I asked if she had found any aspects of the psychology component useful.

B 028 P: (pause) Yes because that's where the child development work came in ... which I've come to think is the ... sort of crucial ....
area for a teacher to understand if you're going to work following children's interests and allow them to develop individually, rather than a teacher directed way, then you've go to know and understand in quite some depth child development to know how they should be going, and what's appropriate. And I think the psychology component generally sometime (laughs) (pause).

She had incorporated the ideas of child development into the role of the teacher earlier (see B 002) but was unsure as to her ability to put theory into practice (see B 008).

She had also found her experience of being a student useful, in two main ways. The first was in peer group discussion and the second in observing the course tutors acting as models. She describes this experience:

B 030 P: (Pause) Yes. And what I think was perhaps ... the most valuable thing there is is ... you're really learning to discuss, with other people, who from different school backgrounds, whose experience is different, ... and to appreciate other people's points of view, to realise that just because they don't agree with what you think, doesn't mean they're wrong; it's just that their experience is different ... and coupled with the common experience of the reading or the discussion or whatever, their experience brings them to a different conclusion, which is perhaps more appropriate for them, ... but it ... it doesn't mean that either you're wrong or that they're wrong; it's just a different point of view, but to share ... those different points of view ... it's very interesting ... much more tolerant perhaps, of other people's points of view (pause). I think it's very interesting. I think what Julie and John were trying to do is ... almost ... what they are advocating is the best way of teaching ... for us, with smaller children, I think they were trying to do ... by knowing what sort of things we should be thinking about, by the development bit, and providing the appropriate reading ... they then let the discussion go, to a great extent, just stepping in now and again to point it an and I think I very often sat and thought "What they're doing is exactly what ... they would say we should be doing" in a slightly different way, obviously cos of the circumstances, but ... I don't think they ever stood up and said "Right this is the way it should be done - you know, you do A, B and C" - they provided the reading and they said "Right what did you think?" and sort of took it from there really ... (laughs) ... practise what you preach (laughs).
In the first part of this statement Penelope describes the value of discussion with peers with different points of view. She appreciates that people can come to different conclusions over an issue which are more appropriate for them, that is of personal relevance. In Perry's terms she has developed the ability to think relativistically and form her own commitment. In the second part of this statement she saw the tutors in a model role, "practising what they preached". She had spoken of this during the first interview when speaking of the teacher educator's role, suggesting that "if they were talking about child centred education, to approach the thing in a way that would be practising what they're preaching", (See A 038). She voiced concern then that this might not be the case. However, her anxieties had proved unfounded.

She found it difficult to describe how she saw the relationship between teaching and learning but felt that teaching provided direction and without it learning would be slower and perhaps less deep. I ask her how she knows how to teach.

B 044 F: (sighs) How do you know how to teach?(laughs) (pause) For me, now, putting together ... a sort of practical experience that I've had before ... and sort of ideas that I've developed about what should go on, how should - how it should happen, ... discussions with other people, listening to people, and then adding this year ... the depth and wealth of reading what we've done, ... that's the theory - putting those two together .... and sort of mixing them up and coming up with their own conclusions almost. I'm sure we've all gone away from this course with different ideas about how it should be done (laughs).

B 045 I: And why do you think that is?

B 046 F: Because we've all brought a different experience to it to start with, so the mixture for everyone is different ... and attitudes, I mean people's attitudes - it's all bound up in your own experience - I think not just teaching experience but general experience ... that makes you what you are, and you bring what you are to the theory, and somebody else's books and what you have, ... and each thing you read or each thing you hear adds a little bit to what you are and changes you a little bit, ...
Er ... yeah I think - I think those sort of things all go together, and what comes out is not ... knowing how to teach but it goes inside you so it comes out as instinct, almost asthough because you've got now I've got the sort of theory behind it, its not just ungrounded instinct ... it's knowing ... O.K. there's there's this and that I've read they're experts in the field, they've researched it, ... and this is what they're saying is best and it seems to fit with what ... I think as well ... or if I put what I've read with what I think, I come up with something in between which seems appropriate (long pause) and I suppose the ... my going back to my initial training ... that sowed the initial seeds of how how to teach on which I've developed since .... (pause) ....

Penelope repeats her views on personal perspectives. She thinks each person will leave the course with different viewpoints, having come to their own conclusions.

She again actively relates theory to practice and may be seen to have both intrinsic/perceptive and extrinsic/theoretical foci.

When it comes to knowing how someone learns she has an intrinsic/introspection focus in that she reflects upon her own experience. She feels that her "instinct" has been backed up by the theory that resulted from the reading she had done this year and therefore also has an extrinsic/theoretical focus.

I suppose .... realising how I learn ....I don't learn by being told ..... so (laughing) why should anybody else? Um, ... and that's that's always been my ..... thinking, that ..... I really resent being told how to do things myself, I'd much rather be given hints and suggestions perhaps to try it this way or and then it sticks much better when I've found out for myself how to do something ..... and because I know I'm like that I think I assume other people are as well, and there again that backed up by the reading this year, ..... I suppose has has brought me to the same sort of conclusion that people learn better through their own, through their own interests, their own experiences, whatever, with guidance, than by being told .... how to do things (pause)

Penelope wished to comment before we finished.
B 076 P: I think it's ... you've caught me really very much between the end of the course and going back into school, and so I'm - I'm betwixt and between - I don't know how the, I know how much I enjoyed the course and how much ... I've gained from it, I suppose a tremendous amount, but exactly what I don't think I'll see ... until I get back into school, ... and yet the impetus of the course itself has finished, we've not got to go back again, and there are no more discussions, no more reading and seminars and things, so ... that's, that's over, its done ... and how it ... has worked for me for my teaching, I don't ... I can't begin to think of of what'll happen, how I'll have changed or really what I've learnt from it I suppose ... I suppose I've learnt a lot but how much I've really deep down understood and can practise ... and to develop ... from what I've now got, I won't know until I actually try it .......... I've definitely got a taste for it ... (pause) ... but I want to go on and do more, there's no doubt.

11.3 Comments

The theme running through both interviews with Penelope was of relating experience, theory and practice. She recognised that other people held different or opposing viewpoints but that did not mean that they were right or wrong, only different. Her own views changed in the light of new experience and this would be consistent with a constructivist viewpoint. In terms of Perry's developmental stages Penelope acknowledges alternative perspectives and follows her own commitment which she continually reviews relating experience, theory and practice.

At the beginning of the course Penelope had been learner and content focused while at the end of the course she was learner, teacher and relationship focused. She remained learner focused throughout but her shift away from content and towards teacher and relationship foci was an interesting one.
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"It is therefore important, if integration of theory and practice is our aim, that educational theory comes to be seen not so much as a corpus of knowledge informed by contributing disciplines - history, philosophy, psychology etc, but rather as an activity, the activity of critical reflection. This activity, theorizing, should draw upon the body of knowledge which is the product of former, prominent theorists, but yet should subordinate this knowledge to the reflection upon the current professional experience of the student teacher. The most important theorizer in a teacher education programme is not Plato, Rogers or Britton; the most important theorizer is the student himself".

[Francis, 1980, p.17]

This study has been concerned with the exploration and understanding of student teachers' personal perspectives in a way that may be of utility to those involved in teacher education and staff development.

This chapter is divided into four sections. The first reviews the study, the second considers the role of psychology in teacher education, the third highlights emergent issues, and finally implications are suggested.

12.1 Reviewing the Study

This section is divided into two parts. The first reviews the research methods while the second reviews the research findings.

12.1.1 Research Methods

I followed a research methodology that considered understanding the participants' view of paramount importance in the study. Within a naturalistic framework the study followed four groups of student teachers (two pre-service and two in-service) throughout one academic year. All fifty-one volunteers completed both
interviews over the year. From past experience of quantitative research and in setting up the pilot study (in which an unexpected move by a key member of staff prevented previously planned access to an entire course), I had anticipated some drop-out rate over the year. Therefore, rather than risk an extensive study of a few participants in which drop-out could be detrimental, I opted for a less in-depth approach with more students. In retrospect this was probably the best option as the school visits, in particular, had presented a number of unforeseen difficulties, and with a larger number of students it was at least still possible to sample a wide variety of classes. I believe the commitment of the students was due to the participant-researcher relationship fostered by the nature of the study, as I was involved with each course throughout the fieldwork period. It was also important to be an interested and empathetic listener both in and out of the interview situation.

Working with a larger number of students over four courses, however, is not without problems. As a large proportion of time was spent actually interviewing it was not possible to spend as much time observing college courses as I would have wished. With four courses taking part at two different main locations there were also other inherent hazards such as clashes of timetable and split sites that prevented fieldwork time being fully utilised. Transcription and analysis of so many interviews was especially time consuming. With hindsight it is suggested that if this type of study is undertaken by a single researcher, it would be prudent to work in more depth with only one or two courses rather than to stretch thinly over more.

The combination of interviews, observations and document analysis had proved a useful one. Each, I felt, contributed to the others to aid my understanding of the student teachers' perspective.

The focused interviews gave me the flexibility to allow me to explore, probe and re-phrase to each individual's requirements. The advantage of this method was that it encouraged the participants to explore their own views, thinking aloud and
reaching a greater depth than with a structured interview. I found that using Kelly's notion of dichotomous constructs in distinguishing between 'good' and 'bad' examples of teacher educators, teachers and pupils most helpful in encouraging the students to expand some of their views. Some students rejected one of the poles, usually 'bad', and substituted their own opposite of 'good'. Occasionally other students rejected the construct completely and replaced it with their own construct that best described their own views. These findings would agree with Buchmann who suggested:

"Thus pupils know a teacher when they see one and notice the difference between a good and a bad one. Depending on personal preferences, they favour some teachers over others."

[Buchmann, 1986 p.11]

The pupils, of course, grow up and some become student teachers themselves, carrying with them impressions from their own classroom days.

The second interview had been developed from the findings of the first interviews and teaching practice visits. Few students had related teaching to learning or knowledge development and I felt this might be a useful area to explore. Entwistle reminds us of the complexity of this relationship:

"At one time it was common to remind student teachers that the verb 'to teach' takes two accusatives - you teach someone something. Then the main point was to force subject specialists to recognise that the learner was an important part of the teaching... the verb 'to learn' has a subject, the learner and an object - what is to be learned which in real life has complex characteristics of its own."

[Entwistle, 1976 p 1]

This also introduced the notion of "know how", or how do students know how to teach or how someone learns. These questions were designed to stimulate reflection on implicit and explicit notions. Interviews might have been usefully extended by the use of repertory grid techniques but were not used in this study because of time constraints in the college timetabling and large sample size. The collection of documentation provided useful supplementary data about the
colleges, courses, classes and schools and rendered a more holistic picture of the student teachers' college life. However, collection was opportunistic and therefore somewhat haphazard depending on my being around as it was made available. Attempts to achieve a more systematic method failed as no one individual on each course was responsible for the production and/or distribution of such literature.

The observations also helped to give me a wider perspective. College observations contributed to the description of the learning milieu described in 6.2, and 7.4. The teaching practice visit observations enabled me to gain perspective from a number of primary schools in the area and to observe the similarities and differences between classes and schools that student teachers of both pre-service courses experience (6.4 and case studies 8.2, 9.2, and 10.2). My interest was in observing the breadth of schools that student teachers are placed in. It would also have been useful to have been able to visit some students several times over the period of their teaching practice. However, with the observation of two pre-service groups during the second term of the fieldwork year, the time-table was tight and I could only have undertaken repeated visits to the some students by not visiting others at all. As I already stated at the beginning of this section I was reluctant to put 'all my eggs in one basket' and risk the possibility that the school, college or the students themselves, might not allow such visits. Further work in this area might usefully incorporate a case study approach with several visits to each of a smaller sample of students.

In an attempt to relate the students' views from the first interview to the teaching practice observations, a "teacher-pupil/class characteristics" checklist was prepared from the first interview transcripts (See appendix C7). The characteristics used were those elicited from the students' descriptions of "good" and "bad" teachers and pupils. ("Class" refers to a group of pupils i.e. a class). In most cases opposite poles were given but where this was not the case I had supplied one. When an observation was made the mark nearest the pole was circled i.e. 'strict - 1 1 1 - lax'. If neither "strictness" nor "laxness" was observed during the visit then the middle, neutral mark was circled. The intention of the checklist was to see if it were possible to observe the range of characteristics that students mentioned in their various permutations that might help me to be more precise in describing class visits and act as a base for further discussion with students on their second interview.
However, the attempt to use such a checklist was aborted. After several observations it became obvious how subjective the task was. One instance of an item would be recorded in the same way as many instances. Both poles of one characteristic may be observed and recorded. On reflection it did not contribute towards my understanding of what was going on in the classroom and was discarded as not useful in this study. However, it gave me insight into the problems faced in teacher appraisal in that trying to be "objective" was fraught with subjectivity. Trying to capture these abstract concepts in practice simply reflected my own biases rather than illuminate the students' perspectives.

The research yielded a wealth of data which has wider implications than simply for the teaching and learning of psychology as was originally intended. The next section discusses the research findings.

12.1.2 Research Findings

Analysing qualitative data in a meaningful way is at best a difficult task the aim being to reduce a mass of unwieldy interview data into a communicable report without losing the flavour of the original research. During the analysis of the data I heeded the warning of Pope & Keen [1981] that:

"...any attempt to categorise perspectives on education would do a great injustice to the great diversity of viewpoints on education held by particular individuals".

[Pope & Keen, 1981 p.1]

Similarly, I noted Pope & Denicolo's [1986] findings using Fox's method of categorising interview statements (1.4). They had shown that at different times the same teacher might be equally categorised in any of the four teaching styles proposed by Fox [1983]. With these in mind I was cautious of describing student teacher thinking purely in terms of grand theories or constrained categories that were mutually exclusive. The data presented is my interpretation of student teachers' perspectives and is in accord with the notion of translation:

"Major acts of translation seem to have a chance necessity. The logic comes after the fact. What we are dealing with is not a science but an exact art".

[Steiner, 1975, p.295]
It was hoped that an examination of similarities and differences in foci between courses and course types might be suggestive of appropriate approaches to professional development. The reader is reminded that this data is simply a frequency count of the percentage of students on each course who share areas of concern and is an attempt to present qualitative data in a form that emphasises shared notions within and between groups. This type of analysis was attempted because, whilst many teacher educators recognise the importance of the individual, primarily they are required to work with groups. Although it may be possible to discern certain trends within and between courses and course types from the frequency tables, such extrapolations should be approached with caution. The next four sections look at the foci in relation to teachers, learners, teachers and learners, and theory and practice.

121.2.1 Teacher Foci

This section looks at both the school teacher and teacher educator as teacher. During the first interviews, students' descriptions of the teachers role were seen to fall into five areas of concern or foci, teacher, learner, content, relationship and control (See chapter 4.1.1 for foci description and examples from transcripts).

The foci listed in descending order of frequency for each course are:

- B.Ed.yr.2 - teacher, relationship, learner, control, content
- PGCE - teacher/learner/relationship, control, content
- B.Ed.1-S - teacher/learner/relationship content, control
- Dip.Ed. - teacher, content, learner, relationship, control

Overall, more students were preoccupied with teacher issues than any other foci. The two pre-service courses were most alike seeing teacher, relationship and learner issues most frequently, then aspects of control and least frequent content. The two in-service courses mainly differed from each other in their emphasis on content and relationship. Dip.Ed. students expressed more concern about content
while B.Ed.1-S mostly reported teacher, learner and relationship issues, then content. Neither in-service group seemed concerned with control.

In the second interview the foci listed in descending order of frequency for each course were:

- B.Ed.yr.2 - teacher, content, relationship, control, learner
- PGCE - teacher, control, content/relationship, learner
- B.Ed.1-S - teacher, content, learner/relationship, other
- Dip.Ed. - teacher, learner, relationship

The second interview showed that there was a significant increase in the number of students who were preoccupied with teacher issues than had been so during the first term. Conversely, there was a significant decrease in the number of students on all courses who were concerned with both learner and relationship issues. This suggests that all courses demonstrated a move towards being more teacher focused and away from being learner and relationship focused. Both pre-service course students became more concerned with content than previously but interestingly they differed with respect to control. More PGCE students focused on control in the second interview, while fewer B.Ed.yr.2 students did so.

Of the in-service courses the main difference between the two groups was in the content focus. More B.Ed.1-S students became content focused than had been during the first term. In contrast, no Dip.Ed. students saw content as an issue whereas most had done so in the first interview.

Over the course of the academic year, changes in students' perceptions of the teacher's role have been observed. The single most important observation here has been that there has was an increase in the number concerned with teacher foci and a decrease in those concerned with learner and relationship issues. My findings therefore did not reflect those of Finlayson & Cohen (1967) that students became most child centred in their second year and more teacher centred in their third (1.4). The B.Ed.yr.2 students appeared to increasingly become more teacher
centred throughout their second year. Each course differed in its structure, format and content but all courses, according to their literature at least, advocated a basically child-centred approach. Both in-service groups were seconded for the year and this period of theoretical study, together with absence from the classroom situation, may have contributed to the emphasis on the teacher focus. However, one might have expected the teaching practice period experienced during this period by both pre-service groups to have had the opposite effect, thus helping the student become more aware of learner and relationship issues. From the comments made by pre-service students, many were predominantly concerned with doing whatever seemed necessary to survive the period, much of which seemed to be dominated by their perception of the assessment. Priority was given to producing documentation such as lesson plans, work sheets and teaching material that would fill their teaching practice files. If educators are to encourage students to focus on other issues it would seem prudent to reward their attempts in that direction. To facilitate this, supervisors would need to foster a supportive role.

Two other observations in relation to the teacher’s role are worth noting. These are changes in control and content foci. Prior to teaching practice a similar proportion of B.Ed.yr.2 and PGCE students were concerned with issues of control. However, following teaching practice, fewer B.Ed.yr.2 students mentioned control whereas there was an increase in PGCE students doing so. It is not easy to account for this difference, although time spent in teaching practice, and in preparation for it may be contributing factors. B.Ed.yr.2 students spent a five-week half-term in teaching practice while PGCE students spanned the whole ten-week term. My school observations showed that classes and schools varied widely, but although that may affect individual students within courses, there were no observed significant differences between the classes and schools experienced by either group. In the first term, PGCE students spent one day each week on school visits in preparation for teaching practice. B.Ed.yr.2 students had only had a few school visits throughout the year-and-a-half they had been in college. Perhaps the most likely explanation is that B.Ed.yr.2 students will go onto another teaching practice
but the PGCE students' next experience in the classroom will be to take up positions as class teachers on their probationary year. Without the support of a class teacher in the background there may be fears of their own ability in class control.

Finally, as regards the teacher's role, there is the increased concern with content in all but the Dip.Ed. course. Most Dip.Ed. students had commented on content during the first interview but none did so during the second. Again this is not easily accounted for; however, one contributory factor may have resulted from the Dip. Ed. course emphasis on process and the heavy Piagetian influence. This course also had less formal contact hours than any other course and almost all teaching was by student-led seminar. In contrast, in the other in-service group, B.Ed.1-S, more students were concerned with content at the end of the academic year than had been previously. Both groups had been in college and away from their classrooms for the year. The B.Ed.1-S course was fairly heavily timetabled with a number of degree modules, the duration of which were one or two terms each terminating in examinations towards the degree class. It is possible that this more exam-orientated approach of 'writing down the facts', may have fostered more students to be concerned with issues of content.

To get a clearer view of the student teachers' world it was important to look at their perceptions of significant others in the educational setting, especially the teacher educator at college and the pupil at school.

The teacher educator's role was seen to fall into six areas of concern or foci: teacher, learner, content, relationship, training and model. (See 4.3.1 for foci descriptions and examples from transcripts) Four foci (teacher, learner, content and relationship) matched those of the teacher foci and two new notions (training and model) were introduced.
The foci listed in descending order of frequency for each course were:

- **B.Ed.Yr.2**: teacher/relationship, learner, content, training, model
- **PGCE**: teacher, learner, training, relationship, model, content
- **B.Ed.1-S**: learner, teacher, content, relationship/model, training
- **Dip.Ed.**: teacher, content, learner, relationship/training/model

There was less similarity between courses than had been observed with the teacher foci. Most students on three of the courses (B.Ed.yr.2, PGCE and Dip.Ed) were concerned with teacher issues while most of the B.Ed.1-S group were learner focused.

Most B.Ed.yr.2 students were concerned with teacher relationships and learner issues which reflected in their view of the teacher. As the most recent school leavers, this group was probably most affected by their own experiences as pupils in school. Most of the other pre-service group (PGCE) were also concerned with teacher and learner issues but more were concerned with training than with relationships. This might be expected, as the first interviews indicated that the primary reason for choosing the one-year certificate course was to qualify as a teacher. Developing relationships with the teacher educators may be of less concern to postgraduates, possibly because of their university experiences or perhaps because of the shorter duration of the course with two college-based academic terms and one school placement term. More B.Ed.yr.2 students were also concerned with content than the PGCE students. I would suggest that this reflected their preoccupation with exams that, following the modular structure of the course, were held at the end of each term.

The two in-service courses differed from each other as to their emphasis of foci. Most Dip.Ed. students were concerned with teacher issues, then content and learner foci, while the B.Ed.1-S students were primarily concerned with the learner, then teacher and content. The B.Ed.1-S students saw the teacher educator's role as being student focused and voiced more disillusionment with those parts of the course in which they felt participation had been discouraged.
The Dip.Ed. course had been run mainly on a seminar basis in which participation was encouraged. Criticism was levelled more at the extent to which students should be guided in discussion rather than allowed to "waffle-on". The teacher educator was seen in a more directive role which was consistent with their emphasis on teacher and content foci.

The role of the teacher educator and the teacher was seen to be fairly similar over the four shared foci. The main difference was that fewer in-service students were concerned with relationships regarding the teacher educator’s role than were pre-service students. As most B.Ed.1-S group were also concerned with issues regarding the learner it may suggest that, as learners, they saw themselves as more autonomous and independent of their mentors. In contrast, more Dip.Ed. students emphasised the teacher focus but not that of the learner, suggesting perhaps that for them teacher educators are in a position of power and as such the student teacher educator relationship is not of any import. The two pre-service groups showed a more marked dependency on the relationship with college staff that matched their concern with relationships between teachers and pupils. More recent experience as pupils and students themselves may account for this concern.

12.1.2.2 Learner Foci

This section looks at both the student and pupil as learner. Throughout the study students were less able to talk about the role of the learner and learning than the teacher and teaching. This finding would suggest that Knowles was optimistic when he stated:

"We have finally really begun to absorb into our culture the ancient insight that the heart of education is learning, not teaching, and so our focus has started to shift from what the teacher does to what happens to the learners"

[Knowles, 1972 p. 52]

When the students were asked about their role as students at college responses could be seen as falling into seven foci: teacher, learner, content, personal, social, goal, and training (See 5.1.1. for foci descriptions and examples from transcripts).
The foci listed in descending order of frequency for each course were:

B.Ed.yr.2. - training, social, learner/content, goal, teacher/personal
PGCE - training, teacher, learner/content/social, personal
B.Ed.1-S - learner, content, personal/goal
Dip.Ed. - learner, teacher, content, goal

The majority of students on both pre-service courses saw themselves as students training in preparation for a career in teaching. Many of the B.Ed.yr.2 also emphasised the social aspect of their student life which might have been expected, as in combining their teacher training with their degree it was the first period away from home for most of this group. PGCE students commented that they had found social aspects of their student life important when they had done their first degree, but with such a short time to prepare for teaching on this course they were working in earnest.

Most in-service students from both courses were learner focused and saw themselves as active agents in the learning process. About one third of each group also emphasised content. However, the two groups differed in that just under one half of the Dip.Ed. students also saw themselves as teacher focused and taking a more passive role while none of the B.Ed.1-S students were teacher focused. No in-service students were social or training focused which might have been predictable. In-service students were already qualified and in post as teachers and had maintained their own home and social life away from the college they attended. Students in all courses were otherwise divided in their areas of concern.

Having discussed the student as learner, what similarities and differences are there between the way students see their role and that of the pupil at school?

When discussing the pupil's role at school student teachers described six areas of concern which were: teacher, learner, content, personal, social and goal. The foci listed in descending order of frequency for each course were:

B.Ed.yr.2 - social, content, learner, teacher, personal
PGCE - social, content, learner/personal, teacher
B.Ed.1-S - social, learner/content, personal, teacher/goal
Dip.Ed. - learner, social, content/personal, teacher/goal
Most students saw the social aspect of the pupil's role as important although more students on the Dip.Ed. course were learner focused.

Most students on three courses (B.Ed.yr.2, PGCE and B.Ed.1-S) saw the social aspect of the pupil's role as important. Although this aspect was also mentioned by over half of the Dip.Ed. students, more of them were concerned with the active participation of the learner. More pre-service students were concerned with content, which may suggest a pre-occupation with pupils acquiring knowledge and skills as evidence of learning taking place. Fewer in-service students were concerned with content. Students in all courses were otherwise divided in their areas of concern.

In comparing the student's role with that of the pupil, six foci were shared, being: teacher, learner, content, social and goal foci. The vocational focus was only seen as relating to the student's role and used only by pre-service students. The pre-service students saw the pupil's role as social and content focused which was not dissimilar to the way they saw their role as students.

The in-service groups differed more from each other in their views of students and pupils. More B.Ed.1-S saw pupils as being social, learner and content focused, while students were primarily learner focused. Most Dip.Ed. students also saw pupils as learner and social focused, while students were seen to be learner and teacher focused. Neither group saw the social aspects of being a student as important. Although these students developed friendship groups within the course, each maintained a family life independent of college and, as such, their social needs were met outside college.

Do the students' views of teachers match up with their view of learners? The next section reviews the students' perspectives of teachers and learners.

12.1.2.3 Teachers and Learners

This section looks at the students' views of teachers and learners at college and at school.

When comparing the teacher educators' and students' roles, four foci were held in common which were: teacher, learner, content and training. B.Ed.yr.2 students
saw teacher educators as predominantly concerned with teacher and learner issues, whereas most students were concerned with training. The same was true of the PGCE students who differed only in that many of them also saw training as part of the teacher educators' role.

Most B.Ed.1-S students saw both the teacher educator's and student's role as learner focused, emphasising the autonomy of the learner. Many of this group also saw the teacher educator's role as teacher focused but none saw the student's role as such. The Dip.Ed. students saw the teacher educator's role as predominantly teacher and content focused, while the student role was learner focused. This view of teacher-centred lecturers and learner-centred students suggests mismatch between teachers and learners at college.

These views had been elicited during the first term and were the students' perceptions of significant others, not necessarily of how they actually were but how they felt they should be.

The Dip.Ed. group received a more coherent learner centred approach on their course while the B.Ed.1-S had a more traditional, "class" structure in which the approach of the lecturer determined how formal or otherwise the class might be.

In only one of the classes that I observed (B.Ed.1-S) was there discussion between the lecturer and the students as to the way in which they felt the class should proceed. This resulted in a show of hands to the various options discussed at the end of the session. I do not know if decisions were reviewed or re-negotiated in the light of experience, as time did not permit further observations, but one would hope that this would have been the case. If the expectation of roles played by the teacher educators and students are made explicit and negotiated as a joint activity, this provides a basis for communication and re-negotiation in which students can reflect on their personal epistemologies and play an active part in their own learning. Are there similar concerns with the teacher and learner at school as at college?

Comparing the teacher and pupil's roles only three issues were held in common which were: teacher, learner and content foci. Most pre-service students saw the teacher's role as teacher and learner focused while the pupil's role was content focused. Similarly, most B.Ed.1-S students saw the teacher's role as teacher and
learner focused but saw the pupil's as more learner focused. Most Dip.Ed. students
saw the teacher's role as being teacher, content and learner focused while the
pupils were seen as learner focused. Overall there was little match between their
perceptions of teacher's and pupil's roles except for the learner foci held by both
B.Ed.yr.2 and Dip.Ed. groups. This suggests that student's view of themselves as
teachers may not be compatible with their view of the pupil. With this in mind
teachers may wish to make more explicit their views of teaching within the
teaching situation and perhaps to open up for discussion with the pupil as to their
role in the classroom. As has already been discussed for the teacher educator and
student, the student as teacher can facilitate his own pupils' awareness and
responsibility for learning.

Students' personal perspectives may reflect one or other of the educational
ideologies which govern their thinking and practice. Kelly's notion of a construct
system is useful here. He describes core constructs as of central importance to the
individual, remaining stable and highly resistant to change. A construct
subsystem has a limited range of convenience that will deal with a particular area
or discipline. Constructs within a system are highly interrelated but may not link
with constructs in other subsystems. The personal ideology of the student or
teacher, implicit or explicit, will be a core construct that guides his action and will
be resistant to change. The foci that I have described may be seen as part of a
construct subsystem and, as such, less resistant to change. In this way such changes
may be relatively superficial, with core constructs, such as the overriding ideology,
remaining intact.

Certain permutations of foci might suggest compatibility with one or other of the
educational ideologies [Pope & Keen, 1981] (1.3). For example, a combination of a
teacher and/or content focus may be indicative of a Cultural Transmission
perspective. A learner and/or relationship focus might suggest more of a
Romanticist position. A teacher and learner focus possibly reflects a Progressivist
approach. Similarly, a learner focus could denote a De-Schooling view. However,
this is suggested with caution as such judgements should not be made out of
context, for instance from a small fragment of interview data but from a wider
perspective. Students may be more Romanticist in their outlook when
considering the pupil but have a Cultural Transmission model of the teacher.
Even the interview as a whole is but a snapshot of a fragment in a student's life.
The Cultural Transmission and Romanticist perspectives may be seen to be diametrically opposed. In some way the Progressivist viewpoint may be seen to lie some way between the two. Most students in this study could be seen to have views most compatible with a Progressivist ideology although within this viewpoint there is considerable breadth. Few students' perspectives were accordant with either the Cultural Transmission or Romanticist view. No students in this sample had views akin to those of the De-Schoolers. These results are not unexpected. The trend in education in the UK, as suggested by teacher education courses, over the last few years has been away from the Cultural Transmission model and towards a more Progressivist approach. Many student teachers may have been pupils brought up with this approach at school. However, the Cultural Transmission view is still in evidence. Knowledge, facts and subject matter are still highly valued in this society, more obviously in secondary and tertiary education. Examinations and qualifications are prized, as are competitions such as "Mastermind".

The Romanticist viewpoint has not occupied a predominant place in the educational system of the UK. My findings did not fully corroborate Jackson's [1977] findings that suggested that elementary teachers reflected a Romanticist position but did agree that many primary teachers took an intuitive approach to teaching [1,6].

I was not surprised to find an absence of students with a predominantly De-Schooling ideology in the sample. I felt it unlikely that any person that held such a viewpoint would attend a formally structured teacher education course of the type that I included in my research.

The case studies presented in chapters 8, 9, 10, and 11 are illustrative of the individual's overall educational ideology and the idiosyncrasies within that framework. Students have points of contact in common and individual differences, each with their own permutation that makes them unique. The differences between individuals are as important as the similarities and should therefore be taken account of by staff developers and teacher educators. The urge to categorise students as X and therefore treat them with Y should be avoided at all costs. The data presented here should be convincing enough to indicate the complexity of student teachers' thinking to suggest that whereas Y might work
with one X student it might not with another because the individual differences between them outweigh the similarities.

The student were able to talk at length about teachers and, to a lesser degree, about learners. What informs their knowledge of teaching and learning? Encouraging the students to consider how they know how someone learns or how to teach introduces issues of theory and practice.

12.1.2.4 Theory and Practice

If education is concerned with teaching and learning and students are involved both in the theory and practice of these processes during their course, it is of interest to examine student teachers' perceptions of how their knowledge of learning and teaching is informed.

From the responses referring to how someone learns, three foci were discerned: intrinsic/perceptive, extrinsic/theoretical and intrinsic/introspective (see 6.5.1.1 for foci descriptions and examples from transcripts). A separate category was used to record those unable to say.

In three of the four courses (B.Ed.yr.2, PGCE and B.Ed.1-S) most students felt that knowing how someone learnt was intrinsic/perceptive. The Dip.Ed. students were split between intrinsic/perceptive and intrinsic/introspective foci.

Half of the B.Ed.1-S and approximately one-third of the two pre-service groups had an extrinsic/theoretical perspective. Most students in both types of course voiced only one viewpoint, with only about one-fifth of the total number of students holding two or more foci.

Three foci were derived from asking students how they knew how to teach. A fourth category was used to record those unable to say (see 6.5.2.1 for foci descriptions and examples from transcripts). In all four courses the majority of students felt that knowing how to teach was intrinsic/perceptive. Just over one-third of the pre-service students suggested an extrinsic/role model and just under one-third of three groups (B.Ed.yr.2, B.Ed.1-S and Dip.Ed.) saw it as
extrinsic/theoretical. Approximately three-fifths of students only voiced one viewpoint with the remainder holding two or more foci.

Thus, "the apprenticeship of observation", (Lortie 1975), was confirmed by some students who were aware of the influence, positive or negative, that their teachers had had on them as pupils. One in-service teacher commented:

307 B016 - well obviously the teachers I was taught by. Um ... um must have done. And I can certainly think of one or two teachers who, on whom I actually modelled myself as directly as I could on occasions. Partly because, um, I wasn't quite sure what my approach should be. Um ... probably more so because they were masterfully successful in my own case. Um ... now I realise that if they were successful in my case they might not necessarily have been in others.

B.Ed.1-S

Others, like this pre-service student, felt they had been negatively influenced:

103 B158 - That's a very good question (laughs) um ... (pause) um I can't say that we go back on our old models for teaching because it's changed such a lot since I was at Primary school, but I suppose that is the basis some of the best models for me have been really bad teachers, because I know not what not ... I know what not to do ... um ... and I suppose in that way it from there onwards it's just I, I can't say that it's instinct but I'm sure it's not instinctive to teach, oh I don't know though, I'm always doing it at home, they always accuse me of doing it at home, I suppose I am, I suppose it is instinctive, I don't know, personality thing.

B.Ed.yr:2.

The informal, occupational socialisation of teachers (Buchmann, 1986) may persuade the student that professional learning is unnecessary as this pre-service student had anticipated:

214 A046 - Because ... I mean, I was doing my observation and ... the teacher I was with was very good. It all seemed too easy and ... and well she made it look so easy, you know. Everyone would be very organised and you'd think ... "Why go to college for a year to learn ..." But when you actually have a go yourself, you realise quite what you've got to ... you've got to get everything sorted out and organised for yourself, before you can even think of going into a classroom.

PGCE
The majority of students in both pre-service and in-service groups therefore, might be seen in Tomlinson's (1981) terms as holding views compatible with "arrogant amateurism/negative romanticism", (1.7). Only a couple of students from the whole sample could be seen to hold the opposite viewpoint of "naive technology/positive professionalism". The remainder felt some combination best informed their views.

Many in-service students had spoken of using their sabbatical year as a period of reflection and to review their teaching in the light of a theoretical framework. It must be somewhat depressing to staff developers to find that at the end of the college year in which theoretical issues have been presented most students' views are polarised towards what Tomlinson would term an "arrogant amateurism/negative romanticism" or an intuitive/common sense approach to teaching. There is little difference between the in-service and pre-service students in the proportion that held single views or the proportion of those that held more than one view.

Observations of students and teachers as they go about their daily business in the classroom is unlikely to reveal their personal epistemology and pedagogy. I observed students with quite disparate perspectives that had points of overlap in their behaviour. In many instances their behaviour may be seen to be exactly similar, yet their intentions have been quite different. Without the privilege of listening to their thoughts and feelings I might have come to very different conclusions. This suggests that tutors should not simply observe students on teaching practice but try to understand their intentions also.

My observations in primary schools confirmed the views of Buchmann when she stated:

"Despite a large critical literature and reform movements associated with famous figures, such as Dewey and Piaget, people tend to do what they have always done in school. Teachers and textbooks are central to what goes on; there are whole class recitations, teachers give lectures, and students work at their seats. Discussions that are not recitations in
disguise are rare and, when they happen, mostly an outlet for youthful energy and opinion”.

[Buchmann, 1986 p. 9]

Teachers and workcards were central to what went on. Teachers gave talks and pupils worked at their seats. Discussions consisted of teachers asking questions and pupils replying to the teacher. One student teacher, having attempted to instigate a discussion without success, said sadly that the pupils had never had a discussion before and did not know what to do. There were, of course, exceptions where pupils were given much freedom in choice, movement and talk. These classes were exhausting to observe, as pupils went about their own business, but exciting places to be in.

During the school visits I was able to observe, match or mis-match between students and their placement. Three of the case studies presented report on the class observation (see Chapters 9, 10 and 11). I observed mis-match with two of the three students, confirming the view that anxiety may result from students' mis-match with placements (Sorenson, 1967). Steve with a strong traditional bias had been placed at one of the most progressive schools I had visited. Both he and the staff were unhappy with the situation. They wished him to be innovative and introduce new ideas, while he wished to please by copying previously observed behaviour. At no time, as far as I was aware, did anyone address the issue of personal perspectives either of the student or school or college staff. This tense situation might have provided a useful forum for exploration and development, had such an approach been used.

Jane also voiced her disillusionment with her school placement. Her Romanticist viewpoint clashed with a more formal setting in which she felt constrained and unable to 'be herself'. In the third term when I saw her for interview, she was clearly depressed and considering leaving the B.Ed degree course. Her placement had confirmed her views of her own unhappy experience as a pupil at school. She still wanted to work with children but in a less restrictive setting and felt that working with mal-adjusted children or some similar group would better fit her views, as she would not be required to be 'detached' from the children. She seemed unaware that schools might vary in their approach to teaching and that other establishments might provide an environment which could be compatible with her own views.
Mary had found her placement more or less to her liking, as she was given freedom to experiment and to follow up some of her own ideas. She found the staff supportive and helpful.

A number of other students found their teaching practice placement matched their own views on teaching:

204 B034 - I think my views beforehand ... before going into school, were very much that way ... and I'm sure if it was if I'd gone into school where the, where it was very formal ... umm ... I would have disagreed probably with the teaching methods ... But not only did they sort of ... do they teach in the way that I'd like to see ... you know children going about school thoroughly enjoying themselves. And it was, you you know it was a really happy atmosphere. It was lovely. But they, you, they stretched it further and they showed me more than you know em So I was introduced to a lot more than what I'd ... thought of beforehand.

A supportive class teacher enabled a PGCE student to experiment with new ideas:

206 B054 - Well that was one of the things that I would say was very supporting about her. That if I had an idea that wasn't ... within her ... box of tricks, as it were, as a teacher. She would say well, okay, well it's your teaching practice, fine if you want to exp ... go ahead with that. And she would let me ... go ahead with it, and if it succeeded, she would say, "that was very good," you know, "I'll have to remember about that." So I mean it was, it was definitely a non two-way thing. She didn't oppress me in any way, didn't, you know. She actually comes here and talks to students and ... you know, she does a lot of work with the college. Its very valuable.

These placements provided a positive experience for these students, but others were not so fortunate. From the sample, a number of students reported mis-match with either the ethos of the class and/or school or with the class teacher. This calls into question the aims of providing school practice and its value to the student as a vehicle for learning. Administratively school practice placements are time consuming and allocated on various practical criteria such as transport routes etc. If practice is such a valuable aspect of training, should colleges not be putting more
resources into the allocation of placements, matching or complementing students' personal pedagogies with the school's ethos to improve the quality of the experience for both parties? However, to do this the student's personal perspectives must be explored. Where mis-match occurs this could be used to extend the student's perspectives but within a supportive framework.

After looking at the findings in general we will now focus more specifically on the students' perceptions of psychology in teacher education.

12.2 Students' Views Concerning Psychology in Teacher Education

Psychology as a discipline has been closely linked with education, offering psychological models of man and theories of learning and teaching. This section is divided into two parts. The first reviews the findings of the study in relation to students' expectations and perceived relevance of the contribution of psychology to their understanding of teaching and learning. Discussion of the summarised data is then followed by a closer inspection of illustrative examples of some of the students' views on the psychology component of their course. This illuminates some of their specific problems and may indicate areas for revision of interest to the psychology lecturer.

12.2.1 The Summarised Data

The first interview focused on the student's expectations of the contribution of psychology to his understanding of teaching and learning (7.1.1). The second interview, during the third term, enquired as to the relevance now perceived by the student (7.2.1).

In three of the four courses (B.Ed.yr.2, PGCE and Dip.Ed.), the majority of students expected the study of psychology to contribute to their understanding of teaching and learning. The fourth (B.Ed, 1-S) group was split in that one-third felt it would help while two-thirds were unsure.

At the end of the college year, the majority of in-service students perceived at least some aspect of the psychological component as useful, whereas the pre-service
students were split between perceiving some relevance and not seeing any at all. Comparing the students' expectations with their perceived relevance of psychology at the end of the year, only the Dip.Ed. students had their expectations met. More of the B.Ed. I-S group had perceived some relevance than had expected to. Although most pre-service students had had positive expectations, fewer felt they had found it relevant over the period of teaching practice, with approximately half these students stating that they had not found psychology relevant for them at all. It is important to note that even those that found some relevance may have only found limited aspects of psychology useful and may have been critical of other aspects.

The Dip.Ed. students had a more positive attitude than the other groups towards the psychology component on their course. This is of particular interest as the Dip.Ed. students were taught on a seminar basis and might be seen as the most interactive of the four courses. The other three courses were taught in a formal manner. Whatever the "method" of teaching used, there was no evidence on any of the courses of students being encouraged to explore their personal perspectives. Of all the disciplines related to education, psychology naturally lends itself to self reflection yet, almost invariably, it is presented as an academic subject.

Overall the pre-service students saw psychology as being less relevant than the in-service students did. The most likely reason for this would be the classroom experience held by in-service teachers prior to attending the course. Having had such experience they may be more able to relate theory to practice. However, simply having the experience does not guarantee that relevance will automatically be perceived. Pre-service teachers were more concerned with survival during their teaching practice and drew on practical aspects of their course such as writing lesson plans, preparing visual aids and worksheets etc.; some, however, reported that since returning to college they found the psychology class more interesting, as they could relate back to their classroom experiences. This could suggest that pre-service and in-service students have different needs to be met in the course of professional training. The emphasis of a pre-service course might be on practical aspects of psychology that would be of utility for practice in the classroom. Building a repertoire of skills to enable the student to reflect on his own practice would be more useful than giving a list of names and facts to regurgitate for exams. This baseline could be built upon in subsequent staff development programmes by introducing theoretical issues that the teacher is able to assess.
critically. Unless a student and/or teacher has developed the ability to think relativistically and critically, he will be unable to play a part in his own development and self appraisal.

When discussing the relevance of psychology to teachers, many issues emerged which may give the teacher educator insight into their students' thoughts and feelings which may, in turn, influence the teaching and learning of psychology.

12.2.2 Issues in Psychology

Throughout the interviews students spoke of issues relating to psychology that concerned them. Such issues might be seen to fall into three main areas, namely: content, presentation and relevance. These issues are obviously not unrelated and the first two may be seen to be subsumed under the third. Students' views are presented here, illustrated by quotes from transcripts, to give the reader a fuller perspective.

12.2.2.1 Content

A number of issues concerning the subject area or content of psychology arose. Some students were uncertain as to the domain of psychology and felt that experience or intuition may be as informative as psychological theory:

214 A114 - I think you've got to be able ... (sighs) I think you've got to have, I was going to say, you've got to have an understanding of children, but maybe that brings in psychology when you say that. You've certainly got to be very sensitive towards them if they do have problems, to be able to sort of ... pick up their moods and everything. Especially if they sort of just develop they don't start off with them. Um ... but maybe that's more experience than psychology, I don't know. Um ... Thinking the teacher I did observation with, I mean I don't, she told me she didn't do psychology but she's certainly very aware of what children are having off days and when there is something going on. And I think that's simply - because she's been with them for so long. Yes, probably. Mm ...(?)... PGCE

Another Dip. Ed. student felt that theory confirmed what she already knew 'by instinct':

317
... well I suppose it's back to old Piaget, I mean um ... I think when you've been teaching a number of years you know things by instinct and I think it's just as well to know, I mean you suddenly see this Oh yes I you know I came to that conclusion years ago, (laughs) but you don't know the actual theory which lies underneath it and I, I think um ... Piaget in spite of all his criticism um ... probably I mean I ... you do, it makes you realise I mean so much of what you do in Primary school you're just flogging your head against a ... you know, you bash your head on a brick wall because um I think it does give you a deeper insight into a child's capabilities, I mean you do, you do glean a lot by the way obviously but I, I think you need the theory as well.

Dip.Ed.

This may suggest a tendency to seek out the theory that best fits your own beliefs and ignore those that do not. It is also important for theories to challenge your beliefs and to be critically evaluated before being rejected or accepted.

Each discipline has its own jargon, and psychology is no exception. This can present a barrier to learning for some students. One PGCE student who had done some psychology as part of her first degree found it gave her an advantage over those students who were new to the subject:

Um ... well I ... from from having done some before ... I mean it wasn't that, that much, but I think it was enough to understand what they are talking about in the lectures here, um ... while I'm while um ... the lecturers talking um ... I'm not having to understand what he's saying, but from what he's saying, because I'm used to the terms I can immediately relate it to the classroom, which I think is an advantage. The people that have done psychology degrees, I mean, are way ahead of me, perhaps in the theory, and er ... they can do it. Whereas other people are still struggling with the terminology, and the names that are thrown at them, rather than ... you know, trying ... I mean you get used to being able to put aside that OK you're not going to follow up what that person said, but um ... then listening to what um was actually said by the lecturer because ... I mean ... I perhaps I could jot down a name or two, but er ... I can always go back and find those out and I can put what he's saying into practice more easily. Cause I think coming out of a couple of the lectures, you see you can tell the people's faces. They think "Oh my goodness I didn't understand a word. That went right over my head." And you you say to them, "Well really it was quite straightforward and they were saying just this ... But you know, probably I missed quite a bit of it. But
um ... I still don't get ... I don't come out of the lectures or don't go into the lectures frightened or ... I quite enjoy them.

PGCE

Most students found it very difficult to think of any specific concept areas in psychology that they found helpful. Those areas most frequently mentioned were: motivation, learning theories, teaching styles, developmental stages, assessment, attitudes and problem children. Even when learning theories were mentioned as being useful, students had found difficulty in talking about learning, as one student commented:

206 A090 - J: Um ... development if that's (?) psychology at all? Its a rather grey grey area. Um... yeah development, child development ... um (Pause) and the er ... the ideas of how people learn ... that I didn't really explain very well to you in that previous question. But er... but we're told. Because I feel that the, the methods of teaching that we're being taught are based upon a psychological analysis of a child's needs... throughout, Well, until adolescence perhaps until he leaves school. So therefore I think it's fundamental perhaps.

B.Ed.yr.2

Psychology was often seen to be more related to the problem child than the normal child, and some believe it only helps to state the problem but does not offer solutions. After experiencing teaching practice, one B.Ed.yr.2 student had observed:

103 B140 - ...I think a lot of it's um ... more ... ex ... implicit knowledge in that um ... a lot of it tends to be rather um... er not facile, but I notice a lot of ... in the staff room especially the teacher seems to be so aware suddenly of Psychology and how that ... the parents, the child must be so much affected by the parent now, and relating a lot of problems back to the home, and whereas, I don't know if that happened before but I was, in a way quite... not shocked by it but I... I wasn't particularly impressed by it, either, because I felt that... I didn't think anything that they came out with was particularly constructive to helping change the situation or helping ... evaluate the situation, whatever they were talking about um... yes, that's a problem I find with psychology ... in that ... psychological education, in that it tend doesn't tend to ... it tends to sort of state the problem but not actually give any help to alleviate it (laughs) I mean its ... it's this based or its that based but um from there ... from then on where do you go?

B.Ed.yr.2
These thoughts were also echoed by an experienced teacher taking the Dip. Ed. course. Her view encompassed her experiences with a child psychologist in her own classroom.

A183 - Um ... (sighs) that, that varies. It does in some way, for example if you've got an emotionally disturbed child, knowing something of the psychology behind that, could help, but it doesn't entirely solve the problem of, of what you should do with that child or how you could best help them, but I can see that psychology would help the teacher in that way, um ... I know when our child psychologist comes to visit our school, he's very interesting to talk to, but he often tends to be, separated from the actually work in, in the classroom, which I think is partly due to his workload, he can't get into the classroom and see what's actually going on, he can only make recommendations, the things that he thinks would help this particular child, um, and he makes recommendations which you can then act upon or try, or try out, sometimes I felt that he's been quite helpful, um ... other than that, I found that the things that he's saying, we knew already (laughs)

A183 - And er, or that were completely separated, that, his knowledge of the, the way the classroom worked or his understanding of, of a classroom was completely different, to, to ours, and that I felt that he, he was making these recommendations and these suggestions and he didn't really have enough knowledge ... to, to base this on which I felt was a pity because I felt that well he could he'd got quite a lot to offer, he's come in as an expert to help you and you're having problems, with this child, in, in an emotional way, ... and therefore he's studied the subject in greater depth than you've had time to do, therefore he should be able to give you, um, some guidelines or ...(Pause)

Dip.Ed.

Psychology here is being seen as descriptive rather than prescriptive. Teachers generally are not content with understanding if this in turn does not offer viable solutions to problems in their classroom. Another pre-service student suggests that although psychology may play a vital part in sorting out her own ideas, there may be times when she chooses not to take cognisance of it in the classroom:

A134 - I think the psychology in, in college was, um... very helpful ... in the early stages, but then, ... I mean experience obviously plays a very big part but I mean I definitely think that, even having brought up your own children, ... and you're an experienced teacher I still think that, um, psychology plays a very vital part in, ... well sorting your ideas out really,
I mean, it interests me greatly, ... and, well it's happened many times I've sort of said well you know blow psychology, black's black white's white he'll do as he's told you know, blow if he's got a problems (laughs) or this that or the other, which comes a time, I still think you've got to be aware, I mean although you can't perhaps, ... fit it into work and as I say many times I, I adopt an approach far from a psychological (laughs) one, but as long as you know, ... I think, it's, got somewhere to be there an understanding of, ... not just understanding children, but understanding the psychology of the child, I think it's, it's vital for every teacher to have that knowledge there even if its in the back of your mind, ... um, it's got to be there, a, a fairly formal knowledge or a, a you know, at least a good sprinkling of child psychology, because I, I think it's very vital ...

Dip.Ed.

A number of students mentioned the work of certain theorists that they had found helpful. The most frequently mentioned theorist was Piaget. One Dip. Ed. student commented during the first interview:

404 A187 - ... I can't think of any psychologists, I can only think Freud, and and Piaget, I suppose he's a bit of a psychologist ... I find Piaget's work very difficult to understand, um ... but I mean he's contributed an awful lot into children's development and understanding of children's development so therefore you know it's all pretty relevant.

Dip.Ed.

The Dip. Ed. course had a substantial part of the psychology component devoted to studying Piaget. During the second interview the above student returned to Piaget:

404 B015 - Well it was going over Piaget again, and reading Margaret Donaldson's book on her criticisms on Piaget's work, and just looking at it again generally in terms of children's development ... really. I felt I understood it (laughs) well I don't by that I felt it had more meaning for me, I understood the terms more and the, the seminars that we had on Piaget and on child psychology I felt were more meaningful and more relevant to me and to my teaching situation, I felt I could sort of interpret them (laughs) more.

1 B016 - so do you think you'll be able to use it in the classroom?

404 B017 - Um ... not so much in the classroom, but I think in discussions with other ... other teachers, and with ... parents perhaps now I feel more confident that I know what I'm doing and I've got the theory to back up what I'm doing, and so therefore I would use it in that way.

Dip.Ed.
Few students appeared to recognise that psychology helps to explain not only a child's behaviour, but also your own behaviour as a teacher:

A060 - Well, because it um enables you to think of more what goes on inside the child's head and your own. If you can't explain a child's behaviour, I think if you've done a psychology course you'll be able to ask yourself why he's done it and you'd probably find a reason in the psychology of why he does that. Especially in problem children and perhaps if in the teacher, of why why the teacher does something a certain way. Mmm.

B.Ed.I-S

Another problem was that of sufficient time for studying a complex subject. Many of the PGCE students had felt that a one year course with one teaching practice term sandwiched between two college based terms too short or condensed for many of the topics, and specifically psychology, to be covered adequately. One mature student compared her previous experience on a professional course with the PGCE course:

A079 - Um ... something I'm thinking very hard about is ... and I did a two year professional course um ... which didn't involve any practical work at all. Um ... and yet it was considered that I needed six terms of fairly intensive academic work to do a job um ... which I think in many ways requires far less skills than something which I'm being expected to do in a year. I mean part of that is that there's this combination of theory to get through and and skills, practical skills to be mastered. And I think it's very ambitious to do that in one year, and ... I think we're skimming over a lot more ... I think psychology is a very good example of something we're just exposed to. And it's not the kind of book you read instead of watching the telly. (Laughs) I mean you know, you're not going to off at the end of this course and go and read Bruner. And we'll all just know that Bruner just popped up a few times. Um ... it's not the only area, but I think it's probably one of the more difficult areas to follow up. I mean things like Sociology you can read kind of quite, sort of books which are actually very light but can make quite sort of profound points. Whereas for me I don't I don't think psychology's like that. I think it's (laughs) actually much more complicated than that. And it is, you know, there's a silence there where, you know, kind of views have a role. But there's a lot more objective stuff which ... um you're not going to have a real command of. I don't ... you know, (?) fundamentally relevant to what we're doing.

PGCE
Issues regarding the content of psychology therefore includes: defining the scope of the subject area, understanding psychological theories, concepts and jargon, and how these might relate to both teachers and learners. Another area that is also connected to content is that of presentation of the material.

Both issues of content and relevance are also related to how psychology is taught. The next section looks at students' perceptions of how psychology is presented.

12.2.2 Presentation

Many students were critical of the way in which psychology was taught. Some thought that psychology might be useful or relevant but felt they hadn't "got to grips" with the subject. Many felt that this was affected by poor presentation of the subject and teaching style:

A116 - The psychology lectures yes, definitely. They were very interesting subjects. Unfortunately the lecturer just used to reel off the list of um ... names and references in the lecture, and um didn't really even give us a taste of it. Um ... to whet our appetite to go and read books. Um ... although I suppose if it was interesting we should have gone over there and got the books. But somehow it never happened unless you know two weeks before exam ... a week before exam week or whatever. Um ... but um other lectures seem to, in the Philosophy field and in the Sociology field seem to manage to stimulate my interest. But I really think the Psychology field let me down in that sense.

B.Ed.yr:2

Some students found it frustrating that teacher educators often did not utilise in their own teaching that which they were advocating their students should do. One pre-service student cited a simple example:

B040 - Well we had a wonderful lecturer on Friday (laughs) who was waffling on about sort of, you know you must make eye contact with your pupils. And, you know must beware when they switched off, and we were just all laughing at him. And he didn't look at one of us, and it just
seemed very sad, that he could do that to a room full of prospective teachers. And he was a very nice chap he just ... not, he's just not successful in the lecture situation. And his content wasn't that boring. He had prepared it very thoroughly. But it was just a failure.

PGCE

On a less obvious but perhaps more salient level teacher educators should be able to justify the college curriculum and content for trainees, as they expect the students to be able to do so in their schools. The following quote from an in-service student illustrates this:

303 A022 - Well, I see them as er ... rather didactic. Um ... which seems to be a contradiction to the ... the ideas that they are trying to put over which irritates me quite a lot at times. Um ... I find them rather vague about what they're doing ... where ... they're really expecting us to be quite precise about the way we're tackling things. And er ... the, the sort of the contradiction there I find difficult to understand. I, I'd like to see more justification for ... the courses that we're doing.

B.Ed1-S.

One student was critical of psychology being presented as a package and that as such, students were not encouraged to discover it for themselves:

215 A073 - (Pause) Well it's at the back of my head while I'm thinking about your questions. (laughs) Um ... I think the trouble with it is that ... um ... we're not discovering it. Its one of those things that um ... is being ... I mean conveyed to us as a package you know sort of. Here's a topic. This is what various famous people have said about it. And this is how(?) this is how that those views have developed. Um ... I've done one essay on Psychology which I found bloody hard work. But I think it's been extremely useful. And and I just think for me, Um ... I need to actually do the stuff myself to do the reading and kind of put the things into their ... into the compartments myself. For it to be of the kind of use that I can pluck it and fit it to things. Um ... It's making ideas float around my head. Um ... I certainly think ... I mean I think it's extremely relevant. But I think it's very difficult to cover one very small portion of a very short course.

PGCE

She points out the danger in "potted" versions of theories appearing too simplistic to be considered to be of any substance:
A007 - Well there's an awful lot of use of ... of stages, his stage theory. Um ... er ... which is has come up in every single subject, I mean you know. Art, P.E. you name it we've had the stages. (laughs) I mean it just seems so simplistic to me. And not and not really worth saying initially. I mean it just seemed, it seemed to be very obvious. Because it had to be presented as sort of you know two minutes out of an hour on on each topic. Whereas in fact I mean it isn't that simple and ... um ... I think it mis-represents it, kind of skim over it. (Pause) You know, potted ... you know from spiral curriculum comes up every quarter of an hour. Very potted little idea. Um ... and they there's this terrible danger that they come over as kind of so obvious, that they are not worth talking about. And really well I'm sure that in the context that they were developed that wasn't the case at all. It's just odd little concepts get ... chosen as sort of favourites and (?)

PGCE

From issues of content and presentation of psychology we move to the third issue of relevance to the classroom.

12.2.2.3 Relevance

Issues of the relevance of psychology to teaching revolved around the relationship between theory and practice. Many students felt that psychology should be relevant, but were unable to relate it to the classroom:

A097 - I don't know if I've missed out or whether I haven't chosen the right modules, but I mean from what I can gather the Psychology we've done so far is just a waste of time. I don't remember any of it. (laughter) Not that I'm negative. I'm not negative. I just don't remember a thing. Did the exam came out, remembered it for eight hours and gone, well, you know, just not there at all. And all the theory seemed well above what you're doing somehow you know. There's all these sort of theories that you sort of read about and you think, "yes fair enough. That's his point of view", but it seems well above the actual level of the classroom somehow. It just isn't there (pause)

B.Ed.yr.2

This student may have taken a surface approach to learning psychology [Marton & Saljo, 1976], which could have resulted from a fact bound syllabus and exam structure [Entwistle, 1981] (1.4).
A similar view was held by an in-service student who suggests that psychology has gained an ‘academic credence’ that makes it ‘remote from normal people’:

307 A044 - I think a lot of it is intuitive in people how people learn, and it just needs bringing out. I think its interesting to look at some of the experiments, some of the experimental work done. I think it's ... um some of the physiological things about learning are important. And in a sense they come in to the psychological side of things obviously. Um ... but I think it's become a remote subject in as much ... and people are reluctant to to read any pure psychology. I think in fact it might even have, even been (?) said that it's gained a academic um sort of credence and it doesn't want to let go of this and part of that is being remote from normal people. Um so yes I think it is a place, but I wouldn't like to sort of overestimate it really.

B.Ed.l-S

The ‘chicken and egg’ question of theory and practice arose. Some students feel that it is necessary to learn the theory before you can put it into practice:

202 B020 - W e l l ... because that’s where you learn the theory. It’s school that you put it into practice, or try to and you but you've got to learn, in a way you've got to learn theory before you can learn practice. But I don't think I’ll put college first because I think ... you learn far more actually on (laughs) teaching practice, than you've ever learnt theorising in college. So a and a lot of the ideas that you get come from college, and the inspirations ...

PGCE

Although recognising that theoretical issues are important it is felt that some attempt should be made to integrate it more into practice:

103 A018 - ... I do think the theories are very important um ... you know ... studying psychology, philosophy and sociology and history of education is very important too. I wouldn't I wouldn't have that taken out of the ... the course. But on the other hand, I do think, I don't know how they can involve it.

B.Ed.Yr.2

Prior to teaching practice many pre-service students found that the theoretical aspects of their course appeared to be irrelevant to the classroom. In retrospect
having returned to college after an initial period of teaching practice, some
students felt that the theory was now more relevant to practice:

202 B036 - Yeah yeah and they're just more ... I mean they're more
understandable and they just suddenly make sense. Whereas I think, to
be quite honest with you, I didn't really ... during teaching practice ... I ... I
suppose I didn't look back to me lectures, but I did ask questions and I did
think well what about their development as people and the ... you know
that I could see that the child development was relevant if only since I've
got ... out of school I've had a chance to look back. So in a way, I suppose
it sounds very bad, but I didn't feel that that it was relevant last term,
because I hadn't. I didn't connect the two I didn't connect the lectures of
last term and the teaching practice term, but now, having come out of
teaching practice, I'm really wanting to say, well why did that happen and
... why are peop. children like that and ...

PGCE

Many of the in-service teachers compared their attitude towards the psychology
component of their pre-service course with their present in-service course. One
Dip. Ed. student felt she had not been able to relate to the psychology taught at her
pre-service college as she had not had experience with children.

405 A078 - Um ... (laughs) ... I don't know, I think its ... it is helpful as a teacher
to have, some perceptions of how, um, ... people's psychological make up
is made up, how it develops and grows, ... um, but I think a lot of that
becomes maturity and then it's quite difficult to sort of, um, ... specify it ...
I also think that when you're, you know as a teacher, and when I look at
what I, I did at college and what actually happened to me ( ) ... um very
much of the psychology that I ... was supposed to learn, that was supposed
to help me, um, was like water up a duck's back, because I had no
experience with children, when I was training, um ... and there have been
many times during my teaching career when I wish I could have done the
psychology part of my course again with the background that I then had to
be able to see the two married together, um, and I've never had that
opportunity ... because I suspect that what I ... um, see as psychology is just
about as woolly as my ideas were about philosophy before I started this
course, um ... and I, I perceive it as being a good thing and probably
helpful, but with a, you know, tremendous lack of knowledge ... um, and
you tend to see in school you know, the Ed. Psych. bit ... um, and they get
a pretty bad press.

Dip.Ed.
Those that felt that the psychology on their initial course had been well taught had a positive outlook.

407  B028 - Well we had when I did my initial training we had a very, very good psychology um lecturer and the, the course was, I thought was excellent and we, I trained as an infant teacher and we had a Frobel lecturer and we did an awful lot of the under five business which we've been doing here, the early childhood was covered magnificently at at college ...

Dip.Ed.

One in-service student found that school visits planned to put some of the psychological theory into action had helped:

402  B070 - (cont) I found the um ... the developmental psychology um work to start with ... a bit stodgy until I actually got it back into the classroom with it, and then it came alive and then I ... from then on I found it fascinating, um ... educational psychology that section of it is very very interesting because it's immediately concerned with children, you don't have this - it's not sort of one step removed its its to deal with what to do with what we're dealing with everyday in the classroom so that that was super.

Dip.Ed.

These issues of content, relevance and presentation of psychology were specific concerns of student teachers who took part in this study. The next section looks at emergent issues of a more general nature.

12.3 Emergent Issues

Although the focus of this study was on the psychology component on education courses, much data of a more general nature was also generated. Both the psychology data and the general data combine to give a more holistic picture of the student teachers' world which has implications not only for teaching psychology, but for an approach to teacher education as a whole. This section looks at some of the emergent issues from the research. It is divided into three sub-sections under the headings of: relevance, alternative perspectives, and reflexivity.
12.3.1 Relevance

One area that was constantly addressed generally by pre-service and in-service students alike was that of relevance. The question of relevance revolved around the tension between theory and practice, not only of the psychology component (12.2.2.2) but of the course in general. One in-service student who had selected the course on the basis of relevance, complained that his expectations so far had not been met:

303 A022 - one of the things that attracted me to this course was the the constant stress on what had happened in your own experience. And that the course was going to be very relevant. And I'm ... I'm not convinced that a lot of it is relevant. Some of it seems to be er ... there because that's what education's about in somebody ... in an academic sense. That there's it, it comes over very much that ... the ... the study that we're doing is becoming ... where there seems to be an attempt to elevate us to ... er an academic understanding of of education which seems to be mind against mind, theory against theory, and the the relevance for the classroom is is somewhat limited.

B.Ed.1-S.

This student, as a teacher, is also concerned with relevance in the school curriculum:

303 A056 - But I think there's an awful lot to re to examine in education at the moment. I think we're ... an awful lot of time is spent doing ... things that are of no use whatever. And I always do try and ask myself "Why? Is it is it worth it? What's the point? Does it matter?" and er ... often the most ... what you know would be considered essential in a school curriculum don't measure up to that sort of questioning really.

B.Ed.1-S

Another pre-service student addresses the issues of theory and practice, recognising that his own experience of being a child at school could help him as a teacher:

101 B039 - Err I I think you can talk till the cows come home but really ... nothing makes ... sense until you actually put it into practice. ...I suppose you could have some idea of the difficulties 'cos you remember your own childhood and. the, the, the things that were so difficult to get ... get into
your mind, my mind, one's mind umm... so you have a... a broad idea as to... umm what children go through, but you don't appreciate the stages, because when you're a child you don't analyse it, you just think I can't do it (laughs) you know. But as a teacher you've got to try and break down that 'I can't do it' and structure it so that err they can, not always successfully (laughs)...

B.Ed.yr.2.

A number of pre-service courses run programmes specifically to help students integrate theory and practice. The PGCE course ran an IT Inset programme during the third term of the course. A team consisted of three or four students, a class teacher and a college tutor, and tasks were undertaken in the classroom with immediate feedback and discussion. Some found it helpful for integrating the theory with practice:

202 B022 - I think the practical... again the practical work that's been based in college has been useful. We've had this term the IT. Inset programme where we're actually we are in a school, but we're working with a tutor and with a class teacher... and with the children, and as a group ourselves, the three of us in the school I am. So that we there's lots of discussion and kind of the theory is is there. But also the, putting it straight into practice. I think that's been helpful.

PGCE

While others did not:

207 B035 - I also don't know if you know about IT. Inset but I think it's a complete waste of time. (laughs) Something like that. The idea is that it's meant to be sort of a team teaching umm... session whereby there in fact there are six in our group, four students a tutor and a class teacher, with a group of err nine to eleven year olds, and we're meant to be sort of team teaching, evaluating... what we're doing, why we're doing it, and assessing the children's response to what we're doing. And I do find it's such a muddle and nobody really knows what they're doing, that it's a bit of a waste of time.

PGCE

This last comment shows that simply implementing a programme designed to integrate theory and practice by giving the student certain experiences may not be enough. Some students are able to utilise such experiences while others are not. A constructivist viewpoint suggests that students may differ from one another in the way they construe the world, and that for change to occur the student is aware...
of at least one alternative way of viewing the world. The following section looks at some students' views of alternative perceptions.

12.3.2 Alternative Perspectives

To be able to change, one has to be aware of alternatives to one's own viewpoint. During the interviews some students addressed the issue of alternative perspectives. In describing what she sees to be the role of the lecturer at college, one pre-service student differentiates between theoretical and professional lecturers in that the former is introducing 'new ways of looking at the world':

101 A022 - I see the lecturer's role as being ... it's not a teaching role I don't think. I think that they are trying to give you ... the experience ... the benefit of their experience ... in ... in a, in a specific area. I think it just varies so much from ... field to field. Um a philosophy lecturer I think can throw things at you just to get a response ... and maybe psychology as well. Um because they are trying to ... perhaps tug elements from your mind that you haven't explored previously. Whereas ... somebody who's teaching you perhaps a professional aspect of education especially like perhaps Maths is perhaps recalling previous knowledge that you've considered in the past in your own school days, um ... but that, and that's more of a sort of practical nature, how you can use your ... past experience, your past difficulties um ... to help others. So I find there's a great difference between the theoretical lecturer who ... who is introducing new ways of looking at the world, I suppose, and the professional lecturer who is really I suppose trying to teach you to teach others.

B.Ed.yr.2.

Another pre-service student indicated his awareness of controversies in education and willingness to entertain alternative viewpoints:

103 A104 - I, I expect a wide range of opinions, not just one narrow branch of um ... because there's so much controversy in education I expect quite a lot of differing opinions which there are to a certain extent.

B.Ed.yr.2

This idea had only recently become a reality for this in-service teacher who admitted:
B057 - I always took the face value of what they said, you know, these people are psychologists or whatever, educationalists and they know what they're doing and they've done this, that and the other and this is what they've found and of course it was confusing for me when er two sets of people said two totally opposing things, um but now of course I can see why. I must say it's made me appreciate, this is something about this course, made me appreciate... this need to get away from extremes... sort of polarisation of of views and... mm

Dip.Ed.

Another in-service student felt through peer group support that he was more able to respect others' philosophies:

B016 - Well I've learnt a lot from the the people I'm doing the course with. Um... it's good to to sit and talk and, we've been together a year now. You get to know each other fairly well and are prepared to talk on a level, that probably you aren't on a weekend course or a week long course. And I think now I probably respect other people's philosophies more. Some of my own points, as I probably hinted at earlier have become more entrenched I suspect, but I hope I'm able to look at other people and say, "Well yes, that, that works for you, that works in your situation. It's not mine. I'm not saying it's wrong, or you should do it my way, but... the question of," yes I can appreciate what you're doing and it seems to work."

B.Ed.I-S

Another in-service student felt that the approach on the B.Ed.I-S course encouraged students to think for themselves. She has become aware of differences of opinion and no longer concludes that theorists are 'right' because they are in print:

A066 - I suppose it's the teaching experience I've seen er children every day and the different behaviours they have, which before you've ever taught obviously you don't know. But also I think it's the approach to lecturing that here em you can, well they do encourage you to think for yourself. They don't just say "this is right - accept it." You have to um explain to yourself why and what... which way is right and who you believe. And I think now maybe it's experience I don't know, or more confidence on my part, but, at the college I didn't... well nobody felt able to say, "Well I don't agree with that." just because it's a person who'd written it down in a book, you know, and it was a college textbook so it had to be right, whereas here... they encourage you and... and they do themselves to disagree with opinions and... of people in books. Whereas before one assumed they were right. Yeah maybe that's er
personal confidence and experience, but I mean I think most students are the same as me from what I can remember.

B.Ed.I-S

Frequently students reported that instead of becoming clearer in their views and finding the 'right' answers during the course, they had become aware of alternative perspectives and were struggling with novel ideas and the practical realities of teaching. One B.Ed.1-S student describes it like this:

307 B010 - Well I've got problems here because I thought I knew at the beginning of the year or what I'd been doing for the last seven or eight years or however long. Um ... and I've been challenged this year; and part of the challenging has reaffirmed my view and part of it has made me think and I don't think I can really answer your question until I've almost been into school for a year. Part of the problem is that I can see that it's better if children discovered things themselves and all of this but this notion of everyone rediscovering the wheel seems a waste of time to me. On the other hand I can also see that a teacher is a, is a fact giver, is a resource in a sense that an encyclopaedia will be and can steer the children into learning certain things. And that seems to me to be equally valid. And I think it's a question of balance between the two is probably my my problem. Particularly as I'm going into a school as I said er which is er ... a "Common Entrance getter" if you like. Er plus a lot of other things, but that's its main aim, probably or one of its main aims. Now how am I going to satisfy my ideals of ... giving the children time to find things out, because a lot of these modern education philosophies take time to do in the classroom, how much am I going to be able to do of that bearing in mind that there's a syllabus to be got through and this must be the problem I suppose a lot of secondary school teachers have ...

B.Ed.1-S

Students who accepted that alternative perspectives can co-exist but found themselves working with others that believed that they were right, experienced tension. This was especially true when working with a supervisor or class teacher in the position of assessor. One PGCE student was preoccupied with this dilemma:

207 B078 - I got the impression while I was at school and having met quite a few teachers, that teachers are very convinced that the way that they do things is right ... and have always got criticisms for what everybody else is doing. But it surprised me to ... to see such, ... I won't say they were narrow views, but firm views, on teaching umm.

PGCE
This he had experienced first hand as his class teacher had definite views on how she would help him as a student:

I'm not saying that my own teacher's way was wrong. The question of right and wrong doesn't really come into it. But she was totally convinced that the way she would approach helping me as a student, would be right, because she'd seen a couple of other students come into school and wasn't happy with the way that they were dealt. So you know, she wanted to have me so that she could do it the right way. Err totally convinced that what she was doing was right. Even though she admitted at the end that she was learning a lot as she went along. So presumably she was changing. But she was still very firm in her views. You know convinced that it was important that children were organised in groups for maths and... and convinced that anybody else that holds an opposite opposing view, or a different view, err is wrong. And it wasn't just her but all the other teachers seem to have the same sort of opinions. Whatever opinions they were... they were very firm and I it surprised me, but when I think about it then... I can understand why. Because teachers are on their own in a classroom and... not really influenced by... much except the curriculum. Which is just something thats on a piece of paper and so while they are locked up in that classroom for four or five hours a day, with the children. They're not open to criticism or... any other different way of doing things except what they themselves do... and presumably they are doing what they do, because they believe in it... Now as a, as a student I couldn't have that view, I couldn't have a firm view as to what teaching was. Otherwise I wouldn't have made it. (laugh) Because whatever view you held there was always the assumption that you could improve. As a graduate and as a teacher trainer, a trainee rather, So... it surprised me that the teacher had such firm views on teaching and yet I wasn't expected to have.

The student was clearly distressed about the double standards that he felt were held by teacher/teacher educators and students. He was not encouraged to express his own views or, by all accounts, examine the views of others who supervised him. Fear of a bad report had an inhibitory effect:

But there were other areas where you know, both the tutors and the teacher... obviously expected me to... to move towards the approach that they had, and the approach that they believed in. And I, I felt that if I had voiced a different opinion, that it would have been detrimental and that I would have... been... had a report at the end of the day which would have said err; you know, he is not adaptable to the situation he is he is not prepared to tackle new things. (laughs) umm...
So what is right, is is having your view on education right or wrong? Umm as a student it seemed to be wrong. As a teacher is seemed to be right.

PGCE

The interview had provided a safe environment for the student to voice his frustrations and express his views without fear of reprisal.

Issues of relevance and of alternative perspectives naturally lead on to issues of reflection.

12.3.3 Reflexivity

Another general issue that emerged was that of reflection. Here students indicated a tendency for some students to actively review their own thoughts in relation to theory and/or practice. One pre-service student felt that the theory had a reflexive influence:

103 B132 - Yes, very useful. (pause) having said that, though I think um the ... the lectures on the theory of education are still important and they taught me ... I don't know if it was an equal amount, but um ... they have more of a reflective influence on me, and that it takes, makes me think, like this module I'm doing now, it's called Compensatory Education and um ... I'm studying the Warnock Report and and the 1981 Education Act ... that um ... that's changed my ideas a lot ... about um ... streaming and ... and integration, and er ... that's been successful in a lecture situation, so that equally important ...

B.Ed.yr.2

Pre-service students often commented that teaching practice had been a period of survival and that time to reflect was a luxury they could not afford:

207 B029 - But you see the teaching practice really, it's such a survival period. That sort of you just don't really get a chance to analyse all this cos I was sort of, you get home and work till about eleven o'clock at night analysing the lessons I'd given them, and planning for the next day's lessons. And really it's a very ... practical existence really. You're just
coping the whole time, and I hope that it will improve, and I'll have more time to sort of reflect. But err... certainly over the teaching practice, it was so hectic... that err it was sort of... there wasn't time for all this reflection.

PGCE

Another pre-service student felt that this lack of time for reflection would continue throughout the teaching career:

202 B038 - Well time (laughs) basically... I mean you look at them from a point of view of the rest of your class or you but you can't read up about them you just do not have time. I think that's going to be a problem when you are a teacher actually that you're just... you're going to be always thinking, Oh I wish I knew more about that I wish I knew how to cope with that, and why does that happen, but never ever being able to really have time to think about if, which is bad... really...

PGCE

This quote from an in-service student confirms that at least for some teachers this is true:

404 A077 - Yes, I think I did, when I was at school, I, I did have this ideal which changed, once I went, went through college and when I started teaching, that, that did change, that concept, um,... I was very much aware of the practicalities of, of teaching, um, and I was more involved with those during my first few years at teaching to wonder very much about the actual quality of what I was teaching or why I was (laughs) doing it, which, as I've now got older and had more experience, I am now going through that, which is, another reason why I came on this, this course which was, I know when I first started teaching, I, I just didn't have those, I was too,... involved with the actual practicalities of coping with a group of children without actually wondering why ab, ... what I was actually teaching them.

Dip.Ed.

Many in-service teachers welcomed the sabbatical year as time out of school for reflection:

303 A062 - I'm hoping that by the end of this year that I, I shall more or less know the way in which I want to teach and what's important. I would like to find that out during the year. But you don't often have the time or the... the time to study deeply what you're teaching in schools, and when you do you've got many constraints on you because you've got slots on timetables to fill

B.Ed.I-S
However, at the end of the year one student felt that a year out of the classroom may be rather too long:

- **B.022** - but it’s been a marvellous opportunity to look back and reflect on one’s classroom practice with a bit of theory input, the input from the colleagues around us. Um ... and to look at some bits of theory. In one sense probably a year's too long. Um, you've got out of touch with the classroom a bit and the ... the novelty and interest and the motivation has certainly worn off by now ...

- **B.Ed.1-S**

The following in-service student welcomed the opportunity for ‘time-out’ for following through thoughts he has been incubating:

- **A.028** - well I think I want to organise my own ideas, um ... and at the same time I, I think that when you've been teaching a few years it's very often that you, you can become ... stuck in your own ideas, I want to organise my own ideas and at the same time draw from other people, who um, are in a similar position, ... and, um, ... I think I want to look at the theory, I mean, I, I've been carrying out all these tasks and I think making a reasonable job of it, but I want to look at the ... theory, which lies behind, um, what I've been doing all these years, because I, really when you're in the job, you haven't got the time to look at it although I've always been interested, and very aware that there's a lot more to it and I have questioned lots of things, but haven't had time to follow it through and I think now is the time to follow through the things that, perhaps you've been, thoughts you've been incubating (laughing) for a, a long period of time, and and really taking them out and looking at them.

- **Dip.Ed**

A year later, this same Dip.Ed. student spoke of what, for him, influences change:

- **B.054** - (sighs) hum - well I suppose if you keep abreast of of research, I mean you don't want to jump on every any every sort of trendy bandwagon but I mean education is a a sort of a growing, I mean, it's by its very nature it's a changing growing thing. I think you've got to be aware of of change, I mean you don't want change for change's sake but on the other hand um ... I think you've got to look at research and new trends and make up your mind for yourself, ... whether they suit you and ... whether you're going to be able to work that way, I mean I don't think anybody can work in a way that is suggested by somebody else if it's not right for them

- **Dip.Ed**
One Dip.Ed. student who was generally critical of the teaching profession spoke of
how he saw professional development since having time to reflect on this course:

404 B064 - Yeah, uh, you, don't think I'm being too destructive on on teachers
will you (laughs) ... or or the profession, it's just the way you know, I
personally see things, and and I and I've been in the same trap ... and
tripped up over the same fences, as, as many people, I think I'm not sure
how you, how you get over this, um ... I almost see it as a part of ...
continual ... er evaluation ... and in-service training - I don't like that
word "in-service training" because that's associated with all kinds of skills
and tricks, and tips er ... but professional development if you like ... I
think our professional development has been evolved with er ... you
know ... how to operate kilns and things like that ... er ... rather than with
teachers developing a sense, a sense of self-awareness - I'm not saying the
other is unimportant, of course teachers need to pick up skills, pottery
and all that kind of thing, but um ... I think also you need sort of group
sessions where er people can become more aware of what they do in the
classroom, and also er perhaps er working together with colleagues with
... er where they can honestly observe each other, look at certain elements
in their teaching, you know, the number of times they ask questions
perhaps, and on a simple check list to begin with to see how many
children they actually miss out - whether they miss out the same children
all the time ... um I'm sure some children come to school for a week, and
hardly have any of the teacher's time ... and I think er we should develop
some way where where teachers can become aware of this.

404 A066 - Well I ... one has a a sort of a ... (sighs) a suspicion in the back of
one's mind ... that that something along these lines should be done, but
I've been able to ... have time on this course er to think more deeply
about it and to read around it ... er and to look at teachers in highly
valued schools, the way they interact with children er and er this has been
very important.

Dip.Ed.

It seems that to be able to be reflexive a student has to have developed the
intellectual ability to think relativistically, and therefore, critically [Perry, 1970,
Heath, 1964] (1.5). Perry's varying stages of development and levels of maturity
were also apparent in my study and are illustrated in the case studies. Both Perry
and Heath described the intellectual development of college students as
culminating in an 'ideal type'. However, not all the students in their studies had
reached this stage by their graduation. Neither worker suggested that the
development of critical thinking might be a life long process open to constant
review and change, however, this study suggests that this might be the case. This is in accord with Day [1985], who recognises that teachers are at varying stages of development and levels of maturity and this must be taken into account in staff development. Students varied both within courses and course types. As a consequence teacher educators should be aware of the individual needs of their student teachers and work with them accordingly.

During the course of the fieldwork year I saw little that would amount to facilitating the students' awareness of their personal perspectives. Although this may have taken place in tutorials, I doubt that this would have been common practice, as many students had reflected on the value of the interviews and some had even suggested that it might be advantageous to include something similar as part of their course. Many of them had found the experience of spending just an hour in the interview, reflecting on their own views, useful, as the following quotations suggest:

210 A066 - ... It's, well it's a personal comment. Um ... a lot of what I've said is ... I, I actually think ... I, I now realise that ... how much I actually take implicitly rather than (?)  um ... 'cause a lot of what I've said I've not actually thought about before. I've sort of known it deep down. Put it this way. I've not been very good at expressing a lot of it ... um ... er... It's, it's it's very difficult to try and sort of put your your common sense angle into everyday English. Um I think that's probably probably part of of the process ... the course should should maybe concentrate on on the common sense angle and ... you can certainly gain a lot if you if you try and put it into words I think ....

PGCE

201 A072 - Um ... I mean I've felt that as I've been talking that, you know, very inexperienced person talking here. And that, sort of, a lot of my arguments probably, they may even contradict one another. I feel at one point, that one of them was doing. But um ... it's hard because I've already felt my attitudes to teaching changing in six weeks I've been here, however long it is, eight weeks have felt that quite dramatically. Um ... like when I first went to this open plan school and thought, "Oh dear, I just can't cope with this situation." And now I'm thinking 'Well, yes it is really important that children should learn like this." And so already sort of my ideas are changing. And you may have caught me at a time when I'm feeling sort of, quite unstable in my own sort of attitudes at the moment. But eh ... I think it's good to think about this. I really do.
In fact I think perhaps the course should be doing something like this (Laughs).

At the end of the second interview another pre-service student commented on how hard it was to talk about these issues that she felt were central to teaching:

B074 - Umm ... Well I have found it interesting. I found it interesting to do the first interview. I found that afterwards. I kept thinking about things I'd said and thinking "that's a load of rubbish." Umm ... and that'll probably happen again. I think, I think it was interesting that they were so hard. (laughs) And so little thought about really. There isn't really an area of the course which addresses itself to these kind of issues Umm ... which are central to, to the whole thing ... I mean we don't have a sort of philosophy. It's, it's a very sort of, we don't have a philosophy of education slot, more kind of um, they are very much putting over an approach ... um ... which we. I mean we can either take on board or reject. But it you, until you've actually been out in the field, it's very difficult to actually weigh up what you think of what they're saying, and so ... a year seems very short. I think that's my conclusion.

This is in accord with the findings of other researchers using interviews and/or repertory grids for investigating student/teachers thinking. They report that many of the students had found the experience of reflecting on their personal perspectives both insightful and rewarding. [See for example Pope 1978, Diamond 1985].

If we are to recognise that such issues will affect students' learning, then we may take account of students' perspectives when planning and teaching our courses. The final section looks at the implications of these findings.

**12.4 Implications for Teaching and Learning Psychology**

This thesis has examined student teacher's perceptions of teaching and learning with special reference to the role of psychology in teacher education. Three main issues emerged: content, presentation and relevance (see 12.2.2.1, 12.2.2.2, 12.2.2.3),
that expressed students' concerns specifically with the psychology component of their course. Three further issues of a more general nature also emerged: relevance, alternative perspectives/critical thinking and reflexivity (see 12.3.1, 12.3.2, 12.3.3), that have implications not only for the teaching and learning of psychology but also for teacher education courses more generally.

My findings echo those of an ever increasing number of writers over the last two decades who have suggested that the personal perspective of the student/teacher is of paramount importance in teacher education [e.g. Morris, 1972, Clark & Yinger, 1977, Fenstermacher, 1980, Pope & Keen, 1981]. If professional learning is about producing intentional change, then teacher education programmes should be designed with this aim in mind. The transtheoretical model of change proposed by Prochaska & DiClemente [1984] takes account of change as a result of both intervention (i.e. therapy or teaching) and self change (see 1.6). Of the four stages of change, movement from precontemplation to contemplation may be seen to be the pivotal point and perhaps the most difficult stage to facilitate. For change to occur the person first needs to become aware of his present position. Awareness may be facilitated by processes of consciousness raising and self-evaluation. A number of psychologically orientated techniques can be used to enable students to reflect on their personal perspectives e.g., repertory grid techniques, self characterisation sketch, introspection diary, biography and tutorials. Using these kinds of techniques the exploration of personal perspectives, I would suggest, should be the common basis of any teacher education programme.

The findings of this study suggest that student teachers are generally disillusioned with much of the psychology taught on education courses. Should psychology be dropped from the syllabus in favour of an alternative "educational discipline" such as sociology or philosophy? Or perhaps the traditional disciplines should be replaced by an interdisciplinary topic-based approach? As psychology is concerned with individual action I would suggest that, as a discipline, it has much to offer regarding teacher effectiveness in the classroom. I suggest three areas in which psychology might usefully contribute. Firstly, a number of alternative perspectives
or psychological "models of man" are offered, e.g., behaviouristic, psychodynamic, information processing, humanistic and interactive psychology. Presentation of such alternatives can raise the student's awareness of alternative viewpoints and promote critical thinking. Secondly, a range of topics, e.g., psychological processes (perception, knowing, thinking, communication, learning, teaching, motivation and emotion), development (physical, cognitive, personality and self) and social interaction (pupil peer group and teacher-pupil relationships) enables the student teacher to become aware of the complexity of some of the psychological aspects affecting the individual within the educational setting and s/he can therefore take account of this in his/her teaching. Thirdly, psychology, as a social science, can offer a range of research skills which will enable teachers to actuate research programmes in their own classrooms. The teacher-as-action-researcher is well placed to set up teaching and learning experiments, derived from questions arising in the natural environment of the classroom, and to critically evaluate their outcome. This continually evolving process of formulating hypotheses, testing and evaluating the outcome leads to an open critical approach, thus improving teacher effectiveness in the classroom. However, although I believe that these three areas can be of value to the student teacher; traditional teaching on psychology courses, reported by students in this study and the literature, leaves much to be desired (chapters 7 and 1.7). Psychology teachers must review their own teaching and psychology reflexively if they are to persuade others of its utility. To effectively facilitate student teachers' learning the psychology lecturer must be able to "see through the eyes" of the student. In this way s/he can help students incorporate aspects of the discipline that are pertinent to their profession.

Educational research has indicated a division between theory and practice which is also confirmed by this study. The recent external pressure to improve the quality of teachers and teaching is forcing training establishments to review their courses and re-assess their values (12). Such reviews should acknowledge the importance of reflection and critical analysis if teachers are to become intelligent educators. It may also be necessary to take account of similarities and differences between pre-service and in-service students.
There is evidence to suggest that groups of student teachers differ in their focus on concerns and needs (see chapters 4, 5, 6 and 7). This should be borne in mind when preparing the psychology component of an education course. I would recommend that the psychology syllabus on teacher education courses takes into account the different needs of pre-service and in-service students, which is based on the relationship between theory and practice as well as the degree to which they have developed self reflection and critical thinking. Ideally the psychology component on such courses would not be isolated but integrated in a coherent framework throughout a staff development programme. The overall aim of such courses would be to develop self awareness, reflection and critical appraisal to enable the teacher-as-action-researcher to improve his/her effectiveness in the classroom.

The focus of the pre-service course would be on utility, starting from where the student is. Facilitating students' awareness of their own, and others', personal perspectives on teaching and learning draws on their own experiences as learners. Selected psychological concepts, relevant to the classroom, should be introduced and presented experientially whenever possible. These should provide a challenge to the students' personal views. Assignments should be predominantly practical, taking the form of project work, child/class observation and child-based research/experimentation. Teaching practice should not become a separate entity but an integrated part of the course, providing the opportunity to put some of the ongoing projects developed in college into practice. This would suggest a change of emphasis away from the traditional academic stance, predominant in my observations, towards the development of self awareness and self appraisal.

In-service courses would be seen as a natural progression from the baseline of the pre-service course. This type of course would encourage experienced teachers to reflect on their own perspectives utilising their school experience. The emphasis would be on developing reflection on personal theory and critical appraisal of a more extensive range of psychological theories aimed to challenge current practice. Development of the teacher-as-action-researcher in the classroom enables the
teacher to test out new ideas and evaluate these with time for reflection, rarely afforded in school. Ideally, such courses encourage class contact throughout the study period. This type of course would primarily be for experienced class teachers returning to classroom teaching. A further type of in-service course might follow for head teachers needing to incorporate and develop managerial skills. The aim of such courses would be to extend the students' professional development to develop wider skills concerned with professional development and a managerial role.

Further research suggested by this study might usefully follow a number of areas. Student teachers' perceptions of psychological concepts might be explored in more depth. This might identify concepts, or theories that students find helpful or difficult and suggest ways in which these might be more effectively presented. The progress of psychology programmes, of the types suggested earlier, could be monitored and evaluated to determine their effectiveness in helping teachers improve the quality of their teaching. Similarities and differences between pre-service and in-service students might indicate preferred methods by these groups. A longitudinal study following teachers throughout their initial training and for a substantial period afterwards, including in-service training might indicate key periods of change that could be useful to staff developers.

This study has explored student teachers' personal perspectives on teaching and learning with special reference to the study of psychology. The present relationship between psychology and teacher education leaves much to be desired. In the light of the research findings emphasising the perspective of the personal, it is no longer acceptable for the psychology teachers on education courses to regurgitate psychological models of teaching and learning without putting into practice what they preach. I reiterate my statement in the opening chapter that: student teachers are in the unique position of alternating roles between student and teacher whilst also studying the formal theories of the processes that they themselves are involved in, i.e. the processes of teaching, learning and knowledge development. If psychological theories are worth extolling psychology teachers
must practise what they preach. By example, teacher educators can help student teachers to realise their potential as intelligent educators.

I conclude with a quote from Diamond that encapsulates the message of this thesis:

"If teachers can be helped to "open their eyes", they can see how to choose and fashion their own version of reality. By repacking their past for whatever needs arise, they can travel ahead in their own devices for observing and appraising."

[Diamond, 1985 p.34]
Epilogue
DIALECTICAL KNOWLEDGE

by John Tyrrell

I am a Lecturer,
something of an expert in my field
I have read many books and written a few,
and have therefore acquired a great deal of knowledge.

They are students,
they have not read the books,
and so lack knowledge.

I go into lectures and give the students the benefits of my knowledge,
sometimes very loudly;
usually they are impressed.

I am a Lecturer,
they are students.

They write my knowledge down in their books,
but it is my knowledge,
and they write it down wrongly.

I go into seminars and ask them questions about my knowledge;
but they are silent,
they have not read the books.

Sometimes though they answer,
wrongly,
and I reprimand them,
in a soft,
friendly voice usually,
for not having my knowledge.

Sometimes they ask me questions,
and I always answer them,
at length,
and with authority;
because I have read the books,
and therefore have a great deal of knowledge.

So they write down my answers to their questions,
and my answers to my questions,
and go away,
feeling very humble,
as they should.

I go away feeling very good,
I have done my job,
I have given them my knowledge;
my knowledge is in their books.

[with the author's permission]
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SUMMARY OF THE REQUIREMENTS RELATING TO SUBJECT STUDIES, and of certain other separate requirements, as they apply to undergraduate courses of initial teacher training.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>For primary teachers</th>
<th>For secondary teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A</strong> The equivalent of at least two full years' course time spent in the study of:</td>
<td><strong>A</strong> The equivalent of at least two full years' course time spent in the study of:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) either a) one specialist subject</td>
<td>either a) one specialist subject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or b) two specialist subjects</td>
<td>or b) two specialist subjects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or c) a wider area of the curriculum</td>
<td>or c) one main and one subsidiary specialist subject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Note: These studies must be pursued at a level appropriate to higher education. They should account for at least 75% of the minimum of two years).</td>
<td>or d) one main specialist subject and a related area of the curriculum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AND</strong></td>
<td>(Note: These studies must be pursued at a level appropriate to higher education)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) the application of the subjects in 1) above to young children's learning</td>
<td><strong>B</strong> The methodology of teaching the subjects in A above</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>PLU S</strong></th>
<th><strong>PLU S</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>B</strong> At least 100 hours spent in the study, observation and practice of teaching mathematics, and of its significance across the curriculum</td>
<td><strong>B</strong> At least 100 hours spent in the study, observation and practice of teaching mathematics, and of its significance across the curriculum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C</strong> At least 100 hours spent in the study, observation and practice of teaching language, and of its significance across the curriculum</td>
<td><strong>C</strong> At least 100 hours spent in the study, observation and practice of teaching language, and of its significance across the curriculum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D</strong> Study, observation and practice in the teaching of other subjects in the school curriculum</td>
<td><strong>D</strong> Study, observation and practice in the teaching of other subjects in the school curriculum</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The above summary of course components is designed only to show the structural relationship between 'subject studies' and certain other course elements, and is not intended to be exhaustive. It should be read in conjunction with CATENOTE 3.

Postgraduate courses do not include subject studies as such. Such courses for primary teachers, however, should include components corresponding to those at A2, B, C and D above; courses for secondary teachers should include the equivalent of B.
Formal Content of Personal Construct Theory

fundamental postulate A person's processes are psychologically channellized by the ways in which he anticipates events.

corollary of construction Each person anticipates events by construing their replications.

corollary of individuality Persons differ from each other in their constructions of events.

corollary of organisation Each person characteristically evolves for his convenience in anticipating events, a construction system embracing ordinal relationships between constructs.

corollary of dichotomy A person's construction system is composed of a finite number of dichotomous constructs.

corollary of choice A person chooses for himself that alternative in a dichotomized construct through which he anticipates the greatest possibility for the elaboration of his system.

corollary of range A construct is convenient for the anticipation of a finite range of events only.

corollary of experience A person's construction system varies as he successively construes the replications of events.

corollary of modulation The variation in a person's construction system is limited by the permeability of the constructs within whose range of convenience the variants lie.

corollary of fragmentation A person may successively employ a variety of construction systems which are inferentially incompatible with each other.

corollary of commonality To the extent that one person employs a construction of experience which is similar to that employed by another, his processes are psychologically similar to those of the other person.

corollary of sociality To the extent that one person construes the construction process of another he may play a role in a social process involving the other person.
"Top down" approach
initial letter

The Dean,
College Address. Date.

Dear Mr __________,

Miss __________ suggested that I contact you as you may be able to help me with my research.

I am a S.S.R.C. funded student at the Institute for Educational Development, University of Surrey. My interest is in the teaching and learning of psychology with Education students. It seems that __________ College would be a good place to visit in connection with my research. I am particularly interested in meeting any staff and students involved in the teaching or learning of psychology on Education Courses. I would be pleased to discuss my research more fully at your convenience.

I would be grateful if you could help me in this matter and have enclosed a "Freepost" envelope for your reply.

Yours sincerely,

Eileen M. Scott (Ms)
Lecturer in Psychology,  
Department of Education,  
College Address.  
Date.

Dear  

I am an S.S.R.C funded student at the Institute for Educational Development, at University of Surrey. My research is in the teaching and learning of psychology with student teachers.

The Dean of the college, Mr __________, has kindly agreed to research facilities being available at this College and has put me in touch with Dr __________ from the Psychology Department. Dr __________ has suggested that I also contact you as the main emphasis of my research is with student teachers and that this falls within your department. I would like to contact staff and students involved in the teaching and learning of psychology on Education Courses who may wish to help me with my work.

I do hope you can help me in this matter and would, of course, be pleased to discuss my research further at your convenience. I enclose a "Freepost" envelope for your reply.

Yours sincerely,

Eileen M. Scott (Ms)
Lecturer in Psychology,
Department of Education,
College Address. Date

Dear Mr. ______,

A mutual friend and colleague, __________, suggested I contact you as you teach psychology to trainee teachers with the Department of Education.

I am a S.S.R.C funded student at the I.E.D, University of Surrey, developing a project around the teaching and learning of Psychology on Education Courses and would appreciate any help you may be able to offer in this area.

I would be pleased to discuss the research further at your convenience. I look forward to hearing from you soon and enclose a "Freepost" envelope for your reply.

Yours sincerely,

Eileen M. Scott (Ms)
Appendix B

Interview schedule B.Ed. Year 4

Are there any experiences over the last four years that stand out in your mind
> good and/or bad experiences

How do you see the role of the staff member/tutor/lecturer
> what are their responsibilities

How do you see your role as a teacher
> good / bad teacher

Has the study of psychology helped
> how
> specific instances

Any other comments
Interview schedule B.Ed. Year 2

What have you enjoyed about your course in the last 2 years
> what have you least enjoyed

How do you see your role as a student
> what do you think your responsibilities are

What do you see as the role of the lecturer/tutor
> what are their responsibilities

How do you feel about your forthcoming teaching practice

What kind of teacher do you want to be
> ideal teacher

How would you describe a 'good' pupil/ 'bad' pupil

Why did you choose your particular age band

Why did you choose your particular education focus (psychology)
> do you think it is relevant

Any other comments
Appendix B6

Exploratory study Interview Schedule - In-service Dip.Ed.

Could you give me a brief background of how you came into teaching

Why did you decide to do a Dip.Ed.

What were your general impressions of the course

What did you think of the psychology component of the course
  > did you find any of it useful

How did you see the role of the lecturers/tutors

How did you see yourself as a student

How do you see yourself as a teacher

How would you describe a "good" teacher

How would you describe a "bad" teacher

How would you describe a "good" pupil

How would you describe a "bad" pupil

Do you think you have changed as a result of the Dip.Ed. course
  > what main ways

Any comments
First Interview Schedule A - Pre-service (B.Ed. Yr.2 and PGCE)

Why did you decide to take this course?

Why did you choose your particular age range?

How do you see the role of the lecturer/tutor here at college?
   > what for you is the difference between a good and bad lecturer/tutor?

How do you see your role as a student?

What is your own approach to learning?
   > how do other individuals learn?

How do you see the role of the teacher?
   > what for you is the difference between a good and bad teacher?
   > what is your own approach to teaching?

What do you see as the role of the pupil at school?
   > what for you is the difference between a good and bad pupil?

What is knowledge?
   > how do you think knowledge develops in an individual?

How do you think the study of psychology might contribute to your understanding of teaching and learning?

Have you any comments you'd like to make about anything?
First Interview Schedule A - In-service (B.Ed.I-S and Dip.Ed.)

Can you give me a brief history of how you came into teaching

Why did you choose your particular age range

Why did you decide to take this course

How do you see the role of the lecturer/tutor here at college
> what for you is the difference between a good and bad lecturer/tutor

How do you see your role as a student

What is your own approach to learning
> how do other individuals learn

How do you see your role as a teacher
> what for you is the difference between a good and bad teacher
> what is your own approach to teaching

What do you see as the role of the pupil (student CEFE)
> what is the difference between a good and a bad pupil/student

What is knowledge
> how do you think knowledge develops in an individual

How do you think the study of psychology might contribute to your understanding of teaching and learning

Have you any comments you'd like to make about anything.
DEMographic INFORMATION CARD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>ID:</th>
<th>OPE:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DATE OF BIRTH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLLEGE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COURSE</td>
<td>AEC RANGE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YEAR</td>
<td>SUBJECT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IN SERVICE SCHOOL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONTACT ADDRESS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tel.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Dear [Name],

I do hope that you had a good Christmas vacation and that you are now settling into your teaching practice.

As you will remember, when we met last term, I was hoping to be able to visit some of you on teaching practice this term. School access is in the process of being negotiated for which Mr. [Name] requires a list of students taking part. May I have your permission to include your name on the list? I can assure you that no other information will be given.

I have enclosed a card for you to complete by return of post please, using the "Freepost" envelope provided. If school visits are approved I will contact you again to make appropriate arrangements.

Your contribution to this project is very much appreciated and I look forward to seeing you again soon.

Yours sincerely,

Eileen M. Scott (Ms)
Letter to B.Ed.Yr2 students

Home tel. no.
Date.

Dear

When I interviewed you for my research project you kindly agreed that I might visit you at school during your teaching practice. I had planned to meet up with all B.Ed.Yr2 students taking part to discuss arrangements. Unfortunately I was misinformed about your timetable this week as no group meetings are being held.

The purpose of the visit is to observe the wide variety of class situations that student teachers experience. I must stress that this is not any kind of assessment and is, of course, confidential. I would like to make a single half-day visit to each student to experience whatever is time-tabled for that period. It doesn't matter if you're not "teaching" for all that time, but it would be useless if you're not with a class at all. I plan to visit you on: __________

Your school has been asked if I may visit by your department and, providing there is no objection, I would contact your Head at school to let them know the actual date. Your teaching practice tutors have also been notified of my intentions to avoid visiting at the same time.

I'm sorry that I have had to write rather than talking to you about it. However, I will assume everything is alright unless I hear from you to the contrary. If you have any queries or problems please ring me at home, Tel: __________, evenings or weekend as soon as possible. Please do not write via the University as this is too slow.

I hope things are going well for you and look forward to seeing you soon.

Yours sincerely,

Eileen M. Scott(Ms)
Teacher - Pupil interaction schedule

Make notes on how:

The Class starts -

The class finishes -

TA - the teacher gains attention of the class

TI - the teacher gains attention of individuals

TM - the teacher changes pupil's behaviour successfully

TMX - the teacher tries to change pupil's behaviour unsuccessfully

A - is attention given to those not actively seeking it

PA - pupils gain teacher's attention

PC - teacher responds to pupil's contribution

Questions

TC - closed questions

TCV - teacher responds to correct answer

TCX - teacher responds to incorrect answer

TO - teacher responds to pupil's response to open questions

teacher praises

teacher reprimands
### Teacher - Pupil/Class Characteristics

#### T.P. - Teacher Characteristics:

- Friendly
- Sympathetic
- Caring
- Respects P's
- Approachable
- Enthusiastic
- Calm
- Patient
- Understanding
- Listens
- Flexible
- Organised
- Fair
- Humour

#### C.P. - Class/Pupil Characteristics:

- Noisy
- Happy
- Friendly
- Enthusiastic
- Interested
- Active
- Autonomous
- Respectful
- Afraid of T
- Stable environ.
- Formal
- Movement

---

### Appendix C7.

Teacher - Pupil/Class Characteristics.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>T.P. - Teacher Characteristics</th>
<th>C.P. - Class/Pupil Characteristics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>friendly</td>
<td>noisy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sympathetic</td>
<td>happy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>caring</td>
<td>friendy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>respects P's.</td>
<td>enthusiastic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>approachable</td>
<td>interested</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>enthusiastic</td>
<td>active</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>calm</td>
<td>autonomous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>patient</td>
<td>respectful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>understanding</td>
<td>afraid of T.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>listens</td>
<td>stable environ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>flexible</td>
<td>formal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>organised</td>
<td>movement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fair</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>humour</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| individual                                      | in control                                           |
|                                                 | strict                                               |
|                                                 | suppresses class                                    |
|                                                 | good relationship                                   |
|                                                 | has favourites                                       |
|                                                 | aware                                                |
|                                                 | involved                                             |
|                                                 | frightens P's.                                       |
|                                                 | even tempered                                       |
|                                                 | encouraging                                         |
|                                                 | interested in P's.                                   |
|                                                 | uses names                                           |
|                                                 | sarcasm                                              |

| not in control                                  | not noisy                                            |
|                                                 | not happy                                            |
|                                                 | not friendly                                         |
|                                                 | not enthusiastic                                    |
|                                                 | bored                                               |
|                                                 | passive                                             |
|                                                 | not autonomous                                      |
|                                                 | not respectful                                      |
|                                                 | not afraid of T.                                    |
|                                                 | not stable environ.                                 |
|                                                 | informal                                            |
|                                                 | no movement                                          |
Second Interview schedule B - Pre-Service (B.Ed.Yr.2 and PGCE)

Anything outstanding from first interview

Teaching
What do you now see to be the role of the teacher at school

What is your own approach to teaching now
> what or who do you think has influenced you most
> were there any aspects of the course you found particularly useful
> were there any aspects of the psychology component you found particularly useful
> did you find your field/degree subject was of use to you

Teaching and Learning
What relationship has teaching to learning
> how do you know how to teach
> how do you know how someone learns

What do you think teaching and learning has to do with the way knowledge develops in a child

Comments
Any comments you would like to add
Second Interview schedule B - In-service (B.Ed.B & Dip.Ed.)

Anything outstanding from first interview

Teaching
What do you now see to be the role of the teacher

What do you think your own approach to teaching is now
> what or who do you think has influenced you most
> were there any aspects of the course you found particularly useful
> were there any aspects of the psychology component that you found particularly useful
> did you find your experience of being a student useful

Teaching and Learning
What relationship has teaching to learning
> how do you know how to teach
> how do you know how someone learns

What do you think teaching and learning has to do with the way knowledge develops in a child

Comments
Any comments you would like to add
# FREQUENCY TABLE - B.Ed. yr.2 PRE-SERVICE COURSE -
STUDENTS PERCEPTIONS OF THE TEACHER'S ROLE, FIRST INTERVIEW

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student ID</th>
<th>Focus</th>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Learner</th>
<th>Content</th>
<th>Relationship</th>
<th>Control</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1,4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1,3,5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1,4,5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1,4,5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2,4,5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1,2,4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1,2,5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2,5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1,2,4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1,4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1,3,4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1,2,4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2,4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1,3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1,3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1,2,3,5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1,2,3,4,5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## FREQUENCY TABLE - PGCE PRE-SERVICE COURSE -
STUDENTS PERCEPTIONS OF THE TEACHER'S ROLE, FIRST INTERVIEW

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student ID</th>
<th>Focus</th>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Learner</th>
<th>Content</th>
<th>Relationship</th>
<th>Control</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>201</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>202</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>203</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,2,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>204</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>205</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,2,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>206</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,3,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>207</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,2,3,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>208</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>209</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,4,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>210</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>211</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,3,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>212</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,3,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>213</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>214</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,2,4,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>215</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,4,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>216</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appendix D2
### Frequency Table - B.Ed. 1-5 In-Service Course -
Students' Perceptions of the Teachers' Role, First Interview

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student ID</th>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Learner</th>
<th>Content</th>
<th>Relationship</th>
<th>Control</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>301</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>302</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>303</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1,4,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>304</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>305</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,2,3,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>306</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>3,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>307</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,2,3,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>308</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>309</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,2,3,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>310</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,2,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Frequency Table - Dip. Ed. In-Service Course -
Students' Perceptions of the Teachers' Role, First Interview

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student ID</th>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Learner</th>
<th>Content</th>
<th>Relationship</th>
<th>Control</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>401</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>402</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,3,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>403</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>404</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,2,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>405</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,3,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>406</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1,2,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>407</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,2,3,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>Learner</td>
<td>Content</td>
<td>Relationship</td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>17</strong></td>
<td><strong>4</strong></td>
<td><strong>8</strong></td>
<td><strong>7</strong></td>
<td><strong>5</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### FREQUENCY TABLE - PGCE PRE-SERVICE COURSE -
STUDENTS PERCEPTIONS OF THE TEACHERS ROLE, SECOND INTERVIEW

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Learner</th>
<th>Content</th>
<th>Relationship</th>
<th>Control</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>201</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1, 2, 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>202</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1, 2, 4, 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>203</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1, 3, 4, 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>204</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2, 4, 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>205</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1, 3, 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>206</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1, 3, 4, 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>207</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1, 2, 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>208</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2, 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>209</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>210</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>1, 3, 4, 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>211</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1, 4, 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>212</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>213</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>1, 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>214</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>1, 3, 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>215</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1, 4, 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>216</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1, 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total** | 14 | 6 | 8 | 8 | 9 |
**Appendix D6**

### Frequency Table - B.Ed. In-Service Course - Students Perception of the Teachers Role, Second Interview

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Learner</th>
<th>Content</th>
<th>Relationship</th>
<th>Control</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>301</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>302</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>303</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>304</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>305</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>306</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>307</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>308</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>309</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>310</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Frequency Table - Dip.Ed. In-Service Course - Students Perception of the Teachers Role, Second Interview

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Learner</th>
<th>Content</th>
<th>Relationship</th>
<th>Control</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>401</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>402</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>403</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,2,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>404</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>405</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>406</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>407</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,2,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### FREQUENCY TABLE - B.Ed. yr.2 PRE-SERVICE COURSE -
STUDENTS PERCEPTIONS OF THE TEACHER EDUCATOR ROLE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Teacher 1</th>
<th>Learner 2</th>
<th>Content 3</th>
<th>Relationship 4</th>
<th>Training 5</th>
<th>Model 6</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,2,4,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,3,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,4,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1,3,4,5,6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,2,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,2,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1,2,3,6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,2,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,2,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,4,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,2,4,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,2,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,3,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>Learner</td>
<td>Content</td>
<td>Relationship</td>
<td>Training</td>
<td>Model</td>
<td>Summary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,2,4,5,6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>202</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,2,4,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>203</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,2,4,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>204</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,2,3,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>205</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,2,3,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>206</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,2,3,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>207</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,4,5,6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>208</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,4,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>209</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,4,6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>210</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,2,3,4,6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>211</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,2,3,4,6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>212</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,2,3,4,6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>213</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,2,4,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>214</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,2,4,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>215</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,4,5,6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>216</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### a) FREQUENCY TABLE - B.Ed. In-Service Course - Students Perception of the Teacher Educators Role

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Learner</th>
<th>Content</th>
<th>Relationship</th>
<th>Training</th>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>301</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2,6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>302</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2,6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>303</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1,2,3,5,6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>304</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1,2,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>305</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>306</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>307</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>308</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1,2,3,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>309</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1,2,3,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>310</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### b) FREQUENCY TABLE - Dip.Ed. In-Service Course - Students Perception of the Teacher Educators Role

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Learner</th>
<th>Content</th>
<th>Relationship</th>
<th>Training</th>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>401</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1,3,5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>402</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1,4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>403</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1,6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>404</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1,2,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>405</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,2,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>406</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>407</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,2,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix E1

**FREQUENCY TABLE - B.Ed. yr.2 PRE-SERVICE COURSE - STUDENTS PERCEPTIONS OF THE STUDENT AS LEARNER**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Learner</th>
<th>Content</th>
<th>Personal</th>
<th>Social</th>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Training</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5,7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4,6,7</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,2,6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5,6,7</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,4,5,7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1,2,6</td>
<td>5,6,7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2,4,5,7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2,4,5,7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2,4,5,7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2,5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3,5,6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2,3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3,5,6</td>
<td>2,3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3,5,6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5,7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3,5,7</td>
<td>3,5,7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3,5,7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1,2,3,5,7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,2,3,5,7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5,6,7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5,6,7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total**: 2, 6, 6, 2, 11, 5, 12
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Learner</th>
<th>Content</th>
<th>Personal</th>
<th>Social</th>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Training</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>201</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,5,7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>202</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5,7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>203</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>204</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>205</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>206</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>207</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3,7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>208</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>209</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>210</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>5,7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>211</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>5,7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>212</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>5,7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>213</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>5,7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>214</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>5,7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>215</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>5,7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>216</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>5,7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### FREQUENCY TABLE - B.Ed. IN-SERVICE COURSE - STUDENTS' PERCEPTION OF THE STUDENT AS LEARNER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Learner</th>
<th>Content</th>
<th>Personal</th>
<th>Social</th>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Training</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>301</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>302</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2,3</td>
<td>4,6</td>
<td>3,6</td>
<td>3,2</td>
<td>3,4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>303</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>304</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>305</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>306</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4,6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>307</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>308</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>309</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>310</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### FREQUENCY TABLE - Dip.Ed. IN-SERVICE COURSE - STUDENTS' PERCEPTION OF THE STUDENT AS LEARNER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Learner</th>
<th>Content</th>
<th>Personal</th>
<th>Social</th>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Training</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>401</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>402</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>403</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>404</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,3,6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>405</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>406</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>407</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID</td>
<td>Teacher 1</td>
<td>Learner 2</td>
<td>Content 3</td>
<td>Personal 4</td>
<td>Social 5</td>
<td>Goal 6</td>
<td>Summary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>3,4,5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,3,5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,2,5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,3,5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,3,5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>3,4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,3,4,5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>3,5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5,1,5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5,3,5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,3,5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Frequency Table - PGCE Pre-Service Course -
Students Perception of the Pupil as Learner

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Learner</th>
<th>Content</th>
<th>Personal</th>
<th>Social</th>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>201</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>202</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>3,4,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>203</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,3,4,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>204</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>205</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>206</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>207</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>3,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>208</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>3,4,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>209</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>210</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,3,4,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>211</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>212</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>3,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>213</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>214</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>215</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>3,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>216</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### a) Frequency Table - B.Ed. I-S In-Service Course -
**Students Perception of the Pupil as Learner**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Learner</th>
<th>Content</th>
<th>Personal</th>
<th>Social</th>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>301</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2,5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>302</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2,5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>303</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>304</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1,4</td>
<td>3,4,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>305</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>306</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3,5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>307</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3,6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>308</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3,4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>309</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3,4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>310</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### b) Frequency Table - Dip.Ed. I-S In-Service Course -
**Students Perception of the Pupil as Learner**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Learner</th>
<th>Content</th>
<th>Personal</th>
<th>Social</th>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>401</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2,3,4,5,6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>402</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2,5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>403</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2,3,4,5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>404</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>405</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1,5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>406</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>407</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### FREQUENCY TABLE - B.Ed.yr.2 PRE-SERVICE COURSE -
STUDENT PERCEPTION OF HOW THEY KNOW HOW SOMEONE LEARNS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student ID</th>
<th>Intrinsic perceptive</th>
<th>Extrinsic theoretical</th>
<th>Intrinsic introspection</th>
<th>Unable to say</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,2,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1,2,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>11</strong></td>
<td><strong>6</strong></td>
<td><strong>4</strong></td>
<td><strong>2</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


### FREQUENCY TABLE - PGCE PRE-SERVICE COURSE -
**STUDENTS PERCEPTION OF HOW THEY KNOW HOW SOMEONE LEARNS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student ID</th>
<th>Intrinsic perceptive</th>
<th>Extrinsic theoretical</th>
<th>Intrinsic introspection</th>
<th>Unable to say</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>201</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>202</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>203</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>204</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>205</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>206</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>207</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>208</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,2,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>209</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>210</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,2,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>211</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>212</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>213</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>214</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>215</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>216</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total      | 10                   | 6                     | 3                      | 1             |         |
### Frequency Table - B.Ed. I-S In-Service Course - Students Perceptions of How They Know How Someone Learns

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student ID</th>
<th>Intrinsic perceptive</th>
<th>Extrinsic theoretical</th>
<th>Intrinsic introspection</th>
<th>Unable to say</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>301</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>302</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>303</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>304</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>305</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>306</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>307</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>308</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>309</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>310</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Frequency Table - Dip.Ed. In-Service Course - Students Perceptions of How They Know How Someone Learns

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student ID</th>
<th>Intrinsic perceptive</th>
<th>Extrinsic theoretical</th>
<th>Intrinsic introspection</th>
<th>Unable to say</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>401</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>402</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>403</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>404</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>405</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>406</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>407</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## FREQUENCY TABLE - B.Ed.yr.2 PRE-SERVICE COURSE -
STUDENTS PERCEPTION OF HOW THEY KNOW HOW TO TEACH

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student ID</th>
<th>Intrinsic perceptive</th>
<th>Extrinsic theoretical</th>
<th>Extrinsic role model</th>
<th>Unable to say</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,3,1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,2,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total 15 5 6 1
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student ID</th>
<th>Intrinsic perceptive 1</th>
<th>Extrinsic theoretical 2</th>
<th>Extrinsic role model 3</th>
<th>Unable to say 4</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>201</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>202</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>203</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>204</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>205</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>206</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>207</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>208</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>209</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>210</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>211</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>212</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>213</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>214</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>215</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>216</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>13</strong></td>
<td><strong>2</strong></td>
<td><strong>5</strong></td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix F6

#### a) FREQUENCY TABLE - B.Ed. I-S IN-SERVICE COURSE -
STUDENTS PERCEPTIONS OF HOW THEY KNOW HOW TO TEACH

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student ID</th>
<th>Intrinsic perceptive</th>
<th>Extrinsic theoretical</th>
<th>Extrinsic role model</th>
<th>Unable to say</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>301</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>302</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>303</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>304</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>305</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>306</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>307</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>308</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>309</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>310</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### b) FREQUENCY TABLE - Dip.Ed. IN-SERVICE COURSE -
STUDENTS PERCEPTIONS OF HOW THEY KNOW HOW TO TEACH

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student ID</th>
<th>Intrinsic perceptive</th>
<th>Extrinsic theoretical</th>
<th>Extrinsic role model</th>
<th>Unable to say</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>401</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>402</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>403</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>404</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>405</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>406</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>407</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Frequency Table - B. Ed. yr. 2 Pre-Service Course -

Students Expectations of the Contribution of Psychology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student ID</th>
<th>Some relevance</th>
<th>No relevance</th>
<th>Unsure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total 13 3 2
## FREQUENCY TABLE - PGCE PRE-SERVICE COURSE -
STUDENTS EXPECTATIONS OF THE CONTRIBUTION OF PSYCHOLOGY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student ID</th>
<th>Some relevance</th>
<th>No relevance</th>
<th>Unsure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>201</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>202</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>203</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>204</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>205</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>206</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>207</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>208</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>209</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>210</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>211</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>212</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>213</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>214</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>215</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>216</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>13</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td><strong>3</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### FREQUENCY TABLE — B.Ed. I-S IN-SERVICE COURSE —
**STUDENTS EXPECTATIONS OF THE CONTRIBUTION OF PSYCHOLOGY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student ID</th>
<th>Some relevance</th>
<th>No relevance</th>
<th>Unsure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>301</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>302</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>303</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>304</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>305</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>306</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>307</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>308</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>309</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>310</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### FREQUENCY TABLE — Dip.Ed. IN-SERVICE COURSE —
**STUDENTS EXPECTATIONS OF THE CONTRIBUTION OF PSYCHOLOGY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student ID</th>
<th>Some relevance</th>
<th>No relevance</th>
<th>Unsure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>401</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>402</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>403</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>404</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>405</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>406</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>407</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Frequency Table - B.Ed.yr.2 Pre-Service Course -
Students Perceived Contribution of Psychology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student ID</th>
<th>Some relevance</th>
<th>No relevance</th>
<th>Unsure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### FREQUENCY TABLE - PGCE PRE-SERVICE COURSE -
STUDENTS PERCEIVED CONTRIBUTION OF PSYCHOLOGY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student ID</th>
<th>Some relevance</th>
<th>No relevance</th>
<th>Unsure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>201</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>202</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>203</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>204</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>205</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>206</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>207</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>208</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>209</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>210</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>211</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>212</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>213</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>214</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>215</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>216</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>7</strong></td>
<td><strong>9</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### FREQUENCY TABLE - B.Ed. IN-SERVICE COURSE -
**STUDENTS PERCEIVED CONTRIBUTION OF PSYCHOLOGY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student ID</th>
<th>Some relevance</th>
<th>No relevance</th>
<th>Unsure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>301</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>302</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>303</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>304</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>305</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>306</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>307</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>308</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>309</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>310</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>9</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### FREQUENCY TABLE - Dip.Ed. IN-SERVICE COURSE -
**STUDENTS PERCEIVED CONTRIBUTION OF PSYCHOLOGY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student ID</th>
<th>Some relevance</th>
<th>No relevance</th>
<th>Unsure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>401</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>402</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>403</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>404</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>405</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>406</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>407</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>7</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
School: Middle Mixed uniformed (not comp) Modern, purpose built.
Location: Village

Class: 1st form 8-9 yrs
Pupils: G = 12  B = 12  Total = 24

4.45 Language
He uses sheets and writing book. Each works on own sheet, some there
T attends to those who raise their hands. Little chatter most working on own
Talk quietly to Ps who seek attention. Raise hands for help
Frequently comments on rote or move only if you for attention by T,
Movement of Ps

10.26 Instructs to put Workbooks in books. 1 Ps collect designated
Ps to put on outdoor shoes + do so - table by table.

Break
11:00 40 worksheets & books
stands by desk attending to
Ps ask for attention
instructs Ps only to ask for help understand
not to shout work otherwise
frequently comments on noise level
and movement.

11:05 instructs class to put things away
and to leave.
pack away sit quietly & up straight
stand by chairs then leave.

12.0 lunch.

T. A. voice voice slightly — usually quiet voice to attract
attention of the class, class noise is low.
T. 1. uses Ps name when attracting the attention of individuals

T.M. presence voice, instructs “sit up, stay here, sit up, sit up.”
T.M.X. threatens — eg. to take object away, to keep in over break or lunch.

Ps. “Good”, “Well done” rather automatic, no change in facial expression.

To No class questions.

P. attract attention by sitting quietly and raising hands
T. “Ps”
raise hand and call “Mr. S.” just call Mr. S. or goes by T.

P. T answers Ps questions directly. If asked in the right and it isn’t
saying “No” but doesn’t explain why unless asked.
Twice replied to Ps. “That question doesn’t make sense”
“I don’t understand what you’re trying to ask.”
HT met and spoke to Ø before class.
He felt inadequate selection criteria for VCE course, should be
more school visits + practice so unsuitable students would
have left by end of first term.
 Favours integrated day working sound project topic
Believes discipline problems on first occasion should be dealt
with lightly, on second occasion dealt with severely and
on third occasion shows Ø not at fault but CT. CT should
look at self for why the problem occurs eg. Look at
top class level of work set meets Ø's capabilities.
Concerned about Ø's ability in class especially in relationship
Ø doesn't seem to have his own ideas. Feels he will not
cope in normal class as this class are particularly good /easy.

CT echoes HT's concerns. Expected lot of ideas and enthusiasm
even arguments about what he was doing so it would be challenging
Concerned that Ø doesn't produce ideas but just expects to do
what he is told. Only works in classroom, not in resources
area (shared with rest of lower school).
School: Primary, mixed, uniform (wearing) sweatshirt with logo.

Location: Village, building old with teraperin.

Class: Untreamed, in teraperin, no displays before TP.

P: age 8-9yrs, G = 15, B = 10, T = 25, M(1)
T

8:55
T checks Ps in assembly to arrive
T takes Ps in assembly to hall
T prepares hall

9:10
T plays piano for assembly

9:30
T gives number for good performance
P return to classroom with Ps v/ct

9:35
Write spellings on B/B
Write up on B/B

9:40
CTcomes with B.

T instructs Ps to put books away
Ps write response on B/B
Ps raise hands, respond when asked
Ps take books to board, Ps on desk to research rounds. Ps collect books a paper, sit at desks
Ps write before drawing a picture
Ps turn desks helping

10:10
CT returns with B. T helps by starting

10:30
CT instructs Ps about wet break routine. Ps stay in class with CT

Break

10:50
Art - (last minute suggestion by CT, changed place)

11:00
T return to class
CT leaves with B. T instructs clean up, put things away
T instructs Ps on task, collect, collect art materials for each group
Ps sit down at desks working on task
Ps goes round tables helping encouraging
tPs who finish quickly, paint another
T works with 2 or 3 on background paper
Ps paint background paper, this joins

11:30
T instructs those who finish to clean up
Ps put out paintings when dry

11:35
Ps on cleaning up, checking. Clear up own desks, group points, floors
Ps instructed to finish off writing
Ps get out writing to finish
Ps instructs, all Ps to sit writing or reading
Ps who finish writing, reads
Ps put things away, sit straight and FILE
Ps allow Ps to leave when necessary, tables collected
Ps leave when called

Lunch

CT came in and out of class during Art class
Class starts - This time unusual because class are giving assembly.
As enter room as they arrive at school, T greets them and they get out parts and go over them for last minute practice.
Normally enter class set in place at table reading.
Class finishes - P's clear everything off desk, sit up straight, T tells individuals or teams to go.

TA. - T gains attention by raising voice
when noisy hit desk hand with ruler, silence followed.

TI. - T gains individual attention by using name
often pulls arm round individual when talking to them, or gives a cuddle
sometimes taps them on the head in fun.

TH - T changes behaviour by instructing P's to wait till she finished
talking before moving.

A - attention given to P's not seeking it when T walks round desks
looking at work commenting and helping. In A P's ask those without raising

PA - P's gain attention by raising hand and writing to be asked to respond
some call out "Miss T...."
stood by T during work sessions will work or quietly.

PC - listen and comments eg "Wow, thats brillant."

TC - TCI repeats response "Yes"
TCI "That isn't what I was thinking."
School: Primary mixed uniform

Location: Village originally old, surrounded with modern extension.

Class: Group in separate room from rest of class with CT.

Age: 9-10 yrs  A = 5  B = 4  T = 7.
1.15  T fetches her group from classroom  Ps enter resource room & sit at table.
  T introduces 0, before starting lesson.
  Maths - on scales, reminds Ps of last session.  Ps listening
  Plan of church on B/B to fill in measurements.
  Q & A
  T asks Ps to give measurements  Ps give measurements & compromise when
  T fills measurements on B/B plan different.
  Q & A on drawing to scale.
  Ps listen to write hands, P chosen to respond.
  T instructs on scale of this plan  Ps listening
  check that everyone understands before starting.  Ps get on with work.
  T works with 1B who doesn't understand.  B sits by T and goes through exercise.
  T walks round table checking work  Ps work consistently.
  Returns to seat, looks through Ps' files
  comments on them as she hands them out.  Ps take files and look at them.
  T walks round again, looking and commenting.

2.11  Instruct Ps to pack away work  Pack away work and sit up at table.
  Instruct Ps to stand  Ps stand put chairs under table.

2.13  T starts a rhythm game, stands
  as leader (clack, clack, clap, clap)
  Ps follow moves when they can
  When all Ps in rhythm T chooses
  another P to be leader, T follows all follow new leader.
  All Ps have turn to be leader.

2.15  Stop game.  T sends Ps to break.  Go out to break.

Break.
class starts - Maths - Ps enter room sit at table very quietly for instructions.
Game - Ps already changd for games immediately after break.
Come up to T for instructions for taking out equipment, not go out into grounds.

class finish - Maths - collected work in folders. Played a rhythm game - T leads Ps watch and listen and join in as soon as they get it. T then chooses P to lead and all join in including T. All Ps get chance to lead. Administration.

TA - doesn't raise voice when with group. Seating arranged so that T is at the front of the table and all Ps face her. Attention probably maintained by seating arrangements and it's only 1 group.
Game - uses whistle, talks slightly louder to overcome distance, doesn't shout.

TS - uses name, in games touches heads, shoulders of Ps when talking or listening.

TM - T changes behaviour by instruction, frequently uses please and thank you.

A - attention is given to all Ps in group whether seeking attention or not.

PA - raise hands and wait till asked to speak in group and games.
"Miss P,...." used sometimes but not frequently.

PC - listens and comments on Ps contribution eg "that's interesting", "did he?"

TC - T,C,V responds to correct response by repeating response and praising.
Eg "That's right," "yes, good B," "you're right," or nods.
TCX - looks questioningly at P who offers wrong response.

Praises - gives praise to correct responses to Ps eg "yes, good B" during games encouraging eg "good", "that's good."
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