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Abstract

This study used Activity Theory (AT) as a lens to explore how administrative and academic activity systems worked in a university, in schools and in the university-school partnership to support Initial Teacher Education (ITE) in Saudi Arabia. It examined the perspectives of partnership coordinators, university tutors, head teachers, cooperating teachers and student teachers involved in the ITE partnership programme at Umm Alqura University. The study was conducted under the umbrella of the interpretive paradigm. Case study was used as the methodology of the study. The study employed multiple methods of data collection: questionnaire, interviews and documentary evidence. Maximum variation sampling was used to select the participants to take part in the current study. The total number of the whole sample with all sub-groups was 187. Ten in-depth interviews were conducted with volunteer interviewees.

The study yielded various findings. Participants’ expectations were influenced by their history and background. In addition, student teachers were supported in learning about teaching in the university, school and through the partnership between school and university. However, different kinds of challenges were identified. These included: extreme centralisation in running the partnership activity system, lack of awareness of the importance of the partnership and of the need to address contradictory points of view about teaching and learning to teach in a constructive way. These challenges were symptoms of unresolved contradictions inherent in the partnership activity system. Despite these contradictions, many opportunities for professional development were highlighted by all partners.

Using AT as an analytical tool, several implications for all partners were identified. The study concluded with the idea that for effective teacher education, not only is it important to understand the interaction between university and school but also how, within each, administrative and academic activity sub-systems operate and interact. This is because clear understanding of all aspects of the academic and administrative elements of the partnership, and of their relationship, is essential for a successful teacher education.
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Abbreviations and terms

**KSA**: The kingdom of Saudi Arabia  
**MOE**: Ministry of Education  
**MOHE**: Ministry of Higher Education  
**AT**: Activity Theory  
**UK**: The United Kingdom  
**LEA**: Local Education Authority  
**PGCE**: Postgraduate Certificate of Education  
**J**: Joint weeks  
**S**: School weeks  
**SPSS**: Statistical Package for the Social Sciences  
**ITE**: Initial Teacher Education  
**HEI**: Higher Education Institution  
**HE**: Higher Education

The terms of the Oxford internship scheme are defined as quoted from McIntyre (1997, p. 202) as follows:

**Mentor**: Subject teacher who takes primary responsibility for the professional education in classroom teaching of (usually) two interns

**Professional Tutor**: Senior teacher who co-ordinates a school’s part in the Internship Scheme, usually with at least eight interns, and leads a General Programme (later called a Professional Development Programme) of school-based seminars on whole-school and cross-curricular issues for the interns

**General Tutor**: University lecturer who liaises with a school, and especially with its professional tutor, and shares responsibility for the school’s General programme

**Curriculum Tutor**: University lecturer with a subject specialism who jointly with the mentors in the same subject area plans the Curriculum Programme for interns’ learning about classroom teaching of the subject, implements the university-based part of the programme and visits interns and their mentors to contribute (once every few weeks) to the school-based part of the programme
Chapter 1

Introduction, context and exploring the gap

1.1 Introduction

Education plays an important role in disseminating knowledge and developing the skills of the members of any society. Therefore, different countries all over the world have paid considerable attention to the development of educational systems at all stages and levels. The development of teacher education institutions is considered one of the most important factors contributing to this development of education. For example, in the United States of America, Ginsberg and Rhodes (2003) assert that: “Improving teacher preparation is among the most prominent reforms suggested for education today” (p.150). Hallinan and Khmelkov (2001) add that:

Evaluations of teacher education programs in Europe and the United States reveal that many existing pre-service and in-service programs are inadequately preparing and training contemporary teachers. This reality has led to systematic efforts to reform teacher education (p.175).

So, in recent years, considerable attention has been devoted to this particular area (e.g. Zeichner and Ndimande, 2008; Yuksel, 2008; Beck and Shanks, 2005; Karlsen and Garm, 2004; Ginsberg and Rhodes, 2003; and Bezzina, 1999).

Despite this attention, reflected in many academic debates, and in the preoccupations of policy makers, teacher education programmes still suffer from several problems and face many challenges. Indeed, Brint (1998) indicates that “Teaching now recruits higher-quality students than before, but the preparation of teachers remains poor in many places. In the absence of further reforms of teacher training, we should not expect great improvements in the way that schools work.” (p.246). The thrust of his argument is therefore that problems in teacher education are significant barriers to educational improvement generally.

As Brint (1998) claims, “Poorly prepared and poorly qualified teachers are a far more important problem in the developing world than they are in the industrialized world” (p.246). Amongst the problems facing developing countries are the following: lack of financial resources, lack of teacher education research and a relatively small number
of staff members compared with the large numbers of students (Alaqail, 2005). He adds that there is a lack of the partnership between school and university in initial teacher education (ITE).

In this context, it is not surprising that the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia (KSA) is looking forward to developing its teacher education institutions. Unfortunately, in the KSA at present, these face several problems which represent an obstacle to achieving the desired aims for the educational system as a whole. Hafez and Meamar (2000) maintain that the teacher preparation process in the KSA still suffers from many difficulties, including financial, human and administrative problems. Alaqail (2005) adds that coordination and cooperation between the educational sub-systems in the KSA is not optimal. This is attributed to the lack of effectiveness of administration, which, in turn, is due to its extreme centralization and inability to cope with change.

Given the inter-relationships between different parts of the educational system that are necessary for effective teacher education (e.g. between the Faculty of Education and schools), this focus on administrative problems in the KSA is of concern. As well as being significant in their own right, administrative problems may well interact with the academic issues (e.g. the issue of the relationship between theory and practice (Pedro, 2005; Brandes, 1995), student teachers learning about classroom management (Haggarty, 1997) and the lack of teacher education research (McIntyre, 1997). It is this interaction among administrative and academic activity systems in school-university partnership in teacher education in the KSA that is the focus of my research.

1.2 Context of the research

Reforming teacher education is part and parcel of the context in which it is carried out. As Linde (2003) emphasises “Teacher education has to be analysed and understood in the context where it takes place” (p. 110). This research has been conducted in the Saudi context. Therefore, detailed information about the educational system in the KSA is given focusing on key aspects of the educational system that are related to this research.
1.2.1 Philosophy of education
The philosophy of education in the KSA is based mainly on the principles of the religion of Islam and spreading it among the youth there. It is also based on understanding Islam in the ‘right way’. This calls for tolerance, co-existence, and development of knowledge and skills for the benefit of humanity. Alsumbel et al. (1998) support this analysis by arguing that the philosophy of education in the KSA is committed to instilling Islamic beliefs and spreading them among youth, understanding Islam in the right manner, bringing up generations on religious bases, providing them with values and virtues, and providing them with appropriate knowledge and skills.

1.2.2 The structure of provision (educational stages)
Education is provided to members of Saudi society with different ages in different stages, as follows:

1.2.2.1 Pre-school
This stage is divided into two sub-stages:
A) Nursery schools:
These schools accept children from one to three years old. They are considered an extension of the home environment and therefore aim to take care of the child and provide opportunities for play. Entry to this stage is not mandatory.
B) Kindergarten:
Like nursery education, this stage is not compulsory. Children join it at the ages of three to six. Its main function is to qualify the child to join the primary school and to provide him / her with useful knowledge and skills. The majority of these institutions are private.

1.2.2.2 General education
This kind of education involves three stages: primary, intermediate and secondary. There are both private and governmental schools in each stage. Only the primary stage is compulsory. Detailed description of every one of these stages is given as follows:
A) Primary school:
The duration of this stage is 6 years. It extends from the age of 6 to the age of 12. Students move from one grade to a higher one after passing the examinations held in the middle and at the end of the year. This stage concentrates on developing the skills of children in reading, writing and arithmetic. At the end of this stage students are given certificates which allow them to join the intermediate stage. Boys and girls systems are run separately at the beginning of this stage.

B) Intermediate school:
The duration of this stage is 3 years. It extends from the age of 12 to the age of 15. In it, students study different subjects which are: Islamic Studies, Arabic Studies, Social Studies and Science. It corresponds to the beginning of adolescence. Therefore, it emphasizes providing students with appropriate knowledge suitable to their age and developing their skills. It is worth noting that beginning from this stage, students study English as a foreign language.

C) Secondary school:
The duration of this stage is 3 years. Students are from 15 to 18 years old. Like the intermediate stage, students study the same different subjects. In addition, they study the computer as a new subject. It concentrates mainly on developing their skills and providing them with appropriate knowledge. Completing it is a basic requirement for entering university. However, due to the specific number of spaces provided by the universities, it is difficult to accept all graduate students from secondary school. Some students join technical institutions instead. Others join the labour market.

1.2.2.3 Higher education
This stage follows the secondary stage at the age of 18 or over. The duration of undergraduate study varies according to specialization. Some courses such as Education and Science last for 4 years, others such as Engineering and Pharmacy are for 5 years, and medicine lasts for 7 years. In addition, most Saudi universities offer postgraduate courses for qualifications such as M.A. and Ph.D.
1.2.3 Administration of the educational system
There are three main authorities supervising the educational system in the KSA. They are:
A) The Higher Educational Policy Committee:
This was established in 1963 and is considered as the highest authority in education. It is chaired by the King and is responsible for drawing up the general educational policy in the state, endorsing the educational plans and funding education.
B) Ministry of Education (MOE):
This was established in 1952. It is responsible for supervising all the educational stages up to secondary level and all local education authorities throughout the country.
In the KSA, there is no co-education. Male and female schools are separated from each others but they are both under the supervision of the MOE.
C) Ministry of Higher Education (MOHE):
This was established in 1975. Its responsibilities include the supervision of all Saudi universities, scholarships and international university relationships, and cultural bureaus abroad.

1.2.4 Teacher education
Due to the important role played by teachers in developing the educational process, detailed information of teacher education in the KSA is given below.

1.2.4.1 System of teacher education
There are two systems of teacher education in the Arab world:
1) The consecutive system:
In this system, after obtaining a BA in an academic specialization such as Science, English, Chemistry, and Arabic, the student joins the Faculty of Education and studies the educational preparation programme for one year. This system is followed in the KSA.
2) The integrative system:
In this system, the student studies the educational preparation programme side by side with the academic preparation programme in his/her field of specialization. The duration of this teacher education programme is four years.
1.2.4.2 The Faculty of Education at Umm Alqura University

The government of the KSA has established many of the educational faculties which prepare prospective teachers and train in-service teachers. The oldest one is the Faculty of Education at Umm Alqura University. This will be the subject of my research, because it is a well established institution and, therefore, I will describe it in more detail in the sections that follow.

The Faculty of Education at Umm Alqura University was opened in 1952 and includes seven educational departments. These are: Educational Administration and Planning, Curricula and Methods of Teaching, Psychology, Islamic Education, Art Education, Sport Education, and Kindergarten. In addition, there is a Centre for Training Courses which offers training courses to in-service teachers and head teachers. The programme, which qualifies graduate students from academic departments to the profession of teaching, is offered by the first four departments. The duration of this programme is one year.

The aims of the teacher education programme, as translated and paraphrased from Alsaid (2005) are as follows:

- preparing the student to be a good citizen;
- developing the different skills of students and providing them with a general overview of educational studies and their importance;
- providing students with educational knowledge in their field of specialization;
- assisting students to become familiar with the educational process, with philosophical, cultural, social and historical dimensions, in light of the values of society and technological advancement;
- providing students with a general overview of school management and some of its pioneers, and widening their horizons about administration in educational institutions;
- familiarizing students with the development of education, the nature of education, educational policy, and the problems facing education in the KSA and how they can be overcome;
• familiarizing students with mental hygiene, counselling and guidance in school, physical, emotional, intellectual and social developmental stages, and branches of psychology, particularly educational psychology;
• familiarizing students with general teaching methods, training them in lesson preparation, choosing appropriate teaching aids, the concept of curriculum, steps in its planning, different types of organization of the curriculum, also, developing students’ ability to criticize these organizations;
• linking educational and psychological theories to practical reality, so students are more able to practise their work according to teaching methods related to each subject and suitable teaching aids. This is achieved through teaching practice with an emphasis on the subject curriculum and the appropriate methods of evaluation; and
• enabling students to enhance the teaching and learning process by using educational aids effectively.

It can be argued that these aims are not achieved completely. This is asserted by Alsaid (2005) in her evaluation of the educational preparation programme at Umm Alqura University. She found that all staff members and graduate female teachers agreed that the aims of the programme were partly achieved. Clearly, even within this well established institution, there are problems to be explored.

The teacher education programme consists of 30 credit hours as shown in the following table.
Table 1.1: Components of the teacher education programme.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Credit hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Introduction to Education</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Introduction to Psychology</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Foundation of Islamic Education</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Citizen Education</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Developmental Psychology</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Administration of School Activity</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Methods of Teaching: level 1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Educational Psychology</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Technology of Education and Means</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Tests and Measurements</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Teaching Practice</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Introduction to Educational Administration</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Education and its Policy in the KSA</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Counselling and guidance</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Methods of Teaching: level 2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Bases of curricula and their organizations</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>School activity design</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>All subjects</td>
<td><strong>30</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These subjects are provided by four main departments in the Faculty of Education which are: Educational Administration and Planning, Curricula and Teaching Methods, Psychology and Islamic Education.

1.2.4.3 Teacher training

In this section, detailed information about the training courses offered by The Faculty of Education at Umm Alqura University to both pre-service and in-service teachers is given. The aims of pre-service teacher training courses; the role of university tutor; the role of cooperating teacher; the role of head teacher and the role of student teacher are dealt with as translated and paraphrased from the teaching practice manual (Qoqandi & Hadi, 2002). The types and aims of in-service teacher training courses are tackled as translated and paraphrased from The Manual of The Faculty of Education.
at Umm Alqura University (2005). These training courses are presented in the following section.

1.2.4.3.1 Courses offered to pre-service teachers

Pre-service teachers undertake school-based work as part of their teacher education programme, through the partnership between school and university when they go for teaching practice experience in local schools. The duration of teaching practice experience is one term (approximately 15 weeks). The aims of teaching practice experience are as follows:

- clarifying and reinforcing the theoretical principles which the student teacher studies in different courses. This is carried out through observation and teaching;
- familiarising the student teacher with the educational situation to get used to it;
- giving the student teacher the opportunity to prove his/her ability to teach and consequently realising how competent he/she is;
- forming in the student teacher positive attitudes towards the profession of teaching;
- enabling him/her to evaluate the educational process accurately;
- getting him/her used to undertaking responsibility;
- developing his/her ability to criticise himself or herself;
- managing the classroom and dealing appropriately, educationally speaking, with pupils in the school;
- acquiring the ability and dealing efficiently with educational means and educational technologies and using them in teaching;
- paying attention to school activities inside or outside the classroom;
- dealing with teachers and school administration in a way that results in good relationships among colleagues and school administration, and recognising how the school is successfully managed;
- dealing effectively with school curriculum according to the student teacher’s field of specialisation in different levels and stages; and
- dealing with the content of the syllabus based on experience, not merely on knowledge and information, aided by the school library and local libraries available to the student teacher.
It could be argued that these aims of teaching practice highlight the importance of both theory and experience. However, they seem to be general guidelines. There is nothing about how student teachers could link theory to classroom practice or about teaching specific ways of working or understanding classrooms. In addition, these aims can not be realised unless there is a productive partnership between school and university with clear roles and division of labour of partners. In the sections that follow, the responsibilities of each one of these partners are delineated.

**The role of university tutor**
Within the teacher education programme, the university tutor has the following responsibilities:

- observing the student teacher during the whole period to provide guidance and to identify the weaknesses to support them and provide the strengths to reinforce them, and to help the student teacher in planning the lesson well;
- involving student teachers in peer-observation for mutual benefit to improve and control their teaching;
- not intervening in student teacher’s teaching unless necessary;
- discussing each student teacher individually after the lesson he/she has given in strengthens and weaknesses and guiding him/her accordingly;
- making a maximum of five visits or a minimum of three to the student teacher to judge whether he/she is qualified for teaching or not;
- assessing the student teacher at the end of the teaching practice experience according to the criteria of assessment; and
- handing the result of assessment to the teaching practice bureau.

**The role of head teacher**
The head teacher is responsible for the following duties within the teacher education programme:

- accepting student teachers to train in the school;
- choosing distinguished teachers in the school to cooperate with student teachers and make use of their experience;
welcoming student teachers and their university tutors in the first day of teaching practice experience and holding a joint meeting between them and experienced teachers to get familiar with the school system and its circumstances;

informing the teaching practice bureau of student teachers’ and their university tutors’ attendance;

informing the teaching practice bureau of any shortcomings from student teachers such as absence, lack of discipline or any other problems;

allocating a dedicated room for student teachers;

handing the results of student teachers’ assessment to the university tutor before the end of the term and according to the regulations mandated by the Local Education Authority (LEA);

handing the check out letter to the student teacher at the end of teaching practice experience; and

cooperating with student teachers in terms of allowing them to attend university exams according to the student teachers’ schedule without causing any harm to the student teacher in this aspect.

The role of cooperating teacher
Within the teacher education programme, the cooperating teacher has the following responsibilities to be carried out:

offering every help and assistance in terms of providing trainees with his/her teaching experience;

providing the student teacher with the timetable she/he is assigned to teach which is eight periods a week with a maximum of twelve periods. This is distributed in coordination with the school administration;

familiarising student teachers with the classroom in the school and preparing the students for their arrival. It is preferable not to maintain the term trainee in front of the students and student teachers are to be introduced as teachers so as not to suffer from lack of attention from the part of classroom students;

informing student teachers about low and high achieving students and suggesting the appropriate ways of dealing with educational problems;

helping them in preparing their lesson plans well;

familiarising them with the school assigned syllabus; and
following the accuracy and objectivity in assessing student teachers according to assessment criteria. It is preferable to visit and observe them several times to make sure that everything is going well inside the classroom.

The role of the student teacher

The student teacher is responsible for the following duties within the teacher education programme:

- Show commitment to teaching.
- Understanding the school regulations and following them strictly;
- Cooperating with the cooperating teacher to the utmost extent and accepting the comments which are intended to help him/her to overcome the problems he/she faces;
- Teaching a minimum of 8 periods and a maximum of 12 periods weekly according to the school’s need;
- Participating in different school activities;
- Observing experienced teachers for a week before starting teaching and coordinating with cooperating teachers in terms of this;
- Preparing a lesson plan in light of what he/she has learned in the university aided by the cooperating teacher and the university tutor;
- Using different ways of teaching guided by the university tutor and cooperating teacher;
- Using teaching aids during lessons;
- Handing his/her check out letter from the school to the teaching practice bureau at the end of the teaching practice experience; and
- Informing the teaching practice bureau of lack of not being followed up by the university tutor so that the bureau could find a substitute without delaying the graduation of the student teacher.

Arguably, these roles are integrated with one another with all partners working together for the benefit of student teachers. In addition, student teachers are assessed by the university tutor, the cooperating teacher and the head teacher. The total score is 100 marks distributed as follows: 70 marks for the university tutor, 20 marks for the cooperating teacher and 10 marks for the head teacher as regulated by the teaching
practice manual. In the light of above, it is clear that the university tutor has the largest part of the score which reflects that the role of the university tutor is the main one in assessing the student teacher.

1.2.4.3.2 Courses offered to in-service teachers

The Faculty of Education is providing several training courses for in-service teachers. These are: a training course for educational mentors at the LEA, student activity supervisors, curriculum mentors and in counselling and guidance. These training courses aim at:

- updating trainees’ knowledge;
- providing them with up-to-date educational, academic, and cultural knowledge in their field of specialisation;
- developing trainees’ skills;
- informing them about modern educational innovations in the fields of educational administration, educational supervision, curricula and teaching methods, educational psychology and Islamic education; and
- developing their academic, technical, administrative, supervisory and performance abilities to be able to solve the problems they face in their work and to deal productively and effectively with students and educators.

These training courses are very important for professional development for targeted groups. However, it is clear that there are no training courses for cooperating teachers. Training courses for cooperating teachers would be beneficial in supporting student teachers’ learning and the partnership between school and university. This is because student teachers work with cooperating teachers more than other partners during the teaching practice experience and try to make use of their experience as asserted by Cheng (2005) that “student-teachers have many more opportunities to interact with the cooperating teacher than they do with any other individual teacher educator” (p.394).
1.3 Exploring the gap

School aims to provide students with knowledge and to develop their skills. It also provides them with appropriate behaviour so they will be able to cope with and serve their society. Fisher (1995) maintains that there is a growing realisation that the development of individuals and of communities relies on education and on the quality of teaching and learning. Fullan and Hargreaves (1992) add that: “A fundamental purpose of education is to prepare young people for life in society, and since societies throughout the world are constantly changing and developing, education can also be expected to change” (p.36).

In order for the school to be able to achieve these noble aims, there should be teachers who are highly qualified and educationally prepared. Alcock (2003) indicates that “Education is now about both knowledge and skills, therefore, and ensuring high standards in both is in the interests of individual learners and their fellow citizens” (p.3). Pring (2000) asserts that:

Education is concerned with the life of the mind, and such a life can atrophy if not carefully nurtured. The job of the teacher is to facilitate that development through putting the learner in contact with further experience or with what others have said (in literature, say) as they make sense of similar experiences (p.13).

Shulman (1987) adds that: “The teacher can transform understanding, performance skills, or desired attitudes or values into pedagogical representations and actions” (p.7). Due to the complexities involved in the job of the teacher, teacher preparation and training is essential if teachers are to realise the complexity of the task they perform. Newell (1996) asserts that: “It has been long recognized that reforming schools requires concomitant reform in teacher education” (p.567). This indicates the importance of effective partnership between school and university in terms of teacher education. “‘Partnership’ is now the orthodox way of describing the appropriate relationship between schools and universities in ITE” (McIntyre, 1997, p. 5). However, “Partnerships between university and school in teacher education are not easily developed or sustained. The formation of partnerships is often difficult for a variety of reasons” (Aubusson, 2003, p.183). For example, Aubusson (2003) highlights that one of these reasons is that “The school and university cultures are
very different, use different language to think about and discuss education issues and value different things” (p. 183).

In the light of above, I argue that there are some contradictions among administrative and academic activity systems in university-school partnership in teacher education all over the world in general and in the KSA in particular. Evidence from educational research studies further support this argument (Callahan & Martin, 2007; Edwards and Mutton, 2007; Yamagata-Lynch and Haudenschild, 2006; Wilson, 2004; Roth & Tobin, 2002; Alkarasneh, 2001; Alsaid, 2005; Jiffry & Alsolimani, 2003; Alkazmi, 1994; and Bokhari, 1994). A full account of these studies will be discussed in the literature review chapter.

In addition, my experience as a teacher for one year in a secondary school, graduating from the Faculty of Education at Umm Alqura University, obtaining both BA and MA from it, and lecturing in educational administration, and discussion with colleagues and some teachers have confirmed my feeling that the contradictions among administrative and academic activity systems in school-university partnership in teacher education are an important focus for study. My reading and my personal experience have therefore united to focus my study on investigating and exploring, in the KSA context, how administrative and academic activity systems work in the university, the school and the university-school partnership to support student teachers’ learning and what contradictions are inherent in student teachers’ learning.

1.4 Aims of the research

This study aims to use Activity Theory (AT) as a lens to explore how administrative and academic activity systems work in the university, the school and the university-school partnership to support student teachers’ learning from the perspectives of partnership coordinators; university tutors; head teachers; cooperating teachers and student teachers. It also addresses the question of what contradictions are inherent in student teachers’ learning. The interpretive stance is being used, focusing on the views of the key players, because every individual’s perspective of these contradictions will affect the way he or she engages with the teacher education programme and its reform. Moreover, different people may have different
perspectives because they will understand these contradictions in the light of their own different experiences.

1.5 Significance of the research

Teachers play an essential role in developing students’ knowledge, skills and attitudes. Teacher education programmes should be developed to promote high quality entrants to the teaching profession. Therefore, the potential significance of this study and its value lies in the following:

First: in terms of AT:

- Using AT as a lens to explore participant perspectives of the synergies and contradictions among administrative and academic activity systems in university-school partnership in teacher education in the KSA is an innovative approach that has not been used before in the Saudi context.
- The study highlights how AT is important in exploring the interactions, complex relationships and contradictions among different activity systems with a common object.
- The study reveals how administrative and academic activity systems interact, and consequently provides a way of understanding the interaction among them in the KSA.
- The study highlights how AT is consistent with the interpretive paradigm, epistemology, methodology and methods of data collection.

Second: in terms of teacher education:

- The study will contribute in promoting the development of the teacher education programme by providing greater understanding of the processes involved and therefore generating appropriate recommendations to solve problems identified.
- Graduate teachers from this programme are expected to be highly qualified and this will have a positive impact on their teaching at schools and, consequently, on the achievement of their students.
- The findings from this study are expected to urge educators and policy makers in the KSA to develop the teacher education programmes and the partnership between the university and the school.
• The findings from this study could help teacher education institutions in the KSA to develop their practice in the current (and future) policy framework in light of the deeper understanding of teacher education processes in KSA that are revealed by the research.

• Other teacher education institutions in the world could make use of the findings of this study taking into consideration their own context and the context in which the current study is carried out.

Third: in terms of partnership between school and university in teacher education:

• The study will lead, in particular, to greater understanding of the partnership between school and university in the Saudi context.

• Teacher education is greatly influenced by the school and the university activity systems. Thus, the study looks at the teacher education programme in a comprehensive way taking into account different parts of the educational system that have a direct impact on the teacher education.

• The study draws to the attention that when the participants work together in school-university partnership in teacher education they are crossing boundaries and engage in a new activity system which requires well-defined rules and responsibilities for the partners.

• Exploring the contradictions inherent in student teachers’ learning leads to productive partnership between school and university.

Fourth: in terms of educational research:

• The findings from this study could open the field for further studies in the development of the teacher education programmes and the partnership between the university and the school.

• The study will contribute to the literature and attempts to develop practice at home.

• A further significance is to explore and demonstrate how useful an interpretive approach is in research methods.

• The study provides researchers with further insights into an innovative theoretical framework which is AT.
• The study provides researchers (particularly in the context of the KSA) with appropriate paradigm, epistemology, methodology and methods of data collection which are consistent with one another and with the theoretical framework.

1.6 Why carry out this research? My personal interest and previous research

There is a concern in many countries around the world, especially in Europe and the United States of America, that current systems of initial teacher education (ITE) do not provide beginning teachers with the knowledge and skills that they need in order to become effective practitioners (Hallinan and Khmelkov, 2001). As an educational researcher, I am concerned with this issue in the context of ITE in the KSA. My interest stems in part from my own experiences as a school student, as a student teacher on an ITE programme and as a secondary school teacher. In addition, following my one year of teaching in a school I joined the Faculty of Education at Umm Alqura University as an assistant lecturer in Educational Administration and Planning and obtained my masters’ degree from it. As part of my job I was a member of the ‘Quality Assurance and Development Committee’ which was responsible for developing the teacher education programme and the ITE partnerships between schools and the university. Being part of this committee enabled me to be an ‘insider’ in the activity system and consequently I became aware of some tensions in the way that the system works. In addition, I taught two modules in the teacher education programme which focused on the educational system in the KSA and on school administration systems. This experience has helped me to become familiar with the educational system in the KSA and aware of the important role that administrators and administration systems have in facilitating and supporting the work of academic staff and ITE students. Furthermore, I am a government sponsored student and my sponsor required me to research administrative aspects of ITE. When I reviewed research studies about reforming teacher education in general and the partnership between school and university in particular, I discovered that little research has been done in the KSA context about this important issue. This study is thus intended as a first step in developing an understanding of the relationship between administrative and academic systems that are involved in ITE in Saudi Arabia.
My personal experiences and reading have given me the feeling that a productive partnership between school and university is essential for successful teacher education. However, establishing and maintaining such partnerships is not an easy task for a variety of reasons. For example, schools and faculties of education in universities are separate institutions with different major roles and with staff that may have different views of what teaching and learning to teach involves. Successful ITE requires the partnership between a school and university to be effective and hence for there to be effective administration systems to support the partnership. This study explores how administrative and academic activity systems work in the university, the school and school-university partnership to support student teachers’ learning. It also explores the contradictions among administrative and academic activity systems in school-university partnerships in teacher education in the Saudi context from the perspectives of all stakeholders using AT as a theoretical framework. In ITE, there are four activity systems to consider: the university academic system, the university administrative system, the school academic system and the school administrative system. AT is the main theoretical lens but it is also important to review teacher education research that has been carried out using other theoretical frameworks.

Evidence and implications from teacher education and AT research

The key to improve education is to improve teacher education (Hallinan & Khmelkov, 2001). Therefore, there is a growing demand from both the public and educators asking policy makers to reform teacher education in Saudi universities (Alaqail, 2005 and Alsaid, 2005). Similarly, in the United States of America, Roth and Tobin, (2002) asserted that teacher preparation is fraught with problems. This is due to the complexity involved in preparing prospective teachers. Most, if not all, teacher education programmes include a practical component, which allows student teachers to spend some time in a school. During these field experiences, future teachers teach some lessons and learn to teach by observing more experienced teachers. However, tremendous difficulties of teaching and learning to teach can be encountered (Roth & Tobin, 2002). Therefore, teacher preparation programmes are regularly criticized for the inability of their graduates to cope with the realities of the classroom (Bobis, 2007). In the American context, Yamagata-Lynch and Haudenschild, (2006) found that the knowledge the Faculty of Education brings to schools through partnerships is
in many cases unusable for classroom teachers. Consequently, university faculty involvements in partnerships often fail to inform classroom practice. This is an indicator of the wide gap between theory and practice. Transforming theory into practice is often challenging. As asserted by Dodd (2001) that: “Translating theory into classroom practice is a challenge in any context--there are some important aspects of teaching that can be learned only through painful experience” (p.13).

To reform teacher education, both the theoretical dimension represented in the university and the practical one represented in the school have to be taken into consideration. Under these circumstances, an effective partnership between university and school has become a crucial requirement for effective teacher education. As asserted by Aubusson (2003): “To develop a consistently high-quality practice teaching experience we need to develop closer partnerships with schools and closer teacher education relationships with teachers” (p. 184). However, maintaining productive relationships between university and school in teacher education is often challenging (Aubusson, 2003 and Yamagata-Lynch & Haudenschild, 2006). Both systems have the common aim of training effective teachers. However, day-to-day internal institutional matters can produce tensions between the two systems (Wilson, 2004). School teachers consider themselves primarily as teachers of school students, not teachers of pre-service teachers (Aubusson, 2003). Roth & Tobin (2002) found that there are also institutional contradictions between school and university in the American context. From a university perspective, student teachers are in the school to learn by applying their knowledge and to be evaluated for their competencies as teachers. From a school perspective, the student teachers often take the place of regular teachers and, therefore, are part of activity systems intended to assist students in learning. They add that there is also a tacit conflict between school staff who know teaching through daily practice and university staff who are considered to know teaching mostly through theory which teachers often consider inapplicable in practice.

With regard to the above mentioned results, it could be argued that student teachers do not just apply their knowledge which they have learned in the university, but they gain experiences from both university and school. A challenge facing teacher educators is to design teaching–learning environments that will empower student teachers to translate theory into practice more effectively (Bobis, 2007). He found that
change in thinking about structure and focus of teacher education courses by looking for opportunities for future teachers to discuss, interpret and reflect on the relationship between theory and practice is very important. Student teachers are able to extract principles which might assist them in new contexts in the future (Wilson, 2004). Student teachers attributed their ability to reflect to their interaction with important others in the programme with which they were involved in reflection on action and for action in their classroom, and they established their reflections on their personal beliefs, as well as educational theory (Pedro, 2005). She pointed out that pre-service teachers highlighted opportunity for reflection in their classes at the university and in the school where they conducted their teaching practice.

Therefore, for student teachers to reflect, a productive partnership between university and school needs to be established. However, both school and university are very busy places (Bullough and Kauchak, 1997). For example, the administrative activity system in the school is concerned with organising the work, making sure that it runs smoothly and within the allocated budget and raising the reputation of the school, so it could attract more students. On the other hand, the academic activity system is concerned with pupils’ learning. This could negatively affect university-school partnership. One possible mechanism is that asserted by Brisard et al. (2006): “schools would be reluctant to take on an increased role in the mentoring and the assessment of student teachers. They perceive this to be the responsibility of university tutors, and the main purpose of tutor visits” (p.58). It could be argued that school teachers have an important role to play with student teachers’ reflection because they know more about the classroom and the lessons to be taught. However, teachers themselves have difficulty engaging in the theoretical input from the university and drawing this into reflection. Hence, there is a role for the university tutor to help them by clarifying the issues related to theory and how it could be linked to classroom practice and reflected upon. However, this requires enough time for all partners to carry out their roles. This emphasizes the important role of administration in providing that kind of support. Ginsberg and Rhodes (2003) point out that good university leadership is crucial to change teacher education particularly with regard to faculty work in partner schools. In addition, school administration can play an important role in establishing strong relationships with university in terms of teacher education. Aubusson (2003) asserts that partnerships require a readiness of university
and school staff to cooperate closely in well-identified roles; interactions among people rather than merely agreements between institutions; sustained funding to allow all parties to achieve these roles; continuous dialog among equals with different complementary expertise to develop a shared vision of teacher education and teaching- its principles and practices; and the flexibility to respond to needs, make use of opportunities and evolve.

It could be argued that for an effective partnership between school and university, sustained funding is crucial. However, the governments may not be ready for it. This was made clear by Smith et al. (2006) that: “collaborative approaches may require a level of resource to operate fully which governments have not been prepared to provide” (p.161). In addition, effective communication between the two different institutions is necessary for building up student teachers’ knowledge about teaching. Unfortunately, many partnership efforts fail due to the lack of communication, but the communication problem is just a symptom to the greater problem of unresolved conflicts (Yamagata-Lynch & Haudenschild, 2006). Within these conditions, the contradictions between administrative and academic activity systems in university-school partnership in teacher education in the Saudi context need to be explored.

1.7 Overview of the thesis

The thesis consists of eight chapters. Chapter one concentrated on exploring the gap, aims of the research, significance of the research and the rationale of the research. In addition, some information about the context of the research was given in this chapter.

Chapter two focuses on the theoretical framework of the study which is AT. It gives detailed information about the history and background of AT, its principles and how AT shapes my work. It highlights the importance of AT as a theoretical framework for understanding the interactions, complex relationships and contradictions among different activity systems with a common object which is teacher education.

In chapter three, the related literature is reviewed. Some administrative and academic issues in teacher education are discussed. In addition, the Oxford Internship scheme as a successful experience of the partnership between school and university in
the United Kingdom (UK) context is presented. Lessons to be learned and implemented to the Saudi context are dealt with.

**Chapter four** focuses on the research design. The research paradigm, ontological assumptions, epistemological assumptions and methodology are presented in this chapter. In addition, the methods and procedures of data collection and analysis are discussed. It highlights the importance of the interpretive paradigm in educational research and how the interpretive paradigm, ontological, epistemological and methodological assumptions are consistent with AT.

In **chapter five**, the quantitative data are presented and discussed according to the main elements of AT which are subject, object, tools, community, rules and division of labour. In addition, the differences among different groups are dealt with.

In **chapter six**, the qualitative data resulting from the analysis of the interviews, open-ended questions of the questionnaires and documentary evidence are presented, discussed, and related to the reviewed literature. The constructed topics, categories and sub-categories are presented in a table in the beginning of the chapter.

In **chapter seven**, further discussion is given using AT as an analytical tool. It highlights the importance of AT as an analytical tool in revealing the interactions, complex relationships and contradictions inherent in the partnership between school and university in teacher education.

**Chapter eight** aims at providing some implications and recommendations which could help in developing the partnership between school and university in teacher education. Furthermore, they could help all partners to carry out their roles effectively. In addition, some suggestions for further research are given in this chapter. Finally, the way ahead for effective partnership between school and university in teacher education is presented.

**1.8 Summary of the chapter**

In this chapter, an introduction about the research was given. Some aspects of the context of the research which is the Saudi context were described. Detailed information was given about the philosophy of education; the structure of provision;
administration of the educational system; teacher education and training. Exploring the gap, aims of the research and the significance of the research were also discussed. The rationale of the research was pointed out followed by an overview of the thesis. Finally, the chapter was concluded with a summary. The next chapter explores the theoretical framework of the study which is AT and how it shapes my work.
Chapter 2: Theoretical framework

2.1 Introduction

In this chapter, the theoretical framework of the study which is AT is discussed. The following aspects are focused on: the history and background of AT, its generations, its principles, activity levels and how AT shapes my work. Pros and cons of AT are also discussed in this chapter followed by some comments on AT. As far as teacher education is concerned, it is a complex process because it takes place in two different settings which are the university and the school. In addition, student teachers learn from lecturers and practitioners as well, considering educational theory and practical expectations, possibilities and constraints as they develop their own understanding and practice. They also bring with them their values and experiences. In relation to teaching these are particularly firmly established because the student teachers were pupils at schools and experienced different educational settings. They also learned from different teachers at different stages. All these experiences contributed in shaping their views about teaching and learning, though they may be flawed as there are only limited opportunities to learn about all aspects of a teacher’s work from the position of a pupil in that teacher’s class. As Lunenberg and Willemse (2006) point out, people construct their own knowledge on the basis of their experiences. These experiences can reinforce their learning in the teacher education programme. On the other hand they can be a source of contradictions. Therefore, AT is a useful framework to capture this complexity. It explores and analyses the complex relationships and interactions between different elements that are necessary for effective teacher education. As Kuutti (1996) asserts “Activity Theory and the concept of activity seem to be particularly suitable and rich to be used as the starting point in studying contextually embedded interactions” (p.37).

2.2 An overview of AT

Humans, in any community, practice different activities which are oriented towards certain objects. Ryder (2007) defines activity as “the engagement of a subject toward a certain goal or objective” (p.2). Waite (2005) points out that “AT illustrates how actions and processes are divided and shaped by the larger community that is involved
in accomplishing a specific activity” (p.1). Kuutti (1996) defines AT as “a philosophical and cross-disciplinary framework for studying different forms of human practices as development processes,” (p.25). AT is not a methodology (Jonassen & Rohrer-Murphy, 1999) but a theoretical framework for analysing and understanding human activities at both individual and social levels, taking into consideration the context in which the activities are carried out. AT with literature on teacher education is used to shape my overall plans, my research questions and methodology, because the assumptions of AT are consistent with those of constructivism (Jonassen & Rohrer-Murphy, 1999). For example, one of the main principles of AT is multi-voicedness which is consistent with the epistemology of this study which is constructivism, because the researcher takes into account the different perspectives of the different participants.

2.2.1 History, background and generations

AT is a cultural-historical descriptive framework used to analyse human activities. AT was developed by Russian psychologists Vygotsky and others in the beginning of 1920s (Engeström & Minettinen, 1999). All AT is grounded on the idea from Vygotsky (1978) that all human activities are mediated by tools. Vygotsky’s work introduced the first generation of AT modelled as a simple triangular structure of subject – tools – object. Figure 2.1 illustrates this basic AT framework.

![Figure 2.1. Basic AT representation (Issroff & Scanlon, 2002, p.78).](image)

The subject is the actor of the activity. The subject brings his or her personal history to the activity system. For example, he or she brings values such as “teaching is a moral job”. In addition, he or she brings their experiences such as who is a good teacher and what good teaching means.
The subject uses tools to transform the object into an outcome. Tools, either psychological or material, are the mediating artefacts that used by the subject to achieve the outcome. Kozulin (1998) asserts that both material tools and psychological tools are social and artificial formations. However, material tools are aimed at controlling the processes in nature, whereas psychological tools control the natural behavioral and cognitive processes of the individual. Unlike material tools which are externally oriented, psychological tools can be internally directed transforming the inner, natural psychological processes into higher mental function. Externally psychological tools are symbolic artefacts such as language, formulae and graphic devices. It could be argued that psychological tools can develop material tools. Bedny & Harris (2005) assert that

When a subject is able to perform mental actions on images, concepts, propositions, and other sign systems, those sign systems become internal psychological tools for action. The ability to use signs as tools is essential for the practical application of knowledge (p140).

Therefore, one consequence of this discussion of tools is that, in order to understand the activity system of teacher education, we need to understand the internal and external activities of student teachers, changes in them and the ways in which ideas are used in dialogue with others.

“The object refers to the “raw material” or “problem space” at which the activity is directed and which is molded and transformed into outcomes with the help of physical and symbolic, external and internal mediating instruments, including both tools and signs” (Roth & Tobin, 2002, p. 113). The object is explored and modified by the subject. The object can be tangible or intangible. Examples of intangible objects are: signs, concepts, and images. Behind the object there is a need or motive or desire to which the activity always answers (Rodriguez, 1998). Bedny & Harris (2005) draw the attention of researchers working with AT not to confuse between the objective which is related to the goal of activity and the object which is modified and explored by a subject according to the goal of activity. Therefore, different subjects may be working towards the same objective but have different objects, motives and needs.

Vygotsky’s work was continued by others. Rajkumar (2006) maintains that Sergey Rubinstein was the first who conceptualized the idea of human action as a unit of psychological analysis. Later Alexey Leontiev, who was one of the disciples of
Vygotsky developed the conceptual framework known as AT. Rajkumar (2006) adds that “Since then Activity Theory became a leading theoretical approach in Russian psychology leading to many studies being carried out that used this approach” (p.1).

Leontiev (1978) emphasises that the works of Vygotsky and to some extent Rubinstein contributed to greater understanding of the meaning of Marxism. This was made clear by Bedny et al. (2000) that:

Marx’ historical materialism played a fundamental role in Vygotsky’s thinking. Marx stated that historical changes in society and material life produce changes in human consciousness and behaviour. Labour and the use of tools modify not only nature, the object of the labour, but man, the agent of the change. Vygotsky, therefore, introduced not only the notion of tools, but the notion of signs to explain the origins of consciousness and cognition in general (p.169).

Important though it was, the first generation of AT was strongly criticised by a group of researchers and scholars (Kuutti, 1996 and Issroff & Scanlon, 2002). Issroff & Scanlon (2002) state that: “the activity theory represented in Fig. 1 cannot deal with the relations between an individual and his or her environment in an activity” (p.78). This point is made clear by Kuutti (1996). He states that: “this structure is too simple to fulfil the needs of a consideration of the systemic relations between an individual and his or her environment in an activity, however, and thus a third main component, community (those who share the same object), has to be added” (p.27). It could be argued that from the above mentioned criticisms that the first generation of AT overlooked the role of the community.

Based on the work of the first generation of AT, Engeström developed a new model for analysing the human activities including the component of the community which was neglected earlier. This is because the subject influences and is influenced by his or her society and this is not explicit in Vygotsky’s model. The new triangular structure proposed by Engeström (2001) suggests that all human activities should be analysed and understood in the context in which they are carried out. Engeström’s model in Figure 2.2 clarifies the relationships between the key elements of human activity system that have an influence on human activity. Engeström et al. (1999) argue that it takes the object-oriented, tool-mediated collective activity system as its unit of analysis, thus bridging the gap between the individual subject and the societal structure. This represents the second generation of AT (Figure 2.2).
In AT the unit of analysis is an activity. The components of activity system as shown in Figure 2.2 include: subject, tools, object, rules, community, division of labour, and outcome. Yamagata-Lynch & Haudenschild (2006) provide definitions of rules, community, and division of labour. They view rules as regulators of the subject’s participation while taking part in an activity. The community is the group of people or the institution of which the subjects are part. The division of labour is the participatory roles and the responsibilities in the activity determined by the community. These elements of activity system are interrelated with one another. The rules regulate the activity. Each member of the community has roles and responsibilities to carry out. All these elements of the activity system work together to achieve the desired outcome. This was made clear by Barab et al. (2002) that:

The components of activity systems are not static components existing in isolation from each other but are dynamic and continuously interact with the other components through which they define the activity system as a whole. From an activity theory perspective, an examination of any phenomenon (e.g., learning in the classroom) must consider the dynamics among all these components (p.79).

Waite (2005) comments on Engeström’s model of AT (Figure 2.2) that it “shows the relationship between the subject or individual, the object and the community, as well as how rules, tools, and the division of labour are used in the transformation of the object into the desired outcome” (p.4). Young (2001) adds that “Yrjo Engeström’s research over the last decade has revitalised learning theory and taken it far beyond

*:The place of mediating artefacts in Figure 2.2 is unusual. It is a misprint as it appeared in the original source. It should be at the top of the triangle with tools and signs.
the narrow confines of behaviourism and cognitivism with their focus on the individual learner in isolation from any context in which learning might take place” (p.157). Although the second generation of AT highlighted the important role played by the community in understanding the activity system, it faces real challenges to deal with the interactions with more than one activity system with a common object. As asserted by Engeström (2001) “when activity theory went international, questions of diversity and dialogue between different traditions or perspectives became increasingly serious challenges. It is these challenges that the third generation of activity theory must deal with” (p.135).

Engeström (2001) adds that: “the third generation of activity theory needs to develop conceptual tools to understand dialogue, multiple perspectives, and networks of interacting activity systems” (p.135). Figure 2.3 represents the third generation of AT.

![Figure 2.3: Two interacting activity systems as minimal model for the third generation of activity theory (Engeström, 2001, p.136).](image)

The third generation of AT deals with minimally two interacting activity systems. For example the university and the school. Learning occurs within and across the boundaries among the different activity systems (Engeström et al, 1995). Engeström (2001) points out that the object of activity is moving and not reducible to conscious short-term goals. The object moves from an initial state of raw material (object 1) to a collectively meaningful object constructed by the activity system (object 2), and to a commonly constructed object (object 3). To clarify this, the researcher in this study gives an example of university-school partnership activity system within teacher education in the KSA context. The university wants student teachers to be good
teachers, the school wants them to be good teachers as well (object 1). This means in the school that student teachers need to follow rules and get the pupils learning well…etc. While in the university it means that student teachers need to be reflective, critical, aware of theories, and understanding a range of alternatives (objects 2).

In most cases, there is a great clash in the middle. For example, how do student teachers while working in this system carry out some things which the school system does not recognize? How does university system value these things carried out by student teachers? This leads to a need to understand deeply the nature of the partnership between university and school with a common object which is teacher education. The problem space (object 3) is concerned with making sure that student teachers have enough support and opportunity to learn about teaching through the partnership between school and university in teacher education. Therefore, to reveal the contradictions between these different activity systems, both administrative and academic sub-systems in the school and the university which have a direct impact on the student teachers’ education have to be taken into consideration. In addition, there may be opportunities for new thinking and actions arising out of the synergies and contradictions among those different activity systems.

2.2.2 The basic principles of AT

AT is a set of basic principles that constitute a general framework, rather than a highly predictive theory (Kaptelinin & Nardi, 1997). Engeström (2001) identified the basic principles of AT as follows:

According to the first principle the activity system is the basic unit of analysis. By generating actions and operations activity systems realize and reproduce themselves. It is important to investigate the activity undertaken if we want to understand the activity system and what are the things to be done to develop the activity.

The second principle is concerned with the multi-voicedness of the community of the activity systems. The division of labour in an activity results in different roles for the participants. The participants bring their own history and the activity system itself has multiple layers and strands of history engraved in its tools, rules and conventions. The
multi-voicedness is various in networks of interacting activity systems. It is a source of trouble and a source of innovation requiring actions of translation and negotiation.

*The third principle* is historicity. Activity systems take shape and get transformed over time. The history plays an important role in understanding the problems and potentials of the activity system. History itself needs to be understood as local history of the activity and its objects, and as history of the theoretical ideas and artefacts that have constructed the activity.

According to *The fourth principle* contradictions are vital sources of change and development. “Contradictions are not the same as problems or conflicts. Contradictions are historically accumulating structural tensions within and between activity systems. The primary contradiction pervades all elements of our activity systems” (Engeström, 2001, p.137). Activities are open systems. When an activity system borrows a new element from the outside (for example, a new technology or a new object), it often result in an aggravated secondary contradiction where some old element (for example, the rules or the division of labour) contradicts with the new one. Such contradictions generate distraction and clashes, but also opportunities for creative attempts to change the activity.

*The fifth principle* claims the potentiality of expansive transformations in activity systems. Activity systems move through relatively long cycles of qualitative transformations. As the contradictions are aggravated, some individual members begin to question and deviate from its norms. In some cases, this increases into collaborative insight and an intentional collective change effort. “An expansive transformation is accomplished when the object and motive of the activity are reconceptualised to embrace a radically wider horizon of possibilities than in the previous mode of the activity” (Engeström, 2001, p.137).

These principles are integrative and not isolated from each other. They constitute the AT system as a whole. As Kaptelinin (1996) put it, “these principles are not isolated ideas. They are closely interrelated; the nature of activity theory is manifested in this set of principles taken as an integrated whole” (p.3).
2.2.3 Activity levels

The activity performed by individual or group of people is directed towards a specific object. The transformation of the object into an outcome does not happen in one step, but needs several processes. Therefore, any activity consists of sets of actions and operations. Actions are oriented towards short-term objectives, whereas operations are directed towards long-term goals. Any activity is determined by a goal and motives. Actions, before being applied in reality, should be well planned. Under certain conditions, conscious actions are transformed into operations. As Kuutti (1996) points out that: “Before action is performed in the real world, it is typically planned in the consciousness using a model. The better the model the more successful the action” (p.31). He adds that: “when the corresponding model is good enough and the action has been practiced long enough…the action will be collapsed into an operation, which is much more fluent” (p.31). For example, the activity of teaching students how to write: in this activity, students want to learn about writing (motive). Therefore, they do some actions such as writing letters individually and then in combination until they manage to write a sentence or a paragraph (actions). Consequently these conscious actions under certain conditions such as plenty of practice are transformed into operations by which students can write skilfully (goal). The hierarchical levels of an activity are represented in figure 2.4.

![Diagram of Activity Levels](image)

**Figure 2.4:** Basic "Structure" and terms used with regard to Human Activity (Leontiev, 1981).

From this figure it could be argued that the elements of the activity levels are not rigid but dynamic and interactive with one another. Therefore, human activities always change and develop. As long as actions and operations are part of the activity, they also change and develop as well. Kuutti (1996) emphasises this point by arguing that:
Activities are always changing and developing. Development is taking place at all levels; new operations are formed from previous actions as participants’ skills increase; correspondingly, at the level of actions the scope of new actions is enlarging, and totally new actions are being invented, experimented with, and adapted as responses to new situations or possibilities encountered in the process of transforming the object (p.33).

In the light of above, the teacher education activity system is defined by a goal and a motive. Student teachers practice different conscious actions which in turn are transformed into operations under certain conditions.

2.2.4 How does AT shape my work?

In the last two decades, there is a growing concern in the western world about using AT as a theoretical framework in analysing human activities in different fields especially in Europe and the United States of America. For example in education (Engeström,1986; 2001); human-computer interaction research (Nardi,1996; Kuutti, 1996; Bodker,1996); cognition and communication at work (Engeström & Middleton,1998); designing constructivist learning environments (Jonassen & Rohrer-Murphy,1999); identifying contradictions and tensions that shape developments in educational settings (Yamagata-Lynch & Haudenschild, 2006; Yamagata-Lynch & Smaldino,2007); information systems (Crawford & Hasan, 2006).

Given the exploratory nature of this study, it discusses how the use of Engeström’s activity theory system helps in analysing different activity systems with a common object which is teacher education. The purpose of this study is to conduct a qualitative investigation to analyse administrative and academic activity systems in university-school partnership in teacher education and explore the contradictions among those different activity systems. What the researcher is trying to find out is how those different activity systems work to support student teachers’ learning and what contradictions are inherent in student teachers’ learning from the perspectives of all stakeholders (The partnership coordinators, university tutors, student teachers, cooperating teachers and head teachers). It mainly focuses on how administrative and academic activity systems work in the university, school and school-university partnership to support student teachers’ learning. To understand the interaction among those different activity systems, the key elements that have an influence on human
activities have to be identified and understood within the Saudi context. Liu (2004) asserts that: “From AT perspective, learning activities cannot be fully understood without understanding the social or institutional context for learning” (p.606). Figure 2.5 gives an example from AT perspective of how each one of those activity systems can be analysed and classified into the following way:

**Figure 2.5:** University-school partnership activity systems within teacher education programme.

In Figure 2.5, the subject in the university activity system is student teachers, partnership coordinators and university tutors that engaged in the teacher education programme. The potentially shared object is teacher education. The tools that help are both administrative such as time and funding and academic such as lectures and discussion. The rules include administrative and academic rules. The partnership community includes partnership coordinators, university tutors, student teachers, and support staff. The division of labour is the responsibilities and roles determined by the community such as supervision.

In the same figure, the subject in the school activity system is student teachers, head teachers and cooperating teachers. The potentially shared object is teacher education. The tools include administrative such as time and access to the school facilities and academic such as observation, discussion, and meeting. The rules include
administrative and academic rules. The community includes head teachers, cooperating teachers, parents, student teachers and pupils. The division of labour is the new responsibilities defined by the community such as supervision and assessment. By analysing the university-school partnership activity systems in Figure 2.5 it is clear that those different activity systems have a potentially shared object which is teacher education.

Furthermore, the study addresses the contradictions brought about by these different activity systems to the teacher education programme. These contradictions constitute the gap between the actual outcomes and intended outcomes of the teacher education programme. Contradictions could be seen as a source of development because the good teacher does not give up to obstacles but tries to find appropriate solutions. In addition, investigating these contradictions helps in solving them. This was made clear by Engeström (2001) that internal contradictions are considered as the driving force of change and development in activity systems.

Within these conditions, the contradictions among administrative and academic activity systems in university-school partnership in teacher education in the Saudi context need to be explored. Therefore, the researcher seeks an analytical tool that enables him discuss three main issues: first, the complex relationships and interactions between those different activity systems. Second, the contradictions among them. Third, the analytical tool must be consistent with the methodological assumptions of the study. AT provides an analytical tool for achieving all these tasks. This was made clear by Roth and Tobin (2002) that: “Activity theory has been used successfully to analyze successes, failures, and contradictions in complex situations without reductionist simplifications” (p.115). The researcher uses AT as a theoretical framework, as a lens to explore teacher education complex relationships and contradictions among those different activity systems within teacher education.

Although there is a common object between the two systems, some contradictions happen. This is due to the different rules, community, tools and expectations of each system. This was made clear by Alexander (1990) that “Partnership in teacher education involves encounters between different institutions, each with its own formal purposes, structures, roles and procedures, and each having its own unique and distinctive culture” (p.60). Kuutti (1996) maintains that “Contradictions manifest
themselves as problems, ruptures, breakdowns, clashes, etc. Activity theory sees contradictions as sources of development; real activities are practically always in the process of working through some of such contradictions” (p.34). Yamagata-Lynch & Haudenschild (2006) point out that “When analyzing the various sources of tension, Engeström identified four levels of inner contradictions” (p.8). Table 2.1 shows the four levels of contradictions.

**Table 2.1:** Engeström’s (1987) Four Levels of Inner Contradictions in Activity Theory Systems

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contradiction Level</th>
<th>Engeström’s Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level 1&lt;br&gt;Primary Contradiction</td>
<td>When activity participants encounter more than one value systems attached to an element within an activity that brings about conflict.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 2&lt;br&gt;Secondary Contradiction</td>
<td>When activity participants encounter a new element of an activity, and the process for assimilating the new element into the activity brings about conflict.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 3&lt;br&gt;Tertiary Contradiction</td>
<td>When activity participants face conflicting situations by adopting what is believed to be a newly advanced method for achieving the object.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 4&lt;br&gt;Quaternary Contradiction</td>
<td>When activity participants encounter changes to an activity that result in creating conflict with adjacent activities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
An example of primary contradictions between administrative and academic activity systems in the university is that staff members may need two hours to mark each assignment to give students an accurate and useful feedback about their work. However, administrators may say that students’ assignments should be marked in half an hour for each one for financial reasons. This may cause conflict between the administrative and academic activity systems and affect negatively on the teacher education activity system and consequently students.

Another example of primary contradictions between university activity system and school activity system is that student teachers at university learn theories about the ideal way to teach. They also learn at school. However, when they go to school they face challenges because the basic function of the school community is to help pupils, not student teachers, how to learn. For example, a teacher in a school may have a very clear way of controlling the pupils, making sure that they are well behaved and focused on the task. The teacher may say to the student teacher, “I want you to do this because I want you to keep the class well behaved and on task in the way that I do it”. A student teacher may say, “Well, I am trying to learn how to teach. I can see how you do it, but I would like to try something else and see how that works”. So the student teacher, in varying practice, might be following the ideal method of helping pupils achieve their goals. However, the community in the school is adhering to the current practice to keep things as they are. In addition, student teachers need resources to do their job. Here, important questions emerge. Do students have enough opportunity to access all the tools they need? When is the library open? And how long is it open? Is it open on the days they wish to use it, and is it clear to the student teachers which division of the library to use, so they can go to the right person to get a particular part of a job done?

Crawford and Hasan (2006) indicate that “A major reason for the use of Activity Theory … is that it provides a well developed framework for analysing the complex dynamics of the setting that are investigated” (p.53). Therefore, AT helps the researcher to understand how different things fit together; for example, administrative activity systems, academic activity systems; and the interaction between the two in both university and school from the perspectives of all stakeholders within the teacher education activity system. AT is a useful way of looking at the contradictions among
administrative and academic activity systems in university-school partnership. This is because it focuses on who is doing the activity, what kind of activity we are trying to produce, what are the tools available to help, what are the community or cultural expectations in a university and school and who is expected to do what and what are the rules regulating the activity system. Figure 2.6 shows an activity system analysis from AT perspective.

![Activity System Analysis Diagram](image)

**Figure 2.6:** An activity system analysis from AT perspective

It gives us a very broad picture in trying to understand how activity happens in a university and at school. To understand the contradictions among administrative and academic activity systems in university-school partnership in the teacher education activity system in the Faculty of Education at Umm Alqura University the third generation of AT is helpful in understanding how the university activity system and school activity system work together with a shared object which is teacher education.
2.2.5 Pros and cons of AT

In the light of above, the following pros and cons could be highlighted about using AT as a theoretical framework in analysing and understanding the contradictions among administrative and academic activity systems in the university-school partnership in teacher education. They are as follows:

- AT is a useful framework to analyse and understand administrative and academic activity systems in both the university and school within the teacher education activity system.

- It is a very important framework in exploring the complex relationships among the different elements of the activity system.

- It plays an important role in revealing the contradictions and tensions among administrative and academic activity systems in both the university and school and how these different activity systems bring about tensions to the teacher education activity system.

- AT takes into consideration the role of the community in determining the human activity and emphasises that all human activities have to be analysed and understood in the context in which they are carried out.

- From the perspective of AT, the components of the activity system are not rigid, but dynamic and interact with one another.

- AT is a useful way in understanding how different activity systems which have a shared object fit together such as administrative and academic activity systems in the university–school partnership in the teacher education programme.

- AT takes into consideration different perspectives of all stakeholders involved in the activity in a way that makes it possible to understand the activity from all its aspects.

The main criticism against AT is that it is a descriptive framework rather than highly predictive theory. Therefore, it does not produce solutions that can be applied in
reality. Waite (2005) adds another criticism of AT which is “AT does not provide an explanation for how communities identify an object that should be transformed, nor does it address how the community is able to determine that the object has been transformed just that these processes occur” (p.11).

2.2.6 Comments

Although AT is a descriptive framework, it is very useful because it takes the activity as a unit of analysis and concentrates on the complex relationships among the key elements of the human activity system taking into consideration the role of the community in which the activity takes place. As McMurtry, (2006) puts it “Cultural-historical activity theory views activity systems and the dialectical relationship between persons and societal wholes as the central and determining factor with regard to human learning and knowledge” (p.209).

The description of activity systems helps in revealing the complex relationships and tensions among them and consequently the development of the activity systems. In addition, AT concentrates on practice and uses a qualitative approach which gives more depth of data. As Zurita & Nussbaum (2007) maintain “Given that it is primarily a descriptive tool, AT is geared towards practice. It embodies a qualitative approach that offers a different lens for analysing a learning process and its outcome, focusing on the activities people are engaged in” (p.214). Jonassen & Rohrer-Murphy (1999) supported that: “Activity theory necessitates a qualitative approach to analysis” (p.68).

Due to the complexity of the teacher education process, AT helps in investigating and exploring the complex relationships, interactions, and contradictions among different activity systems engaged in the teacher education activity. In addition, AT emphasizes the sociocultural and historical nature of the learning setting (Nelson & Kim, 2001). Goodchild & Jaworski (2005) indicate that “casting contradictions and tensions in the role of sources for development provides access to areas of the project to which developmental effort needs to be made” (p.47). Therefore, using AT as a lens to explore participant perspectives of the contradictions among administrative and academic activity systems in university–school partnership in teacher education in the Saudi context is a very useful and rich framework. I am not interested in how the
partners work jointly to plan a lesson, to teach or to discuss that afterwards. The intellectual puzzle in my study is how the system works. The problem space in this activity is concerned with making sure that student teachers have enough support and opportunity to learn about teaching through the partnership between school and university in teacher education. Therefore, the literature review related to the key issues in the teacher education activity system, in the light of AT and its implications to the current study, is explored in the next chapter.
CHAPTER 3

Literature review

3.1 Introduction

In this chapter, the related literature is reviewed and some definitions are provided. Some administrative and academic issues facing the development of the teacher education programmes in the KSA are presented, and the interaction between them is pointed out. The partnership between school and university in teacher education is discussed. Key aspects of teacher education reform, particularly in the UK are outlined to make use of the experience of this developed country in reforming the teacher education programmes in the KSA. Therefore, considerable attention is paid to explore and discuss the Oxford internship scheme as a successful experience in reforming teacher education and the partnership between school and university in the UK context. This scheme is chosen for a variety of reasons. First, the scheme is so well documented (e.g. Benton, 1990; McIntyre, 1997). Second, Oxford University is an international university which has a prestigious reputation all over the world. In addition, the Department of Educational Studies has a long and rich experience in terms of teacher education and partnership with schools. The third reason as mentioned by Ellis (2008) is that, nationally, since 1992, government policy for PGCE (Postgraduate Certificate of Education) has required 24 out of the 36 week programme to be spent full-time in schools. At Oxford, this course pattern was introduced in the late 1980s as a result of intensive and innovative joint work with local schools, and therefore, Oxford University partnership is one based on professional negotiation rather than a more pragmatic response to government policy. Student teachers have been known - unusually for the UK- as ‘interns’. Fourthly, the scheme’s stability over many years ago would have allowed all partners time to familiarise themselves with roles, extending and developing their expertise (Burn, 2006). Reforming the teacher education programme needs to be analyzed and understood in the context in which it takes place. However, reviewing teacher education reform in developed countries such as the UK can provide useful experience for developing the teacher education programme at home. As Leavitt
(1992) asserts: “a study of issues and problems associated with teacher education in other countries can provide a good perspective on one’s own issues and problems” (p.viii). After reviewing the Oxford internship scheme, the recent developments in teacher education and the partnership between school and university are discussed. Finally, an overview of the reviewed literature and its contribution to the current study and in forming the research questions are presented.

3.2 Definitions

There are some concepts in this study that need to be defined. These are as follows:

3.2.1 Administrative issues

Administrative systems are clearly important and do much to enable university/school partnerships to operate smoothly. However, when considering ways to improve these partnerships it is helpful to focus on issues that arise in their administration. These are defined operationally as the problems caused by the administration system in the Faculty of Education and by the school administration system that hinder the development of the teacher education programme. These administrative problems are studied within the AT framework, which seeks to understand how different things interact and fit together, for example, the interaction between school and university administrative systems, and between administrative and academic systems.

3.2.2 Teacher education

Hallinan and Khmelkov (2001) define teacher education as “a series of educational experiences aimed at preparing entrants to the profession for successful teaching careers and at providing continuing education for those already engaged in teaching” (p.175). This definition highlights the importance of the partnership between school and university in terms of teacher education because the educational experiences required for preparing prospective teachers cannot be offered by the university alone without the school as an effective partner to provide student teachers with practical experience and opportunities to learn in the professional context of teaching. This emphasises the value of AT as a lens to explore the interaction between these different activity systems in the KSA context taking into consideration that this thesis in mainly focussing on pre-service teacher education.
3.2.3 Partnership between school and university

Bezzina (1999) defines partnership between school and university as “Collaborative relationships among educators in schools and those within the Faculty to promote educational renewal” (p. 2). AT is a very useful analytical tool in exploring the interaction and complex relationships between school and university in terms of teacher education in the KSA context.

3.3 Some administrative and academic issues in teacher education in the KSA

There are certain administrative and academic issues facing the development of teacher education in KSA. In this section, some major issues are focused on. These draw on evidence from educational research studies and my experience in this field.

3.3.1 Some administrative issues in teacher education in the KSA

3.3.1.1 Centralization

Centralization is one of the characterising features of the administrative educational system in KSA. Within a centralized structure, Eden (2001) asserts that: “Domination is maintained by control; this is related to influence and power, so whoever controls has the power and ability to influence” (p.97). Leavitt (1992) indicates that:

This basic issue of centralized versus decentralized control of teacher education is a burning problem fraught with political overtones, as reported in fourteen countries: the six Arab Gulf States, Australia, Brazil, Canada, China, England / Wales, Germany, Japan, and Nigeria (p. xii).

Centralization is considered a major problem facing the educational system in KSA in general and teacher education institutions in particular. It has many shortcomings, but is not a completely bad mechanism. In terms of teacher education and the partnership between school and university in the KSA, centralization is evident in a number of aspects. Firstly, funding is run centrally (the pros and cons of central funding will be discussed in the next section about funding). Secondly, any changes in the curriculum or the course structure must be endorsed first by the MOHE. Thirdly, staff members and students are not engaged in the decision-making process. Bokhari (1994) investigated the most important problems facing the academic departments at the
Umm Alqura and King Abdulaziz universities. He found that centralization in decision-making was a common problem in both institutions. Centralization was seen as problematic because it restricts the ability of individuals to initiate and share in decision-making. This was made clear by Alaqail (2005) that centralisation makes individuals resistant to change and innovation. The managerial problems could have an impact on the teacher education programme. Alkasneh (2001) studied participants’ perspectives of initial social studies teacher preparation in Jordan. The study found that there were managerial problems running through each component of the programme, both in the university and schools. Leadership roles and responsibilities were unclear, and the system seemed to be reliant on historical traditions and practice. He concludes that this lack of management either reflects a lack of vision or a lack of ability to implement the vision.

A point to be made here is that centralisation reinforces bureaucracy which restricts the ability of partners to carry out their roles flexibly. Due to the centralised structure which is common in the Saudi context, flexibility is not really used. Flexibility is highly important for the partnership between school and university to be successful. This is made clear by Directorate-General for Education and Culture (2007) that policy plays an essential part in establishing partnerships by intentional steering, while allowing some degree of freedom for both school and university to design the partnership between them according to their local conditions and needs.

Decentralization is suggested as a new structure of control. Eden (2001) points out that “The new structure enables the organization’s members to feel autonomous and unified; it gives the clients the feeling of response to their needs. It solves the double dilemma of control versus teachers’ autonomy and the need to incorporate the parents” (p.108). This shows that decentralization has many advantages that need to be made use of. These advantages of decentralization are seen as disadvantages of centralization. This justifies the need for the educational system in the KSA to depend less on centralization and to adopt an approach that encourages a decentralized structure. Judge (1992) asserts that teacher education should be confident and soundly based in established and autonomous institutions which will be able to resist successive changes in the political mood.
3.3.1.2 Funding

Education in the KSA is free at all levels as it is funded by the Saudi government. In higher education, students get a monthly financial reward once they join university. Alkhedair (1999) maintains that higher education is in need of the government funding, either partly or as a whole, for the following reasons:

- the high cost of higher education;
- the high demand for higher education;
- providing equal opportunities for all citizens to join higher education; and
- ensuring the quality of programmes.

Teacher education funding comes from the budget allocated to the MOHE. The schools have allocated budgets from the MOE to teach pupils. In terms of teacher education, the partnership between school and university requires sustained funding to operate to support student teachers’ learning and to help all partners to carry out their roles. It is made clear by Jubeh (1997) that there is an urgent need to recognise the responsibility and changed role of the whole school in teacher education and to provide resources to the preparation of all staff for this changed role. In addition, funding from central government is necessary if they wish schools to take great responsibility for teacher education. However, this could get lost when the funding of ITE is with one ministry and the funding of the schools is with another. Another related issue is that the KSA relies on petroleum as the major source of income. Therefore, funding of higher education is influenced by the country’s budget, which fluctuates according to the international price of oil. However, oil is a temporary source of income. Therefore, it would be wise for those who are responsible for administrating higher education in KSA to vary the sources of funding. This can be achieved through partnership with the private sector, encouraging investment in private universities, and accepting donations and gifts from associations and societies. These sources will contribute to increasing the income of the university, and consequently making resources available for developing teacher education programmes in KSA. For the partnership between university and school to be successful, there are some requirements that need to be met to avoid undesirable patterns of partnership. This is pointed out by Bullough & Kauchak (1997) that:
Unless sufficient resources can be freed to provide opportunities to support the extended conversation needed to create a shared agenda and unless there is a greater commitment to stabilizing participation, separatist partnership patterns will not only persist but predominate (p.231).

3.3.2 Some academic issues in teacher education in the KSA

3.3.2.1 Content of the pre-service teacher education programmes

Curriculum development and innovation in general, and the teacher education curriculum in particular, are problematic world-wide. Leavitt (1992) asserts that: “This curriculum issue is the single most frequently reported problem among the twenty-one countries” (p. xii). It is worth noting that the KSA is one of these twenty-one countries. Alaqail (2005) maintains that Saudi universities did not seek to develop their curricula. Development was restricted to little changes, which included the omission or addition of a topic or course. This did not make university curricula responsive to the demands of development, and the needs of society and the labour market. As far as the educational diploma is concerned, (see section 1.2.4.2) Alsaid (2005) assessed the educational preparation programme at Umm Alqura University in the KSA from the view of staff members and graduates. The study revealed that the teaching staff and the teachers agreed that the purposes of the educational preparation programme had been partly achieved. In addition, the educational and psychological courses provided by the programme were intensive.

It could be argued that student teachers learn to teach in the university and in the school and different kinds of knowledge are relevant to this learning. University is well placed to provide the research-based knowledge and the school is well placed to provide context specific knowledge. Both have a responsibility to help student teachers to link the two kinds of knowledge. However, student teachers have a demanding job to do in the school during the teaching practice experience. This is a part from the intensive course they take at the university. Therefore, it could be difficult for them to meet the requirements of both the school and the university. This in turn adds to the pressure they might be experiencing during the course which may affect their ability to learn about teaching. This was made clear by Jiffry & Alsolimani (2003). They explored the reasons for the decline in male and female students’ tendencies towards reading at Umm Alqura University in the KSA. The
study yielded that the reasons for the decline in male and female students’ reading were that the curricula were overloaded and the students’ academic work interfered with their personal lives. In addition, there was a negative effect of this decline: students’ inability to express themselves, to communicate with intellectuals and to face problems.

Leavitt (1992) justifies the problematic issues in the content of the teacher education programme by pointing out the extreme difficulty in reconciling the needs for theoretical knowledge and practical knowledge. McIntyre (1997) asserts that “The development of appropriate and viable ITE partnership curricula of consistently high quality continues to be the fundamental challenge towards which all other teacher education research should ultimately be directed” (p.7). He adds that “partnership curricula depend of course on their effective planning and implementation by many people working in complementary roles” (p.6).

3.3.2.2 Conceptualizing the link between theory and practice

During the last decades, the gap between theory and practice in teacher education has been widely discussed (Laursen, 2007; Orton, 1992). There is a close relationship between theory and practice. On the one hand, theory does not work in a vacuum; it needs to be implemented in reality. On the other hand, practice needs theory which provides it with principles and guidelines. As Brandes (1995) puts it: “theory informs practice and practice modifies theory” (p.213). It could be argued that this is not always the case. Applying educational theory into classroom practice is not easy and often challenging. This is made clear by Burn (2007). She asserts that “Critically important as such research-based, theoretical knowledge is, it is inevitably decontextualised and generalised, and cannot simply be ‘applied’ to offer solutions about how to act in particular situations”. (p.446).This is asserted by Laursen (2007) that: “Many student teachers experience problems about the relationship between ‘theory’ and ‘practice’ in teacher education and find ‘theories’ irrelevant to the development of teacher competences” (p.2). He adds that student teachers conceived that the lecturers at the university teach theories but do not care about how these theories should be linked to classroom practice and if they talk about ideas about practice, these ideas are too theoretical and far from the classroom practice.
Although some teachers consider theory irrelevant to classroom practice, it is indispensable for the work of teachers as asserted by Blaise (2006) that: “Preservice and beginning teachers are often told by more experienced teachers that theory does not matter. Yet, theory guides and shapes everything that teachers do in the classroom” (p.96). She explained this point of view that in the field of education, teachers use learning theories to explain how students learn. They consciously or not use learning theories and theories about knowledge to provide a suitable learning environment, plan lessons, communicate and interact with students and parents and assess students’ learning.

Furthermore, the practice of pre-service teacher education is based on what was learned in teacher education programme courses. This is indicated by Pedro (2005) that: “The pre-service teachers’ reflections were also based on educational theory that they had learned in their university courses as they progressed through the teacher preparation program” (p.59). This was made clear by Haggarty and Postlethwaite (2003) who found that theories, context and values were indeed important elements in the reflective process. However, there were interesting issues surrounding each of these elements. In terms of theory, teachers do not use formal theories only, but also use personal theories which were shaped by their previous personal experiences about learning and teaching. In relation to context, the inter-locking web of relationships, expectations and previous histories are part of the context. With regard to values, teachers’ values might mismatch with practice.

It could be argued that student teachers come to the teacher education programme with their values, personal experience, expectations and preconceptions about teaching, learning to teach and what makes a good teacher. These elements are very important as a part of teacher education and need to be explored and examined to reinforce the appropriate ones and modify the misconceptions. One line of research is on views of the ideal teacher and the reasons for becoming a teacher (Liu and Meng, 2009; Arnon and Reichel, 2007; and Younger et al, 2004).

Liu and Meng (2009), studied perceptions of teachers, students and parents of the characteristics of good teachers across China and the United States. The results revealed four main themes representing the characteristics of a good teacher. These
are: teacher ethics, professional skills, professional development and test scores. In terms of teachers’ ethics, a good teacher is described as responsible; fair in treating all students; caring for all students; maintaining good relationships with students, parents and peers; meeting individual differences; patient; having a sense of humour; considerate of students; strict with students; a good model for students; communicating with students and parents; respectful; controlling temper. With regard to professional skills, a good teacher is knowledgeable; has excellent teaching skills; designs lesson plans based on students’ actual levels; presents the lesson content in a logical sequence; uses flexible teaching methods; encourages student participation in class; offers timely praise for student progress; communicates well in class; applies the textbook appropriately to real life; demonstrates a clear and complete design of instruction; efficiently uses class time; creates active classroom atmosphere; arouses students’ learning interest and manages classroom well. As far as professional development is concerned, a good teacher keeps abreast of new content knowledge and pedagogy knowledge by continuing in-service learning and continues to improve their professional development. Regarding test scores, a good teacher focuses on students’ test scores and teaches in such a way that enables students to achieve good test scores.

In the Israeli context, Arnon and Reichel (2007) conducted a study on who is the ideal teacher. They attempted to find out the similarity and difference in perception of students of education regarding the qualities of a good teacher and of their own qualities as teachers. The findings indicate that there are two main categories that constitute perspectives of the ideal teacher. The first category is personal qualities which include general personal qualities such as having a sense of humour, being kind, calm, fair, optimistic, humane, stubborn and principled; empathy and attentiveness which include love of children and listening to them, flexibility, non discrimination, involving parents, sensitivity to children, forgiveness and openness; leadership qualities such as being authoritative, setting a personal example, able to cope with situations and having self-confidence and self-discipline; attitudes towards the profession such as being motivated, having an educational vision, caring, instilling values and being serious; having wide-ranging general knowledge and being well-versed in many subjects. The second category is knowledge of the subject taught as well as didactic knowledge. The study also revealed that both student teachers and
beginning teachers attributed great importance to personal qualities of the ideal teacher. However, there is a difference in their perspectives of the importance of knowledge. The beginning teachers gave great importance to knowledge and realised it as quality similar in importance to personal characteristics, whereas the student teachers, who had not started their teaching careers, gave less importance to knowledge as a characteristic of the good teacher.

The expectations of student teachers could play an important role in shaping their reasons for becoming teachers. In the UK context, Younger et al. (2004), explored student teachers reasons for becoming teachers and their preconceptions of what this will mean. In terms of the reasons for becoming a teacher, student teachers identified the following ones: love of subject, desire to share their own enthusiasm and pleasure in subject with others, previous positive experience about teaching, desire to work with children, career change, strong emotional commitment to teaching as a moral job and inspirational teachers. With regard to expectations about teachers, student teachers mentioned that they were influenced by experienced teachers at their placement schools because they were influential models. In addition, student teachers were influenced by their experienced colleagues. Student teachers also spoke about good teachers in terms of their personal characteristics such as confidence, social skills, commitment to pupil success, enthusiasm and their encouragement of pupils. In addition to the personal characteristics, student teachers viewed a good teacher in terms of having good classroom management skills, teaching well structured and prepared lessons and developing a good rapport with pupils. As far as learning to teach is concerned, student teachers learned about teaching in the university context. They view that it is the responsibility of subject studies lecturers to train them in how to teach their subject through sessions which presented practical guidance, strategies and resources, and different topics and types of lessons. They also learned by observing experienced teachers in the school context. They also learned by practicing teaching at schools. Regarding trainees’ views of themselves as trainee teachers, some student teachers identified strengths in their teaching skills such as good classroom management and ability to maintain pace and tension in a lesson. Others spoke about their confidence and grounding in relation to their subject matter. Some trainees spoke positively about how their previous experiences linked to teaching such as being a parent and experience gained in different educational institutions. In contrast, trainees
identified some personal weakness such as impatience, disorganization and lack of classroom presence, shyness, intolerance and sense of panic. Others were concerned that they lack the knowledge to be able to respond to pupils’ questions.

These characteristics of a good teacher are very important and need to be linked to classroom practice. This highlights the importance of the link between theory and practice. However, in teacher education programmes in the KSA, there is a wide gap between theories taught in courses and classroom practices. Alaqail (2005) claims that, due to the gap between the university curricula and classroom practice, students are not able to implement the theories they have learned in an effective way.

Perhaps this is partly because the teaching methods curriculum depends on rote learning. However, there may be deeper reason behind it because what is valued by university teachers is of a different nature from what is expected in school. The two communities have different expectations. University teachers expect students to be knowledgeable about theory. On the other hand, school teachers expect student teachers to be oriented towards classroom practice because what matters for them is what works. Therefore, the expectations of the two communities clash. This could be a productive clash but only if it is acknowledged and managed as a learning opportunity rather than simply left as a clash for student teachers to deal with in whatever way they can. What AT can do is to provide a framework for the interaction of these different expectations and show how they can be bridged.

3.3.2.3 Teacher education research

It is obvious that teacher education programmes in the world context in general, and in the KSA in particular, suffer from several problems including the above-mentioned ones. As far as the teacher education and the partnership between school and university in KSA are concerned, it has been pointed out that these problems are in urgent need of real solutions. These should be based on systematic research, the results of which will be beneficial for the development of teacher education and the partnership between school and university, as well as the learning and teaching processes. McIntyre (1997) points out that: “it is important that programmes of initial teacher education should be planned in the light of good research-based understandings of the nature of teaching” (p.4). He adds that: “It is only through
research and evaluation studies, however, that one can discover whether or not any particular conception of school-university partnership does in practice offer clear shared understandings, and whether or not it is both viable and effective in achieving its purposes” (p.5). Tobin and Roth (2002) highlight the need for research to be conducted to deepen the understanding of the partnership between school and university in terms of teacher education. They state that: “Despite the persistence of the problems in teacher education, there is a lack of research that attempts to understand the situation in ways that retain the complexity of learning to teach in schools, and to enact practices that lead to positive change” (p.109).

It is paradoxical that research in teacher education in the KSA suffers from several problems. Alaqail (2005) maintains that expansion in higher education in the KSA has resulted in a lack of research in universities. He further explains that this is due to the following reasons:

- the fact that the university’s staff members are busy teaching to large numbers of students and consequently have insufficient time to conduct research;
- the lack of experience in conducting research;
- the lack of funding for conducting research; and
- the bureaucracy surrounding the attainment of research scholarships.

To conclude, this shows that a starting point in overcoming the problems facing the development of the teacher education programme in the KSA is to solve the problems of research about teacher education. This, in turn, will contribute to solving the other problems in a systematic way.

3.3.3 Interaction between administrative and academic issues

The success of an institution in achieving its aims is an indicator of its successful administration and vice versa. In educational institutions in general, and teacher education institutions in particular, administration is not isolated from the academic process. It intervenes, either directly or indirectly, in a way that leads to success or to administrative problems that result in academic problems. The following example will clarify the nature of the interaction between administrative and academic problems. The entire dependence of the university on governmental funding, and the neglect of
other sources of funding, reinforces centralization, which limits the independence of the university. Some administrative problems, such as the lack of funding, result in academic problems such as the following:

- ineffective teaching methods resulting from the lack of learning resources;
- the inability to attract distinguished staff members;
- the lack of educational research; and
- the lack of effective partnership between school and university in terms of teacher education.

As far as the partnership between school and university in teacher education is concerned, the new activity system requires well defined roles, familiarizing all partners with their roles, providing all the requirements of the partnership and training all partners to be able to carry out their roles. To achieve this, there is a need for effective administration to facilitate and support the academic process.

3.4 University and school partnership in teacher education

To contribute to the development of teacher education, and consequently to the development of the teaching and learning processes in schools, different aspects of the partnership between the universities and schools need to be highlighted. This was the case a long time ago. Hewett (1971) asserts that “In recent years there has been growing concern over the relationship between schools and colleges” (p.102). There are many advantages of the partnership between the university and school. Fullan & Hargreaves (1992) maintain that:

First, the university can offer help with specialist content in curriculum areas where staff have a particular expertise. ...Second, the partners can use the combined skills available to them to offer schools, or groups of schools, support with the crucial task of understanding their own progress and achievements. ...Third, the university and the school board together can provide a secure environment for justifiable educational experiment in which both new and experienced teachers can feel supported in trying out new ideas; they will need explicitly to signal their readiness to protect a climate in which educationally justifiable risk-making is valued more highly than never trying anything different (p.207).

The Directorate-General for Education and Culture (2007) in Europe outlined the benefits of partnership for all partners including the school, initial teacher institutions,
student teachers and the system of partnership. As for the school, it is directly involved in the initial education of new teachers; in-service professional development of staff within the school; increasing school’s capacity for innovation and knowledge generation through support from university staff and through student teachers’ development and research activities and the feedback of the outcomes of educational research into the reality of the professional development within schools. In terms of teacher education institutions, the partnership offers opportunities to link the curriculum of teacher education more closely to the complex reality within the school; to provide student teachers with a realistic learning environment and to get realistic and relevant research questions and assignments for interns. Regarding student teachers, involvement in the reality of schools helps them to reduce the practice shock; get a more realistic view of the profession and its demands and engagement in a wider variety of activities, better reflecting the breadth of the profession. Concerning the system as a whole, partnership can play a role in moving towards a more coherent and integrated approach to teacher education that relates initial education to training and continuous professional development and creates strong bonds between innovation, professional development and research.

Although these benefits are ideal and could result in real improvement of teacher education programmes, achieving them is not an easy task. This could raise academic and administrative difficulties. This is evident in many educational research studies which highlighted the benefits, challenging and contradictions in the partnership between school and university in teachers education (Callahan and Martin, 2007; Yamagata-Lynch and Haudenschild, 2006; Brady, 2002; Cheng, 2005; Bullough and Draper, 2004; Ni Aingleis 2008; Edwards and Mutton, 2007). Although the student teachers’ learning through the partnership between school and university in teacher education is the focus of this study, some studies which focused on the partnership between school and university in terms of in-service teachers’ professional development were reviewed. Reviewing these studies could be justified for the following reason. When in-service teachers attend professional development programmes in the university, they could get many benefits such as having access to the most up-to-date knowledge, interacting with university tutors in a way that could bridge the gap between their different perspectives about teaching and learning to teach and learning about new theories could help in-service teachers bridge the gap.
between theory and classroom practice. It could be argued that the benefits that in-service teachers could gain through engaging in the professional development programmes in the university could be reflected on the student teachers when they go to practice and learn about teaching in the school through the teaching practice experience. This is because the cooperating teachers work with student teachers in the schools to help them to learn about teaching and to make use of their experience. The awareness of experienced teachers of the up-to-date knowledge about teaching could help student teachers in their learning about teaching in the school. This could reduce the tensions between what student teachers want to do in their practice classroom influenced by their university course and what cooperating teachers expect them to do. In addition, this could support the professional development of cooperating teachers when they discuss up-to-date knowledge with their student teachers.

In the American context, Callahan and Martin (2007), using a comparative case study approach, explored two university–school partnership case studies, and proposed a framework for investigating and evaluating partnerships as learning systems. The study revealed the following findings: first, the university partner appeared to be functioning as a provider of educational services to client schools interested in paying a fee. Any school that chose to pay an annual fee could send up to three individuals to periodic training conferences that occurred throughout the year. Second, there were a wide variety of learning activities. These included conferences, continuing education seminars, and graduate degree cohort programmes. As a result, school district teachers benefited from the most up-to-date research on topics of the greatest information to the school district. Third, there was a need for a system to share the knowledge deeply within each organization. For example, the initiative had a limited process for sharing information beyond the workshop participants and after the actual date of the workshop.

In the same context, Yamagata-Lynch and Haudenschild (2006) examined the contradictions and tensions in teacher professional development. The study revealed that there was misalignment between the objects of teachers and that of school-university professional development activities. This misalignment inevitably created four types of contradictions which are primary, secondary, tertiary and quaternary. The primary contradiction indicates that teachers, schools and university do not share
a common value system on how to spend time and money on professional development activities. The secondary contradiction is that schools and university do not take into consideration responsibilities introduced to teachers from continuing and intensive professional development programmes that bring difficulty to meet other daily teaching responsibilities in the school. The tertiary contradiction denotes that new methods for teaching provided in the professional development programme are not necessarily suitable for daily classroom practice. The quaternary contradiction indicates that one area of change to teachers’ daily classroom practice affects other activities in the classroom and requires more change.

As far as student teachers’ learning is concerned, the partnership between school and university in teacher education is fraught with challenges, contradictions as well as benefits. Brady (2002) examined school-university partnerships from the perspectives of schools’ principals in Australia. The study showed that there is strong support for quite a number of partnership initiatives in the development of student teachers’ learning, pupils’ learning and the professional development of university tutors and teachers. Support is evident for supervision and mentoring, collaborative teaching initiatives, joint research, professional development, shared planning and school support. It is evident that schools are ready to adopt partnership initiatives. However, there is a real challenge which is the overwhelming responsibilities expected to be carried out by teachers. It would be very challenging to use the new strategies without enough time and rewards. In addition, the same challenge is experienced by the university tutors. Cheng (2005), using a sociocultural view of learning, studied teacher professional development during the field experience period in Hong Kong. The findings of the study revealed that there were a set of opportunities for professional development for both student teachers and supporting teachers. In terms of the professional development of the student teachers, it involved being psychologically prepared to be a teacher, understanding the role of a teacher, developing a feeling of responsibility, modifying teaching strategies, reflecting and improving their own teaching practice and constructing the knowledge of teaching. Student teachers also gained some support from the supporting teachers such as providing advice about teaching, classroom management and information on pupils’ learning needs, modelling, providing emotional support, providing knowledge about school context and sharing teaching experiences. With regard to supporting teachers’
professional development, two main aspects were identified. These were: updating knowledge of teaching approaches and reflecting on teaching methods adopted.

Bullough and Draper (2004) described the negotiation of power and position in the relationship between school mentor, university mathematics supervisor and student teacher in the United States of America. The study showed that the student teacher views herself as confused, frustrated and stuck between the contradictory demands of her university tutor and cooperating teacher. She considered the university tutor as a knowledgeable person who is aware of theory, but that this theory is not closely relevant to her classroom practice. On the other hand, she considered the cooperating teacher as not informed about how to teach but who has the authority to evaluate her success by giving her good marks. Therefore, she adjusted her practice to conform to the expectations of her cooperating teacher. The university tutor viewed himself as an expert based on his research and reading, and as an educator imposing his expectations upon the cooperating teacher and the student teacher. He considered the job of the cooperating teacher as simply to allow the student teacher to put theory into classroom practice with as little interference as possible. The university tutor’s goal was to infuse the recent knowledge in teacher education into the practice of the mathematics teachers in the school. The interns were charged to carry out this heavy task. However, when the university tutor’s goal was not achieved and his ideas were not recognised by the cooperating teacher and the school administration he lost hope and gave up. He attributed his failure to the resistance to change on the part of the school. The cooperating teacher felt that her primary job is to focus on pupils’ learning not on student teachers’ learning. Finally, the cooperating teacher’s role was to validate the student teacher as a teacher in terms of her conformity to the thinking and practice of the school. The cooperating teacher positioned the student teacher as ineffective when she tried to follow the advice of the university tutor. It is clear that this example is very extreme but not unusual story as mentioned by the authors. Obviously, this indicates that there are several contradictions inherent in the partnership between school and university in terms of teacher education. These contradictions could increase when the partners are not keen on the success of the partnership. Although the willingness to take part in the partnership is very important, it is not enough for the partnership to be successful and fruitful. What is more important is the awareness of all partners of their role and responsibilities towards
each others. Another more important point to be made here is that the significant role of the administration in both different institutions is to bridge the gap among different views of the partners by providing the required tools and training for the partnership to be successful.

Another study on the partnership between school and university in terms of student teachers’ learning was conducted by Ni Aingleis (2008) who explored the development of the partnership in learning to teach in Ireland. The findings indicate that schools want a systematic role in the student teachers’ learning during the teaching practice experience. Schools also do not wish to be responsible alone for the evaluation of student teachers. They consider the Faculty of Education to be expert in all matters relating to student teachers’ professional development including evaluation. The school mentors concentrate on the curriculum coverage, classroom management and pupils’ progress. However, encouraging student teachers to reflect upon their practice was less obvious in classroom mentoring. In contrast, student teachers were able to observe teaching and be observed by mentors in the school and consequently this helped them learn about teaching. However, less able and less flexible students did not benefit from mentoring where their emphasis was on completing the course.

In the same field, Edwards and Mutton (2007) examined professional learning through the partnership between school and university in teacher education in the UK. The study revealed that many of the schools were working with more than one higher education institution. The rationale behind that was that for trainees to gain mutual support from each other, and to ensure that student teachers could benefit the teaching of several curriculum areas. Furthermore, accepting a reasonable number of student teachers meant that initial teacher education could be part of school context. However, there were some contradictions in this partnership. A primary contradiction was evident in the lack of sufficient time and resource to work with student teachers. A tertiary contradiction can happen when student teachers need to use new methods that do not fit with classroom practice or when the higher education institution proposes a change in a partnership arrangement. The study also yielded that there was not enough commitment to one higher education institution when more than one was engaging with school, and co-ordinators sometimes ignored the meeting held by the university.
Some schools remained convinced that working with more than one higher education institution would make the teaching practice experience more complicated.

It could be argued that there is no doubt that the partnership between school and university in teacher education is very beneficial for all partners. However, achieving such partnership is not without challenges. It requires an effective partnership between the two different activity systems with clear vision and division of labour among partners. As McIntyre (1997) points out, “For such partnership to be effective, it is probably necessary for there to be a clearly specified, persuasively justified and mutually agreed division of labour between the two partners and also shared understandings about how their contributions should be inter-related” (p.5). In the next section the Oxford internship scheme as an excellent example of the partnership between school and university in the UK context is explored.

3.5 Oxford internship scheme

In this section, the Oxford internship scheme, its definition and its development (Pendry, 1994) the ideas and principles which informed the planning of the scheme (McIntyre, 1990), and its model and practice (Pendry, 1994) are reviewed. Being conducted in the UK context, which is different from the KSA context, the main aspects of the Oxford internship scheme are summarised and paraphrased as mentioned or formulated originally by the above mentioned authors. However, some comments on these aspects are made taking into consideration the context in which the Oxford internship scheme has been implemented. Problems, comments, and opportunities offered by the scheme are discussed in this section. In addition, lessons to be learned from the Oxford internship scheme which could be implemented in the Saudi context are dealt with. Finally, a conclusion about the scheme and its future is given. It is worth noting that I am describing the original planning and that things could change to keep up with the government requirements.

3.5.1 The development of the internship scheme

The Oxford internship scheme is a partnership between the University of Oxford represented in the Department of Educational Studies and its partner schools for students joining the PGCE programme. The beginning of the scheme was preceded by
years of planning involving both school teachers and university tutors, taking into consideration evidence from educational research studies. The planning for internship began in the mid 1970s, and the detailed planning took place from 1985 to 1987. The appointment of Harry Judge as the director of Oxford University Department of Educational Studies in 1973 was vital because his leadership led to the partnership between schools and university to which all student teachers were attached for their teaching practice experience. In 1985, Harry Judge made and presented a formal proposal to head teachers and LEA representatives for adopting a new model for the partnership between the school and university. Twelve teachers were seconded from the LEA to work with the university tutors to develop the new model. By 1986, the development group had been identified. The principles of the scheme were formulated by Donald McIntyre whose role as a reader was central to the scheme. However, the conception of teacher education was still unclear due to the subjective meanings of change which were not taken enough into consideration.

The development group began its work to explore different aspects of the programme through action research. During the planning of the scheme, tensions became increasingly clear in the meetings between the development group and university tutors from the Department of the Educational Studies. Moreover, the involvement of school teachers in the meetings made them more problematic. There was little opportunity for them to discuss their own ideas. This is in addition to the discomfort of the university tutors to hear their work being criticised by school teachers. However, these difficulties did not derail the planning and, at the end of the planning stage, when the participating schools were invited to an open evening the response was overwhelming. In July 1987, a weekend conference was held and all schools invited were represented with the aim of informing, inducting and starting the new scheme.

3.5.2 Ideas and principles guiding the scheme

The planning of the Oxford internship scheme was informed by goals of the teacher education programme, endemic problems of teacher education which needed to be solved, and principles guiding the scheme (McIntyre, 1990, pp17-32). A detailed account of each of the above mentioned categories is described as follows.
3.5.2.1 Goals to be achieved in the teacher education programme

By the end of the PGCE interns are expected to achieve the following goals:

1- to master management skills and subject matter teaching strategies;

2- to have a critical understanding of curriculum organisations and pedagogical knowledge related to their subjects to be justified in the approaches or strategies they adopt;

3- to acknowledge the opportunities and problems of achieving social justice in their teaching taking into consideration different aspects among pupils,

4- to adjust competently to different dimensions of being a teacher which expand beyond the boundaries of their own subject area(s);

5- to be able to relate educational theories to classroom practice and be aware of tensions between school and university;

6- to be capable of understanding student characteristics and the individual differences among pupils and relate these to classroom practice;

7- to have developed a critical understanding of practising teaching habits;

8- to have developed their own criteria for self evaluation; and

9- to be able to critically examine and make decisions about different areas of their teaching.

It could be argued that these goals of the teacher education programme are integrated with one another. If these goals are achieved, the gap between theory and practice could be bridged. This gap is always a source of tension and contradiction in initial teacher education (McIntyre, 1995). However, there is no guarantee that these goals will be achieved completely. There are some problems and challenges that constitute obstacles to achieve them.
3.5.2.2 Problems to be solved in teacher education programmes

Among endemic problems in teacher education in general and in PGCE programmes in particular (McIntyre, 1990) are the following:

- Prospective teachers are marginal people in schools because they lack status, authority and situational knowledge needed to feel like real teachers. They spend, at most, a term in one school. Much of this time is devoted to learning about the pupils, the rules of the school, the classroom in which they are placed and the resources available. This knowledge is important for all teachers. However, student teachers take much longer than experienced teacher to learn it. By the time they have done so, there is not much time left for practicing teaching in a way that makes adequate use of such knowledge. Another problem is that pupils make so much noise in a way that makes the task of teaching practice difficult for student teachers. In addition, cooperating teachers are often unwilling to have well-established plans to help prospective teachers try out their own ideas about teaching. A related problem is the personal feeling of frustration and incompetence that student teachers often feel that postpones the acquisition of appropriate skills which they will need when they become full time teachers.

- Educational theories are often considered by the cooperating teachers as largely irrelevant to the tasks facing student teachers in the classroom. This results in a wide gap between educational theories taught at the school of education and practice at the school.

- There is often lack of opportunities for student teachers to practice educational theories in the school context while teaching and learning during their teaching practice. Such opportunities will in most cases rely upon resolving the mismatch between the thinking of university tutors and the practice of experienced teachers.

- Little value is given to the observation of experienced teachers. This results in little learning from such observation. Student teachers’ observation of experienced teachers during the field experience tend to be focused at the early stages of their school experience, when their own understanding of the
teaching process is so narrow that they do not know what to note or ask questions about. Student teachers and their supervising teachers tend to move to the real task of learning to teach from experience. Therefore, little knowledge of teaching from experienced teachers is passed on to the student teachers.

- Student teachers are not given enough support to criticise the range of practice they observe in schools. Despite the fact that student teachers may learn little from experienced teachers about teaching, they may be influenced by different patterns of teaching that are used by experienced teachers. The collaboration of cooperating teachers is something to be grateful for by university tutors and needs to be sustained diplomatically which makes critical perspectives difficult.

- There is a big variation in the quality of cooperating teachers’ diagnostic assessment of student teachers’ teaching. This is because being a good teacher does not mean that he / she will be necessarily skilled at assessing the teaching of student teachers or skilled at knowing how to address issues that are identified.

- University tutors’ visits to the school are often seen mainly as occasions for examining student teachers’ competence, and not for guidance and support.

- Prospective teachers often learn to meet different perspectives and criteria of experienced teachers at schools and university tutors with different performance for different audiences. University tutors are concerned with research evidence, educational theory and social values embodied in different practices whereas cooperating teachers are concerned with the value of different practices taking into consideration political, resources, expertise, and time constraints. This imposes different demands upon student teachers in their work.

- In contrast to their learning about teaching in the university which is based on scholarly reflection, student teachers learn about teaching in the school by trial and error. Much of the university-based work in teacher preparation
programmes has not been directly focusing on the act of teaching and therefore has not been useful in school context. On the other hand, student teachers’ learning in the school frequently consists of giving classes to gain experience. This results in many problems such as encouraging student teachers to seek oversimplified ways of carrying up the tasks. This in turn discourages analytic reflection of student teachers not only now but in their future teaching.

- Graduate student teachers, subject tutors and cooperating teachers all are inclined to be mainly concerned about subject teaching at the expense of cross-curricular concerns such as multicultural education, equal opportunities, special needs and information technology which may be neglected.

- Student teachers bring with them to the PGCE programme not only their reasons for joining the programme but also their own individual agendas about what being a teacher involves. However, this is problematic for teacher educators in two ways. On one hand, teacher educators have responsibility to make sure that student teachers develop skills, attitudes and understandings necessary for teaching which may be different from the agendas brought by the student teachers. On the other hand, these agendas are not explicitly articulated by student teachers and consequently not accessible to their teacher educators. In order to avoid the tensions between student teachers’ agendas and teacher educators’ responsibilities, teacher education programmes should take into consideration the different agendas of student teachers.

It could be argued that these endemic problems of teacher education are serious and could lead to disastrous consequences in teacher education if not solved. In addition, it is important to emphasize that these endemic problems of teacher education are just symptoms of greater contradictions among different activity systems of teacher education. Furthermore, the majority of these endemic problems are not restricted to the UK context but face teacher education programmes all over the world including the KSA context. This clearly calls for an effective partnership between school and university in terms of teacher education to solve these problems and contradictions according to well formulated principles guiding the partnership between the two different activity systems.
3.5.2.3 Principles of the scheme

The main principles of the scheme may be summarised as follows:

1- interns are concentrated in particular schools in order to raise the profile of initial teacher education in these schools, and to make it a valuable task for the teachers involved;

2- prolonged engagement of the student teachers as interns in the schools, so that they can become settled, with practical knowledge of pupils, teachers, tools, norms and ethics of the schools, and have more of the status of beginning school teachers;

3- collaborative partnership between university and school staff in planning the teacher education programme, with agreement on issues of concern, their ordering, and the related tasks to be carried out by staff and interns in school and university;

4- integration of different elements of the teacher education programme. In effect there is one coherent programme, with closely interconnected elements in school and university. As a result there are clear and explicit relationships between school and university;

5- safe learning environments for student teachers, with learning activities being carefully graduated in a flexible way so that interns are not burdened by the complexity of the tasks;

6- encouraging student teachers to use ideas from different sources including their own personal histories and background as well as university and school sources to inform their thinking and practices;

7- explicit statement, by interns, university tutors and school staff that there is no consensus about many dimensions of good practice or useful ways of thinking;

8- concentrating on examining all ideas according to various criteria of learning about teaching;

9- dividing the work according to clear principles:
a. assistance and advice of any kind are welcome from any part;

b. university staff are particularly responsible for assistance with generalised, de-contextualised ideas and criteria, and school staff are particularly responsible for assistance with contextualised school-related ideas and criteria;

c. assessment of interns’ teaching performance is a shared responsibility by school staff in cooperating with university staff; and

d. wherever an activity could be a shared responsibility to be undertaken by university or school staff, it is the responsibilities of university staff to carry it out;

10- the existence of two main stages of initial teacher preparation: the first is concerned with the development of student teachers’ classroom competence, conceived according to agreed upon professional criteria and the second is concerned with the development of their abilities in conceptualising their professional aspirations as teachers in evaluating their teaching; and

11- Studying issues of schooling in their context, so that issues of school policy and of school community relations are concentrated on.

These principles of the Oxford internship scheme are not isolated from one another but integrated with one another. They do not only guide the scheme but also are embedded in practice. Therefore, they have to be well presented to and understood by all partners to make sure that they shape practice.

3.5.3 The internship model in practice

At the beginning of this section, I would like to draw the attention again that I am describing the original planning of the scheme and that things may change to keep up with the government requirements. In the academic year of 1993-4, there were 250 student teachers distributed to thirty schools as partner schools. Student teachers of the same subject worked in pairs in the attached schools. In each school, there were normally four sets of pairs. The involvement of schools is re-negotiated annually and schools need to meet the requirements of the partnership scheme. The period of the
teaching practice experience in the Oxford partnership scheme extends from the end of September until May. For the purpose of orientation, student teachers spend two weeks in a primary and then secondary school near their home before they start their PGCE course at Oxford. Once they start their programme, they spend thirteen weeks split between schools and university. Student teachers spend two days a week in their internship school and three days in the university. This period is known as joint (J) weeks. Student teachers are full-time in schools from the end of January until May half-term. This period is called school (S) weeks. During this period they visit the university occasionally. At summer half-term, student teachers leave their internship schools and join alternative second-school experience for four weeks.

From the previous structure, it is clear that the teaching practice experience offered through the scheme is extensive including four stages during the PGCE course. These stages are: the orientation stage, the J-weeks stage, the S-weeks stage, and the second school stage. The orientation stage gives student teachers the opportunity to be familiar with the school system and teaching process. During the second stage (J) weeks, student teachers have the opportunity to learn about teaching and educational theories and how to link theory to classroom practice. Furthermore, student teachers can discuss any problems, challenges and contradictions facing them in the school and reflect upon them with their university lecturers. The third stage (S) weeks is a real opportunity for student teachers to practice teaching and learn about it from experience. The fourth stage gives further experience in which student teachers join a second school. This widens their horizons about different school contexts.

During the year, there are two paths to the intern’s programme: the general programme which is concerned with whole-school and cross-curricular issues, and the curricular programme which focuses on subject-specific or curriculum work. Whereas the university general tutor and school professional tutor share the responsibility for the general programme, the university curriculum tutor and school mentor are responsible for the curriculum programme (Full definitions of what is meant by each one of these positions are mentioned at the beginning of the thesis). The roles and responsibilities within the scheme are fully elaborated in the mentor and professional tutor handbook (Hagger, Burn, and McIntyre, 1993).
The professional tutor works with general tutor in the school to coordinate all activities related to internship in his / her school and together they participate in planning, organising and monitoring of the general programme. The mentor’s role includes administering the school-based programme for the pair of student teachers, working with them side by side, observing their teaching and providing them with appropriate feedback on it, giving student teachers an access to his / her craft knowledge, and helping them develop self-evaluation skills critically. An important role played by the mentor is to assess the competence of the student teachers according to the criteria agreed upon and identified by the scheme. This requires mentors to develop their skills as teacher educators which is possible through the training programme offered by the university. The curriculum tutor’s role is concerned with leading a team of mentors in designing and evaluating the programme for all student teachers in one subject area, organising the placements of student teachers in schools, chairing sessions in the university, helping student teachers and mentors in schools and working with mentors in assessing student teachers’ work. Together, they design, evaluate and make decisions of the programme. The general tutor works with the professional tutor in the school and works also with a group of student teachers in the university through leading seminars and workshops in the common programme. It is worth noting that these different roles and responsibilities are integrated with one another to achieve the principles of the scheme.

3.5.3.1 The general programme

The general programme focuses on areas which are concerned with whole-school, cross-curricular issues. These issues are represented in three general themes within which several topics are included. The first theme is curriculum and assessment including topics on the National Curriculum and information technology as two examples. The second theme is the Structures of Schooling including topics on the role of the form tutor and the politics of schooling. The third theme is concerned with taking account of differences with topics on ability, gender, race and class. During J weeks, a common session is held in the university to discuss issues related to the general programme once a week. The weekly school-based session complements that held in the university and offers an opportunity for student teachers to reflect upon their teaching at the school and to relate it critically to the topic discussed in the
university. The assessment of student teachers in this programme is a shared responsibility between professional and general tutors focusing on qualities of educational thinking and general professional qualities.

3.5.3.2 The curriculum programme

In this programme, those who are concerned with each curriculum design their programme such as English, History, Mathematics and Science. Each curriculum programme is divided into a number of themes which are discussed throughout the year including such areas as lesson planning and classroom management. Work related to each theme in the curriculum programme is carried out both in the context of school and the university. An example of this is lesson planning. In the university context, they take into account the possible benefits and goals of planning and a set of conceptual models of the nature of planning specially those of experienced teachers. In the school context, student teachers design their lesson plans collaboratively with their mentors and teach with them in a protected environment and then evaluate the lessons with them to make use of their experience. Student teachers gradually become independent in planning and teaching the lessons. They are in the school not just to teach but to learn about teaching. During S and J weeks, curriculum tutors visit student teachers and their mentors. The aim of these visits is not to assess the interns’ work but to observe and discuss their lessons with them and with their mentors. Student teachers’ learning during the year is divided into two stages. The first stage is concerned with student teachers achieving teaching competence according to the predetermined criteria. The second stage emphasizes them developing the criteria on which they will be assessed as teachers and through self-evaluation they learn how to assess their own teaching.

3.5.4 Problems, comments and opportunities offered by the scheme

Reaching a strong and productive partnership between school and university in terms of teacher education is difficult but not impossible to achieve. This is because partners, when working together to achieve a common goal, cross boundaries and engage in a new activity system which needs a clear definition of goals, roles, rules and division of labour. In addition, both school and university undertake a lot of responsibilities.
For example, school is busy with getting pupils to learn in addition to surviving parental and LEA pressures to meet the highest levels of performance standards.

Being a new innovative scheme, it is not surprising that Oxford Internship Scheme faced many problems and criticisms during the planning and the implementation stages. It is not certain that the scheme will not face problems and challenges in the future. This is not only because of the complications involved in the teacher education process but also because of the complex development of student teachers’ thinking (Burn et al, 2003). This was made clear by McIntyre (1997) that given the magnitude of the problems, radical solutions were necessary; and the Oxford Scheme, both in its practical arrangements and in its principles of what was to be done, was indeed quite radical. However, this meant that the scheme was moving into a new territory. Even if the problems, the benefits, the strategies and skills that could be used most successfully in old system were understood, it was difficult to know how best to do things in our new system. Even if the problems of the old system were diagnosed correctly, that did not mean at all that effective solutions for these problems were necessarily identified. Even if the solutions suggested by the scheme were in principle appropriate, it had yet to be learned how difficult and complex the implementation of these solutions might be. It was possible that the organisational innovations offered by the scheme would themselves create new problems. Finally, even if some important problems in teacher education were successfully resolved, that would almost certainly mean that other important problems would now become more obvious. McIntyre adds that the new scheme was not seen, therefore, as providing a solution to all the problems of initial teacher education, but much more as a framework within which suggested solutions to some problems might be tried out and other unresolved problems could be identified and explained. The problems, comments and opportunities offered by the scheme could be seen from three main angles which are: the perspectives of the participants in the scheme, those who are concerned with the scheme and the evidence from educational research studies conducted by the development group. These are as follows:

Time

For the partnership between school and university in teacher education to be successful, enough time is needed for all partners to carry out their responsibilities.
The lack of time could constitute an obstacle to achieve the desired outcome. Linda Haggarty (1990), the math curriculum tutor, expressed her point of view in terms of the problems raised by the internship scheme. She asserted that the main and biggest problem is shortage of time. Mentors were allowed approximately one lesson each week for carrying out their role. In fact, many mentors have spent much more time than this in discussing ideas with student teachers and organising teaching programmes for them but this can not be acceptable. Student teachers are also short of time. In just the one year PGCE course, they need to meet a lot of requirements in both school and university. They need to read, reflect, learn and write assignments throughout the year and this can result in pressure upon them which can not be overlooked. This is made clear by Burn et al (2003) that: “The PGCE year-or, more accurately, 36 weeks-provides a very compressed and extremely demanding course of professional preparation” (p.327). There are also some problems Haggarty posed as questions. How can mentors and student teachers be convinced to be honest with each other? How can student teachers be persuaded to use a variety of criteria to help them conceptualize their own theories on each set of issues? How are other teachers and mentors engaged in the scheme? And how are they helped to understand the principles of the scheme?

It could be argued that sufficient time is required for all partners especially student teachers to cover the different aspects of professional development and make sure that they represent themselves and their work properly to express their identity (Ellis, 2008). Furthermore, “The student teachers should be encouraged to test all ideas they encounter against the diverse criteria valued in each context” (Burn, 2007, p.446). In addition, McIntyre and Hagger (1992) assert that a major concern is that student teachers should experience sufficient support and security so that they can explore issues and problems of classroom teaching with confidence and rationality. Support is given by mentors, by student teachers working together in pairs, by preparation in the university for teaching tasks in the schools, by clearly defined frameworks for diagnostic assessment, and by follow-up discussion in both school and university contexts. They add that the whole rationale of the internship scheme depends mainly on experienced teachers being able to conceptualize the knowledge they use in their teaching to share it with student teachers, and also being able to use that knowledge as a framework against which they can help student teachers test ideas they learn from
other sources. What remain clear is that, despite the move to school-based scheme of training, it was still difficult to sustain high levels of professional development across the full-time period of the PGCE course (Burn et al, 2003).

Theorising

Another issue to be discussed is the difficulty in linking theory to classroom practice. One of the main criticisms of the Oxford Internship Scheme was made by Paul Hirst (1990). His criticism was summarised and responded to by Donald McIntyre (1995). The first point made by Hirst is that student teachers should be provided with a consensual body of knowledge and principles about good professional practice by initial teacher education. Hirst’s second criticism is a lack of realism about an expectation that student teachers could learn from practical theorising. The third criticism is that the Oxford scheme rationale suffers from a lack of clarity about the kinds of theory involved in the scheme and the roles of the different groups of staff in related to the different kinds of theory.

McIntyre responded to the first point asserting that Hirst opposed the core idea of practical theorising that student teachers should question, and test diverse criteria, any ideas they learn or those they bring with them to the teacher education programme. What is at issue here is not the idea of consensus but where consensus is required in the teacher education programme. The rationale of Oxford Internship Scheme treats this by negotiating consensus among university and school staff. In terms of the second criticism, McIntyre mentioned that Hirst ignored two important issues which are student teachers’ preconceptions about teaching and learning to teach and that teacher education can modify these preconceptions through the experiences and knowledge it offers. A primary concern therefore is to encourage student teachers to articulate such preconceptions. The second issue is the opportunity offered by the scheme for analytical learning. Finally McIntyre responded to the third criticism that one of the most essential principles of the scheme is that experienced teachers have a wide body of professional knowledge related to initial teacher education not codified, but implied in their experience. He adds that there is a very clear distinction between kinds of theory in the rationale of the Oxford scheme, one which relates directly to the roles of tutors and of mentors. University tutors have the main responsibility for familiarising student teachers with, and helping them to understand, those general
theoretical concepts, formulations, arguments and claims, and the empirical research, which they judge to be related to the issues and practices which they have agreed with their school partners should be considered in the course. In addition to such relatively abstract and generalized knowledge, it is their duty to introduce student teachers at second hand to important practices and materials which they may not come across at first hand in their school. Mentors and professional tutors, in contrast, have crucial responsibility for making available to student teachers ideas which are embedded in their own and their colleagues’ practices, and which inform their school and departmental policies. Burn (2007) further supports McIntyre’s argument that: “The Oxford Scheme was originally premised on fundamental distinction between the different types of knowledge that could be offered to beginning teachers within an ITE partnership” (p. 446).

It could be argued that practical theorising is very important for student teachers to learn about teaching in school. This is on the one hand because experienced teachers have in depth experience about teaching and learning to teach. The most important thing is that experienced teachers should not only use their knowledge in teaching but reflect upon it to help student teachers to get access to their professional knowledge. On the other hand, student teachers experience different educational situations in school during the teaching practice experience and need to test their own ideas to respond to these situations making use of the cooperating teachers’ expertise.

Student teachers’ learning

The scheme was planned and implemented to support student teachers’ learning. Therefore, the development group has conducted many educational research studies within the Oxford internship scheme to reveal problems and challenges which faced the implementation of the scheme (e.g. Davies, 1997; Jubeh, 1997; Pendry, 1997; Haggarty, 1997). Davies investigated, through action research, the problems of achievement of shared understandings about initial teacher education between school and university. Two major findings were identified. First, student teachers were highly concerned to avoid conflicting situations with those who have power over their success on the course. Second, because of the lack of training, mentors in their new role as teacher educators view their role as mainly concerned with providing student teachers with practical guidance and support. Based on the previous findings, Davies
suggests that these obstacles are attributed to the lack of dialogue among mentors and student teachers on the one hand and mentors and university tutors on the other. The reasons for this lack of dialogue as suggested by the research are:

- a structural hostility or indifference on the part of cooperating teachers to the kind of theorising traditionally associated with university input into teacher training;

- a suspicion on the part of schools that the university’s encouragement of questions about the way English is taught in schools constituted a hidden attack on the schools’ practice and expertise; and

- the lack of time and opportunity on the part of mentors during busy and pressured school days to take part in philosophical debates.

In a case study of student teachers in one school, Jubeh (1997) explored student teachers’ learning and progress. The study revealed big variation in their experience of the role of the mentor and the curriculum tutor. In terms of mentors, there were mentors who were knowledgeable and able to help student teachers and provide them with guidance and a good feedback. There was the mentor who was ready to help, discuss and provide feedback but she was not knowledgeable enough to meet student teachers’ expectations about her role. There was the absent mentor who was not interested at all in student teachers’ learning. Regarding the curriculum tutor, for some student teachers the curriculum tutor had played an effective role in providing encouragement, critically appraising their classroom practice and pointing to alternative teaching strategies and resources. For others, the curriculum tutor visits were too few and their comments were too unspecific to have been of any particular use. Student teachers’ perceptions of their various university curriculum programmes were varied. For some, these programmes were seen as essential sources of new ideas and skills and as relating well to the realities of practice in the school.

In terms of student teachers’ learning about pedagogy, Pendry (1997) explored the pedagogical thinking and learning of History student teachers. The study revealed the richness of the ideas that student teachers bring with them to their teacher education programme. Based on the result of the study, Pendry implies the need to enable
student teachers to articulate and examine the ideas that they bring with them to initial teacher education.

Another aspect of student teachers’ learning in the school was learning about classroom management which is part of pedagogy. Haggarty (1997) studied readiness among student teachers for learning about classroom management issues. She found that classroom management issues are significant concerns for all interns at some stage of their learning. Interns come to the course either already concerned and expecting problems, or already concerned and not expecting problems themselves, or unconcerned.

Opportunities

Although faced with challenges, the scheme has been offering many opportunities. Howard Green (1990), head teacher of the Henry Box School, Witney, throughout the planning phase of Internship and during the first three years of the scheme’s operation asserts that his involvement with the Internship scheme at both institutional and LEA levels has been one of the most rewarding experiences in the 20 years of his professional life. He refers to some benefits the scheme has brought to the school staff. The first benefit for the school is that the school has become a real partner in the preparation of student teachers. Secondly, it has brought into the school context a group of young teachers with energy, enthusiasm and good ideas. Thirdly, the Internship scheme has provided a good opportunity for professional development for experienced teachers at school. This was made clear by McIntyre & Hagger (1992). They assert that one of the most important benefits of the scheme is facilitating the professional development of experienced teachers. He adds that the main aim of the scheme is to provide student teachers with a good opportunity to learn about teaching. It was not planned in order to reinforce the professional development of experienced teachers. The scheme is not therefore in any way trying to make a balance between the needs of student teachers and the needs of experienced teachers’ professional development.

As far as student teachers’ learning is concerned, they had the opportunity to learn about teaching through the collaborative teaching with their mentors. Burn (1997) examined the value of collaborative teaching between student teachers and mentors.
within the scheme. The study yielded various findings. Planning with mentors gives student teachers access to their practical knowledge. Taking responsibility for parts of a lesson helps student teachers to be familiar with real teaching while working in a protected environment. Through concentrating on specific parts to be taught by student teachers, this allows them to approach the task of teaching more rationally both while practicing teaching and in analysing it afterwards. However, learning through collaborative lessons is often too demanding as it requires careful planning to make use of the opportunities offered. Any fears of student teachers being hindered, or pupils being confused about who is responsible, can be removed by clarity between student teachers and mentors about their roles.

It could be argued that the Oxford Internship scheme has offered a lot of benefits for all partners. However, it is worth noting that the scheme was designed and planned for student teachers to learn about teaching through the partnership between school and university not for professional development for experienced teachers at school. This clearly shows that there are additional benefits brought about by the scheme which were not intended.

3.5.5 Lessons to be learned from the Oxford internship scheme and implemented in the Saudi context

Oxford must be congratulated and thanked not only for what they have achieved but for presenting this scheme (Hirst, 1990). Indeed, regards and appreciation to Oxford for introducing this unique scheme not only to the UK context but to the world context as well. As a researcher in this field, I find that there are many useful lessons to be learned and implemented in our own context in the KSA. First of all, the scheme is a move in the right direction towards effective and productive partnership between school and university in teacher education. It highlights the importance of this kind of partnership in reforming teacher education. This movement in this direction needs to be highlighted and given more attention in the Saudi context than hitherto. Second, secondment of practicing teachers from the LEA to work with university tutors to develop the new model is vital because of their rich experience which provides useful practical insights that complement the theoretical insights provided by university tutors. It is worth noting that the LEA played an important role in cooperating with the Department of Educational Studies by seconding those teachers to work full time
in the university. Third, meetings, seminars and workshops held among partners create common ground among them. Fourth, the partner schools are assessed annually. This gives the Department of Educational Studies the opportunity to decide upon the partner schools which meet the requirements of the partnership. Fifth, the orientation stage is very important for student teachers because it enables them to know more about the school context, for example, teachers, pupils, classrooms, facilities, administrative work and relationships among staff and pupils. In addition, they have the opportunity to learn about teaching from experienced teachers by observation and discussion. Furthermore, the orientation stage plays a key role in preparing student teachers psychologically for the teaching practice experience (Cheng, 2005). Moreover, this stage helps student teachers to reinforce or modify existing perceptions or construct new perceptions. These perceptions could enter another cycle of modification or reinforcement when student teachers join the PGCE course. Sixth, during the “S” weeks student teachers are full-time at school. This period has a lot of advantages as asserted by McIntyre & Hagger (1992); and Pendry (1994). One advantage of being full time in the practice school is to enable student teachers to develop complex situational knowledge from actual classroom practice. Another advantage is to get familiarity with the school context and to be part of the school fabric, not unwelcome visitors as they are usually looked at. Finally, there are two points to be made about assessment. The first one is that both school and university are partners in assessing student teachers. The second point is that the aim of the assessment process is not to catch mistakes or just to give the student teacher a mark but to support the student teacher to learn about teaching.

3.5.6 Concluding thoughts on the scheme

Both school and university have an important contribution to make to teacher education through the partnership between them. However, for the scheme to be continued and developed, there are three main issues that need to be taken into consideration. First of all, sustained funding is crucial for effective and productive partnerships between school and university in teacher education. This is made clear by Aubusson (2003) that: “Effective partnerships in teacher education is not a 'cheap' option. Sustained funding is essential to their success” (p.183). Funding is very important in supporting both school and university with appropriate resources for
student teachers’ learning. It is also important to allow all parties to fulfil their roles (Aubusson, 2003). However, there still remains an urgent need to increase the resources to the internship school because teachers may be less than willing to have their good will exploited (Green, 1990). Pendry (1994) asserts that “we have to take seriously the real financial and political context in which initial teacher education now operates” (p.79). Second, sustained training is very important for all partners to understand their roles and coordinate among each other through meetings and workshops. Moreover, the scheme expands and new partners will join the scheme in the future. These new partners need training to be informed about the scheme and expectations about their roles and to mix with their colleagues involved within the scheme. The third issue is sustained educational research. Teacher education and training is a complex process. Therefore, educational research is important to reveal potential problems and suggest appropriate solutions. To conclude, these three elements are not separated but integrated with one another. Funding is essential for both training and educational research and research will feed and develop training. Therefore, any lack of funding, educational research or training will affect negatively the partnership between school and university in terms of teacher education.

The perspective of AT gives other useful insights into The Oxford Internship scheme. Internship provides a clear example of how partnership between schools and a university can promote boundary crossing between the two different activity systems and produce expansive learning opportunities for student teachers as contradictions are revealed and explored in a constructive manner. Managing these expansive learning opportunities proved to be a significant challenge for interns, lecturers and mentors (Haggarty, 1990) which, in terms of AT might be understood in terms of each activity system bringing its own culture, concepts, expectations and objects to the task. These difficulties persisted even though the Oxford scheme was developed by negotiation involving all partners (lecturers at the university, mentors at schools, and administrators at university, LEA and schools). The development process included seconding teachers to do action research to develop parts of the model such as the approaches it took to mentoring. An essential factor which underpinned the development of the Oxford scheme was the administrative initiative of Harry Judge which promoted the development of effective and collaborative ITE partnership structures with schools, and the work of Donald McIntyre and others in the scheme.
who developed academic principles and procedures that were designed to be consistent with the emerging administrative structure and to exploit the opportunities that this structure afforded. Much of the subsequent writing about Internship has focused on these academic principles and procedures, but the administrative innovation was also central to the success of the Oxford Internship scheme. It was one of many examples of the administrative creativity of Dr Judge. As Phillips (2008) points out “A feature throughout Harry Judge’s work in education has been his desire to make things happen, to initiate processes which move things on, which make a difference” (p. 273).

3.6 Recent developments in teacher education and the partnership between school and university

According to the components of the teacher education programme, it is clear that the programme is implemented in two different educational activity systems which are the university and school. Both institutions have a potentially shared object which is teacher education. This is because, on the one hand, the school is keen to recruit qualified teaching staff. This, in turn, is reflected on the students’ performance. On the other hand, the university is keen to accept distinguished students to be qualified teachers in the future. This means that student teachers learn about teaching in two different contexts “with distinctive and sometimes conflicting missions, organizational structures, and cultures” (Bartholomew & Sandholtz, 2009, p. 156).

Teacher education becomes increasingly school-based (McIntyre, 1995; Hobson et al, 2009; Buitink, 2009). This is because student teachers’ learning about teaching is heavily situated (Edwards & Protheroe, 2003). Hodkinson and Hodkinson (2005) support this idea that:

> Teachers often learn through their own individual teaching activities. In particular they are constantly adjusting and modifying their practice, in response to actions, reactions, interactions and activities in the classroom, and in anticipation of approaching situations (p. 115).

They add that student teachers learn well about teaching when actively collaborating with more experienced teachers, both formally and informally. This has resulted in a new role for schools especially mentors in teacher education. As asserted by Edwards and Collison (1996):
Being a mentor, if it involves active mentoring, is clearly a new role which needs to be accommodated into the dynamics of a developing school. If it is not recognized by the school as an important new role and taken seriously as a part of the dynamics of the school, there is the danger that mentors will be desert-islanded with their students (p. 135).

In creating new roles, the idea of identity is often useful (Edwards & Collison, 1996). Both student teachers and their mentors have their knowledge and expectations about teaching and learning to teach (Haggarty & Postlethwaite, 2003). For student teachers, they need to examine all ideas they have learned in teacher education programme or which they brought with them based on their previous experience. This was made clear by Burn (2007) that: “the explicit emphasis on testing ideas out is intended to create a climate in which all ideas, from all sources, including the student teachers’ personal histories, will be subjected to critical scrutiny and careful evaluation” (p. 447). As for the cooperating teachers’ new role, their identity should “depends not merely on existing knowledge, but on the capacity to generate new professional knowledge; an identity which includes a role as learner, not merely one as an ‘expert’ teacher” (Burn, 2007, p. 445). “Mentoring, then, if taken seriously, is an additional function which has to be incorporated into the priorities and practices of school and needs to fit into existing patterns of relationships and responsibilities” (Edwards & Collison, 1996, p.135).

Within the increasing role of school in teacher education, “the question of whether and in what sense there is a useful place for theory in ITE remains a source of tension and confusion” (McIntyre, 1995, p. 365 ). The Oxford internship scheme gave an excellent example of linking theory to classroom practice. This was made clear by Edwards et al (2002) that:

Although the purpose of the school-based training was to enable the interns to acquire professional knowledge, their acquisition of formally coded disciplinary theory was not neglected. The interrelationship between the two was made. Thus there is an appropriate consideration not just of professional knowledge but also of public theory and research (p.68).

Furlong et al (2000) described three models of partnership between school and university in teacher education. These are as follows:
Complementary partnership

The partnerships between school and university in teacher education are seen as having separate and complementary responsibilities without any systematic attempt to bring these two aspects into dialogue. In this kind of partnership, there is no integration in the course. The integration is the responsibility of the student teacher to achieve.

Collaborative partnership

The school and university provide different kinds of educational knowledge to the student teachers. Experienced teachers at the school have their distinguished body of situational knowledge from those in higher education. Student teachers are expected and encouraged to reflect upon what they have learned in the university and school. By doing so, they are expected to build up their own body of situational knowledge. For the model to succeed, experienced teachers and university tutors need opportunities and enough time to work and plan together regularly. This kind of collaboration is crucial for developing a teacher education programme that is integrated between the university and the school.

The HEI-led model of partnership

This kind of partnership between school and university is led by those in higher education. It also makes use of some experienced teachers working as consultants. The aim is to make use of schools as a resource in providing learning opportunities for student teachers. Course leaders have a number of aims (often established as a number of competences) to be achieved and this requires that school work in similar ways and provide available comparable opportunities for all student teachers. Within this idealized model, quality assurance- providing comparable training opportunities – is a high priority. The key features of each model are summarized in the following table:
Table 3.1: The key features of each type of the three models of the partnership between school and university in teacher education (adapted from Furlong et al., 2000, pp. 79, 81 and 118)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Complementary partnership</th>
<th>Collaborative partnership</th>
<th>HEI-led model of partnership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>broad planning of structure with agreed areas of responsibilities</td>
<td>emphasis on giving all tutors and teachers opportunities to work together in small group</td>
<td>HEI-led with at most some consultation of small group of teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HE visits to school</td>
<td>non or only for ‘troubleshooting’</td>
<td>collaborative to discuss professional issues together</td>
<td>strong emphasis on quality control; monitoring that school is delivering agreed learning opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Documentation</td>
<td>strongly emphasized, defining areas of responsibility</td>
<td>codifies emerging collaborative practice</td>
<td>strongly emphasized, defining tasks for schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content</td>
<td>separate knowledge domains, no opportunities for dialogue</td>
<td>school and HE recognize legitimacy and difference of each others’ contribution to an ongoing dialogue</td>
<td>HEI defines what students should learn in school, often utilizing an explicit competency framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentoring</td>
<td>mentoring comes from knowledge base of school</td>
<td>defined as giving students access to teachers’ professional knowledge – mentor ‘training’ as professional development, learning to articulate embedded knowledge</td>
<td>mentors trained to deliver the competences the course defines as necessary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment</td>
<td>school responsible for teaching assessment</td>
<td>collaborative, based on triangulation</td>
<td>HEI-led and defined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contractual relationship</td>
<td>legalistic, finance led with discrete areas of responsibility</td>
<td>negotiated, personal</td>
<td>directive with lists of tasks and relationship responsibilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legitimation</td>
<td>either principled commitment to role of school or pragmatic due to limited resources</td>
<td>commitment to value of collaboration in ITE</td>
<td>acceptance of HEI-defined principles of ITE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It could be argued that the Oxford internship scheme provided a good example of the collaborative model of partnership between school and university in teacher education. However, the collaborative model requires sustained funding and support to work effectively which the government is not always ready to provide. In addition, when the two different activity systems work with a potentially common object Engeström (2001) draws the attention of the possibility of expansive transformations in the activity system. This is because when partners work through the partnership activity system they cross boundaries and engage in a new activity system of systematic learning in which contradictions and opportunities could arise. Hodkinson & Hondkinson (2005) assert that:

[T]eacher learning is best improved through a strategy that increases learning opportunities, and enhances the likelihood that teacher will want to take up those opportunities. This can be done through the construction of more expansive learning environments for teachers (p. 109).

They used the concept of expansive and restrictive learning environments developed by Fuller and Unwine (2003) to examine secondary school teachers’ learning in workplace. This approach gives a very useful perspective on the context for learning, and a framework for the analysis of learning in the workplace (Hutchinson, 2008).

Figure 3.1: shows the continuum of expansive-restrictive learning environments for teachers (Hodkinson & Hodkinson, 2005, p. 124).
Figure 3.1: Continuum of expansive-restrictive learning environments for teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXPANSIVE</th>
<th>RESTRICTIVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Close collaborative working</td>
<td>Isolated, individualist working</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colleagues mutually supportive in enhancing teacher learning</td>
<td>Colleagues obstruct or do not support each other's learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An explicit focus on teacher learning, as a dimension of normal working practices</td>
<td>No explicit focus on teacher learning, except to meet crises or imposed initiatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supported opportunities for personal development that goes beyond school or government priorities</td>
<td>Teacher learning mainly strategic compliance with government or school agendas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out of school educational opportunities including time to stand back, reflect and think differently</td>
<td>Few out of school educational opportunities, only narrow, short training programmes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities to integrate off the job learning into everyday practice</td>
<td>No opportunity to integrate off the job learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities to participate in more than one working group</td>
<td>Work restricted to home departmental teams within one school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity to extend professional identity through boundary crossing into other departments, school activities, schools and beyond.</td>
<td>Opportunities for boundary crossing only come with a job change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support for local variation in ways of working and learning for teachers and work groups.</td>
<td>Standardised approaches to teacher learning are prescribed and imposed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers use a wide range of learning opportunities</td>
<td>Teachers use narrow range of learning approaches</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The continuum shows some academic obstacles (e.g. isolated, individualist working) and administrative obstacles (e.g. lack of funding and training) which hinder the expansive learning through the partnership between school and university in teacher education. It is this interaction between school and university and within each administrative and academic activity sub-systems that is the focus of the research.

3.7 Overview of the reviewed literature and stating the research questions

Many educational research studies in teacher education in general and the partnership between school and university in teacher education in particular were reviewed. The reviewed literature informed the study by emphasizing that achieving effective partnership between school and university in terms of training prospective teachers is a very challenging issue. Although it has been conducted in the UK context, the Oxford internship scheme gives a clear example of the challenges inherent in the
partnership between the two different institutions. The reviewed literature provided the appropriate theoretical framework which is AT, methodology and methods of data collection. In addition, it helped in formulating the research questions by looking for gaps in reviewed literature. My study is distinguished from previous literature because it takes into account different parts of the educational system that are important for effective teacher education. It concentrates on the partnership between school and university in teacher education and within each administrative and academic activity sub-systems to explore participant perspectives of how administrative and academic activity systems work in the university, school and university-school partnership to support student teachers’ learning and what contradictions are inherent in student teachers’ learning in the Saudi context. Based on the previous literature, my personal experience and discussion with supervisors and colleagues, the main questions of the research are:

- How do administrative and academic activity systems work in the university to support student teachers’ learning?
- How do administrative and academic activity systems work in the school to support student teachers’ learning?
- How does the partnership between the university and the school work to support student teachers’ learning?
- What are the contradictions inherent in student teachers’ learning?

The next chapter concentrates on the research design, including the case study methodology and methods of data collection and analysis in order to develop comprehensive responses with which to answer the research questions.
Chapter 4

Research design

4.1 Introduction

A well conceived research design helps to guide a researcher through the whole research process and involves formulating clear research questions, choosing appropriate methods for data collection and analysis and finally discussing the findings and drawing conclusions. Yin (2003) argues that every kind of empirical research work has an implicit, if not explicit, research design. He defines a research design in the most basic sense, as a logical sequence that links the collected data to initial research questions and, finally, to its conclusions. In this chapter, I focus on the research design of the study. The following aspects are addressed in detail: the research paradigm, ontological assumptions, epistemological assumptions, methodology, population and sampling strategy, methods of data collection, procedures of data collection, data analysis, and validity. Ethical issues are also discussed in this chapter.

4.2 Research paradigm

This research is conducted under the umbrella of the interpretive paradigm. MacNaughton et al. (2001) indicate that “Interpretivism seeks to explain how people make sense of their circumstances, that is, of the social world” (p.35). This paradigm is used because I believe that people’s perceptions of the issues will affect their approach to these issues. Radnor (2001) asserts that “interpretive educational research has explanatory power and can inspire through offering illuminating insights into human situations” (p.vii). To explore the issues within the interpretive paradigm, I obtained both qualitative and quantitative data through the use of questionnaires, interviews and documentary evidence about how administrative and academic activity systems in the university, school and school-university partnership work to support student teachers’ learning and the contradictions inherent in student teachers’ learning in the KSA context.
4.3 Ontological assumptions

Crotty (2003) defines ontology as “the study of being. It is concerned with ‘what is’, with the nature of existence, with the structure of reality as such” (p.10). By focussing on the different perspectives of the different participants, the ontology of this research is ‘multi-realism’ because it involves socially constructing the reality of how administrative and academic activity systems in the university, school and school-university partnership work to support student teachers’ learning and what contradictions are inherent in student teachers’ learning. These contradictions and the interaction among these different activity systems are socially constructed from the multiple perspectives of all participants. As Pring (2000) puts it:

Rather is reality ‘socially constructed’ and there are as many realities or ‘multiple realities’ as there are social constructions – which could be an enormous number. Research, therefore, is often focused upon people’s ‘perceptions of reality’ where one lot of perceptions is as good as another (p.60).

The reality of the nature of the partnership between school and university in teacher education is outside the mind of the researcher and needs to be explored and constructed from the multiple perspectives of multiple partners.

4.4 Epistemological assumptions

Wellington (2000) defines epistemology as “the study and validity of human knowledge” (p.196). The epistemology of this research is constructionism. In constructionism, Crotty (2003) argues that “meaning is not discovered, but constructed. In this understanding of knowledge, it is clear that different people may construct meaning in different ways” (p.9). Radnor (2001) asserts that: “I believe that it is a multiple socially constructed reality; in other words, everyone has their own view on what they perceive reality to be” (p.21). I aim to construct an understanding of how administrative and academic activity systems in the university, school and school-university partnership work to support student teachers’ learning and of the contradictions inherent in student teachers’ learning and the interaction among these different activity systems. This reality is socially constructed from the perspectives of the different partners because they may have different views which could affect their approach towards the partnership between school and university in teacher education.
Crotty (2003) adds that: “In this view of things, subject and object emerge as partners in the generation of meaning” (p.9). In order to take account of this the perspectives drawn from the participants through the methods of data collection were interpreted by the researcher and discussed with some participants.

4.5 Methodology

Ernest (1994) defines methodology as “a theory of which methods and techniques are appropriate and valid to use to generate and justify knowledge, given the epistemology” (p.21). Case study is adopted as the methodology of this study. Robson (2002) defines case study as:

A well-established research strategy where the focus is on a case (which is interpreted very widely to include the study of an individual person, a group, a setting, an organisation, etc.) in its own right, and taking its context into account. Typically involves multiple methods of data collection. Can include quantitative data, though qualitative data are almost invariably collected (p.178).

He further highlights some important points. Firstly, it is a strategy that is a stance or approach, rather than a method, such as observation or interview. Secondly, it concentrates on a phenomenon in context, typically in situations where the boundary between the phenomenon and its context is not obvious. Thirdly, it uses multiple methods of evidence or data collection. Yin (2003) summarised the main features of case study. He maintained that it copes with the technically unique situation in which there will be many more variables of interest than data points, and as a result, relies on multiple sources of evidence, with data requiring to converge in a triangulating fashion. In addition, it benefits from the previous development of theoretical propositions to guide data collection and analysis. Freebody (2003) asserts that: “The goal of a case study, in its most general form, is to put in place an inquiry in which both researchers and educators can reflect upon particular instances of educational practice” (p.81). Case study can be exploratory, descriptive, or explanatory (Yin, 2003).

Given the exploratory nature of this study, case study is relevant to the aims of this study because the research seeks to explore participant perspectives of how administrative and academic activity systems in the university, school and school-university partnership work to support student teachers’ learning and to reveal any
contradictions inherent in these systems. Furthermore, it seeks to study in depth the perspectives of different participants using various methods of data collection: questionnaire, interviews and documentary evidence. Case study can employ any mix of quantitative and qualitative evidence (Yin, 2003) to provide detailed information about the situation. In addition, case study is consistent with AT because it studies a particular case and explores the interactive processes within that case. Verma & Mallick (1999) point out that: “One of strengths of a case study is that it allows the researcher to focus on a specific instance or situation and to explore the various interactive processes at work within that situation” (p.114). This was made clear by Skinner (2010) who said that “Case study research… is valuable because of the insight it can provide into the processes occurring in a particular context” (p.290).

The case is the Faculty of Education at Umm Alqura University in the KSA, and its partner schools in a particular teacher education programme. Twelve partner secondary schools (6 male schools and 6 female schools) were chosen. The male schools were chosen by the partnership coordinator whereas the female schools were chosen by a supervisor in the LEA. The schools were chosen according to the following criteria:

- the schools had to be partner schools to which student teachers were allocated for teaching practice experience;
- the schools had to be cooperative in terms of the partnership between school and university because this encourages the school staff to participate in the study;
- the schools had to be located inside Makkah city to enable collection of the required data in the time period available.
- the number of student teachers in each school had to be two or more because this reflects on a large scale the interaction between student teachers and school staff and consequently shapes the participants’ perspectives.
4.5.1 Population and sampling

The participants in the current study were drawn from its population which consisted of partnership coordinators, university tutors, student teachers, cooperating teachers and head teachers. The total number of the whole sample with all sub-groups was 187 distributed as follows: partnership coordinators (n = 2), university tutors (n = 30), student teachers (n = 92), cooperating teachers (n = 51) and head teachers (n = 12). The participants were purposefully selected to take part in the study. Gorard (1999) distinguishes between a population and a sample as follows: “The group you wish to study is termed the ‘population’, and the group you actually involve in your research is the ‘sample’” (p.10).

Maximum variation sampling was used to select the participants to take part in the current study. Maykut and Morehouse (1994) assert that maximum variation sampling provides the qualitative researcher with a method by which the variability characteristic of random selection can be discussed, while acknowledging that the goal of a qualitative study is not generalizability. They add that the goal is not to construct a random sample, but rather to select individuals or settings that are thought to represent the range of experience on the phenomenon that is being focused on. The participants in this study varied in gender, subject of specialisation of student teachers, role and years of experience as shown in Tables 4.1 and 4.2.
Table 4.1: Distribution of the sample according to gender, role and years of experience for the whole sample except student teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage in relation to the whole sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender for the whole sample</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>50.3 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>49.7 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>100.0 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>role for all groups</td>
<td>Partnership coordinators</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.1 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University tutors</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>16.0 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Head teachers</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6.4 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cooperating teachers</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>27.3 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student teachers</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>49.2 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>100.0 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years of experience for all groups except student teachers</td>
<td>Less than 10 years</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5.9 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>From 10 - 20 years</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>25.7 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>More than 20 years</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>18.2 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>49.7 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.2: Distribution of the sample according to subject of specialisation of student teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage in relation to the sample of student teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subject of specialisation of student teachers</td>
<td>Geography</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.26 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16.30 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>History</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.34 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Information and media</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.08 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Biology</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7.60 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Islamic studies</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11.95 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Physics</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.34 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.26 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arabic language</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>29.34 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Libraries and information</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.17 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>English</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8.69 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Computer science</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7.60 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>100 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ten in-depth interviews were conducted with volunteer interviewees. These were the partnership coordinator, 4 student teachers, 2 university tutors, 2 cooperating teachers and a head teacher. More details about the procedures of administration of the questionnaire and conducting the interviews are given in section (4.8).

4.5.2 Generalization from case study

The results of this case study will not be generalised. However, in the Saudi context, there are some similarities between the institutions which run teacher education programmes. These similarities are as follows:

- All the Saudi universities are under the supervision of the MOHE and therefore are not completely independent in their decision making.
- The administrative organisational structure of Saudi universities is similar and based on centralization. Any problems due to centralization will have similar impacts on different universities.
- Staff members at all Saudi universities enjoy the same incentives and follow the same regulations. Consequently, they face similar problems.
- All schools are under the supervision of the LEA and are required to follow the same regulations.

Therefore, it could be argued that the results from this study may be transferable to similar cases in the Saudi context.

4.6 Methods of data collection

In this section detailed information about the methods of data collection is given. Questionnaires, interviews and documentary evidence were used as methods of collecting quantitative and qualitative data from the participants. These are discussed in terms of aims, design, content and type of documentary evidence. Questionnaires and interviews were designed according to the theoretical framework of the study (AT). Questionnaires were used to understand the range of views of the participants, but the main data collection tools were interviews.
4.6.1 Questionnaire

Questionnaires were used because “Such a survey could be designed as part of a case study and produce quantitative data as part of the case study evidence” (Yin, 2003, p.91). This survey was informed by some of the thinking that is part of the scientific paradigm. Yin (ibid) asserts that: “This type of survey would follow both the sampling procedures and the instruments used in regular surveys, and it would subsequently be analyzed in a similar manner” (p.91). Three versions of the questionnaire (one for student teachers, one for the partnership coordinators and university tutors, and one for head teachers and cooperating teachers) were constructed and used as methods of collecting data from the participants. Questionnaires were used because they are effective tools for collecting quantitative and qualitative data. Verma & Mallick (1999) assert that:

For post-graduate research students and for professional researchers alike, the questionnaire is often a vital tool in the collection of data. If it is well-constructed, it can provide data economically and in a form that lends itself perfectly to the purposes of the study (p. 117).

Moreover, it can be distributed and collected from a large sample size. In addition, the respondents fill it in without being under pressure because their confidentiality and anonymity are preserved. The aims of the questionnaires were as follows:

- to obtain quantitative and qualitative data from the perspectives of all stakeholders and consequently provide detailed information about each element of AT: subject; tools; object; community; rules and division of labour;
- to highlight specific issues which are investigated in more depth in the interviews.

The questionnaire was semi-structured because the research sought specific responses from the participants. Some closed questions used a five-point Likert scale. Other open questions gave the participants space to express their opinions more fully. Peterson (2000) asserts that: “The primary benefit of an open-end question is that its answers can provide extremely insightful information. Because study participants provide answers in their own words, no researcher bias is introduced by presenting or predetermining answers” (p.33). The questionnaires were designed to be self-completed by the respondents with very clear instructions given explaining how to
complete them. The questionnaires were designed attractively, using clear and simple language, and efforts were made to make them as brief as possible taking into consideration all AT elements to be covered. This encouraged the participants to respond to the questionnaires as evident by the overall response rate to the questionnaires which was 79%.

To achieve their aims, the questionnaires consisted of several dimensions. First of all, the researcher sought demographic information such as gender, specialisation for student teachers, role and years of experience. This demographic information was sought partly because it serves the sampling strategy adopted in this study which is maximum variation sampling and partly because it enables comparisons between the different groups of participants. In addition, to cover all elements of AT, the following dimensions were included:

- subject (expectations about a good teacher; history and background that have helped to shape participants’ views about what makes a good teacher; expectations about teaching and expectations about learning to teach);

- object (student teachers’ object for joining the teacher education programme at the university and the practical component at the school; university object for training student teachers and school object for training student teachers);

- tools (academic tools available to the student teachers in the university that help them learn about teaching; academic tools that the student teachers learnt to use in the university that help them teach pupils in school; administrative tools in the university that help the student teacher learn; academic tools available to the student teachers in the school that help them learn about teaching; academic tools that the student teachers learnt to use in the school that help them teach pupils and administrative tools in the school that help the student teacher learn);

- community (learning in the university; learning in the school and learning through the partnership between school and university);

- rules (routine and assessment); and
• division of labour (the cooperating teacher’s role; the university tutor’s role; the role of school administration and the role of teacher education programme administration).

4.6.2 Interviews

Making use of categories raised from the questionnaire, the interview was used as the main method of data collection. Three interview schedules (one for student teachers, one for the partnership coordinators and university tutors, and one for head teachers and cooperating teachers) were constructed. Janesick (1998) defines an interview as: “a meeting of two persons to exchange information and ideas through questions and responses, resulting in communication and joint construction of meaning about a particular topic” (p.30). The interviews aimed to probe the insights of the participants to obtain qualitative data and consequently build up a picture of the complex relationships and interactions among AT elements in school-university partnership in teacher education using the third generation of AT.

In terms of the design of the interviews, Robson (2002) distinguished between three types of interviews as follows:

• A fully structured interview has predefined questions with fixed wording, usually in a pre-established order. The use of mainly open-response questions is the only main difference from an interview – based survey questionnaire.

• A semi-structured interview has predefined questions, but the order can be changed based upon the interviewer’s perspectives of what seems most appropriate. Question wording can be modified and explanations given; specific questions which seem inappropriate with a particular interviewee can be omitted, or additional ones can be included.

• In unstructured interviews, the interviewer has a general area of interest and inquiry, but lets the conversation develop within this area. It can be completely informal.

Semi-structured in-depth interviews were conducted with volunteer interviewees. Flick (2006) asserts that semi-structured interviews have attracted attention and are
widely used. This attention is connected to the expectation that the interviewed subjects’ opinions are more likely to be expressed in an openly designed interview situation than in a structured interview or a questionnaire. Radnor (2001) adds that the semi-structured interview has a number of benefits. Firstly, it keeps the conversation smooth and the interviewer able to judge the appropriate time to ask the emergent questions in a way that is coherent with the style of the interview. Secondly, it ensures that similar information in the sense of the topics covered is collected in different interviews, thus achieving the research objectives. Thirdly, it allows the interviewee the opportunity to expand on what they see as a priority in their own situation. Semi-structured interviews were designed and implemented to collect data from the interviewees that it would not be possible to collect if structured or unstructured interviews had been used. The interviews consisted of several open-ended questions details of which are in appendices 4, 5 and 6.

4.6.3 Documentary evidence

In addition to the questionnaires and interviews, documentary evidence to collect qualitative data was also used. Yin (2003) asserts that: “Because of their overall value, documents play an explicit role in any data collection in doing case studies” (p.87). May (1993) adds that documents inform the practical and political decisions which individuals make on a short-term and longer-term basis and may even shape a particular understanding of past social or political events. Therefore, documents were obtained from the schools, university and LEA. The main aim of the documentary evidence was to obtain mainly qualitative data to inform the findings obtained from the questionnaires and interviews since Yin (2003) argues that for case studies, the most important use of documents is to support and reinforce evidence from other sources. Secondly, documents constitute the third angle of triangulation and this in turn can increase the validity of the data. Thirdly, they played an important role in constructing the questionnaires and interviews since, as argued by Briggs and Coleman (2007) documentary research provides the opportunity to devise and design their own methods of data collection and analysis.

Various documents were obtained from different sources. These were:
• The teaching placement schedule was collected from the office of the teaching practice in the Faculty of Education at Umm Alqura University and showed the beginning and the end of the teaching practice period.

• The Teaching Practice Manual was collected from the same office and provided detailed information about the teaching practice experience, its importance, its aims; the role of each partner and the student teacher assessment process.

• Actual attendance sheets were obtained from the school and showed the actual dates of arrival of the student teachers to the schools.

• LEA instructions were collected from the LEA and included guidance for the head teachers and cooperating teachers about the teaching practice experience.

• The Manual of the Faculty of Education at Umm Alqura University was obtained from the Faculty of Education at Umm Alqura University. This gave detailed information about the Faculty of Education, its history, departments, programmes and the training courses it offers.

4.6.4 The relationships between the data collection methods

Three different methods of data collection which are questionnaire, interview and documentary evidence were used. These methods are not isolated from each other. They are working together to answer the research questions of the study by providing both quantitative and qualitative data about how administrative and academic activity systems in the university, school and school-university partnership work to support student teachers’ learning and what contradictions are inherent in student teachers’ learning from the perspectives of all stakeholders. In addition, they are consistent with each other and with the theoretical framework of the study which is AT. Furthermore, they are consistent with the methodology of the study which is case study because a good case study requires as many sources of evidence as possible (Yin, 2003). Verma & Mallick (1999) indicate that:

In conducting a survey, the researcher will probably employ questionnaires and, probably, interviews. In this way, the results from one
form of data will help to inform and refine the other data, so that the conclusions drawn are meaningful, precise and representative (p.115).

They add that:

It is common for the two tools to be used in the same study: the questionnaire providing what are often called the ‘hard data’, and the interviews making it possible to explore in greater detail and in depth some particularly important aspects covered by the questionnaire (supplementary) or related topics which do not lend themselves to the questionnaire approach (complementary) (p.122).

The evidence obtained from the documents reinforces the findings obtained from both questionnaires and interviews. Figure 4.1 shows the relationships between the methods of data collection.

![Diagram showing relationships between data collection methods]

**Figure 4.1:** The relationships between the data collection methods
4.7 Translation of the questionnaires and interviews

The questionnaire and interview schedules in their various versions were translated from English into Arabic and reviewed by a specialist in the field of translation. I had to translate the questionnaires because they were distributed to the participants to respond to them in Arabic which is their native language. The interview schedules were also translated so that the questions were clear both to the researcher and interviewees when conducting the interviews.

4.8 Procedures of data collection

In this section detailed information about the procedures of data collection are given. The administration of the methods of data collection of the current study proceeded through three main stages.

Stage 1: Obtaining permissions

This stage involved gaining the permissions and approvals needed in order to carry out the study. Firstly, a Certificate of Ethical Approval from the Graduate School of Education at the University of Exeter was completed with brief information about the research project, participants in the research, ethical issues which needed to be taken into consideration throughout the research process and methods of data collection. Section 4.11 discusses ethical issues in more detail and a copy of the ethical approval form is provided in appendix 8. Secondly, agreement from my sponsor to conduct the field work was sought. Permission to collect the data from the participants in a period of three month was given. Thirdly, agreement to conduct the study was provided by the administration of Umm Alqura University, the LEA in Makkah city in the KSA, the schools and the participants.

Stage 2: The pilot study

Robson (2002) defines a pilot study as: “a small-scale version of the real thing, a try-out of what you propose so its feasibility can be checked” (p.185). Yin (2003) adds that: “the pilot study will help you to refine your data collection plans with respect to both the content of the data and the procedures to be followed” (p.79). The pilot questionnaire was distributed to 2 male university tutors, 2 cooperating teachers (one male and one female) and 20 student teachers (10 male and 10 female). Three
participants from the questionnaire sample were selected from volunteers to take part in the pilot interviews. They were one university tutor, one cooperating teacher and one student teacher.

The pilot study was beneficial in five ways. First of all, it helped to ensure that the wording of the questionnaire and the questions of the interview schedules were not ambiguous to the respondents. Secondly, it helped me devise a sensible way to distribute the questionnaires and conduct the interviews. For example, when distributing the questionnaire to the student teachers, it was realised that the best way was to distribute it to the student teachers at the end of a lecture and to be with them while completing it. Thirdly, it helped to judge the time required from the respondents to complete the questionnaire and to conduct the interviews. Fourthly, it was very useful in identifying the suitability of the location provided by the Faculty of Education at Umm Alqura University to conduct the interviews. Finally, after the administration of the pilot questionnaire, it was apparent that some of the respondents did not answer some of the open-ended questions in the questionnaire. This is in spite of the fact that the questionnaire included directions for highlighting the importance of the open-ended questions and encouraging the participants to answer them. Not answering some of the open-ended questions may be because it takes too much time as asserted by Peterson (2000) who said that open-ended questions require a lot of time and effort to be answered and analysed.

In addition, reluctance to answer the open-ended questions could be attributed to the research context where the participants are used to answering close-ended questions. Being designed according to AT, it was inevitable that open-ended questions would be included in the questionnaire. For example, expectations, history and objects of the participants were intended to be obtained through the open-ended questions. Although these aspects were included in the interview questions, the researcher sought to obtain as many responses as possible from all the participants who responded to the questionnaire. In addition, the participants’ responses were expected to generate further categories to be explored in depth in the interviews. Therefore, encouraging the participants to respond to the open-ended questions was taken into consideration during the conduction of the main study.
Stage 3: The main study

Sub-stage one: Administration of the questionnaire

During this stage, I visited the Faculty of Education at Umm Alqura University and met the male partnership coordinator who welcomed me. I pointed out the aim of the study and nominated the targeted groups to the partnership coordinator and gave him his own copy of the questionnaire. The partnership coordinator facilitated the access to both male university tutors and student teachers. In terms of university tutors, the partnership coordinator invited me to attend a meeting with university tutors and introduced me to the university tutors at the beginning of the meeting. Then, I gave a brief presentation about my study and responded to the questions coming from the attendants. Being a new theory to the Saudi context, most of the discussion was about AT to the extent that one of the university tutors highlighted that AT in general and the third generation of AT which is adopted in the current study are new to the Saudi context. Then, I distributed the questionnaires to them. Those who did not attend the meeting were contacted and handed out the questionnaires individually. In terms of the female partnership coordinator and university tutors, the questionnaire was sent to them and returned back to me. The responses from the participants to return the completed questionnaire ranged from one working day to three weeks. Those who did not return the questionnaires were reminded courteously either in person or by telephone. All the partnership coordinators returned the questionnaires completed. The overall response rate of the returned questionnaires by the university tutors was 71%.

With regard to student teachers, the male partnership coordinator allowed access to me through his lecture to meet the male student teachers and distribute the questionnaires. It is worth noting that I gave a brief introduction about my study and was with the student teachers until they finished completing the questionnaires. Then, I collected the questionnaires from the respondents. It took me the whole lecture to administer the questionnaire. During the administration of the questionnaire, I distributed bottles of water to the participants to encourage them to complete the questionnaires given that the weather was very hot at that time. In addition, I sought help from one of my previous colleagues to assist in distributing the bottles and the questionnaires and collecting them.
As for female student teachers, the same procedure was followed to administer the questionnaire in coordination with the female staff because it was not permissible for me to meet the female student teachers face to face. However, I remained in contact through the telephone to answer any questions raised by the female student teachers. The response rate of the questionnaires returned by both male and female student teachers was 76%. With regard to head teachers and cooperating teachers, 12 secondary schools were chosen as maintained in section 4.5. I visited each male school. I met the head teacher and cooperating teachers. I was very keen to meet the targeted group, partly to explain the aim of the study and partly to encourage them to fill in the questionnaires. In terms of female schools, the questionnaires were sent to the schools and returned to me. All head teachers from both male and female schools returned the questionnaires completed with a response rate of 100%. The overall response rate of the questionnaires returned by the cooperating teachers was 85%.

**Sub-stage two: conducting the interviews**

There was a section at the end of the questionnaire asking participants who were interested in the research to give their details such as the contact telephone number and email address so that they can be contacted by me to take part and give detailed information during the semi-structure interviews. Therefore, the questionnaire helped me to involve participants in another method. This is supported by Fielding and Fielding (1986) who maintain that questionnaire data can be beneficial in specifying participants for qualitative methods.

After collecting the questionnaires, I classified them according to the groups of the research. By doing so, I identified the participants who were interested in doing the interview. Then, I randomly selected a group of participants for the interviews taking into account the maximum variation technique. Ten in-depth semi-structured interviews were conducted with volunteer participants. They were the male partnership coordinator, 4 male student teachers, 2 university tutors (one male and one female), 2 cooperating teachers (one male and one female) and a male head teacher. It is worth noting that some precautions were taken before and during the conduction of the interviews. I contacted the interviewees the day before the interviews to remind them gently of the appointment. This also was to confirm the pre-determined time of the appointment. Furthermore, during the interviews both the researcher’s and the
interviewee’s mobile phones were on the silent setting. In addition, the door of the room where the interviews were conducted was closed. These precautions were taken to avoid any interruptions during the interviews.

The majority of the interviews (7 out of ten interviews) were conducted face-to-face. Only three interviews were conducted via telephone. These were with the female university tutor, the female cooperating teacher and one male student teacher. In terms of the female interviews, it was stated in the approval form obtained from the LEA to conduct the interviews that they should be conducted via telephone. The same regulation applied for the university. In terms of the student teacher, he apologised for not participating in the interview face-to-face because he had finished his study one day before the interview and had to travel to his home town. Due to the fact that it was too late for me to look for another student teacher to conduct the interview with, I had to conduct the interview with that student teacher via telephone. Table 4.3 shows the meta-data of the interviews. During the interviews, some biscuits, juice and water were offered as a way of refreshment given that the weather was very hot and almost all interviews exceeded one hour.

**Table 4.3: The meta-data of the interviews**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO</th>
<th>Interviewees</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Duration of the interview</th>
<th>Mode of the interview</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The partnership coordinator</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>2.10 hs</td>
<td>Face-to-face</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Student teacher</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>1.27 hs</td>
<td>Face-to-face</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Student teacher</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>1.33 hs</td>
<td>Face-to-face</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Student teacher</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>1.26 hs</td>
<td>Face-to-face</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Student teacher</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>1.18 hs</td>
<td>By telephone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>University tutor</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>1.22 hs</td>
<td>Face-to-face</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>University tutor</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>1.15 hs</td>
<td>By telephone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Cooperating teacher</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>1.45 hs</td>
<td>Face-to-face</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Cooperating teacher</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>48.21 ms</td>
<td>By telephone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Head teacher</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>1.21 hs</td>
<td>Face-to-face</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
All interviews were recorded using a digital voice recorder. Esterberg (2002) asserts that there are three advantages of recording interviews. Firstly, recording enables the researcher to listen carefully to what the interviewee is saying because if the researcher is trying to take notes, they cannot make eye contact or give the interviewee full attention. Secondly, recording also enables the researcher to go back and listen again to the interview which is of great help in conducting the analysis. Thirdly, recording also allows the researcher to pay attention to small details or specific ways of phrasing things that might otherwise be missed.

**Stage 4: The documentary evidence**

This stage was devoted to collecting certain documents for the current study. From my personal experience and the academic reading in educational research, it was felt that evidence provided by such documents was necessary to reinforce the finding obtained by other methods. After obtaining the agreements to conduct the study, I visited the Faculty of Education at Umm Alqura University, the LEA and the schools and obtained the required documents as mentioned in section (4.6.3).

**4.9 Data analysis**

In this section, detailed information is given about data analysis which was obtained through the methods of data collection which are: questionnaires, interviews and documentary evidence. Table 4.4 shows the types of data collected through the methods of data collection.
Table 4.4: Types of data collected

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Methods of data collection</th>
<th>Type of data</th>
<th>Data collected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Questionnaires</td>
<td>Quantitative data</td>
<td>• Obtained questionnaires including both open-ended and close-ended questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+ Qualitative data</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviews</td>
<td>Qualitative data</td>
<td>• Recorded materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Transcripts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Excel files</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Documentary evidence</td>
<td>Qualitative data</td>
<td>• Time plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Teaching practice manual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Actual attendance sheets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• LEA instructions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• The manual of the Faculty of Education at Umm Alqura University</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.9.1 Questionnaires data analysis

Completed questionnaires were numbered from 1 to 187 and a coding sheet was used to transform raw data into numerical data suitable for entry to an SPSS file (Statistical Package for the Social Sciences, version 15). For example, for the gender variable, a code (1) was given to males and another (2) was given to females. Norusis (1990) maintains that: “SPSS is a powerful, comprehensive, and flexible statistical and information analysis system” (p.1). Bryman & Cramer (1999) add that: “The great advantage of using a package like SPSS is that it will enable you to score and to analyze quantitative data very quickly and in many different ways” (p.16).
The data was saved in many places such as the researcher’s own computer; email; university secure files and mass storage device. In addition, a copy of the data was sent to the research supervisors. These precautions were taken to keep the data safe and to facilitate access to them whenever needed.

Provided that the sample consisted of different groups, I was interested in comparing the differences among the different groups and to identify with which group the difference lies. The normality test was used to see the normality of the distribution of the responses. According to the result of the normality test, either the non-parametric or parametric test will be used (see section 5.2.1.1 in the next chapter). In terms of the open-ended questions of the questionnaire, they will be left aside to be analysed qualitatively with the qualitative data of the interviews.

4.9.2 Interviews data analysis

The interviews were recorded and transcribed by the researcher. One student teacher’s transcript was translated from Arabic into English because the language of the study is English. This transcript is included in the thesis (see appendix 7). Only the parts that are included in the findings from other transcripts were translated. Several copies were photocopied from the original transcripts and saved in secure places. The transcripts were then inserted into a Microsoft Office Excel file with answers to each question separated by coloured space from that of other questions.

Topics and categories were identified both inductively and deductively. The original questions, questionnaire and interview schedules provided the initial coding of topics and categories (deductive). However, some topics and categories emerged from the discussion of the transcripts (inductive). “In other words, you do not start with ready made categories within the main topics but allow them to emerge from the data as you become more and more familiar with the content” (Radnor, 2001, p.70).

This required reading the interview transcripts carefully many times to ensure all topics and categories are identified (Richards, 2005). The data were then coded according to these topics and categories. Using the Excel programme enabled me to send the file to supervisors and some colleagues to discuss the process of analysis. Using the filter facility, the various quotations related to the same category were
grouped and could be accessed easily. Figure 4.2 shows an example of the qualitative data inserted to the Excel file.

**Figure 4.2:** an example of the qualitative data inserted to the Excel file

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Learning at the university.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Out of my experience when I was a school student and particularly in the primary school</td>
<td>yoseph self</td>
<td>his1</td>
<td>History and background.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>my father was a mathematician teacher who was interested in teaching.</td>
<td>yoseph family</td>
<td>his2</td>
<td>History and background.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>He was using a new way of teaching</td>
<td>action in</td>
<td>yoseph classroom</td>
<td>his3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>which is learning by fun let the student play and learn at the same time.</td>
<td>action in</td>
<td>yoseph classroom</td>
<td>exp1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>This makes the student more active and enthusiastic especially in the primary stage</td>
<td>yoseph outcome</td>
<td>exp6</td>
<td>Expectations about a good teacher.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>because pupils like playing</td>
<td>explanation-</td>
<td>yoseph pupil learning</td>
<td>exp7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>and therefore they will never forget what they have learned.</td>
<td>yoseph outcome</td>
<td>exp6</td>
<td>Expectations about a good teacher.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>In addition, there was in the secondary school a Biology teacher who made me love Biology. Now I completed my study in the Biology department.</td>
<td>outcome-own</td>
<td>yoseph outcome</td>
<td>exp6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>In addition, there was in the secondary school a Biology teacher who made me love Biology. Now I completed my study in the Biology department.</td>
<td>yoseph own teacher</td>
<td>his4</td>
<td>History and background.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>His way of teaching was attractive and interesting</td>
<td>action in</td>
<td>yoseph classroom</td>
<td>exp1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>the lesson wasn’t boring</td>
<td>action in</td>
<td>yoseph outcome</td>
<td>exp6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>He was using learning resources to explain the lesson in a simple way</td>
<td>yoseph classroom</td>
<td>exp1</td>
<td>Expectations about a good teacher.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>to make it understandable</td>
<td>action in</td>
<td>yoseph purpose</td>
<td>exp2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>He amused us</td>
<td>action in</td>
<td>yoseph classroom</td>
<td>exp1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>He had a logical sequence of presenting ideas in a way that attracted our attention and stimulated our thinking and senses</td>
<td>action in</td>
<td>yoseph classroom</td>
<td>exp1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>to be able to understand the lesson.</td>
<td>yoseph purpose</td>
<td>exp2</td>
<td>Expectations about a good teacher.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In column A, the quotations were stated. Column B refers to the name of the interviewee. Column C refers to the categories. Column D refers to the code. For example exg1 refers to the code and number 1 refers to the category. Finally, column E indicates the name of the topic. A full list of topics, categories and sub-categories is presented in the qualitative data analysis chapter. These topics, categories and sub-categories of the translated interview were used as basic information for analysing the other transcribed interviews. The same coding was used to analyse the rest of the qualitative data. Similar quotations were combined under specific topics, categories and sub-categories. It is worth noting that new categories were often constructed from the qualitative data through analysing the other interviews transcripts.

4.9.3 Documentary evidence data analysis

Several documents were obtained (see section 4.6.3) in this chapter. The documents which need to be returned were photocopied by the researcher and stamped by the authorised person. Some documents such as the Manual of the Faculty of Education at Umm Alqura University and Time plan were original.

Given the main aims of the documentary evidence mentioned in section (4.6.3), the researcher was not interested in doing coding and content analysis of the documents. The documents were read carefully and many times to make sure that no important information were neglected. The important aspects were highlighted. This process generated rich data which in turn reinforced the findings obtained through questionnaire and interviews.

It is worth noting that some documents such as the Manual of the Faculty of Education at Umm Alqura University and Time plan were available before conducting the field work and designing the questionnaire and interviews. This helped the researcher in making use of these documents in designing the questionnaire and interviews. In addition, out of the researcher’s experience as a graduate from the Faculty of Education at Umm Alqura University who undertaken teaching practice himself, he was familiar with some of the documents such as the teaching practice manual and the LEA instructions. This helped the researcher design the other methods and obtain these documents easily.
4.10 Validity

Wallen & Fraenkel (2001) define validity as: “the extent to which an instrument gives us the information we want” (p.86). To check the validity of the questionnaire and the pre-defined questions of the interviews, face validity was used (Preece, 1994). Wallen & Fraenkel (2001) assert that:

Content-related evidence refers to the nature of the content included within the instrument, and the specifications the researcher used to formulate the content. How appropriate is the content? How comprehensive? Does it logically get at the intended variable? Such evidence most often relies on the judgments of people who are presumed to acknowledgeable about the variable being observed. It is sometimes referred to as “logical” or “face” validity (p.89).

The questionnaire and the interview questions were shown to a number of experts including my supervisors and the school partnership coordinator at the University of Exeter. Based on the feedback obtained from the experts, recommended modifications were carried out.

Moreover, to ensure the quality of the interpretive paradigm, triangulation of methods of data collection and of sample categories (partnership coordinators; university tutors; student teachers; cooperating teachers and head teachers) was employed. Figure 4.3 shows the triangulation of methods of data collection.

![Figure 4.3: Triangulation of methods of data collection](image-url)
Cohen et al. (2007) point out that:

> Triangular techniques in the social science attempt to map out, or explain more fully, the richness and complexity of human behaviour by studying it from more than one standpoint and, in so doing, by making use of both quantitative and qualitative data (p.141).

Robson (2002) asserts that triangulation can help address threats to validity. In addition, I ensured that the case is detailed enough (completeness) and the information obtained can be trusted (trustworthiness). This was reflected in providing detailed information of the process of data collection and analysis. These ideas of completeness and trustworthiness improve the quality of the interpretive paradigm.

**4.11 Ethical issues**

Cohen et al. (2007) assert that: “Whatever the specific nature of their work, social researchers must take into account the effects of the research on participants, and act in such a way as to preserve their dignity as human beings: responsibility to participants” (p.58). Mason (2002) argues that: “You will need to consider the ethics and politics of your arguments, analyses, and explanations, and of the way you are presenting them to a wider audience” (p.120). The first ethical issue taken into consideration was that of obtaining the agreement of the participants to take part in the study while respecting their privacy. Two other related ethical issues are anonymity and confidentiality. One aspect of maintaining the anonymity and confidentiality of the participants is to keep all the data obtained from them in a secure place. Another aspect is that the names of the participants and the partner schools were kept confidential. When reporting the research, fictitious names were used. In addition, I explained the aims of the study to the participants and ensured the confidentiality of the information given by them. Esterberg (2002) stresses that the researcher must ensure that participants freely agree to take part in the research, and he/she must protect the privacy of his/her research participants. He adds that they also must inform participants of all potential risks from taking part in the research and gain formal agreement before beginning.

The participants’ autonomy was respected and their involvement was maximized. Regarding the participants’ autonomy, I gave them the right to withdraw from the research at any time they wished. I obtained the data from the participants via
questionnaires and interviews and involved them in interpreting the results. Pring (2000) recommends that:

It may be necessary within some institutions to check, with the people being researched, the data and the conclusions before they are conveyed to others...there may be other perspectives and other interpretations of the data which should be considered (p.152).

The interviews were recorded. The sensitive ethical issues in conducting and recording the interviews were taken into consideration. Powney and Watts (1987) assert that: “Vulnerability in an interview also comes from internal pressures. It is a situation in which it very possible to lose face” (p.45).

To avoid the negative impact of these sensitive issues in conducting the interview, I took the following precautions:

- I obtained agreement from the participants to record the interviews.
- I gave the participants the freedom to decide upon the time and place of interviews.

By proceeding in this way, the participants felt less stressed. Finally, by taking into account these ethical issues, I attempted to show respect to the participants. As Radnor (2001) maintains “The principle of ethics-in-action focuses centrally on the need for the researcher to show respect for the participants” (p.39).

Being a new method of data collection in the KSA context, some participants showed interest in taking part in the interview and did not have reservations about having it recorded. However, female student teachers declined to participate in an interview and have it recorded. I respected their desire and thanked them for their participation in responding to the questionnaire.

4.12 Summary of the chapter

In this chapter the interpretive paradigm, ontological assumptions, epistemological assumptions, methodology, sampling, methods of data collection and process of analysis were discussed. The chapter highlighted how these aspects were consistent with one another and with the AT. In the next chapters (Chapter five and six) the quantitative and qualitative findings of the current study will be presented.
CHAPTER 5

Quantitative findings and making sense of the data

5.1 Introduction

In this chapter findings resulting from the questionnaire data analysis are presented and discussed. The quantitative data were analysed using SPSS. Given the aims of the questionnaire (see section 4.6.1) detailed information was given by the respondents about the main elements of AT: subject, object, tools, community, rules and division of labour. Although this study is mainly qualitative in nature a questionnaire as a method of data collection was used for the reasons given in section 4.6.1. Tables of statistics were prepared from the results of this questionnaire. Not all the tables are presented in detail due to the thesis word limit. Instead, section 5.2 gives an example of the process of analysis, the results of which are presented in two sections. The first section presents for the whole sample the descriptive statistics for the responses of agreement or disagreement to the items in the questionnaire within each element of AT. The second section presents the differences among the groups who responded to the questionnaire according to their roles, gender and years of experience. The findings of this section are then summarized and discussed. Overall summary tables are then presented in sections 5.3 - 5.8 based on the approach set out in this example.

5.2 An example of the process of analysis

This section gives detailed information about responses to the three questions under one sub-topic of the AT topic of ‘subject’: the respondents’ expectations about a good teacher. The aim of this example is to provide detailed information about the process of analysis. Another aim is to show that appropriate use of the range of the results that comes from the SPSS programme was made.

5.2.1 Expectations about a good teacher

Almost all the participants either strongly agreed or agreed that a good teacher is knowledgeable about the subject matter, able to link theory to classroom practice and
aware of pupils’ characteristics. Table 5.1 shows the descriptive statistics for the responses to this section.

**Table 5.1:** The descriptive statistics for the responses to the sub-topic of expectation about a good teacher

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>SA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A good teacher is knowledgeable about the subject matter</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>25.7</td>
<td>70.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A good teacher is able to link theory to classroom practice</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>32.6</td>
<td>64.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A good teacher is aware of pupils’ characteristics</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>36.9</td>
<td>58.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key to codes:**
No. Number of respondents  
SD: Strongly disagree  
D: Disagree  
N: Neutral  
A: Agree  
SA: Strongly agree

5.2.1.1 Differences among different groups according to role, gender and years of experience

A Kolmogorov-Smirnov normality test was used to find out whether the responses of the participants were normally distributed. Table 5.2 shows the results of the normality test.

**Table 5.2:** The results of the normality test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Statistic</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Significance level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A good teacher is knowledgeable about the subject matter</td>
<td>.412</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A good teacher is able to link theory to classroom practice</td>
<td>.389</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A good teacher is aware of pupils’ characteristics</td>
<td>.353</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The significance values are all less than 0.05 showing that, for each question, the actual responses did not match the normal distribution. As Pallant (2007) asserts,
“unfortunately, in social science research, this is a common situation. Many of the attributes we want to measure are in fact not normally distributed” (p.109). Therefore, Chi-squared, which is a non-parametric test not assuming that the responses are normally distributed, was used to compare the differences among different groups of participants. The choice of the chi-squared test gave rise to a new problem. As Table 5.1 makes clear, the number of responses in some cells of the table was very small. However, there are restrictions on how small these values can be if a valid chi-squared test is to be conducted. Responses were regrouped into two groups: “strongly agree” and “agree or less”. The later group includes the participants who responded “agree”, “neutral”, “disagree” or “strongly disagree”. Although this inevitably results in a loss of information, it is necessary to preserve the validity of the statistical test. Responses were regrouped to have at least 2 responses in each cell which is a requirement for using a chi-squared test (Hopkins and Glass, 1978). My analysis usually conformed to the most widely known limit (expected cells should not be less than 5) and where it did not, it certainly matched the Hopkins and Glass criterion. To identify for which group the difference lies in, a contingency table was used comparing the actual values with the expected values provided by the contingency table. The contingency table can be found online through the following link http://www.physics.csbsju.edu/stats/contingency.html.

Table 5.3 shows the differences among groups according to role regarding knowledge about subject matter.
Table 5.3: The differences among groups according to role regarding knowledge about subject matter

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Chi-value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig (2-sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UT</td>
<td>HT</td>
<td>CT</td>
<td>ST</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A good teacher is knowledgeable about the subject matter.</td>
<td>Agree or less</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expected value</td>
<td>8.80</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expected value</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>8.48</td>
<td>35.3</td>
<td>65.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>186</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key to codes:**
- UT: University Tutors
- HT: Head Teachers
- CT: Cooperating Teachers
- ST: Student Teachers
- Chi-value: Chi-square value
- df: degree of freedom
- Sig (2-sided): Level of significance.

*** Significance level at 0.001 or less

In terms of knowledge about subject matter, there was a significant difference according to role. The largest difference between actual and expected values lay with student teachers, who were less likely than other groups to “strongly agree”.

Knowledge about subject matter is a very important part of being a good teacher. Although all groups either “strongly agreed” or “agreed” that a good teacher is knowledgeable about the subject matter, student teachers were less likely to strongly agree than others. This might be because they were currently studying the educational diploma course and were being taught that there are different aspects of being a good teacher such as knowledge about teaching, classroom management, learning theories and dealing with pupils. These factors other than subject knowledge might therefore have been a bigger part of their day to day discourse about teaching than would be the case for experienced teachers. In addition, student teachers lack experience which could help them realize the importance of subject matter in classroom practice. A similar analysis was done for gender and years of experience and no significant differences among different groups were revealed.
The next item to be explored was “linking theory to classroom practice”. There were no significant differences among groups according to gender and years of experience. However, there was a significant difference according to role. The difference lay with university tutors who were more likely than other groups to “strongly agree”. Table 5.4 shows the differences among groups according to role.

Table 5.4: The differences among groups according to role regarding linking theory to classroom practice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>UT</th>
<th>HT</th>
<th>CT</th>
<th>ST</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Chi-value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig (2-sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A good teacher is able to link theory to</td>
<td>Agree or less</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.011*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>classroom practice.</td>
<td>Expected value</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>Expected value</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>118</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>185</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key to codes:
* Significance level at 0.05 or less

This indicates the greater awareness of university tutors of the important role of theory in classroom practice. This could be understood in terms of the nature of their work which is mainly based on theory (Roth & Tobin, 2002). Again the daily discourse of the people in a particular role group might have influenced their response. While student teachers might also engage in this discourse in the university, their current experience might encourage them to recognise that linking theory to practice is difficult and not always a part (or at least an explicit and observable part) of the working pattern of ‘good teachers’ in school.

The final example of analysis concerned “awareness of pupils’ characteristics”: there were no significant differences among groups according to role and gender. However, there was a significant difference according to years of experience. The difference lay with the most experienced group who were more likely than other groups to “strongly agree”. Table 5.5 shows the differences among groups according to years of experience.
Table 5.5: The differences among groups according to years of experience regarding awareness of pupils’ characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Years of experience</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Chi-value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig (2-sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Less than 10 years</td>
<td>From 10 - 20 years</td>
<td>More than 20 years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A good teacher is aware of pupils’ characteristics</td>
<td>Agree or less</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>8.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expected value</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expected value</td>
<td>7.33</td>
<td>32.0</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>93</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The difference might be attributed to the role of experience in understanding pupils’ characteristics and influencing participants’ views about what makes a good teacher (Lunenberg & Willemse, 2006). Perhaps, to know about pupils’ characteristics and to recognize their importance in shaping learning, teachers need to teach to pupils at schools and interact with them for many years.

Sections 5.3 – 5.8 present a similar analysis for all items reported as summary tables showing the percentages and the significant levels for differences amongst different groups. These are reported section by section broadly corresponding to AT categories.
5.3 Subject

Under this topic, there are four sub-topics: expectations about a good teacher (the findings of this sub-topic were presented in the example section 5.2), history and background that have helped to shape participants’ views about who is a good teacher, expectations about teaching and expectations about learning to teach. Table 5.6 shows the descriptive statistics for the responses to this topic.

Table 5.6: The descriptive statistics for the responses to the items related to the AT topic of subject

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-topics</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>SA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>History and background</td>
<td>Personal experience</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>0 %</td>
<td>2.7 %</td>
<td>4.3 %</td>
<td>38.0 %</td>
<td>53.5 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Personal values</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>0 %</td>
<td>2.1 %</td>
<td>5.3 %</td>
<td>50.3 %</td>
<td>38.5 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parental influence</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>2.1 %</td>
<td>7.5 %</td>
<td>4.3 %</td>
<td>19.3 %</td>
<td>15.5 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expectation about teaching</td>
<td>Teaching as demanding</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>4.3 %</td>
<td>15.5 %</td>
<td>2.7 %</td>
<td>35.3 %</td>
<td>41.7 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pupils learn from discussion</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>0 %</td>
<td>8.6 %</td>
<td>2.7 %</td>
<td>52.4 %</td>
<td>36.4 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pupils respect student teachers</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>11.2 %</td>
<td>41.2 %</td>
<td>9.6 %</td>
<td>33.2 %</td>
<td>4.8 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expectation about learning to teach</td>
<td>Learning by observation</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>0.5 %</td>
<td>4.8 %</td>
<td>2.7 %</td>
<td>54.0 %</td>
<td>38.0 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Learning by reading</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>2.1 %</td>
<td>10.2 %</td>
<td>10.7 %</td>
<td>60.4 %</td>
<td>16.6 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Learning from lectures</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>3.2 %</td>
<td>18.7 %</td>
<td>3.7 %</td>
<td>56.1 %</td>
<td>18.2 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Learning by practicing teaching</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>0.5 %</td>
<td>0.5 %</td>
<td>1.1 %</td>
<td>44.4 %</td>
<td>53.5 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Learning from discussion</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>1.1 %</td>
<td>3.7 %</td>
<td>1.6 %</td>
<td>55.1 %</td>
<td>37.4 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The numbers of respondents often vary between items. This is because not all items required responses from all groups of participants. Furthermore, there were some missing data because some participants did not respond to some items of the
questionnaire. The participants’ views about a good teacher were influenced by their history and background. The majority of the participants either agreed or strongly agreed that their personal experience (91.5%) and personal values (89%) have shaped their views about a good teacher.

5.3.1 Differences among different groups

The results of the differences among different groups according to role, gender and years of experience in terms of the topic of subject are summarized in the table below.
Table 5.7: The differences among groups for the responses to the items related to the AT topic of subject

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-topics</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Significance level</th>
<th>Nature of difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Role</td>
<td>Gender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History and background</td>
<td>Personal experience 0.135</td>
<td>0.306</td>
<td>0.036*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Personal values 0.009**</td>
<td>0.273</td>
<td>0.020*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parental influence -</td>
<td>0.660</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expectation about teaching</td>
<td>Teaching as demanding 0.004**</td>
<td>0.639</td>
<td>0.483</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pupils learn from discussion 0.070</td>
<td>0.956</td>
<td>0.046*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pupils respect student teachers 0.192</td>
<td>0.194</td>
<td>0.338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expectation about learning to</td>
<td>Learning by observation 0.282</td>
<td>0.266</td>
<td>0.473</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teach</td>
<td>Learning by reading 0.510</td>
<td>0.534</td>
<td>0.051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Learning from lectures 0.054</td>
<td>0.972</td>
<td>0.387</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Learning by practicing teaching 0.499</td>
<td>0.165</td>
<td>0.257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Learning from discussion 0.576</td>
<td>0.664</td>
<td>0.837</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key to codes:
- The differences among groups were not measured according to these variables. (This is because only student teachers were asked to respond to this item)
= No significant difference among groups was found
** Significance level at 0.01 or less
Italic with + +: in the column of nature of difference means that the group with which the difference lay was more likely than other groups to respond “strongly agree”
Italic with +: in the column of nature of difference means that the group with which the difference lay was less likely than other groups to respond “strongly agree”
With regard to personal experience the difference could possibly be attributed to the lack of experience of the least experienced group unlike the more experienced groups who view experience in-service as the most important influence. In terms of personal values, the difference according to role indicates that student teachers might not be aware of the role of personal values in shaping their views about a good teacher. This is to be expected given that they have not started actual teaching. Therefore, they had limited experience of situations where recourse to values was required as part of the repertoire of the good teacher. Regarding years of experience, the difference might be because the more experience one gets, the greater the acknowledgement of the role of personal values in shaping views about a good teacher. With respect to teaching as demanding, the difference might be attributed to the lack of experience and awareness of the difficulty of the profession of teaching.

Overall, it could be argued that experience and values play an important role in shaping participants’ views and expectations about teaching and learning to teach (Haggarty & Postlethwaite, 2003).

5.4 Object

This topic is divided into three sub-topics: student teachers’ object of joining the teacher education programme at the university and the practical component at the school, university object of training student teachers and school object of training student teachers. Table 5.8 shows the descriptive statistics for the responses to this topic.
Table 5.8: The descriptive statistics for the responses to the items related to AT topic of object

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-topics</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>SA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student teachers’ object</td>
<td>To be a qualified teacher</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>0.5 %</td>
<td>7.0 %</td>
<td>0.5 %</td>
<td>40.1 %</td>
<td>51.9 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To relate theory to practice</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>1.1 %</td>
<td>9.6 %</td>
<td>3.7 %</td>
<td>50.3 %</td>
<td>35.3 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To get benefit from experienced teachers</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>1.6 %</td>
<td>10.7 %</td>
<td>4.8 %</td>
<td>42.2 %</td>
<td>40.6 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University object</td>
<td>To graduate qualified teachers</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>1.1 %</td>
<td>1.6 %</td>
<td>4.8 %</td>
<td>34.8 %</td>
<td>57.8 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To attain a good reputation</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>4.8 %</td>
<td>21.9 %</td>
<td>19.3 %</td>
<td>35.8 %</td>
<td>17.6 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School object</td>
<td>To ensure recruiting qualified teachers</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>4.3 %</td>
<td>8.0 %</td>
<td>6.4 %</td>
<td>44.4 %</td>
<td>36.9 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To get pupils learning well</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>7.0 %</td>
<td>23.0 %</td>
<td>13.4 %</td>
<td>38.0 %</td>
<td>18.7 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The majority of the participants either agreed or strongly agreed that preparing a qualified teacher was the common object of student teachers (92%), university (92.6%) and school (81%).

5.4.1 Differences among different groups

The results of the differences among groups according to role, gender and years of experience with regard to the topic of object are presented in table 5.9.
Table 5.9: The differences among groups for the responses to the items related to AT topic of object

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-topics</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Significance level</th>
<th>Nature of difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Role</td>
<td>Gender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student teachers’ object</td>
<td>To be a qualified teacher</td>
<td>0.246</td>
<td>0.944</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To relate theory to practice</td>
<td>0.132</td>
<td>0.505</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To get benefit from experienced teachers</td>
<td>0.298</td>
<td>0.340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University object</td>
<td>To graduate qualified teachers</td>
<td>0.086</td>
<td>0.330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To attain a good reputation</td>
<td>0.831</td>
<td>0.054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School object</td>
<td>To ensure recruiting qualified teachers</td>
<td>0.948</td>
<td>0.271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To get pupils learning well</td>
<td>0.488</td>
<td>0.085</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key to codes:
Non italic with +: in the column of nature of difference means that the group with which the difference lay was less likely than other groups to respond “either agree or strongly agree”
In terms of attaining a good reputation, the difference could possibly be because of the least experienced group’s lack of experience and awareness of what the university wanted to achieve. In addition, attaining a good reputation is very important for teacher education institutions (Yamagata-Lynch & Haudenschild, 2006).

It is worth noting that this was the only difference among groups for the responses to the items related to AT topic of object. This means that the participants believe in the importance of these objects. However, achieving these objects through the partnership between school and university in teacher education is not an easy task. Many challenges, obstacles and contradictory points of views could be encountered (Haggarty, 1990; Dodd, 2001; and Aubusson, 2003).
5.5 Tools

The sub-topics under this topic are: academic tools available to the student teachers in the university that help them learn about teaching; academic tools that the student teachers learnt to use in the university that help them teach pupils in school; administrative tools in the university that help the student teachers learn; academic tools available to the student teachers in the school that help them learn about teaching; academic tools that the student teachers learnt to use in the school that help them teach pupils; administrative tools in the school that help the student teachers learn. The responses were gathered via ticking boxes of the questionnaire. Table 5.10 shows the descriptive statistics for the responses to this topic.

Table 5.10: The descriptive statistics for the responses to the items of the AT topic of tools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-topics</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Ticked</th>
<th>Not ticked</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic tools available in the university that helped student teacher</td>
<td>Assignments</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>31.0 %</td>
<td>69.0 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lesson plan</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>62.0 %</td>
<td>38.0 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Library</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>30.5 %</td>
<td>69.5 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Framework for reflection</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>46.5 %</td>
<td>53.5 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Meeting with a tutor</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>47.1 %</td>
<td>52.9 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic tools learned in the university that helped student teacher</td>
<td>Information technology (IT)</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>55.6 %</td>
<td>44.4 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lesson plan</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>54.5 %</td>
<td>45.5 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Methods of assessment</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>41.2 %</td>
<td>58.8 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Theories of learning</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>38.5 %</td>
<td>61.5 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative tools in the university</td>
<td>A time table for student teachers to go to school to practice teaching</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>73.3 %</td>
<td>26.7 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Time for university tutors to observe</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>57.8 %</td>
<td>42.2 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic tools available in the school that helped student teacher</td>
<td>Meeting with supervising teachers</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>77.5 %</td>
<td>22.5 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Observing experienced teachers</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>69.0 %</td>
<td>31.0 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic tools learned in the school that helped student teacher</td>
<td>Lesson plan</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>69 %</td>
<td>31 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teaching assessment</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>38.5 %</td>
<td>61.5 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Resources</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>49.7 %</td>
<td>50.3 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IT</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>38.5 %</td>
<td>61.5 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Work sheets</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>33.2 %</td>
<td>66.8 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative tools in the school</td>
<td>Time for cooperating teacher to meet with student teacher</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>70.6 %</td>
<td>29.4 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Access to resources</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>60.4 %</td>
<td>39.6 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Principal’s support</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>52.4 %</td>
<td>47.6 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The most frequent academic tools available to the student teachers in the university that help them learn about teaching are arranged respectively as follows: lesson plan (62 %), meeting with a tutor (47.1 %) and framework of reflection (46.5 %). In terms of academic tools that the student teachers learnt to use in the university that help them teach pupils in school, the most frequent were information technology (55.6 %) and lesson plan (54.5 %). With regard to administrative tools in the university, the most frequent tool was a time table for student teachers to go to school and practice teaching (73.3 %). As far as academic tools available to the student teachers in the school that help them learn about teaching is concerned, both meeting with supervising teachers (77.5 %) and observing experienced teachers (69 %) were ranked high. Respecting academic tools that the student teachers learnt to use in the school that help them teach pupils, the most frequent tools were lesson plan (69 %) and resources (49 %). Concerning administrative tools in the school, time for cooperating teacher to meet with student teachers (70.5 %) and access for resources (60.4 %) were ranked high. Overall, the lesson plan was the most frequent academic tool available and learned in both school and university and consequently helped student teachers teach pupils in the school.

5.6 Community

Under the topic of community, there are three sub-topics: learning in the university, learning in the school and learning through the partnership between school and university. Tables 5.11, 5.12 and 5.13 show the descriptive statistics for the responses to this topic. The participants were asked to respond to a number of items in the questionnaire to find out the extent of their agreement or disagreement regarding the kind of support or hindrance in learning about teaching in school (see table 5.11), university (see table 5.12), and through the partnership between school and university (see tables 5.12 and 5.13).
Table 5.11: The descriptive statistics for the responses to the items of the AT topic of community: learning in the school

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-topics</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>SA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Learning in the school</td>
<td>School pupils consider student teachers not to be ‘proper’ teachers</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>0 %</td>
<td>5.9 %</td>
<td>2.7 %</td>
<td>36.4 %</td>
<td>54.5 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cooperating teachers concentrate more on pupils’ learning than student teachers’ learning</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>1.1 %</td>
<td>21.9 %</td>
<td>9.6 %</td>
<td>40.6 %</td>
<td>25.7 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sufficiency of resources</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>10.2 %</td>
<td>38.5 %</td>
<td>8.0 %</td>
<td>28.9 %</td>
<td>13.4 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The school assigns student teacher with extra work that is not related to learning to teach</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>10.7 %</td>
<td>24.1 %</td>
<td>13.4 %</td>
<td>28.9 %</td>
<td>22.5 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student teachers enjoy all the privileges provided by the school administration to the regular teachers</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>5.9 %</td>
<td>40.1 %</td>
<td>10.7 %</td>
<td>28.9 %</td>
<td>12.8 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teachers feel that they can learn from student teachers</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>10.7 %</td>
<td>32.6 %</td>
<td>13.4 %</td>
<td>32.6 %</td>
<td>10.7 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teachers in school regard student teachers as an unwelcome burden</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>19.3 %</td>
<td>43.3 %</td>
<td>13.9 %</td>
<td>16.0 %</td>
<td>6.4 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student teachers as a chance to reduce burdens</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>2.1 %</td>
<td>9.1 %</td>
<td>4.3 %</td>
<td>35.3 %</td>
<td>49.2 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Principals’ negative attitude towards student teachers</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>7.5 %</td>
<td>38.5 %</td>
<td>20.3 %</td>
<td>24.1 %</td>
<td>9.6 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Access to facilities</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>3.7 %</td>
<td>9.6 %</td>
<td>10.7 %</td>
<td>49.2 %</td>
<td>26.7 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Normal class size</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>12.3 %</td>
<td>30.5 %</td>
<td>8.0 %</td>
<td>39.0 %</td>
<td>9.6 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cooperating teachers’ support to student teachers to understand uses of pedagogy</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>2.7 %</td>
<td>11.8 %</td>
<td>9.1 %</td>
<td>45.5 %</td>
<td>30.5 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cooperating teachers’ support to student teachers to develop teaching skills</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>2.1 %</td>
<td>15.5 %</td>
<td>7.5 %</td>
<td>45.5 %</td>
<td>29.4 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cooperating teachers’ support to student teachers to address gaps in subject knowledge</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>2.7 %</td>
<td>15.5 %</td>
<td>13.9 %</td>
<td>44.9 %</td>
<td>22.5 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cooperating teachers’ support to student teachers to evaluate lessons</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>2.1 %</td>
<td>15.5 %</td>
<td>10.7 %</td>
<td>49.2 %</td>
<td>21.9 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cooperating teachers’ support to student teachers to plan lessons</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>5.3 %</td>
<td>18.2 %</td>
<td>9.6 %</td>
<td>43.9 %</td>
<td>21.9 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Possibility of observing experienced teachers</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>1.6 %</td>
<td>7.0 %</td>
<td>6.4 %</td>
<td>50.8 %</td>
<td>33.7 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Possibility of discussing with experienced teachers</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>1.6 %</td>
<td>5.9 %</td>
<td>7.0 %</td>
<td>56.1 %</td>
<td>28.9 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Several kinds of hindrances and support about student teachers’ learning in the school were revealed by the majority of participants who either agreed or strongly agreed with these kinds of hindrances and support. In terms of hindrances, these included: student teachers were seen by school pupils as not proper teachers and therefore they make a lot of discipline problems (91%); concentrating more on pupils’ learning at the expense of the student teachers’ learning (66%); student teachers were assigned extra work that is not related to learning to teach (51%); student teachers were considered as a chance to reduce cooperating teachers’ burdens of teaching (84.5%).

As far as kinds of support are concerned, student teachers enjoyed access to all facilities in the school (76%); student teachers were supported to understand uses of pedagogy (76%), to develop teaching skills (75%), to address gaps in subject knowledge (67%), to evaluate lessons (71%), and to plan lessons (66%). In addition, student teachers were able to observe experienced teachers (84.5%) and to discuss ideas about teaching with them (85%).

The descriptive statistics of the participants’ responses to the sub-topics of learning in the university and through the partnership between school and university are presented in the following table.
Table 5.12: The descriptive statistics for the responses to the items of the AT topic of community: learning in the university and through the partnership between school and university

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-topics</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>SA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Learning in the university</td>
<td>Normal class size at the university</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>4.8 %</td>
<td>27.3 %</td>
<td>3.2 %</td>
<td>24.1 %</td>
<td>7.0 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Availability of educational aids</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>8.0 %</td>
<td>36.4 %</td>
<td>5.9 %</td>
<td>8.0 %</td>
<td>7.5 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Appropriateness of lecture halls</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>4.8 %</td>
<td>18.2 %</td>
<td>1.6 %</td>
<td>30.5 %</td>
<td>10.7 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Availability of library resources</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>2.7 %</td>
<td>13.4 %</td>
<td>5.9 %</td>
<td>26.7 %</td>
<td>17.1 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Studying courses during teaching practice</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>14.4 %</td>
<td>5.9 %</td>
<td>2.1 %</td>
<td>25.1 %</td>
<td>18.2 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University tutors’ support to student teachers to understand uses of pedagogy</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>3.7 %</td>
<td>8.6 %</td>
<td>8.6 %</td>
<td>32.1 %</td>
<td>12.3 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University tutors’ support to student teachers to develop teaching skills</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>3.7 %</td>
<td>10.2 %</td>
<td>5.3 %</td>
<td>33.7 %</td>
<td>11.8 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University tutors’ support to student teachers to understand relationship between theory and practice</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>3.2 %</td>
<td>9.6 %</td>
<td>10.7 %</td>
<td>33.2 %</td>
<td>8.0 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University tutors have enough time to visit student teachers in schools</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>5.3 %</td>
<td>10.7 %</td>
<td>9.1 %</td>
<td>29.4 %</td>
<td>10.7 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning through the partnership between school and university</td>
<td>The university lecturers teach some theories that school teachers find inappropriate for classroom practice</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>1.1 %</td>
<td>11.8 %</td>
<td>10.7 %</td>
<td>46.5 %</td>
<td>28.3 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Different views in identifying student teachers’ role</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>1.6 %</td>
<td>15.0 %</td>
<td>8.0 %</td>
<td>48.7 %</td>
<td>26.7 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Different views in identifying good teaching</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>0.5 %</td>
<td>9.6 %</td>
<td>5.9 %</td>
<td>49.2 %</td>
<td>34.8 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The teaching practice gives student teachers the opportunity to reflect upon what they have learned in the university</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>4.3 %</td>
<td>10.7 %</td>
<td>2.7 %</td>
<td>47.6 %</td>
<td>34.2 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The teaching practice helps in developing student teachers’ teaching skills</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>1.1 %</td>
<td>3.2 %</td>
<td>2.1 %</td>
<td>33.2 %</td>
<td>59.9 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the role of the university overrides that of the school in teacher education</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>9.1 %</td>
<td>34.8 %</td>
<td>7.0 %</td>
<td>31.0 %</td>
<td>16.6 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In terms of learning through the partnership between school and university, there was a question of whether or not the different views between school and university about teaching and learning to teach constituted a problem for the participants. This question had to be answered using ‘yes’ or ‘no’. Table 18 shows the descriptive statistics of the responses to this question.

**Table 5.13:** The descriptive statistics for the responses to whether or not the different views between school and university about teaching and learning to teach were a problem

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-topic</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Learning through the partnership between school and university</td>
<td>Different views between school and university about teaching and learning to teach constitute a problem for you</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>49.2 %</td>
<td>40.6 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Different kinds of support in learning about teaching in the university were identified. These included: the availability of library resources (44%); support on the part of university tutors to student teachers to understand uses of pedagogy (44%), to develop teaching skills (45%); to understand relationship between theory and practice (41%). On the other hand, student teachers were hindered in learning about teaching in the university by the lack of educational aids. This was highlighted by (44%) of the participants. Furthermore, (43%) of the participants highlighted that student teachers were studying some courses in the university during the teaching practice period which could hinder them from learning about teaching in the school because they had to meet different requirements of both school and university at the same time.

As far as learning through the partnership between school and university is concerned, contradictory points of views about teaching and learning to teach were revealed. The majority of participants either agreed or strongly agreed that: the university lecturers teach some theories that school teachers find inappropriate for classroom practice (75%); school teachers consider student teachers as regular teachers but university tutors think that student teachers are in the school to learn about teaching (75%); the university lecturers rely upon theory derived from educational research in identifying good teaching, while teachers depend upon their own classroom experience and that
of their colleagues (84%). These contradictory points of views were seen as problematic by about half of the participants (49%).

Although there were some contradictory points of views about teaching and learning to teach, the majority of participants either agreed or strongly agreed that teaching practice experience gave student teachers the opportunity to reflect upon what they have learned in the university (82%); it also helped student teachers to develop their teaching skills (93%).

5.6.1 Differences among different groups

The results of the differences among different groups according to role, gender and years of experience in terms of the topic of community are summarized in tables 5.14 and 5.15.

Table 5.14: The differences among groups for the responses to the items of the AT topic of community: learning in the school
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-topics</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Significance level</th>
<th>Nature of difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Learning in the school</td>
<td><strong>School pupils consider student teachers as not regular teachers</strong></td>
<td>0.007**</td>
<td>0.120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Cooperating teachers concentrate more on pupils’ learning than student teachers’ learning</strong></td>
<td>0.021*</td>
<td>0.239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Sufficiency of resources</strong></td>
<td>0.004**</td>
<td>0.116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Student teachers’ assigned work</strong></td>
<td>0.019*</td>
<td>0.769</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Student teachers enjoy all the privileges provided by the school administration to the regular teachers</strong></td>
<td>0.001***</td>
<td>0.187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Teachers feel that they can learn from student teachers</strong></td>
<td>0.007**</td>
<td>0.000***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Teachers’ negative attitude towards student teachers</strong></td>
<td>0.174</td>
<td>0.001***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Student teachers as a chance to reduce burdens</strong></td>
<td>0.044*</td>
<td>0.000***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Principals’ negative attitude towards student teachers</strong></td>
<td>0.119</td>
<td>0.039*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Access to facilities</strong></td>
<td>0.000***</td>
<td>0.201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Normal class size</strong></td>
<td>0.276</td>
<td>0.079</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Cooperating teachers’ support to student teachers to understand uses of pedagogy</strong></td>
<td>0.001***</td>
<td>0.084</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Cooperating teachers’ support to student teachers to develop teaching skills</strong></td>
<td>0.000***</td>
<td>0.013*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Cooperating teachers’ support to student teachers to address gaps in subject knowledge</strong></td>
<td>0.000***</td>
<td>0.000***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Cooperating teachers’ support to evaluate lessons</strong></td>
<td>0.083</td>
<td>0.000***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Cooperating teachers’ support to plan lessons</strong></td>
<td>0.051</td>
<td>0.006**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Possibility of observing experienced teachers</strong></td>
<td>0.000***</td>
<td>0.088</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Possibility of discussing with experienced teachers</strong></td>
<td>0.000***</td>
<td>0.518</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key to codes:** Non italic with + +: in the column of nature of difference means that the group with which the difference lay was more likely than other groups to respond “either agree or strongly agree”. M: Male group. F: Female group.
In terms of considering student teachers not as regular teachers, the difference could possibly be because student teachers were the group that interacted directly with school pupils during the teaching practice and experienced difficulty in dealing with them and consequently difficulty in managing the classroom. This was made clear by Roth & Tobin (2002). In terms of the idea that cooperating teachers concentrate on pupils’ learning more than student teachers’ learning, the difference might be because student teachers were in a position to judge whether or not they get enough support from cooperating teachers. With regard to sufficiency of resources; support given to student teachers to understand uses of pedagogy, to develop teaching skills, to address gaps in subject knowledge; possibility of observing experienced teachers and possibility of discussing with experienced teachers, the difference could possibly be because cooperating teachers work in the school with student teachers and know more than other groups about what is available and what kind of support is given to the student teachers (Cheng, 2005).

However, the male group was more likely than the other group to respond either agree or strongly agree that school teachers regard student teachers as an unwelcome burden and consequently this affected the kind of support provided to the student teachers by the cooperating teachers. This resulted in considering student teachers as a chance to reduce the cooperating teachers’ burden as supported by the male group and the more experienced group who were more likely to respond strongly agree than other groups. On the other hand, the male group was less likely to respond either agree or strongly agree than the other group that school principals regard student teachers as an unwelcome burden. This was clear because the head teachers were more likely than other groups to respond strongly agree in terms of giving student teachers access to school facilities. The difference could possibly be because they were in a position to give access to facilities in the school.

5.6.1.1 Differences among groups in terms of the sub-topics of learning in the university and learning through the partnership between school and university

The differences among groups according to role, gender and years of experience in terms of sub-topics of learning in the university and learning through the partnership between school and university are presented in the table below.
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Table 5.15: The differences among groups for the responses to the sub-topics of learning in the university and through the partnership between school and university

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-topics</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Significance level</th>
<th>Nature of difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Learning in the university</td>
<td>Normal class size at the university</td>
<td>0.204</td>
<td>=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Availability of educational aids</td>
<td>0.539</td>
<td>=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Appropriateness of lecture halls</td>
<td>0.329</td>
<td>=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Availability of library resources</td>
<td>0.328</td>
<td>=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Studying courses during teaching practice</td>
<td>0.687</td>
<td>=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University tutors’ support to student teachers to understand uses of pedagogy</td>
<td>0.119</td>
<td>=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University tutors’ support to student teachers to develop teaching skills</td>
<td>0.489</td>
<td>=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University tutors’ support to student teachers to understand relationship between theory and practice</td>
<td>0.100</td>
<td>=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Time to visit student teachers in schools</td>
<td>0.079</td>
<td>=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning through the partnership between school and university</td>
<td>The university lecturers teach some theories that school teachers find inappropriate for classroom practice</td>
<td>0.355</td>
<td>=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Different views in identifying student teachers’ role</td>
<td>0.069</td>
<td>=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Different views in identifying good teaching</td>
<td>0.826</td>
<td>=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>different views between school and university about teaching and learning to teach constitute a problem for you</td>
<td>0.198</td>
<td>=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Opportunity to reflect</td>
<td>0.281</td>
<td>=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The teaching practice helps in developing student teachers’ teaching skills</td>
<td>0.593</td>
<td>=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The role of the university overrides that of the school in teacher education</td>
<td>0.139</td>
<td>F + +</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
With regard to the idea that the teaching practice experience helps in developing student teachers’ teaching skills, the difference could possibly be because the most experienced group has long experience in dealing with student teachers during the teaching practice course and know that the teaching practice experience is very beneficial to develop student teachers’ teaching skills. This also indicates the important role of experience in learning to teach. In addition, the female group responded either agree or strongly agree more often than the other group that the university considers its role in teacher education as the main role and the role of the school is complementary. This contradictory point of views was supported by Bullough & Draper (2004) in their study of the negotiation of power and position in the relationship among school mentor, university mathematics supervisor and student teacher.

5.7 Rules

This topic is divided into three sub-topics: routine, learning to teach and assessment. Some questions about routine and assessment were answered using ‘yes’ or ‘no’ and Table 5.16 shows the descriptive statistics of the responses to these questions.

Table 5.16: The descriptive statistics for the responses for the participants to ‘yes’ or ‘no’ questions in terms of routine and assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-topic</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Routine</td>
<td>Do you meeting the cooperating teacher daily at the start of the school day</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>42.8%</td>
<td>54.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment</td>
<td>Have you been shown the criteria of evaluation at the beginning of the student teaching experience</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>56.7%</td>
<td>40.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Have you been able to discuss the criteria of evaluation</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>47.1%</td>
<td>49.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other items sought information about the frequency of meetings and Table 5.17 shows the descriptive statistics for the responses to these items.
Table 5.17: The descriptive statistics for the responses for the participants to the frequency of meetings held in terms of routine

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-topics</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Daily</th>
<th>Once a week</th>
<th>Once every two weeks</th>
<th>Once a month</th>
<th>Once a term</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Routine</td>
<td>Meeting the university tutor</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>24.1%</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
<td>20.9%</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Meeting both cooperating teacher and university tutor</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
<td>19.8%</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
<td>25.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The cooperating teacher’s attendance</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>19.8%</td>
<td>18.7%</td>
<td>14.4%</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
<td>23.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The university tutor’s attendance</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
<td>26.2%</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
<td>21.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Further items asked respondents to indicate the extent of agreement or disagreement and Table 5.18 shows the descriptive statistics of the responses to these items.

Table 5.18: The descriptive statistics for the responses showing the agreement or disagreement of the participants in terms of routine and learning to teach

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-topics</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>SA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Routine</td>
<td>Doing university paperwork helps in learning about teaching</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
<td>50.3%</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Doing school paperwork helps in learning about teaching</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
<td>53.5%</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sufficiency of the amount of teaching</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>22.5%</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>47.1%</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sufficiency of the length of teaching practice</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>40.6%</td>
<td>22.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning to</td>
<td>Discussion with cooperating teacher before</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>23.0%</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>23.5%</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teach</td>
<td>teaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Enough feedback from the cooperating teacher</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>21.9%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>29.4%</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Enough feedback from the university tutor</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>31.0%</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Although half the participants highlighted that student teachers did not meet their cooperating teachers daily at the start of the school day to discuss their work (54%) or had the opportunity to discuss the criteria of evaluation (49.7), the majority of the participants either agreed or strongly agreed that doing university paperwork (65%) and school paperwork (71%) was helpful in learning about teaching.

5.7.1 Differences among different groups

The differences among groups according to role, gender and years of experience in terms of routine, assessment and learning to teach are presented in the table below.
Table 5.19: The differences among groups for the responses to the items of the AT topic of rules

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-topics</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Significance level</th>
<th>Nature of difference</th>
<th>Years of experience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Role</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Years of experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Routine</td>
<td>Meeting the cooperating teacher daily</td>
<td>0.399</td>
<td>0.028*</td>
<td>0.343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Doing university paperwork helps in learning about teaching</td>
<td>0.174</td>
<td>0.000***</td>
<td>0.348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Doing school paperwork helps in learning about teaching</td>
<td>0.462</td>
<td>0.006**</td>
<td>0.412</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The amount of teaching student teachers do is sufficient to help them</td>
<td>0.021*</td>
<td>0.000***</td>
<td>0.406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>develop their teaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sufficiency of the length of teaching practice</td>
<td>0.003**</td>
<td>0.750</td>
<td>0.686</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning to teach</td>
<td>Discussion with cooperating teacher before teaching</td>
<td>0.387</td>
<td>0.000***</td>
<td>0.248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Enough feedback from the cooperating teacher</td>
<td>0.599</td>
<td>0.028*</td>
<td>0.209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Enough feedback from the university tutor</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.027*</td>
<td>0.907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment</td>
<td>Seeing the criteria of evaluation</td>
<td>0.514</td>
<td>0.014**</td>
<td>0.079</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The student teachers’ discussing of the criteria of evaluation</td>
<td>0.012*</td>
<td>0.031*</td>
<td>0.044*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key to code:**

Bold: in the column of nature of difference means that the group with which the difference lay responded “yes”
The male group was less likely than the other group to respond either agree or strongly agree to the ideas that doing university and school paperwork helps in learning about teaching; student teachers discuss their work with cooperating teachers before teaching, getting enough feedback from the cooperating teacher and university tutors. In addition, student teachers were more likely than other groups to respond either agree or strongly agree that the amount of teaching student teachers do and the length of teaching practice are sufficient to help them develop their teaching, the differences might be because they were in a position to judge whether or not they had enough support to learn about teaching. However, the female group was less likely than the other group to respond either agree or strongly agree that the amount of teaching student teachers do is sufficient to help them learn about teaching. The difference could possibly be because of the large number of female student teachers as stated in the registry form in the university.

5.8 Division of labour

There are four sub-topics under this topic which are: the cooperating teacher’s role, the university tutor’s role, the role of school administration and the role of teacher education programme administration. Table 5.20 shows the descriptive statistics for the responses to this topic.
Table 5.20: The descriptive statistics for the responses to the items of the AT topic of division of labour

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-topics</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>SA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>The cooperating teacher’s role</strong></td>
<td>Attending to observe</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>49.7%</td>
<td>27.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Supporting in solving problems</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>46.5%</td>
<td>39.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student teachers know their roles</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>48.7%</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student teachers know the role of cooperating teacher</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
<td>50.8%</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The university tutor’s role</strong></td>
<td>Attending to observe</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>58.3%</td>
<td>23.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student teachers know their roles</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
<td>55.6%</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student teachers know the role of university tutor</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
<td>55.1%</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The role of school administration</strong></td>
<td>Organizing the course</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>62.0%</td>
<td>25.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Monitoring the work</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td>61.5%</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Providing student teachers with a place for discussion</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>23.0%</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>46.5%</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Providing appropriate teaching aids</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td>24.6%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>39.6%</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Helping student teachers to solve any problem</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>52.9%</td>
<td>20.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The role of teacher education programme administration</strong></td>
<td>Admission</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
<td>49.7%</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Managing the liaison</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
<td>46.5%</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Funding the course</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
<td>24.1%</td>
<td>39.6%</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Monitoring the work</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
<td>51.9%</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Placing student teachers in the schools</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
<td>28.3%</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>31.6%</td>
<td>18.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Managing the assessment</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>18.7%</td>
<td>20.3%</td>
<td>42.8%</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Supporting student teachers to solve any problems</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
<td>43.9%</td>
<td>18.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Liaising with school when there are problem</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
<td>49.2%</td>
<td>18.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Training school staff</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
<td>25.1%</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
<td>32.6%</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Handling complaints</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>19.3%</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
<td>36.9%</td>
<td>18.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Organizing quality assurance</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
<td>24.1%</td>
<td>41.7%</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
These roles are not isolated from each other. The partners work in complementary roles to support student teachers’ learning in the university, school and through the partnership between them in teacher education. Although more than half of participants either agreed or strongly agreed with the duties representing these roles, (32%) of participants either disagreed or strongly disagreed with the role of school administration in providing appropriate teaching aids. In addition, the role of teacher education programme administration was also either disagreed or strongly disagreed with, in terms of lack of placing student teachers in the school (42%) and training school staff (35%).

5.8.1 Differences among different groups

The results of the differences among different groups according to role, gender and years of experience in terms of division of labour are summarized in the table below (the table continues over two pages).
Table 5.21: The differences among groups for the responses to the items of the AT topic of division of labour

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-topics</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Significance level</th>
<th>Nature of difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>The cooperating teacher’s role</strong></td>
<td>Attending to observe</td>
<td>0.012*</td>
<td>ST + M + =</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Supporting in solving problems</td>
<td>0.010**</td>
<td>UT + = =</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student teachers know their roles</td>
<td>0.910</td>
<td>= = =</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student teachers know the role of</td>
<td>0.846</td>
<td>= = =</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>cooperating teacher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The university tutor’s role</strong></td>
<td>Attending to observe</td>
<td>0.038*</td>
<td>ST + M + =</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student teachers know their roles</td>
<td>0.878</td>
<td>= = =</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student teachers know the role of</td>
<td>0.211</td>
<td>= M + =</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>cooperating teacher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The role of school administration</strong></td>
<td>Admission</td>
<td>0.034*</td>
<td>UT + = =</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Organizing the course</td>
<td>0.342</td>
<td>= = =</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Monitoring the work</td>
<td>0.242</td>
<td>= = =</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Providing student teachers with a place for</td>
<td>0.090</td>
<td>= = =</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>discussion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Providing appropriate teaching aids</td>
<td>0.019*</td>
<td>CT ++ F + From 10 – 20 + +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Helping student teachers to solve any problem</td>
<td>0.034*</td>
<td>UT + = =</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The role of teacher education</strong></td>
<td>Admission</td>
<td>0.215</td>
<td>= M + =</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>programme administration</td>
<td>Managing the liaison</td>
<td>0.183</td>
<td>= M + =</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Funding the course</td>
<td>0.000***</td>
<td>ST ++ M + =</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Monitoring the work</td>
<td>0.017*</td>
<td>ST ++ = =</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Placing student teachers in the schools</td>
<td>0.011*</td>
<td>UT ++ = =</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Managing the assessment</td>
<td>0.025*</td>
<td>CT + M + =</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Supporting student teachers to solve any</td>
<td>0.006**</td>
<td>CT + = =</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>problems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task</td>
<td>Likelihood</td>
<td>Probability</td>
<td>Significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liaising with school when there are problems</td>
<td>0.356</td>
<td>0.636</td>
<td>0.050*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training school staff</td>
<td>0.039*</td>
<td>0.269</td>
<td>0.078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handling complaints</td>
<td>0.557</td>
<td>0.832</td>
<td>0.026*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizing quality assurance</td>
<td>0.382</td>
<td>0.945</td>
<td>0.050*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

More than 20 ++
In terms of the cooperating teacher’s role and university tutor’s role in attending to observe, the differences could possibly be because they were in a position to judge whether or not the cooperating teachers and the university tutors attended to observe them. On the other hand, the university tutors were less likely than other groups to respond strongly agree to the idea that the cooperating teachers support student teachers in solving problems, the school administration admits student teachers in the school and supports them to solve any problem. The difference might be because the university tutors were responsible for supervising student teachers when they were in the school and gave lectures in the university. Therefore, they discussed with them any emergent problems and know whether or not cooperating teachers and school administration provided enough support to the student teachers.

Furthermore, the cooperating teachers were less likely than other groups to either agree or strongly agree that the teacher education programme administration manages the assessment in a good way. The difference according to role might be because managing the assessment was the role to be done by the teacher education programme administration and because they were involved in the process with only 20% of the total score as stated in the teaching practice manual (Qoqandi & Hadi, 2002).

In terms of gender, the male group was less likely than the other group to either agree or strongly agree with the following roles: cooperating teacher’s role and university tutor’s role in attending to observe student teachers; student teachers knowledge of the role of university tutor; the teacher education programme’s administration of liaison and funds. Finally, the most experienced group were more likely than other groups to respond either agree or strongly agree that teachers education programme administration liaises with school when there are problems, handles complaints and organizes quality assurance. The difference could possibly be because of their long experience in supervising student teachers which could shape their views of the kinds of support provided by the teacher education programme administration (Haggarty & Postlethwaite, 2003).
5.9 Conclusion

To conclude, quantitative data were presented and discussed in this chapter showing the descriptive statistics and differences among different groups according to role, gender and years of experience for all dimensions of the questionnaires corresponding to AT categories. The main themes of the questionnaire were: perceptions of a good teacher, history and background, perceptions of teaching, perceptions of learning to teach, student teachers’ objects of joining the teacher education programme, university objects of training student teachers, school objects of training student teachers, tools, learning in the university, learning in the school, learning through the partnership between school and university, rules and division of labour. The questionnaire provided detailed information about each element of AT. It was clear that the expectations of the participants were influenced by their history and background. In addition, although the partners have a shared object which is teacher education and several kinds of support were given, some hindrances and contradictory points of views were revealed in learning about teaching in the university, school, and through the partnership between them in teacher education. This could be attributed to the different organisational structures and cultures of the two different institutions (Bartholomew & Sandholtz, 2009). These are explored and discussed in-depth in the next chapters.

In terms of differences among different groups, there were some items where significant differences were not found among different groups. This might be attributed to the similarity of views held by the different participants. As for differences, 71 significant ones were revealed. This indicates the wide differences among the participants’ views towards the issues surrounding the school-university partnership in teacher education. These differences could possibly be attributed to the contradictions inherent in student teachers’ learning through the partnership between the two different activity systems. These contradictions will be revealed in-depth in the qualitative data analysis chapter. The findings of the open-ended questions are presented qualitatively with the findings of the interviews and documentary evidence in the next chapter.
CHAPTER 6

Qualitative findings and making sense of the data

6.1 Introduction and preview of the findings

The qualitative data were obtained through interviews, open-ended questions on the questionnaire and documentary evidence. The interviews and open-ended questions on the questionnaire were transcribed and analysed qualitatively. Some topics, categories and sub-categories emerged from the data. The research questions, the items of the questionnaire and the interview schedules gave access to other topics and categories. Detailed information about the process of qualitative data analysis was given in the research design chapter see section 4.9. The findings, then, are discussed and related to the previous literature and the context of the study. It is worth noting that the quantitative data gave some answers to the research questions. However, it raised some issues to be explored in-depth qualitatively in an attempt to address the following research questions.

- How do administrative and academic activity systems work in the university to support student teachers’ learning?
- How do administrative and academic activity systems work in the school to support student teachers’ learning?
- How does the partnership between the university and the school work to support student teachers’ learning?
- What are the contradictions inherent in student teachers’ learning?

Table 6.1 shows the topics, categories and sub-categories of the qualitative data analysis (this table continues over three pages).
### Table 6.1: The topics, categories and sub-categories of the qualitative data analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topics</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Categories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Expectations about a good teacher</td>
<td>Exg</td>
<td>1. Purpose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Disposition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. Knowledge:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.1 Knowledge about subject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.2 Knowledge about teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4. Action:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.1 Action in the classroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.2 Action-own learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5. A good teacher’s tools for personal learning:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6. Teaching outcome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7. Explanation pupils learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2- Expectations about learning to teach</td>
<td>Exl</td>
<td>1. Tools for personal learning:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.1 Tools for personal learning at the university</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.2 Tools for personal learning at the school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3- Expectations about teaching</td>
<td>Ext</td>
<td>1. Views about teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.1 Positive views about teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.2 Negative views about teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.3 Requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4- History and background</td>
<td>His</td>
<td>1. Personal experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. Own teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4. Other influence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5. Values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6. Influence of history and background</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5- Objects</td>
<td>OB</td>
<td>1. Student teachers’ objects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Student teachers’ hardest objects to be achieved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. University objects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4. School objects</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 6- Learning at the university | LU | 1. Feeling about learning in the university  
2. Action-own learning  
3. Support at the university:  
3.1 Support – tools at the university  
3.2 Support – teaching staff members at the university  
4. Hindrance at the university:  
4.1 Hindrance – time at the university  
4.2 Hindrance – teaching staff members at the university  
4.3 Hindrance – tools at the university  
5. Recommendations for learning at the university |
|---|---|---|
| 7- Learning at the school | LS | 1. Feeling about learning in the school  
2. Support at the school:  
2.1 Support – tools at the school  
2.2 Support – teachers at the school  
2.3 Support – school administration  
2.4 Support – attitudes to the student teacher’s role  
3. Hindrance at the school:  
3.1 Hindrance – different purposes  
3.2 Hindrance – teachers’ view of student teachers as regular teachers  
3.3 Hindrance – teacher workload  
3.4 Hindrance – pupil attitudes  
3.5. Hindrance – attitude to the role of the student teacher  
3.6 Hindrance – tools  
3.7 Hindrance – time at the school  
3.8 Hindrance - student teachers  
3.9 Hindrance – class size  
3.10 Hindrance - parents  
4. Recommendations for learning at the school |
| 8- Learning through the partnership between school and university | LSU | 1. Support through the partnership  
2. Feeling about learning through the partnership between school and university  
3. Hindrance through the partnership:  
3.1 Hindrance through the partnership – tools  
3.2 Hindrance through the partnership – distribution  
3.3 Hindrance through the partnership – university tutor  
3.4 Hindrance through the partnership – course load  
3.5 Hindrance through the partnership – length of teaching practice  
3.6 Hindrance through the partnership – administrative process  
3.7 Hindrance through the partnership – number of student teachers  
3.8 Hindrance through the partnership – working with more than one teacher education institution.  
3.9 Hindrance through the partnership – training  
4. Different points of views  
5. Dealing with different points of views  
6. Recommendations for the partnership between school and university |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 9- Professional development | PD | 1. Professional development for student teachers  
2. Professional development for teachers  
3. Professional development for university tutors |
| 10- Assessment | ASS | 1. Attitude towards assessment  
2. Recommendations |
6.2 Perspectives on a good teacher

Seven categories were constructed under this topic. These were: purpose, disposition, knowledge, action, a good teacher tools for personal learning, outcome and explanation pupils’ learning. These categories are presented below.

6.2.1 Purpose

Half the interviewees expected that a good teacher would have a purpose in mind, and a variety of purposes was identified. Several were related to the students who were taught by the student teacher:

A good teacher attempts to explain the lesson to his students in the best way possible so that students are able to reach and understand the information in the lesson by themselves easily (ST1).

‘A good teacher seeks to build the personality of the pupils’ (ST 2).

‘A good teacher tries to find out whether or not the aims of teaching were achieved’ (CT2).

‘A good teacher aims at modifying the student’s behaviour’ (HT).

These purposes reflect concerns about students’ learning, about the development of the students in a broader sense, about assessing learning and about behaviour management. The ability to respond to the students’ questions competently was identified as something that would be in the mind of a good teacher and this was seen as the stimulus for actions that a good teacher would take outside the classroom. For example, a student teacher mentioned:

A good teacher expands his knowledge through research using the internet and books so as when he is asked by his students they realise how knowledgeable he is (ST1).

This statement suggests that the purpose of responding effectively for this student teacher was not simply to support the learning of his students, but involved the development of the teacher’s own reputation in the eyes of those students.
It is clear that the role of the teacher is not just to give the lesson to the student but to go beyond that to achieve a range of purposes. This is consistent with Shulman (1987) that a good teacher is expected to have a purpose in mind. Having a purpose related to student learning or behaviour in mind helps the teacher to make a judgment and evaluate whether the aims of teaching have been achieved or not and consequently try to find a way to achieve the aims. The most important thing is that such objects have to be clear enough for the teacher because they give a cumulative picture of the outcome that the teacher expect the pupils to achieve and consequently the assessment is based on the achievement of the outcome (Leask and Moorhouse, 2005). However, the data suggests that good teachers are also expected to have wider purposes in mind including the development of their own reputation.

6.2.2 Disposition

Some dispositions were revealed by three interviewees as expectations of a good teacher. For example, a student teacher stated, ‘A good teacher is innovative’ (ST1). He added that ‘A good teacher is creative’. Another disposition was shown by a cooperating teacher who stated: ‘A good teacher is faithful and honest’ (CT2). The personality of the teacher was also revealed as an important disposition of a good teacher. According to the partnership coordinator:

A good teacher has to have a good personality which differentiates between a distinguished teacher and a non-distinguished one. There are some teachers who have a charisma for teaching (PC).

In addition, some dispositions were revealed from the open-ended responses to the questionnaires. For example,

‘A good teacher is characterised by patience and wisdom especially at difficult situations’ (CT).

‘A good teacher is optimistic and not frustrated. He always feels that he is serving the society’ (CT).

‘A good teacher is fair, kind, merciful and treats the students like her kids’ (CT).

‘A good teacher loves to work with his students’ (UT).
‘A good teacher strongly belongs to the profession of teaching’ (UT).

Overall, the dispositions were found as expected of a good teacher included: being innovative, creative, faithful, honest, charismatic, wise, patient, optimistic, fair, kind, merciful, fond of work and linked to the profession of teaching. Similar findings were revealed by Arnon & Reichel (2007) in their study about who is the ideal teacher. Having positive dispositions is very important for good teachers because it could help them overcome the stress, challenges and obstacles involved in the profession of teaching (Cohen et al., 2004). “This is because individual teachers’ actions and dispositions help structure the learning environment they work in. They are part of it. It is not just external to them” (Hodkinson & Hodkinson, 2005, p. 124).

However, it is clear that the most of these quotations came from the university tutors and cooperating teachers rather than student teachers. This suggests the important role of experience in broadening participants’ views of a good teacher (Haggarty & Postlethwaite, 2003; Furlong et al., 2000).

6.2.3 Knowledge

Two sub-categories were constructed under this category. These were: knowledge about subject matter and knowledge about teaching. In terms of knowledge about subject matter, five out of ten interviewees highlighted this sub-category. A good teacher was expected to be knowledgeable about subject matter. For example,

‘According to educational studies, a good teacher has to be competent in his field of specialisation’ (PC).

‘A good teacher is knowledgeable about the content of the material to be taught to the students’ (CT1).

Knowledge about curriculum emerged from a response to the open-ended question in the questionnaire by a student teacher who stated, ‘A good teacher does not only cover the teaching material but also goes beyond it’.

Thus, a good teacher was expected to be knowledgeable about the subject matter whether knowledge about the content to be taught and knowledge about curriculum. These findings are supported by the existing literature (Liu & Meng, 2009; Arnon &
Reichel, 2007; Younger et al., 2004) who emphasise that a good teacher is knowledgeable about the subject matter. Being knowledgeable about the subject matter is very important because it helps the teacher to give pupils accurate information and respond to their questions competently.

A good teacher was not only expected to be knowledgeable about subject matter but also about teaching. For example the partnership coordinator mentioned:

> A good teacher has to be knowledgeable in two areas: subject matter knowledge and knowledge about teaching because the former is his area of specialisation and the latter helps the teacher to convey the subject knowledge to the students as learning experiences (PC).

Three other interviewees referred to the importance of knowledge about teaching. For example, a student teacher stated, ‘The teacher who is educationally qualified is better for teaching than the teacher who is not educationally qualified’ (ST1). It should be remembered that in the Saudi context different aspects of knowledge about teaching were mentioned. For example, a questionnaire participant mentioned, ‘A good teacher is capable of managing the classroom’ (UT). Another questionnaire respondent stated, ‘A good teacher is knowledgeable about teaching strategies and various methods of teaching’ (CT). Another a third questionnaire participant mentioned, ‘A good teacher is able to discuss students, make a dialogue with them and give them the freedom to talk without shyness’ (ST).

Knowledge about the subject matter was seen as not enough for a good teacher according to the findings of the current study. There was another important aspect of knowledge that was required for a good teacher which was knowledge about teaching such as classroom management and teaching the subject matter. This is consistent with Younger et al. (2004) and Shulman (1987) both of whom recognise the importance of pedagogical knowledge. Being knowledgeable about the subject matter and teaching helps a good teacher to convey the information to the pupils using the best way possible and to establish and maintain an ideal environment in which teaching and learning can occur (Capel et al. 2005). This is also in agreement with the fact that “the teacher must have not only depth of understanding with respect to the particular subjects taught, but also a broad liberal education that serves as a
framework for old learning and as a facilitator for new understanding” (Shulman, 1987, p.9).

6.2.4 Action

Two sub-categories were constructed from the data related to action which were action in the classroom and action in relation to own learning. Action in the classroom was referred to by all the interviewees. A good teacher was expected to have good manners and deal with the students properly. For example, a student teacher mentioned:

A good teacher has good manners and is honest with the students. He respects and loves them even those who are not well behaved. God says “Whenever you are treated badly return it in a good way so that your enemy becomes like a close friend”. A teacher should be polite and respectful (ST 2).

Likewise, a cooperating teacher added, ‘A good teacher has a skill in communicating with students and conveying information’ (CT 1). Other actions in the classroom included:

‘A good teacher attempts to apply what she has learned in practice’ (CT 1).

‘A good teacher prepares the lesson in advance’ (ST 4).

‘A good teacher encourages discussion and cooperative learning among his students’ (ST1).

‘A good teacher was using learning resources to explain the lesson in a simple way’ (ST 1).

Action in classroom was an aspect of being a good teacher that was raised by all the interviewees. For example, dealing and communicating with pupils in a respectful way. This is supported by Liu & Meng (2009) who state that a good teacher is characterized with being respectful and can communicate well with students.

It could be argued that respecting pupils when dealing with them in the classroom and having good communication skills could encourage pupils to learn about the lesson
and respect their teachers. However, this pedagogical rationale for behaving in a respectful fashion is matched by a different driving force: namely the adherence to religious imperatives which are clearly an aspect of the Saudi context. Another aspect of actions expected of a good teacher was linking theory to classroom practice which is in agreement with Blaise (2006) who argues that, given that the teacher does a wide range of actions in the classroom (such as providing a suitable learning environment, planning a lesson, building pupils’ personality, communicating and interacting with pupils and parents and assessing pupils’ learning), these actions have to be guided by theories to help school pupils learn effectively and make use of recent knowledge. Another example of actions expected from a good teacher in the classroom was having good preparation and using effective teaching methods and resources to explain the lesson to the pupils. This could help school pupils learn effectively as asserted by Leask (2005) that “Effective teaching requires some planned learning to occur in those being taught. Therefore, for your pupils to learn effectively, you must plan carefully” (p.94).

As far as action regarding own learning is concerned, this sub-category was highlighted by six interviewees. For example, a cooperating teacher mentioned, ‘A good teacher should follow up what is new in educational research in the field of teaching practice’ (CT 1). This reflects the awareness of the teacher of the role of theory in teaching. Joining a post-graduate course was revealed as another expectation of a good teacher by a student teacher who stated:

There was a Biology teacher in the school who was studying for his master’s and who was very cooperative with me on a daily basis although he was not my cooperating teacher. He was encouraging me. I asked him to teach the pupils physiological concepts and show them the blood cells during the school activity class and this encouraged me (ST 1).

Post-graduate study helped the teacher to be aware of the role of the cooperating teacher towards the student teacher.

Responses to the open-ended questions included:

‘A good teacher continuously develops himself through reading and attending workshops which could help develop his skills and subject matter knowledge’ (CT).
‘A good teacher has to listen, learn, ask the experts and learn from his mistakes’ (HT).

Similarly reflection based on experience was highlighted by a head teacher who stated:

The daily situations provide the teacher with experience. This experience shows the difference among teachers who have been in a job for a year, two, three or ten. This difference is clear in the way the teacher stands inside the classroom, presents the lesson, manages the time, elicits the students’ ideas and revises the information given to the students. This experience enables the teacher to judge who is a good teacher (HT).

Although a good teacher was expected complete some actions for the pupils in the classroom, actions for own learning such as referring to educational research findings, joining post graduate courses and attending teacher training and workshops were also expected of a good teacher as resulted in the current study. This agrees with Liu & Meng (2009) and Callahan & Martin (2007) who highlight the importance of the professional development of a good teacher. In-service professional development is very useful for teachers because it enables them to keep their knowledge up to date not only in the subject matter but also in teaching (Leask & Moorhouse, 2005). In addition, a good teacher was expected to be reflective (Zeichner & Liston, 1987; Artzt & Armour-Thomas, 2002; Brookfield, 1995; Hutchinson, 2008) as this enables a good teacher to look back at what has been taught, what went well and what did not, and consequently provides a room for development. This result is in agreement with Shulman’s definition of reflection (1987) that:

This is what a teacher does when he or she looks back at the teaching and learning that has occurred, and reconstructs, reenacts, and/or recaptures the events, the emotion, and the accomplishments. It is that set of processes through which a professional learns from experience (p.19).

6.2.5 A good teacher’s tools for personal learning

A good teacher was expected to use specific tools for personal learning. This was highlighted by two interviewees. A variety of tools were identified. For example:
‘I had a computer certificate. This helped me in preparing PowerPoint slides for my students and writing exam questions using the computer’ (ST2).

‘A good teacher... expands his knowledge through research using the internet’ (ST1).

‘When I get back to my house I read using the internet’ (ST2).

Reading books was also revealed as a tool for a good teacher personal learning as mentioned by a questionnaire participant, ‘A good teacher develops himself continuously by reading’ (CT).

Overall, using the computer in presenting the lesson using PowerPoint, using the internet for research and reading and reading books were identified as tools for a good teacher personal learning. These tools are very important for teachers’ learning as mentioned by Hodkinson & Hodkinson (2005).

### 6.2.6 Teaching outcome

Teaching outcome was a category of response which consisted of comments about the outcomes to be achieved as a result of the above mentioned expectations about a good teacher. This category was highlighted by three interviewees. For example a student teacher said:

He was using a new way of teaching, which is learning by fun, let the student play and learn at the same time. This makes the student more active and enthusiastic especially in the primary stage … and therefore they will never forget what they have learned (ST1).

Another teaching outcome related to action in the classroom was the enjoyment of the lesson as mentioned by a student teacher, ‘His way of teaching was attractive and interesting so the lesson wasn’t boring’ (ST1). Acquiring confidence was revealed as an outcome as mentioned by a student teacher, ‘He was dealing with us in a good way. He was respectful. That is why I liked him. He was trying to convey the information to us. He considered us as his brothers. He gave us confidence’ (ST2).

Changing the classroom environment resulted in students’ happiness about learning. This was highlighted by a student teacher:
Any student likes change in the classroom environment. When I accompanied them to the lab to do an experiment or to present using PowerPoint in the learning resources room, they were enthusiastic, comfortable and happy (ST3).

Overall, using a new way of teaching as an action in the classroom resulted in helping students to be active and enthusiastic, and not to forget what they have learned. In addition, enjoying the lesson, acquiring confidence and students’ happiness about learning were identified as teaching outcomes. These outcomes are explained in the next category.

6.2.7 Explanations for pupils’ learning

Three interviewees referred to this category by giving explanations for pupils’ learning. For example, using a new way of teaching which was based on playing could help pupils’ learning, ‘Because pupils like playing’ (ST1). Another explanation of pupils’ learning, emphasising the importance of the teacher, was given by a student teacher who argued that, ‘In primary and intermediate schools, pupils learn more from the teacher than book, community and parents’ (ST2). A third student teacher argued that changing the classroom environment could help in pupils learning ‘Because changing the classroom environment was a positive thing for students’ (ST3). Overall, love of playing, teacher influence and changing the classroom environment were highlighted as explanations for pupils’ learning.

6.3 Expectations about learning to teach

Under this topic, the category of “tools for personal learning about teaching” was constructed. This is presented below.

6.3.1 Tools for personal learning about teaching

Under this category, two sub-categories were constructed: tools for personal learning at the university and tools for personal learning at the school. Tools for personal learning at the university were highlighted by four interviewees. Reflection was expected to be an important tool to learn about teaching at the university. For example, the partnership coordinator mentioned:
After student teachers visit the school, they come to the university in the evening to attend the lecture of teaching method (level 2). They meet the university tutor and talk about what they learned in the university and how they applied it in the school. They also talk about what were the useful things they learned from the course and what were the problems they faced. It is important for student teachers to talk with the university tutor about what they face in the school. In addition, student teachers can talk with other university tutors in their offices (PC).

Other tools included observation and discussion (face to face or electronically mediated):

‘Learning to present using the PowerPoint and how to use the lab is only done through observation’ (ST1).

‘Whenever there is a chance, I discuss with student teachers some challenges or problematic issues they face and try together to find solutions for these’ (UT1).

‘I am a member in the discussion salon and student union in the university of Umm Alqura and therefore I am provided with an email account given to union members only to participate in discussion’ (ST1).

The course material was expected to be a useful tool for personal learning about teaching at the university as stated by the partnership coordinator:

We do our best to provide student teachers with some guidelines in teaching methods, classroom management and basics of curricula. We explain to them how to deal with pupils in the school in a comfortable way. We point out to them that pupils at the intermediate stage could be like your son and in the secondary stage could be like your brother. It is important for student teachers to know that when the classroom environment is relaxed, he could be creative. The problems arise when the pupils at the school feel that the teacher is tough and likes domination. In this case they challenge him. Therefore, he needs to be easy going (PC).
There is an interesting reference to Islamic values in this analogy between the responsibilities of the teacher and those that apply to family relationships.

As far as tools for personal learning about teaching at the school is concerned, this category was highlighted by four interviewees. Observation and discussion were again important. For example,

‘Student teachers are enabled to observe experienced teacher in different places in the school either in classrooms, the learning resources center, the lab and school yard’ (HT).

‘After the observation stage, the student teacher is given a time table by the school administration to start teaching’ (HT).

Discussion with cooperating teachers, head teacher and university tutor in the school was seen as an important tool as stated by a university tutor:

When student teachers discuss their ideas with their cooperating teachers, they make use of their experience in teaching. In addition, sometimes I arrange meetings with student teachers, cooperating teachers and the head teacher for discussion. These meeting are very useful (UT1).

Furthermore, a student teacher stated:

Now I and my colleagues don’t sit in that room and instead I sit with some teachers and deputy head teacher who welcomed me more than the head teacher. Now I have gained wide experience as I hear from them and try to correct my mistakes through observing them (ST1).

In addition, pupils’ feedback after teaching a lesson was also revealed by a questionnaire participant who mentioned, ‘I learn about teaching from my pupils and their criticism to me and the experienced teacher’ (ST).

It could be argued that according to the findings of the current study, student teachers were expected to learn about teaching from the course material provided by the teacher education programme. During the course, student teachers attended lectures and studied some theories, principles, concepts and teaching strategies which
provided them with knowledge about teaching and learning to teach. This finding is consistent with Hodkinson & Hodkinson (2005) that teachers could learn from attendance at courses.

In addition, the findings indicate that student teachers were also expected to learn by and from observation. This is supported by (Heightman, 2005) who highlights the importance of observation for student teacher learning. Observing experienced teachers, fellow student teachers and beginning teachers have great advantages for the student teacher because it gives him/her the opportunity to watch how they do some teaching activities such as presenting the lesson, dealing with pupils, managing the classroom and creating an ideal environment of learning. This enables the student teacher to make use of their experience and consequently observation becomes a source for professional learning. However, observation has some limitations such as inability to understand why something was done. Therefore, student teachers are in the school during their teaching practice experience to apply what they have learned in the teacher education programme in practice and to make use of the experience of experienced teachers at the school. This led to other expectations about learning to teach which were reflection and discussion. This is in agreement with the idea that:

In order to improve pupils’ learning experiences teachers continually reflect upon their lesson. They consider the content, how it was taught, then involvement of individual pupils and the class as a whole and, ultimately the most important consideration, what the pupils learned. Whilst continuing to cast a critical eye over what they do, it is important that teachers also share and discuss their ‘findings’ with fellow professionals. It is by doing this that they can refine their teaching methods, discover new approaches and compare how others have tackled similar situations. Thus, evaluation and reflection is central to the development of good teaching (Bartlett & Leask, P. 292).

Student teachers were also expected to learn about teaching by reading books. This could be because reading books about teaching and learning to teach could give the student teachers some guidelines and principles of the ideal way to plan a lesson, to teach, to interact and evaluate pupils’ progress (Arthur et al., 2006; Nicholls, 1999; Arends, 1998). Student teachers were also expected to learn by practicing teaching at the school. This is supported by Furlong (1990) who emphasises the value of practicing teaching at the school for student teachers in learning about teaching.
6.4 Expectations about teaching

Some views about teaching were constructed from the responses to the open-ended question in the questionnaire. First of all, there were some positive views about teaching. For example:

‘Teaching is an enjoyable process, but needs flexibility’ (ST).

‘Teaching is a favourable profession and has several moral ends because the teacher wants to promote the students’ thinking and level’ (ST).

‘Teaching is a mission in the first place. It is also a responsibility we will be accounted for in front of the God’ (CT).

‘Teaching is a tool in developing the mind, discovering the abilities and preparing students to be able to learn and understand’ (ST).

Teaching was also seen as a field of practicing what was learned. For example, a student teacher stated, ‘The profession of teaching is an application of what have been learned in the previous years during the teacher education programme’ (ST). This emphasizes the importance of linking theory to classroom practice.

Secondly, one negative view about teaching was constructed. This was stated by a student teacher, ‘Teaching is a boring profession because of the lack of innovation in curricula and methods of teaching’ (ST).

Thirdly, there were some views about the requirements of teaching. For example,

‘The profession of teaching requires patience, endurance and control of emotions’ (ST).

‘The profession of teaching requires continued reading of and research in the most recent developments in subject matter and methods of teaching’ (UT).

‘Teaching needs an ability to deal with different people in the school community’ (UT).
'The profession of teaching requires considerable financial and human resources' (CT).

To sum up, both negative and positive views were held about teaching. Teaching was seen as enjoyable, favourable and having moral ends and a field of practicing what was learned in the teacher education programme. It was seen as a tool for developing the mind and abilities which is in agreement with Pring (2000) who emphasises the important role of the teacher in facilitating pupils’ learning. The Saudi context added a further dimension: teaching influenced by religious values. However, it was also seen as a boring and demanding profession. This result is consistent with Cohen et al. (2004) that:

We cannot escape the fact that teachers are under very great pressure, and, despite the pleasures of working with developing minds and young people, their morale is low and they are leaving the profession in droves. …teachers hold the government responsible for this in terms of workload and prescribing initiatives. More means less (p.11).

Therefore, it is clear that teaching required patience, endurance and control of emotions. It also required professional preparation and training, ability to deal with different groups and human and financial resources as evident in the data.

6.5 History and background

Under this topic, six categories were constructed. These were: personal experience, family, own teacher, others’ influence, values and influence of history and background. These are presented as follows.

6.5.1 Personal experience

All the interviewees highlighted the importance of personal experience in shaping their views about a good teacher. For example, the partnership coordinator stated:

There are several sources of personal experience. One source is when I was a student I was thinking why a good teacher was so and why a teacher was not good. Throughout the previous learning stages, there were certain characteristics of a good teacher such as his manners, fatherhood of the student, competence of subject matter, hard work and ability to transfer
experiences in his field of specialisation so that the students could learn them. However, a bad teacher does not teach students anything but intimidate them. Then when I joined the English Language Department to be a teacher I studied some courses which helped me to know how to be a good teacher, to value the significance of mastering the area of specialisation, to know about courses such as teaching methods, educational aids, evaluation, school activities and to be familiar with school facilities whether it is designed to be school or rented building. Then I had the chance to get a scholarship abroad to complete my higher education in the United States. I had my master’s degree in applied linguistics to teach foreigners and my PhD in curriculum and instruction with an emphasis on TESOL. These programmes provided me with knowledge and experience. In addition, my visits to the school helped me to know about teaching and learning and related problems and how a teacher could be good. All these experiences shaped my background and influenced my practice (PC).

Supervising student teachers at the school also helped in shaping the view of a good teacher as stated by a university tutor:

Before working at the university I was a teacher for three and half years. Then I moved to work as a teaching assistant in the university in 1976 for a year. When I was a teaching assistant, I supervised many student teachers. Then, I travelled to the United States for studying and returned in 1984. Since then up till now I have been supervising student teachers for twenty five years. I have worked for quarter a century in helping and supervising student teachers. This experience helped me to reveal some problems and challenges facing student teachers to learn about teaching (UT1).

Other sources of personal experience included:

‘What I have learned during study at the Faculty of Education helped in shaping my view about a good teacher’ (CT1).
‘My long experience in teaching and teaching practice helped in shaping my view about a good teacher’ (CT2).

‘My previous experience in evaluating teachers, making use of experts in evaluating teachers and observing teachers helped in judging who is a good teacher’ (HT).

‘Moving from school to another and dealing with students and teachers helped in shaping my view of a good teacher’ (CT2).

In addition, experiencing other educational systems was another source of shaping the view of a good teacher. For example, the partnership coordinator stated:

I had an experience when I enrolled my little son in primary school in the United States. After ten days the school administration contacted me to attend the school to discuss joining him in a course. I went to the school and met the head teacher who guided me to the library where the teacher was. The teacher told me that he teaches four classes with approximately twenty pupils with difficulty in language compared to American pupils. He told me that there are some educational research studies which dealt with this issue. Look, this was a primary school teacher who relied on the findings of educational research done by university researchers. Here, there are no different points of view but agreement in point of views that school should make use of the findings of educational research studies done in the university (PC).

The responses to the open-ended questions revealed some personal experiences such as reading and research in teacher education, for example,

‘Reading in the field of teacher education and research for the best way of preparing teachers according to the international quality standards in teaching helped in shaping my view of a good teacher’ (UT).

‘My experience in teaching and supervision helped shape my view of a good teacher’ (UT).
'Attending some workshops which helped in preparing me as a good teacher shaped my view of a good teacher’ (CT).

‘My love of this great profession helped in shaping my view of a good teacher’ (CT).

‘My work as a partnership coordinator for six years since I started working at the university helped in shaping my view about a good teacher’ (UT).

Thus, previous schooling, supervising student teachers, the educational preparation programme, teaching at the university, teaching at the school, work experience, moving from one school to another, experiencing other educational systems, reading and research in teacher education, academic supervision, attending training workshops and love of the profession were constructed as personal experiences in shaping the view of a good teacher. The findings indicate that participants’ expectations were influenced by their history and background. The personal experience played an important role in shaping participants’ views of a good teacher (Haggarty & Postlethwaite, 2003; Gahin, 2001; Lunenberg & Willemse, 2006). Personal experiences such as previous schooling, supervising student teachers and work experience enabled the participants to experience different educational situations and to work with different teachers who have different styles of teaching helped the participants in shaping their views and constructing their knowledge of a good teacher (Lunenberg & Willemse, 2006).

6.5.2 Family

Family was constructed as an influence of the history and background related to shaping the view of a good teacher. This category was highlighted by three interviewees. For example, a student teacher mentioned:

My father is a head teacher. He has been working in the field of teaching for thirty years. He made me love teaching. He was a hard working teacher. I used to go with him to the school early in the morning. He accustomed me to go to school early. I saw him as a good teacher who was punctual and had good manners (ST4).
The role of brother was also revealed. For example, a student teacher stated, ‘In addition, my brother is a teacher and obtained the educational diploma as well’ (ST1).

Being a mother as well as a student teacher helped in shaping the view of a good teacher as stated by a female student teacher who responded to the open-ended question of the questionnaire, ‘My experience ... and family education helped me with some aspects which shaped my view of a good teacher’ (ST).

Another questionnaire participant mentioned, ‘Teachers in my family helped in shaping my view of a good teacher’ (ST).

It could be argued that another influence of history and background was the important influence of family in shaping the views of a good teacher. This was evident in the data. Some student teachers were influenced by their parents’ and brothers’ views of a good teacher because of their long experience in the profession of teaching.

6.5.3 Own teacher influence

Own teacher influence was constructed as a part of history and background in shaping the view of a good teacher. This category was referred to by five interviewees. For example, a cooperating teacher mentioned, ‘When I was a student teacher in a secondary school in Makkah city, there was a cooperating teacher who supervised me and had a great influence on my learning and on the experiences which I gained’ (CT2). Another student teacher stated, ‘I joined the chemistry department not because I liked it but because I liked my chemistry teacher’ (ST3).

Identifying with the personality was another influence of a good teacher as mentioned by a cooperating teacher:

A student could be influenced by a teacher and see that teacher as an example to be followed, so the student identifies with the personality of that teacher and wishes to be similar in the future (CT2).

Other influences of a good teacher included:
'There was in the secondary school a Biology teacher who made me love Biology' (ST1).

'In the secondary school I was taught by an Iraqi teacher who made me love history' (UT2).

'Some university staff told me that the educational diploma is the way to succeed in teaching' (ST1).

In addition, some influences of a good teacher were revealed from the open-ended responses to the questionnaires. For example:

'I love the profession of teaching because of teachers who influenced me and made me love it' (ST).

'A good teacher leaves a good influence on the student whereas a bad teacher does not leave but a painful memory' (ST).

To summarize, being a source of transferred experiences, having a positive attitude, identifying with the personality, making the students love the subject matter and the profession of teaching, Guiding and advising students, and leaving a psychological impact on students were highlighted as influences of a good teacher. In addition, the influence of one’s own teacher was seen crucial not only in shaping the views of a good teacher but also transferring the experience and the attitudes towards the subject matter and teaching. This clearly shows the great influence of the teacher on his or her students. This is consistent with Shulman (1987) that the teacher is able to transform understanding, skills, attitudes and values.

6.5.4 Others influence

Six interviewees highlighted the influence of others in shaping the view of a good teacher. For example, a student teacher stated:

Some of my colleagues started teaching without obtaining the educational diploma. When I asked them about their way of teaching, I realised that they face difficulty in teaching compared to my father and my brother (ST1).
Another student teacher added, ‘Previous student teachers who did the teaching practice in the last term told us about the challenges which may face us and the kind of support which may be provided by the school’ (ST2).

Peer observation was revealed as an influence of others as stated by a cooperating teacher, ‘Exchanging visits with other teachers shaped my view of a good teacher’ (CT1). In addition, a questionnaire respondent mentioned, ‘Dealing with more than one supervisor, head teacher and teacher in the same field of specialisation helped in shaping my view of a good teacher’ (CT).

Overall, influence of colleagues, peer observation and dealing with supervisors, head teachers and teachers were revealed as other influences in shaping the view of a good teacher. Similar findings were found by Hodkinson & Hodkinson (2005) that “Teachers learn from other people (fellow teachers, pupils, student teachers and people outside work)” (p. 116).

### 6.5.5 Values

Two interviewees emphasized the moral value of teaching in shaping their view of a good teacher. For example, a cooperating teacher mentioned,

‘A good teacher fears the God in teaching’ (CT2).

Likewise, questionnaire participants added:

‘A good teacher is very keen to work faithfully and persistently and fear the God in private and public and does not consider teaching as a job only for earning a salary’ (HT).

‘Our first example is Prophet Mohammed peace be upon him because he was a model of a good educator and teacher’ (CT).

‘Belief in the value of the profession shaped my view of a good teacher’ (HT).

Therefore, some values of teaching such as fearing God, following the prophet Mohammed peace be upon him as an example and belief in the value of the profession of teaching helped in shaping the view of a good teacher. This was clearly
related to the Islamic context in which the field work of the current study was carried out. In Western literature, it is well established that long accumulated values and beliefs influence what teachers do and how they learn (Hodkinson & Hodkinson, 2005). However, an explicit religious basis for these values is rarely mentioned. Since religious beliefs are a fundamental cornerstone of Saudi society, their influences on teaching (as noted in the quotations above) are likely to have significant impact on teachers’ practices and learning.

6.5.6 Influence of history and background

History and background have influence on tools and community. This was highlighted by all the interviewees. In general terms history and background has some positive and negative influences on reasons to teach and view of student teachers. In terms of positive influence, a student teacher stated,

‘I joined the educational diploma because of the insistence of my father and mother’ (ST4).

With regard to the negative influence, a cooperating teacher said,

‘We have some teachers who do not hold the educational diploma and their way of teaching is better than some student teachers who are studying the educational diploma’ (CT2).

This negative comment is interesting. It could result in the cooperating teacher failing to engage with student teachers as his/her confidence in the diploma programme is reduced, or it could lead to a constructive engagement with what is happening here – what the role of theory might be, what kinds of expertise the unqualified teacher has which the student has not (so far) acquired. The second response is more likely if there is an open discussion between the university and the schools about the nature of student teacher learning.

In terms of the influence on tools used by the student teachers to learn about teaching, a student teacher mentioned:

I worked in a lab for the university for one year. I gained a lot of experiences about how to move inside the lab, how to prepare material
and tools and how to work in a professional way. This helped me when I moved to school in using the lab effectively and comfortably (ST3).

Another student teacher added, ‘In the school you use the tools available according to your knowledge and ability. Unless I obtained the international computer driving licence, it would be difficult for me to use the tools at the school’ (ST2).

Mastering the use of tools by student teachers helped the head teachers to identify and provide the required tools as mentioned by the head teacher, ‘The ability of the student teacher to use the educational tools such as data show or the computer helps the head teacher in providing them in the school’ (HT).

Furthermore, a university tutor stated:

Out of my study, the situations that I experienced and supporting student teachers in previous years, I found that it is important to provide all the tools and learning resources in the partner schools. In every visit to the school, I ask the head teachers to contact the Local Education Authority to provide the required tools (UT1).

The previous history influenced the tools by guiding the student teachers to use the most effective ones. For example, a cooperating teacher asserted, ‘Using some educational tools in previous years helped me in guiding the student teachers to use them’ (CT2). Another influence is represented in developing some courses in the educational diploma. For example, the partnership coordinator stated:

When I was asked to help in developing the educational preparation programme, I found out of my personal experience when I was a student in American universities that there were some important courses which needed to be added such as micro-teaching… and research methods (PC).

The teaching practice component was also influenced by the history and background as mentioned by the partnership coordinator:

The teaching practice experience used to be provided in two terms. In the first term, the student teachers visited the school once a week for observation. In the second term, they practice teaching. When we faced a
lot of problems surrounding this practice such as the school administration reluctance to accept student teachers because they came to the school as visitors and caused confusion in the school work, we developed the course to be one intensive term in which the student teachers go to the school everyday (PC).

The community was also influenced by history and background. History and background helped in building a good relationship in the school community which, in turn, helped student teachers to learn in that community. This was mentioned by a university tutor,

Most of the teachers at the school were either my colleagues or students during the teacher education programme. This helped me when I go for supervising student teachers to have a good relationship with them and school administration (UT2).

Another influence was the influence of work experience as stated by the head teacher, ‘My previous experience in working with student teachers and cooperating teachers helped me in supporting student teachers’ learning at the school’ (HT).

It is clear that student teachers bring with them to the teacher education programme their expectations, history and background, and values about teaching and what a good teacher means. In addition, they bring with them their formal and informal theories which were shaped by their previous personal experience (Haggarty & Postlethwaite, 2003). In addition, some student teachers were guided by their parents, other family members and own teachers to join the educational diploma to be good teachers. Their guidance to student teachers to join the course may be attributed to the beneficial information and training they gained when they joined the educational diploma at the university and how that was helpful in their classroom at the school.

Furthermore, the tools were influenced by the personal experiences, history and background of the participants. Some student teachers gained good experience of how to use the educational aids in the university. Some of them attended training courses outside the university such as training in using computer. These experiences enabled them to use the tools available in the school effectively. In addition, the experience of working with student teachers for a long time helped the cooperating teacher to decide
upon using some tools which helped student teachers to learn about teaching in the school context. The partnership community were also influenced by the personal experiences. For example, a university tutor had good relationships with the school teachers and administration because she taught them when they were studying at the university and worked with them in terms of teaching practice for a long time. This intimate relationship reflected on the student teachers as a kind of support to learn about teaching in the school. Therefore, student teachers’ expectations, values, formal and informal theories need to be examined in both the university and the school to reinforce the appropriate ones and modify the inappropriate ones which could lead to a disaster (McIntyre, 1990).

6.6 Objects

Three categories were constructed under this topic. These were: Student teachers’ objects from joining the teacher education programme including the teaching practice experience, university objects for training student teachers and school objects for training student teachers.

6.6.1 Student teachers’ objects

Seven objects were constructed from the qualitative data analysis of the interviews and the open-ended questions of the questionnaire. These were highlighted by all the interviewees. For example, a student teacher stated, ‘Increasing my grade is one of the main objects from joining the educational diploma in general’ (ST2). Increasing the grade was highlighted because it could be related to the possibility of obtaining a job as stated by a student teacher, ‘When you graduate from the university with a high grade, this increases your opportunity to get a job’ (ST3). Another student teacher added, ‘The educational diploma along with a bachelor in a field of specialisation is a basic requirement for employment. Therefore, I decided to get it’ (ST4). This was also emphasised by the head teacher that:

The educational diploma is essential for most areas of specialisation in the field of teaching. There is a difference in selection for appointment and salary between a teacher who is educationally qualified and a teacher who is not educationally qualified (HT).
The thirdly object as stated by a student teacher was:

‘Obtaining the educational diploma is very useful for me and my students. It enables me to be a qualified teacher, something which I wish’ (ST2).

A fourth issue was related to the object of school based work:

‘The school is a workshop for the student teachers to apply what they have learned in the university such as culture, knowledge, principles, ethics and values’ (ST4). This was supported by a cooperating teacher who stated, ‘One of the objects of the student teachers from my point of view is to link theory to classroom practice because this provides the student teacher with the skills of teaching and ability to deal with pupils at school’ (CT1).

This theory into practice model is rather at odds with notions of reflective practice, of situated learning and of boundary crossing between activity systems.

The fifth object was to survive the teaching practice shock. For example, a student teacher stated, ‘My object is to get to know the students and how to deal with them’ (ST2). This was supported by a questionnaire participant who mentioned, ‘I joined the course to get over the personal fear of teaching for the first time’ (ST).

Other objects were revealed from the responses to the open-ended questions of the questionnaire. These are of concern as they are unlikely to support effective learning on the teacher education course. For example, some student teachers joined the course because it was the only option available. For such students, graduation rather than high quality development as a teacher was one of the objects. For example, a questionnaire participant mentioned, ‘My object is not to teach but to do managerial work’ (ST). Another questionnaire participant stated, ‘My wish is to join the school of medicine but I could not because of my grade’ (ST). This was emphasised by the partnership coordinator who stated, ‘Some student teachers stated clearly that they do not want to be teachers but to join the military forces so why do you stress on quality. Let us graduate’ (PC). This may be attributed to the lack of clarity of the object on the part of the student teachers as mentioned by the partnership coordinator:
In developing countries the objects of student teachers are not clear. The student teacher may join a department because of the wish to be like his friends. Unlike the students in developed countries where they are followed and guided by the institution and have a file about their tendencies. This file is with the student as he moves from one stage to another. Lack of records in our schools makes it difficult to guide the students unless the student has a family background with educated parents. Otherwise, the object will not be clear (PC).

The last object was constructed from the responses to the open-ended question of the questionnaire:

‘My aim is to convey the information to the pupils in a clear way and help them understand the subject matter’ (ST).

Overall, increasing the grade, obtaining a job, being a qualified teacher, linking theory to classroom practice, getting over the teaching practice shock, joining the course because it was the only option and helping school pupils learn were the objects of student teachers for joining the teacher education programme including the teaching practice experience. This is supported with Mtika (2008) that student teachers joined the teacher education programme at the Faculty of Education to achieve certain objects.

6.6.2 Student teachers’ hardest objects to be achieved

This category was constructed from the responses to the open-ended question in the questionnaire. Although the student teachers identified their objects from joining the teacher education programme, not all objects had been achieved. For example:

‘It was difficult to increase my grade because of the lack of support and cooperation from the part of university tutors’ (ST).

Another justification provided by another questionnaire participant was:

‘The problem in increasing my grade in the educational diploma is because of the psychological pressures resulting from the demands of the course’ (ST).
The responses to the open-ended question also revealed that course structure was problematic:

‘The teaching practice period was not enough to overcome the teaching shock’ (ST).

‘The short period of the teaching practice did not help me to master the knowledge of subject matter’ (ST).

‘It was difficult to convey the information to all pupils due to the large number of pupils in the class’ (ST).

One comment suggested that the student teacher did not recognise the nature of the task of teaching ‘I could not gain the respect of students because of their age as adolescents’ (ST). This could be seen as rather like doctors complaining that they could not practice medicine because the people who came to see them were ill! However, a more thoughtful comment was that ‘It was challenging to link theory to classroom practice because of the different context in which these theories originated’ (ST).

Thus, increasing the grade, overcoming the teaching practice shock, controlling pupils’ behaviour, linking theory to classroom practice, mastering knowledge of the subject matter and helping pupils learn were the hardest objects for student teachers to be achieved. It is clear that some justifications were given by the participants about the reasons which hindered student teachers to achieve these objects. This could be attributed to the hindrances inherent in student teachers’ learning about teaching in the university, the school, and through the partnership between school and university in teacher education. Therefore, more explanation and discussion will be given when presenting the findings under these topics.

6.6.3 University objects

Four objects of the university for training student teachers were constructed by all the interviewees. For example, the partnership coordinator stated:

Our duty is to make sure that the theories we taught find their way in classroom practice. We point out to the student teacher that this period is for training and linking theory to classroom practice therefore we ask
them to try this way and the other and try to come up with a new way; an eclectic approach (PC).

In addition, a student teacher said:

‘The university is an educational institution and its object is to prepare and graduate qualified teachers’ (ST4).

Making a judgment whether or not the student teacher is suitable for teaching was revealed as an object of the university as stated by the partnership coordinator:

‘We train the student teacher in the school to find out whether or not the student teacher is suitable for teaching in relation to knowledge about subject matter and grasp of aspects of educational preparation’ (PC).

The last object was running the course as mentioned by a questionnaire participant, ‘The university considers the teaching practice component as a complementary course to complete the educational diploma’ (CT).

Overall, linking theory to classroom practice, preparing qualified teachers, making a judgment whether or not the student teacher is suitable for teaching and running the course were the university objects for training student teachers at schools. It could be argued that the role of the university tutor from visiting the student teachers in the school is not just to make a judgment of their competence, but to help them to learn about teaching in the school context (McIntyre, 1990).

6.6.4 School objects

Being the place in which the student teachers practice teaching and because the teaching practice experience is a main component in the teacher education programme, it was very important to ask the interviewees and questionnaire participants about the school objects for training student teachers. Five objects were constructed by all the interviewees. For example, a cooperating teacher stated, ‘The object of the school is complementary to the university object which is preparing qualified teachers’ (CT1). Although working with the university in preparing prospective teachers was one of the stated objects of the school, there was another hidden object as mentioned by the partnership coordinator:
There are a stated object and hidden one for the school for training student teachers. The stated one is noble and outspoken that we have to train student teachers to be qualified teachers in the future. The hidden one is to increase the number of student teachers in the school to reduce the teachers’ teaching load. Once they arrive, the school the cooperating teachers pass the responsibility to them and do not care (PC).

This object was also mentioned by a cooperating teacher, ‘One of the school objects for training student teachers is to reduce teachers’ teaching load’ (CT2). In addition, this was also observed by a student teacher who stated, ‘A negative object is to reduce teachers’ teaching load and do not know that I am here to learn from them’ (ST1).

Another school object as mentioned by the head teacher was:

Out of my experience and dealing with other head teachers, one of the school objects for training student teachers is to cover the lack of teacher in the school. When a head teacher asks the Local Education Authority to cover the lack of teachers in the school, all promises are given to send student teachers to cover the lack in the school in the nearest chance possible (HT).

It is normal that there might be a lack of teachers in some field of specialization in the school. However, it is the responsibility of the LEA to cover the lack of teachers by graduate teachers not student teachers because student teachers are in the school to learn about teaching. This was made clear by the partnership coordinator who stated:

The university is not responsible for covering the lack of teachers in the school because student teachers are in the school for training and learning about teaching. They can not replace the main teachers. This is the biggest problem. Covering the lack of teachers in the school is the responsibility of the Ministry of Education and the LEA. Even though there might be some distinguished trainees, they should not be overloaded because they do not take a salary for what they do (PC).

Linking theory to classroom practice was also highlighted by a university tutor that:

‘One of the school objects is to relate the educational theories to the classroom
practice’ (UT1). This was supported by a questionnaire participant who stated, ‘The object of the school is to enable student teachers to apply the teaching methods course they had in the university in the classroom’ (CT). This, of course, raises the question of the nature of this theory/practice relationship. A more productive partnership may need to reconceptualise the nature of, and relationship between, the objects of school experience and university experience.

Another object as stated by a university tutor was: ‘One important mission of the school is to enable student teachers to make use of the experience of school teachers’ (UT1). This was also supported by a questionnaire participant who mentioned, ‘We want student teachers to make use of our experience during the teaching practice period’ (CT). This raises the question of how to help student teachers to gain access to this expertise.

Two other objects were constructed from the responses to the open-ended question in the questionnaire. For example:

One of the school objects is to make use of the student teachers’ ideas to develop some skills of the teachers in the school specially those who graduated many years ago because student teachers have new ideas in presenting information and encouraging pupils (CT).

The other object is simply to participate in running the course by receiving student teachers as required by the LEA. For example:

‘The school has no freedom to receive student teachers or not’ (CT).

In such a situation, the school has achieved its object simply by allowing the student teacher to attend – which is unlikely to generate a context in which student teachers’ learning is thought about, problematised and supported.

To sum up, sharing with the university in preparing qualified teachers, reducing the teachers’ teaching load, covering the lack of teachers in the school, linking theory to classroom practice, making use of the experience of the teachers in the school, developing teachers professionally, and participating in running the course by receiving student teachers as required by the LEA were the school objects for training
student teachers. It could be argued that school objects, university objects and student teachers’ objects are not isolated from each other. The interactions among them during student teachers’ learning about teaching in the university, school, and through the partnership between school and university in teacher education is clearly problematic and will be discussed in-depth in the next topics and in Chapter 7 using AT as an analytical tool to explore the contradictions inherent in student teachers’ learning.

6.7 Learning at the university

Five categories were constructed under the topic of learning in the university. These were: feeling about learning in the university, action-own learning, support at the university, hindrance at the university and recommendations for the university. These categories are presented as follows.

6.7.1 Feeling about learning in the university

Seven interviewees expressed their feeling of being part of the university community. For example:

‘In fact, I feel comfortable as a part of the university community. I feel that the educational process is improving and I could participate in the development process by solving many educational problems’ (UT1).

In addition, a student teacher who mentioned:

I am very comfortable as a part of the university community because it widens the scope of my thinking and increases my knowledge. In the university community, the ideas vary. Honestly, it was a nice and beneficial community’ (ST3).

Feeling of frustration was also obvious as stated by a student teacher:

I feel upset because of the way of dealing of staff members in the chemistry department. I came to the educational diploma with the feeling that the university community is surrounded by unfairness. While taking
the educational diploma, one of the staff members has a bad way of treatment (ST2).

Overall, feeling comfortable in learning in the university, feeling comfortable as a learner in the university and feeling of frustration were revealed as feelings about learning in the university community.

6.7.2 Action-own learning

This category was referred to by one interviewee. He stated:

When the student teacher finishes the lecture with understanding the information and goes to the central library, deals with the topic, opens a book and reads new information in it, he can innovate in addition to the information he previously had (ST1).

He added:

‘Through the internet you gain new information day after day’ (ST1).

In addition, response to the open-ended question revealed that:

‘Discussing pedagogy with the university tutor helps the student teachers in developing their teaching skills’ (ST).

Action-own learning, learning through internet and discussion were constructed as kinds of action-own learning in the university. The student teachers learn about teaching in the university. They are given lectures by the university teaching staff members to help them develop their knowledge and skills about teaching to be qualified teachers. However, these lectures are not enough for student teachers to learn about teaching without their own action to develop their skills.

6.7.3 Support at the university

Two sub-categories were constructed under this category. The university supports the student teachers by providing the educational tools. Another support comes from the teaching staff members at the university. In terms of the availability of tools at the
university, five interviewees highlighted this category. For example, a student teacher stated:

‘I am supported at the university by the library and the learning resources centre’ (ST1).

Another tool was constructed from the responses to the open-ended question. For example, a questionnaire respondent said:

‘At the university, I am supported by useful lectures’ (ST).

The availability of the tools helps the university teaching staff members in using them to help student teachers learn about teaching. For example, a university tutor mentioned:

For me I teach the teaching methods course in the learning resources centre because I use some educational teaching aids such as computer, PowerPoint and video. All these aids are available in the learning resources centre (UT1).

Therefore, the university administration is trying to provide the required equipment as stated by a university tutor:

Up to the best of my knowledge and contact with the learning resources centre, I was informed that the university contracted with SONY to equip three new halls with the most recent equipment such as smart boards. This will help student teachers to learn about teaching (CT1).

As far as the support coming from the teaching staff members at the university is concerned, this was highlighted by five interviewees. Several kinds of support were identified:

In the teaching methods course, we were taught by a university tutor who was very knowledgeable about teaching. He had very good thinking. He was trying to link theory to classroom practice…I have learned a lot from the course. For example, how to prepare a lesson using the virtual way
and horizontal one, the best way to deal with pupils, teachers and head teacher at the school (ST3).

‘I gained respect from my university tutors and colleagues. This encouraged me to complete my study of the educational diploma’ (ST4).

‘Both university staff and colleagues encourage me a lot’ (ST1).

‘What is supporting is that some university teaching staff members teach in an attractive way using overhead projector and data show’ (ST1).

Overall, the availability of tools, university tutor’s knowledge about teaching, the way of dealing with student teachers, encouragement and the way of teaching were seen as kinds of support by university tutors at the university for student teachers to help them learn about teaching. Although student teachers were supported in the university to learn about teaching, several kinds of hindrances were also constructed.

6.7.4 Hindrance at the university

Three sub-categories were constructed under the topic of hindrance at the university. These were: time at the university, teaching staff members at the university and tools at the university. In terms of time at the university, this was highlighted by two interviewees. For example:

What is hindering the student teacher is the time of the lectures which is not suitable because the times of lectures are distant from one another so one lecture is at 1 pm and the other is at 7 pm which is not comfortable for the student teacher because he has family commitments and personal affairs (ST1).

‘The short time of the lecture hinders the university tutor to use some tools such as discussion or group work’ (ST2).

‘There is no time to ask questions to the university tutor during the lecture and therefore I have become frustrated and reluctant to ask any question’ (ST2).

The distance of the time of the lecture and the short time of the lecture were seen as hindrances for the student teachers in learning about teaching in the university. These
responses suggest that time for discussion with tutors is short in the university context- something which Haggarty (1990) also recognises in the context of university tutor visit to student teachers in school. In addition, the short time of the lecture makes the university tutor concentrate on giving the lecture instead of responding to the students’ questions. This could result in frustration and reluctance from the part of student teachers to discuss their ideas with the university tutor as evident in the data.

A number of hindrances were constructed in relation to teaching staff members at the university. This was highlighted by half of the interviewees. For example a student teacher stated:

‘What is also hindering is the lack of specialist teacher educators in methodology of Biology and I am taught instead by a teacher educator who is specialised in methodology of physics’ (ST1).

Lack of specialist teacher educators in each field of specialisation could result in difficulty in understanding the lesson given to the student teachers as mentioned by a student teacher:

In the university, there are teaching staff members who are specialised in methods of teaching Science in general. However, the students vary in their field of specialisation. I have been taught by a university tutor who is specialised in methods of teaching Mathematics. He gives examples from the field of Mathematics; therefore, I cannot understand the examples given (ST2).

A related issue as stated by a university tutor was:

‘There is a lack of teaching assistants who could help the university tutor in explanation and in giving practical sessions’ (UT1).

Although the tools are available at the university, they are not used as stated by a student teacher, ‘The teaching aids are available at the university but not used by some university teaching staff members’ (ST2). The reason behind that as stated by a student teacher could be:
‘I was taught by a university tutor who was very old. ... He was not very active and sitting most of the time’ (ST3).

Another student teacher added:

Some university tutors are very old and unable to use modern tools such as projector and PowerPoint due to their age. They experienced a very old system 20 years ago. It is difficult for them to change their methodology and way of teaching. They still adhere to the old practice (ST2).

He added:

What is hindering is that some university tutors are retired and re-contracted by the university. ... We were taught by some of them. They were using a traditional way of teaching. It was better for us if they just ask us to read the book and come to the test instead of reading it with us (ST2).

Some hindrances were constructed through the responses to the open-ended question of the questionnaire. For example:

‘Harshness, toughness, lack of respect of others, unfairness and nepotism hinder me in learning in the university community’ (ST).

‘What is hindering is unfairness in assessment’ (ST).

‘In the university, we learn about the ideal way in dealing with pupils in the school. However, some university tutors do not apply this with us during learning in the university’ (ST).

‘Some university tutors only criticize and do not encourage us’ (ST).

Therefore, lack of specialists in each field of specialisation, lack of teaching assistants, lack of using the educational tools, age related hindrances, lack of dealing with student teachers in a good way and lack of encouragement were seen as hindrances in learning about teaching in the university.
As far as tools at the university are concerned, some hindrances related to the tools were constructed by four interviewees. For example:

‘In the university some classes are not well equipped. There are only chairs, desk for the university tutor and a board’ (ST4).

‘There is a lack of some books in the library’ (ST3).

‘At the university, the tools are suitable but not accessible’ (ST1).

Lack of access to the tools available in the university prevented the student teachers from practicing how to use the tools as stated by a student teacher:

In the university, I learned about educational aids theoretically but not practically. The university lecturers did not teach me how to use the teaching aids, whereas, at the school I have to use them (ST1).

Lack of practice minimised the benefit from the course of Educational Teaching Aids. This was made clear by a student teacher who mentioned:

I did not benefit from the course of the Educational Teaching Aids. I was assigned to prepare a lesson using overhead projector transparencies. These are already available in the print shops. I want to learn how to make and present them properly (ST2).

The responses to the open-ended question of the questionnaire included:

Omitting the course of Micro-teaching deprived the student teachers from practicing teaching in small groups before joining the teaching practice experience. In addition, omitting the course of research methods deprived them from understanding methods and kinds of educational research (PC).

6.7.5 Bringing the university–related findings together and making sense of the data

The findings of the study indicate that at the university, there were some kinds of support which made student teachers feel comfortable. However, there were certain kinds of hindrances which caused frustration for some student teachers. The
availability of some educational tools such as the library, the learning resources centre supported the university teaching staff members in helping student teachers to learn about teaching in the university. This is in agreement with Davison & Leask (2005) that tools are very important for the teacher to help student learn. In addition, student teachers had the opportunity to learn through discussion via internet networks. Although there were some educational tools available in the university, not all classes were well equipped and there was only one learning resources centre. This inevitably, resulted in a lack of the access to these tools as evident in the data. Furthermore, student teachers studied the course of Educational Teaching Aids which aimed at training them in how to use the tools effectively. However, due to the large number of student teachers, the learning of how to use the tools was only theoretical with little practice. This negatively affected the student teachers’ ability in using the educational aids. In addition, omitting the courses of Micro-teaching and Research Methods from the plan of the programme affected student teachers’ learning negatively because these two modules were seen by the partnership coordinator and university tutor as essential in helping student teachers to learn about teaching and how to use educational research in solving some educational problems they may face in the future.

Given that teaching and learning are very complex processes (Roth & Tobin, 2002), it could be argued that having good educational research skills is an important requirement for a good teacher to overcome some problems related to teaching and learning in the classroom (van Zee, 1998). Another kind of support for student teachers at the university came from the part of the university tutors who were knowledgeable about teaching. This could be because of the nature of their work which is based on research and theory (Bullough and Draper, 2004; Ni Aingleis, 2008). This helped student teachers to learn about teaching in that context because the university tutors supported them to understand uses of pedagogy, to develop teaching skills and to understand the relationship between theory and practice. However, there was a lack of specialist teacher educators in each field of specialisation. As evident in the data, some student teachers were specialised in Biology and they were taught instead by a teacher educator who was specialist in methodology of Mathematics. According to his field of specialisation, the teacher educator gave some examples of how to plan a lesson from the field of Mathematics. These examples were not understood (or at least, not seen as relevant) by those student teachers from other
fields of specialisation and consequently hindered them in learning about teaching in the university context.

In addition, age was a related issue of some university tutors. Some of them were old. This affected their movement inside the classroom and using some modern educational aids and consequently student teachers’ learning about teaching especially with the lack of teaching assistants who could help the university tutors in preparing and using the educational aids. It is important for a teacher to be aware of some classroom management skills such as movement (Davison & Leask, 2005). Dealing with student teachers in a good way and encouraging them to learn about teaching were constructed as a kind of support from the part of the university tutors. However, other university tutors are incapable of dealing with student teachers and encouraging them properly. Good communication with student teachers is important in helping them to learn (Zwozdiak-Myers & Capel, 2005). In addition, motivating prospective teachers is essential in supporting them to learn about teaching (Capel & Gervis, 2005).

6.7.6 Recommendations for the university

Some recommendations for the university were given by three interviewees. These included:

‘It will be better for the student teacher if he has enough time to go to the library to catch up with what he has missed’ (ST1).

I do not want the university tutors to give out of date information. They should give up-to-date knowledge and train the student teacher in how to use educational tools such as PowerPoint and how to prepare transparencies (ST2).

‘There should be at last three students sharing one machine’ (ST1).

It is better for student teachers in specific specialisation to be taught by the methodology teacher educator of the same specialisation because this will help me as a student teacher to understand how to teach during the teaching practice experience (ST1).
Overall, organising the timetable of the lecture, giving student teachers up-to-date information and training them in how to use educational aids and appointing enough teaching staff members in each field of specialisation were recommended for the university to help student teachers learn about teaching in the university context.

6.8 Learning at the school

Four categories were constructed under the topic of learning in the school. These are: feeling about learning in the school, support at the school, hindrance at the school and recommendations for the school. These are presented as follows.

6.8.1 Feeling about learning in the school

All the interviewees expressed their feeling about learning and being part of the school community. For example, a student teacher mentioned, ‘I feel comfort during the teaching practice experience’ (ST2). A university tutor stated, ‘I am comfortable when I go to the school for visiting student teachers because I feel that I help them to learn about teaching’ (UT1). Given that there are many partner schools, being comfortable as part of the school community depends on the cooperation of the school community with the university tutors in helping the student teachers in learning about teaching in that community. This was made clear by the partnership coordinator who stated:

I feel comfortable when the school community is interested in the student teachers’ learning. This helps to cooperate and exchange experiences. However, if the school staff members are not cooperative, the university tutor will never taste the feeling of comfort. In addition, we will be worried that the student teachers’ learning might be hindered by the school community (PC).

Another view related the feeling of being comfortable in the school community with the readiness of the student teachers to learn and accept guidance from the part of cooperating teachers in the school. For example, a cooperating teacher mentioned, ‘I feel comfortable when the student teacher shows enthusiasm and ambition to be a good teacher’ (CT1).
The cooperation among all partners is very important for the partnership between school and university to be successful. Overall, the interviewees expressed their feeling of comfort as part of the school community in teaching practice. However, this comfort depends on the cooperation among all partners.

6.8.2 Support at the school

Four sub-categories were constructed under the category of support at the school. These are: tools at the school, teachers at the school, school administration, and attitude towards the role of student teachers. In terms of tools as a kind of support for student teachers’ learning at the school, this was highlighted by nine interviewees. For example a student teacher stated, ‘The tools are available at the school’ (ST2).

Tools are very important in supporting student teachers’ learning. Therefore, the interviewees were asked whether or not the tools are suitable for the objects. Several tools were identified at the school. For example:

‘Tools such as educational aids are available at the school. In addition, there is a room for learning resources’ (ST4).

‘At the school there are a room for learning resources, library and labs. These are available for the student teacher to make use of’ (ST3).

‘In our school, we have educational aids such as computer, cameras, documentaries, paper educational aids and three dimensional objects’ (CT1).

‘The school provides the student teachers with a room for meetings and discussion. This is apart from the teachers’ room’ (UT1).

The tools available at the school are not confined to the tangible ones. This was made clear by a head teacher who stated:

‘The regulations, rules, styles and strategies of teaching are also tools available for the student teachers at the school’ (HT).

As for the support coming from the teachers at the school is concerned, this sub-category was highlighted by eight interviewees. Transferring the experience to the
student teachers was mentioned as a kind of support from the part of the cooperating teacher. For example, a student teacher stated:

I worked with a cooperating teacher who had 30 years of experience in the field of teaching. He exerted no effort to help me. He always come to me and asks if I need any help. I felt that he was trying to transfer his experiences to me (ST3).

This highlights the importance of the experience of the cooperating teachers which could be made use of by prospective teachers. Visiting student teachers, motivating them and providing them with constructive feedback were also highlighted. For example, a student teacher mentioned:

My cooperating teacher visited me in the classroom. He praised my performance and encouraged me in front of the pupils. After the period, he met me and gave me a sheet of feedback and thanked me. His feedback was useful in developing my performance. This way of providing feedback was wonderful because it made me accept his constructive criticism with an open mind (ST3).

Training student teachers in using some educational aids available at the school was another kind of support. For example:

‘The cooperating teacher helps student teachers to use some educational aids available in the school effectively’ (CT1).

In addition, a student teacher stated:

My subject is Chemistry. Sometimes I need to use the lab to conduct some experiments. The teaching assistant helps me in preparing the chemical substances required for the experiment. He is a very cooperative person (ST3).

As for the support coming from the school administration, this was highlighted by six interviewees. For example:
‘Once the student teachers arrive to the school, I introduce them to the school community. I show them the school facilities and departments. This helps preparing them psychologically and socially’ (HT).

‘When I introduce them to the pupils at the school I do not introduce them as student teachers but as new regular teachers’ (HT).

‘The school administration helps the student teachers by giving them specific classes with specific pupils to help them learn about teaching’ (HT).

The school administration also supports the student teachers when problems emerge as mentioned by the head teacher:

Sometimes, I support the student teacher by attending his class. I talk to the pupils. I advise them to be well-behaved and warn them not to make trouble. Sometimes, I change the class environment to help the student teacher control the class (HT).

Other kinds of support included:

‘I support the student teachers by giving them access to all facilities available at the school’ (HT).

‘The head teacher was supportive and cooperative. He respected me and treated me as if I am a regular teacher at the school’ (ST4).

Overall, familiarizing student teachers with the school community, allocating them specific classes, supporting student teachers when problems emerge, making school facilities available to them and dealing with them respectfully were sort of support given to student teachers by the school administration.

With regard to the attitude of the role of student teachers at the school, six interviewees raised this point. For example, the head teacher stated, ‘In the past, I was annoyed because of the presence of student teachers in the school. However, after I knew the role of the school administration towards prospective teachers, I became more welcoming to be in the school’ (HT). This was made clear by a university tutor who stated, ‘A lot of head teachers, teachers and teaching assistant welcome student
teachers in the school’ (UT1). In addition, a student teacher who mentioned, ‘There are some schools which consider the student teacher as a welcomed guest’ (ST1). This positive attitude towards student teachers’ role in the school helped them to learn about teaching. However, some kinds of hindrances were revealed in learning about teaching in the school context.

6.8.3 Hindrance at the school

Ten sub-categories were constructed under the category of hindrance at the school. These include: different purposes, teachers’ view of student teacher as regular, teachers’ workload, pupils’ attitude towards student teachers, attitude to the role of student teacher, tools, time at the school, hindrances related to student teachers, class size and hindrances related to parents.

In terms of the different purposes, some of the purposes of the school are conflicting with those of the student teachers. The school teachers and administration consider student teachers a chance to reduce their burden and cover the lack of teachers at the school. This was highlighted by eight interviewees. For example, a student teacher mentioned:

What is hindering is that there are some head teachers and teachers who look at student teachers as a chance to reduce the teachers’ burden and cover the lack of teachers at school. They don’t take into consideration that I am still studying at the university while practicing teaching at the school. The head teacher wants to comfort the cooperating teacher and overburden the student teacher by giving him more periods than he should be given (ST1).

This was also emphasized by the head teacher who stated:

Some schools reduce some teachers’ teaching load to make use of them in other duties in the school. One year I was in need of student teachers to reduce some of the teachers’ teaching burden. I needed those teachers to help the school administration in carrying out some administrative duties and non teaching activities (HT).
This was made clear by a cooperating teacher who mentioned, ‘Some teachers have little experience or are not educationally prepared. Nevertheless, they are assigned by the school administration to supervise student teachers. This is done because of favourism and reducing their teaching load’ (CT2).

In addition a student teacher mentioned:

There are a small number of teachers in the school especially for teachers of Islamic studies and Arabic Language. There are only four teachers of these subjects. That is why they are happy because of the coming of student teachers to the school to reduce their burdens (ST2).

This is clearly evident in the document obtained from the LEA that:

The plan of the Faculty of Education and teachers’ college include a component of teaching practice in which the student teachers are attached to the schools to learn about teaching. The supervisors from the LEA noticed the following:

- The regular teacher gives up teaching his subject and following the levels of his pupils and assessing them. He leaves the student teacher to work alone without supervising or helping him. The regular teacher thinks that the student teacher comes to the school to reduce his teaching load.

- The regular teacher leaves the school depending upon the presence of the student teacher (LEA instruction).

Another different purpose as mentioned by a cooperating teacher was:

‘When the head teacher asks the cooperating teachers to give the student teachers some classes for teaching, they give them the naughty classes to have peace of mind’ (CT2).

To sum up, reducing teachers’ teaching load, covering the lack of teachers at the school and giving naughty classes to the student teachers were constructed as contradictory purposes of the school and student teachers.
Another hindrance at the school context was considering student teachers as regular teachers by the school administration and teachers and not as trainees who come to school to learn about teaching and need to be supported. This was highlighted by four interviewees. For example, a student teacher mentioned, ‘A negative view. Teachers say that ‘you are now a teacher and have a specific task to do’ (ST1). This was also supported by the head teacher who stated:

I consider the student teacher as a regular teacher who is assigned to prepare lessons, teaching aids, follow pupils, attend school activities, attend the morning assembly, attend prayers and supervise pupils. The student teacher does all the duties of the regular teacher but without a salary (HT).

Teachers’ workload was also constructed as a hindrance in the school by eight interviewees. School teachers already have a lot of things to do in the school. For example, a student teacher stated:

In my school the cooperating teacher says to me “I am very busy”. I only see him once or twice a week. When I started the teaching practice I asked him once about how to plan a lesson and about the pupils. He said to me “they are all ok” (ST1).

Another student teacher added:

It is only two weeks before the end of the teaching practice experience and I do not know until now who is my cooperating teacher. I only approach teachers and ask them about the lessons… I do not want to embarrass them. Nobody has seen my preparation notebook yet. They say you teach the pupils the way you like. This hinders me and the pupils because I am just in the school for three months and then a new teacher will come and they will get used to a new way of dealing with them (ST2).

This was made clear by a cooperating teacher who stated, ‘Heavy workload of the cooperating teacher which is about 20 periods a week in addition to supervising pupils constitute a hindrance for the cooperating teachers in helping student
teaching’ (CT1). He added, ‘I rarely visit the student teacher because I am overloaded’ (CT1). This is also supported by documentary evidence coming from the LEA stating that:

The supervisors from the LEA noticed that the cooperating teacher is away from the student teacher. This makes the student teachers start teaching without supervision and this result in a weak start with a lot of mistakes’ (LEA instruction).

After two years from the first instruction, the problem still persists. This was clear according to another instruction from the LEA that:

We observed, based on our reports that there is a lack in supervising the student teachers from the part of the LEA supervisors, head teachers and cooperating teachers. Therefore, the student teachers do not obtain the appropriate educational experience and the aims of the teaching practice are not achieved (LEA instruction).

Student teachers were also hindered in learning about teaching in the school by pupils’ negative attitude towards them. This was highlighted by all the interviewees. For example:

Some pupils make discipline problems. They may stop some of the machines and consequently I can’t learn. Some pupils don’t want to study and are interested in other things. I saw some pupils trying to throw the projector with shoes. Furthermore, one of the teachers found some of the plugs were taken off and when we asked, who is the doer? They say “we don’t know”. Some of them move or raise their hands in front of the projector to distort the picture. Occasionally, they talk to each other especially when the light is turned off (ST1).

’School pupils make noise in the period of the student teacher even when I and the cooperating teacher are there. I advise them and also report that to the head teacher’ (UT2).

Pupils at the school make the noise for several reasons. For example:
‘The pupils say that “you are a student teacher”. Is there any shame in this? Pupils look at you as a student like them who is examined. They look at you as if not a regular teacher, not all students’ (ST1).

‘Sometimes school pupils have rapport with their regular teacher. When they are taught by student teachers, they face difficulty in building this rapport with them’ (UT2).

‘School pupils look at the student teacher as a trainee who is in the school for a specific period of time and then will leave. Therefore, they exploit the situation and make some discipline problems’ (CT1).

‘The school pupils make discipline problems in student teachers’ classes and regular teachers’ classes as well. This is because of the weakness of the pupils’ assessment system in the school’ (PC).

The discipline problems made by the school pupils have negative consequences on the student teachers. For example, a university tutor stated:

‘Some school pupils make discipline problems and consequently distract the student teacher during the lesson’ (UT2).

The distraction resulting from the noise made by the school pupils affects the performance of the student teachers as mentioned by the head teacher:

The inability of the student teacher in managing the classroom affected his performance and the ability to convey the information to the pupils. Lack of respect was another consequence of the student teacher’s inability to manage the classroom. This results in a tense relationship between the student teacher and the pupils to the extent that some student teachers asked for changing the classes they were allocated to teach. In addition, some student teachers started to be confused and terrified by these problems (HT).

These problems also affected the student teachers psychologically. For example, a student teacher stated, ‘They look at you as if not a regular teacher, not all students.'
This makes me nervous and sometimes I reprimand the pupil and at last I am the one to be blamed’ (ST1).

Another hindrance at the school context was the negative attitude towards the student teachers’ role. This was mentioned by nine interviewees. For example:

‘Some head teachers do not accept student teachers to come to school for teaching practice. Even if they accepted them they treat them as an unwelcome burden’ (UT2).

The reasons for this negative attitude could be:

‘Some head teachers declare clearly that ‘we are unwilling to participate in the partnership’ (UT2).

‘Some teachers are very keen on the achievement of their pupils and therefore they prefer to teach to their classes instead of giving them to the student teachers’ (UT2).

‘Some teachers refuse to give the student teachers their classes because they established a good way of dealing with pupils and want to keep on it’ (ST2).

Dependence on student teachers by cooperating teachers in doing the whole work made some head teachers to look at student teachers as an unwelcome burden. For example the head teacher stated:

Honestly, at the beginning of my work as a head teacher, I was not welcoming to the student teachers to come to school for teaching practice because of the dependence of some teachers on them to reduce their burden (HT).

Another hindrance at the school was related to the tools. This was highlighted by nine interviewees. Although some schools are well equipped, there is a lack of tools in others. For example:

‘Some schools suffer from the lack of educational aids which are needed by the student teachers to learn about teaching’ (UT1).

There is only one room for learning resources while there are forty six teachers in the school. This results in a difficulty in reserving the room’ (ST2).
A related issue as stated by a cooperating teacher was:

Student teachers are not allowed to use the educational aids available at the school any time they want. The reason behind that is the inability of the student teacher in managing the classroom which could result in misusing the tools from the part of school pupils (CT2).

Other problems related to the tools in the school included:

‘Some schools are rented buildings and not suitable for learning’ (UT1).

‘Some schools do not have a suitable room for meeting with partners’ (UT1).

The time devoted to student teachers to practice teaching at the school was not enough. This constituted a hindrance to learn about teaching at the school. This was highlighted by four interviewees. For example:

‘The periods given to the student teacher to practice teaching is only two periods a day with a maximum of eight periods a week which is not enough to practice and learn about teaching in the school context’ (CT2).

‘The time of the period at the school is only forty five minutes which is not enough for me to explain the lesson, link theory to classroom practice and deal with pupils’ problems’ (ST3).

Another hindrance at the school is related to the student teachers themselves as highlighted by six interviewees. For example:

I noticed that most student teachers do not join this profession because of their desire and being convinced. They join the course because it helps them to get a job in the future. They do not come to the university tutors in their office hours to ask them. In addition, they do not read enough about educational research (PC).

‘Some student teachers are weak in knowledge in subject matter. Therefore, when they teach to pupils at the school they do not teach well and consequently the pupils’ achievement decreases’ (UT2).
'At the beginning of the teaching practice, I faced a problem which was that some student teachers lack of ability in classroom management. They dealt with pupils at the school in a very tough way’ (UT2).

‘One of the hindrances in the school is that some student teachers do not listen to the advice of their cooperating teachers ’ (CT1).

Being with the cooperating teachers and other school community during the teaching practice experience is a real opportunity for student teachers to learn about teaching and make use of the cooperating teachers’ experience. However, some student teachers absent themselves a lot as stated by a cooperating teacher, ‘One of the hindrances in learning about teaching in the school is that some student teachers do not attend the school regularly’ (CT2).

The large number of pupils in the classes given to the student teachers could constitute an obstacle for student teachers to learn about teaching in the school. This was highlighted by five interviewees. For example, a university tutor stated, ‘Some schools suffer from the large class size. This has an influence on the activities in the school due to the large number of the pupils in the classroom’ (UT1). This was also made clear by a cooperating teacher who mentioned that, ‘The classes given to the student teachers range between forty and forty three pupils in each class’ (CT1). Furthermore, a cooperating teacher said:

Large number of pupils in the classroom has a negative influence on the tools. For example, as a Biology teacher I have fifteen microscopes in the lab whereas the class size is forty pupils. It was difficult for the pupils to recognise the sample because they were not given enough time to look at it (CT2).

Another hindrance facing student teachers in the school in learning about teaching was the parents’ negative attitude towards them as highlighted by two interviewees. For example, a cooperating teacher mentioned:

Some parents come to school and ask for their pupils to be taught by regular teachers instead of student teachers because they think that the student teachers lack experience and are not knowledgeable about subject
matter. This results in problems with parents due to the lack of awareness of the importance of training prospective teachers (CT2).

Even if some parents agreed for their children to be taught by the student teachers, they come to school after a while and complain because of the under achievement of their children as stated by a university tutor, ‘The school administration received some complaints from parents because of the under achievement of their children after they were taught by the student teachers’ (UT2). However, this was not the case with all student teachers. Some of them were praised by some parents as stated by a cooperating teacher, ‘Some parents acknowledge the student teachers’ performance after the progress of their children’ (CT2).

Overall, some hindrances in the school context which hinder student teachers in learning about teaching in the community were established.

6.8.4 Bringing the school-based findings together and making sense of the data

According to the teacher education programme at the Faculty of Education, there is a practical component in which student teachers are attached to the school for their teaching practice experience. They are given the opportunity to observe experienced teachers and make use of this experience. They are also given classes to practice teaching at school. However, tremendous difficulties related to learning to teach can be encountered (Roth & Tobin, 2002). This could possibly be because the school is an institution different from the university and has its own purposes, tools, rule, division of labour and culture (Alexander, 1990). In addition, the school is a very busy institution (Bullough & Kauchak, 1997). Teachers at the school are required to carry out a lot of duties such as planning lessons, presenting them to their pupils, working with their pupils to understand the lesson, marking pupils’ homework, supervising them, solving some behavioral problems and dealing with parents’ concerns.

According to the findings of the study, the school teachers were overloaded and under pressure. This is supported by Cohen et al. (2004) who argue that the huge demands of the profession of teaching put a lot of pressure on teachers. Therefore, school teachers concentrated more on pupils’ learning than student teachers’ learning. This result is in agreement with Aubusson (2003) and Bullough & Draper (2004) both of whom recognise that teachers are very busy and therefore focus on pupils’ learning
more than student teachers’ learning. This could be attributed to the desire of school staff to achieve high educational standards and to meet the expectations of school pupils and their parents and consequently to raise the reputation of the school (Wilson, 2004). Furthermore, student teachers were considered as regular teachers in the school who have to teach pupils and carry out the same duties of the school teachers. Similar findings were revealed by Roth & Tobin (2002) in their study about redesigning an urban teacher education programme. Therefore, student teachers were seen by some school teachers and head teachers as a chance to reduce their burden and help them in both administrative and academic school duties. This is supported by Aubusson (2003) in his study on challenging changes in a secondary teacher education programme. Being overburdened resulted in a lack of visits on the part of some cooperating teachers to their student teachers. Unfortunately, this lack of visits coincided with a lack of visits from the part of the university tutors as evident in the data. The lack of visits of the university tutors to the student teachers at the school could possibly be because of their huge commitments to the university such as teaching to undergraduate and postgraduate students, supervising postgraduate students, conducting educational research, attending meeting and conferences, and supervising student teachers during their teaching practice experience (Brady, 2002).

According to the findings of the study, student teachers were allocated some classes in the school to teach during their teaching practice. Being not supervised enough by their university tutors and cooperating teachers to examine their expectations and theories, student teachers took full responsibility for this. In spite of the fact that student teachers bring with them their expectations, history, background about a good teacher and what good teaching means, values, formal and informal theories, student teachers applied what they believed to be right which could lead to a disaster (McIntyre, 1990). In addition, student teachers were allocated some large classes in which the number of pupils was up to forty two. This was in addition to be given classes with a lot of naughty pupils. Given that effective classroom management is essential to effective learning (Capel et al., 2005) some student teachers faced difficulty in managing the classroom. This was because they were seen as not regular teachers by the school pupils. In addition this may possibly be because the school pupils want to challenge the “new guys” (Roth & Tobin, 2002). Another possible reason could be because school pupils miss the rapport with their regular teacher.
Similar justification was given by Roth & Tobin (2002). Another reason could be attributed to the context of the school which was the lack of awareness on the part of some teachers of the importance of introducing student teachers as teachers not as trainees. Another issue related to the school context was some parents’ desire for their children not to be taught by student teachers because of their views of student teachers as trainees who came to the school to learn about teaching and therefore they did not want their children to be the victims of this process. Moreover, the discipline problems caused by school pupils could possibly be because of the awareness of school pupils that student teachers are in their school for a short period of time and will leave. The discipline problems happened sometimes even with the presence of the university tutors as evident in the data.

Unfortunately, the ultimate outcome was frustration, nervousness and distraction of student teachers from the main task to be done in the school which was learning to teach and about teaching. Consequently, another outcome started to appear which was that the school administration received many complaints from parents about their concerns regarding the decline in their children’s achievement. This in turn, resulted in considering student teachers as an unwelcome burden by some teachers and head teachers because they need to teach after them to raise the pupils’ achievement and to avoid harming the reputation of the school. This result is in agreement with Roth & Tobin (2002) who found that school teachers needed to “clean up” after student teachers to bring pupils up to speed again. Another issue related to the lack of classroom management due to the behavioural problems caused by school pupils was the lack of access to some school facilities such as the learning resources room and the computer lab. This could be attributed to the worry of the school teachers and administration about the safety of the equipments in the labs.

This does not indicate that this was the case with all partner schools as in other schools student teachers gained different kinds of support from the part of cooperating teachers such as transferring experience to student teachers, visiting them and providing them with feedback. This is consistent with Hodkinson & Hodkinson (2005) who state that student teachers learn about teaching well when interacting actively with experienced teachers. It could be argued that attending student teachers’ classes by their cooperating teachers and providing them with feedback about issues
related to learning to teach such as lesson planning, teaching and classroom management were very useful in helping the student teachers in learning about teaching in the school context. This in agreement with Cartaut and Bertone (2009) that the historical perspective and the participatory actions of the cooperating teacher and university tutor can be essential conditions to ensure that the student teacher develops effective action in the classroom. However, the most important thing was the transfer of experience to student teachers. This is in agreement with McIntyre and Hagger (1992) that experienced teachers at the school need to be able to conceptualize the knowledge they use in their teaching to share it with student teachers, and also they need to be able to use that knowledge as a framework to help student teachers test ideas they learn from other sources.

Another kind of support came from the school administration such as supporting student teachers when problems emerge, giving them access to school facilities and dealing with student teachers respectfully. These kinds of support are consistent with the ideas of McIntyre and Hagger (1992) that sufficient support and security is needed for student teachers to learn about teaching in the school confidently and rationally.

6.8.5 Recommendations for the school

Some recommendations were given by all the interviewees for the school to help student teachers learn about teaching in that community. For example:

‘I recommend to the ministry of education to give a salary to the student teachers or financial reward at the end of the teaching practice period because they work at the school during that period’ (ST4).

‘For the student teachers to develop their skills, they have to be allocated to good classes. This helps them learn about teaching’ (CT2).

‘The number of pupils in the student teacher’s class should not exceed twenty five pupils in each class’ (CT1).

Referring to the findings of educational research was recommended by the partnership coordinator:
The experience is the recent knowledge acquired by the teacher through research to develop himself in the field of specialisation…. The experience is to practice what you have learned in the best way possible making use of the recent knowledge available. The knowledge is vital. Look at computer science, there are new software every six months. Likewise, the teachers have to develop themselves both in subject matter knowledge and knowledge about teaching (PC).

A related recommendation was to employ teachers on a contract basis. For example, the partnership coordinator mentioned:

In developed countries, the teacher is employed on an annual contract basis. Renewing the contract is subject to the teacher’s performance. In our context, teachers are employed forever and therefore they do not care. This is the difference. This is the difference (PC).

Urging teachers to cooperate effectively with student teachers to help them learn about teaching in the school context was also recommended by a student teacher who stated:

In my school, the head teacher says “this room is for student teachers”. Why doesn’t he say to the teachers at the school that these are student teachers could you work with them and let them benefit from your experience? How can I sit in an isolated room and don’t know about what is going on around me (ST1).

Overall, several recommendations about learning to teach in the school community were highlighted. These include: paying a monthly salary for student teachers during the teaching practice period, allocating student teachers good classes to help them learn about teaching, reducing the class size, the need for teachers at the school to refer to the findings of educational research and develop themselves, giving employment on an annual contract basis, and urging school teachers to cooperate effectively with prospective teachers to help them learn about teaching in the school community.
6.9 Learning through the partnership between school and university

The partnership between school and university in teacher education is very important for student teachers’ learning about teaching. Therefore, for effective partnership between school and university, different parts of the activity system need to be taken into account. These parts include university and school activity systems and within each administrative and academic activity sub-systems. Clear academic understanding of the nature of the partnership is crucial and could help student teachers to achieve their objects from joining the teacher education programme. Although the teaching practice experience could enable student teachers to make use of situational knowledge in the school context and try to link what they have learned in their teacher education programme into classroom practice, the application of theory into practice is not straightforward and the partnership is full of challenges, obstacles and contradictory points of views. Therefore, support from the part of administration for academics is very important to help them carry out their roles.

Six categories were constructed under this topic of learning through the partnership between school and university in teacher education. These are: support through the partnership, feelings about learning through the partnership between school and university, hindrances through the partnership, different points of views, dealing with different points of views, and recommendations for the partnership between school and university. These categories are presented as follows:

6.9.1 Support through the partnership

Some kinds of support for student teachers through the partnership between school and university were identified by all the interviewees. For example:

‘The most valuable opportunity provided by the university was the coordination with the Local Education Authority to enable us to go to school for teaching practice experience’ (ST3).

‘The partnership supports me by various teaching experiences such as visiting the library, attending computer training courses and reading newspapers about teaching. This helps me to learn’ (ST1).
'When I visit student teachers at the school I ask the cooperating teachers and head teachers to be close to and cooperate with student teachers’ (UT1).

‘If I feel that the student teacher is badly exploited at the school and the school administration does not cooperate, I reallocate the student teacher to another school’ (PC).

‘Some university tutors are very respectful. They give us feedback and criticise our work in a polite way’ (ST3).

Despite the fact that there is a lack of visits of university tutors, some of them exceed the number of visits beyond what is recommended by the university regulations. For example, a university tutor stated:

‘According to the regulations of the university, the number of visits should not exceed five visits. However, I exceed this when I feel that the student teacher needs more help to learn about teaching’ (UT2).

This indicates the awareness of the university tutor of the importance of supporting student teachers at the school through providing them with enough time and feedback.

Other kinds of support included:

‘The university gives me the freedom to select which school to go. Therefore, I select those which are near to my house because this comforts me in supervising student teachers’ (UT2). In doing so, this could help university tutors and save their time to supervise student teachers effectively.

Overall, providing an opportunity for student teachers to go to school for teaching practice, providing some tools, visiting student teachers, intervening when there is a problem at the school and enabling university tutors to select which schools they want to go were highlighted as a kind of support through the partnership between school and university in teacher education. This kind of support could be helpful in helping student teachers to learn about teaching. However, achieving effective partnership between school and university in teacher education is not an easy task. Some challenges, hindrances and contradictions could be encountered (McIntyre, 1995; Edwards & Collison, 1996; Haggarty & Postlethwaite, 2003; Hodkinson &
Hodkinson, 2005; Burn, 2007; Hutchinson, 2008; Bartholomew & Sandholtz, 2009; and Skinner, 2010).

6.9.2 Feelings about learning through the partnership between school and university

This category was highlighted by eight interviewees who expressed their feelings about the partnership. For example,

‘The partnership between school and university is neither useful nor successful’ (ST1).

‘The partnership between school and university is not strong enough to be productive and effective’ (HT).

‘The partnership is mainly a formal agreement. They knew that student teachers have to be trained in the school. Therefore, they are aware of this only formally’ (PC).

This was made clear by a cooperating teacher who stated:

‘There is no real partnership between school and university. The partnership is between the university and the Local Education Authority represented in the department of teachers’ affairs’ (CT2).

The partnership between school and university in teacher education was seen as not effective. This could be because of the challenges inherent in the partnership between the two different institutions (Aubusson, 2003).

6.9.3 Hindrances within the partnership between school and university

Nine sub-categories were constructed under this category. Hindrances related to tools were highlighted by five interviewees. For example, a university tutor stated:

‘During the previous years, there was a lack of meetings among all partners. This hindered me to express my point of view about the partnership’ (UT2).

Meetings held by all partners are very important to clarify the roles and discuss any problems surrounding the partnership between school and university in training student teachers and helping them to learn about teaching. Unfortunately, lack of
meetings among partners was seen as a hindrance towards effective partnership between school and university.

Another issue related to the tools was that some schools are well equipped with modern educational aids which are not found in the university. This results in the inability of student teachers to use the tools at the school effectively because they were not trained in using them at the university. This was made clear by a student teacher who stated:

At the university I learned how to use traditional educational aids such as video but not how to use the projector and to prepare PowerPoint slides at all. This hindered me to use the modern tools available in the school (ST2).

The random distribution of the student teachers was seen by six interviewees as a hindrance through the partnership between school and university. For example, a student teacher mentioned:

‘The distribution of the student teachers to the schools is done randomly without organisation’ (ST2).

This resulted in undesirable consequences for the student teachers who complained of the distance of the school from where they live. For example, a student teacher stated:

For me, the school is 30 kilometers far from my house, approximately more than half an hour. Although I have a car, I am not the only person driving on the road. To reach the school I have to cross several districts. The distribution of student teachers is random and not suitable because they don’t take my opinion into consideration (ST1).

Another hindrance related to the university tutors during their work in the partnership was highlighted by all interviewees. For example:

‘We feel frustrated because we are not consulted by some university tutors about the reality of learning in the school context’ (HT).
The lack of communication among partners could result in lack of visits from the part of university tutors to the schools to supervise student teachers. For example:

‘The university tutor visits twice a term. This is not enough to help student teachers learn about teaching’ (CT1).

This is also evident from documentary analysis that:

One of the roles of the university tutor is to visit the student teacher a maximum of five times and a minimum of three a term to judge whether or not he or she is qualified for teaching’ (Teaching practice manual, 2002).

This makes the main aim of the university tutor’s visit is to assess the student teachers as stated by a student teacher:

‘The university tutor visited me only three times. This is not enough. He did not give me guidance in how to plan a lesson. The aim of the visit was only for assessment’ (ST2).

The lack of visiting student teachers in the school could be justified as stated by a university tutor that:

We are overloaded. I have to teach for undergraduate and postgraduate students. I have to supervise postgraduate students and read their theses. I have to attend meetings in the Faculty of Education. Therefore, I am already overloaded (UT1).

Another justification could be:

‘There is a lack of university tutors to the extent that the university depends upon some teaching assistants to supervise student teachers’ (UT2).

The course load was also revealed as a hindrance facing student teachers through the partnership between school and university. This was highlighted by nine interviewees. For example, a student teacher stated:
I study five courses at the university and I should present research work. However, I have some research work which I haven’t finished yet because I go to the school early at 6.30 in the morning and finish at 1 pm. I finish the school exhausted then I take a break for one hour and afterwards I go to the university to study till 8 pm. The teaching practice is exhausting and the student teacher shouldn’t take any courses during it. When I come back from the university I am very tired, how can I prepare my lessons for tomorrow’s work in the school? The mind can’t stand this (ST1).

Student teachers’ absence from the school was a result of the intensive as mentioned by a student teacher:

I study five courses at the university. I have to attend examinations and submit assignments. Yesterday, I was absent from the school because I had to finish two assignments. This is something which hinders me. How can I compromise between the requirements of the university and that of the school? (ST2).

In addition another student teacher stated:

‘Due to the lack of time, sometimes I complete some assignments required by the university at the school’ (ST3).

The short time of the teaching practice period was also highlighted by four interviewees. For example:

‘From my point of view the time allocated for the teaching practice is not enough’ (PC).

This was evident from the documentary analysis that:

The teaching practice requires student teachers to be full time in the school for five days a week for one term without studying any courses at the university in the morning (The teaching practice manual, 2002).

This shows that the length of the teaching practice is short given that part of this time is spent in familiarising student teachers with the school facilities and consequently
the time left to learn about and practice teaching in the school context is not enough. This was made clear by a cooperating teacher who stated:

The student teachers do not arrive the school at the beginning of term. When they arrive the school, they need at least one to two weeks to observe the experienced teachers and get familiar with the school context. In doing so, there is no much time left for practicing teaching and make use of the experience of the cooperating teachers at the school (CT2).

Another hindrance facing student teachers through the partnership was some administrative views and processes. This was stated by nine interviewees. For example, the partnership coordinator stated:

‘The university administration does not give considerable attention to support the Faculty of Education to carry out its role. They concentrate on the scientific faculties which need their support’ (PC).

He added that:

I met the president of the university and discussed with him the problems of the teaching practice. He said to me ‘what do you mean by teaching practice? When the student teacher graduates and joins the school and practice teaching he will learn about teaching by trial and error and through experience his skills will develop’. This is the point of view of the president of the university (PC).

For the partnership between school and university in teacher education to be successful, there must be awareness among partners of the importance of such partnership. In addition, sustained funding to facilitate and help all partners to carry out their role is essential. The lack of awareness from the part of university administration of the important role of the partnership between school and university in preparing prospective teachers resulted in lack of funding as stated by the head teacher that:
'The university does not fund the teaching practice. This hinders the teachers in learning about teaching in the school due to the lack of some requirements for them to learn about teaching' (HT).

Another hindrance related to administration was the extreme centralisation. For example, the partnership coordinator mentioned:

There is extreme centralisation based on individual interest. The Local Education Authority gives us no choice to select the partner schools. They coordinate to send the student teachers to the schools in which teachers are overburdened to reduce their teaching load (PC).

This is supported by documentary analysis that:

The Local Education Authority specifies the names of available schools and the needed specialities in each school. Then, the bureau of the teaching practice at the Faculty of Education distributes the student teachers to these schools according to specific forms provided by the Local Education Authority (The teaching practice manual, 2002).

This long administrative process resulted in a delay in distributing student teachers to the partner schools. This negatively affects student teachers’ learning as stated by a student teacher:

'I have not actually started practicing teaching until one and half month from the start of the teaching practice period. Both the university and the Local Education Authority think that the problem is not their responsibility' (ST2).

This delay is evident from documentary analysis that there is sometimes a six-week-gape between the official start of the term and the actual start of student teachers’ arrival to the school for teaching practice.

The lack of coordination between the MOE and the MOHE resulted in a lack of effective partnership between school and university. For example, the partnership coordinator stated:
'They change the school curricula and we do not know the reasons for the change. They have to consult and coordinate with the university about this change’ (PC).

This was made clear by a university tutor who stated:

There is a lack of communication between the Faculty of Education and the schools. The bureau of the teaching practice needs to actualize this communication and organise some meetings among all partners. This will help the partners to work together through the partnership (UT1).

The large number of student teachers joining the teaching practice experience was stated by five interviewees. For example:

‘The number of student teachers is very large. This term I am supervising fourteen student teachers. I used to supervise up to twenty two student teachers. I distributed them to four schools’ (UT2).

The large number of student teachers could also result in a difficulty in finding partner schools for them as mentioned by a university tutor:

In this term, ten classes were allocated for student teachers to practice teaching. However, there were still four student teachers without classes. Therefore, I divided the student teachers into two groups. One group practices teaching for one and a half month and the other group practices teaching the rest of the term (UT2).

Working with more than one teacher education institution could confuse the work in the school. This was highlighted by one interviewee. She stated:

‘One of the hindrances which confuse the work in the school is that we have some student teachers from the college whose teaching practice period is different from student teachers from the university’ (CT1).

Another hindrance was the lack of training. This was seen by seven interviewees. For example, a cooperating teacher stated:

‘We are not aware of the modern ways of teaching used in the university. In addition, the university tutors use some theories which we do not know about’ (CT1).
This was made clear by the partnership coordinator who mentioned:

The teachers at the school teach the new curriculum in a traditional way because they have not been trained in using the modern way of teaching. This is a real problem I have experienced during my visit to the school (PC).

Furthermore, a cooperating teacher added:

‘Some of the cooperating teachers who supervise student teachers lack experience and not educationally prepared. This negatively affects the student teachers’ (CT2).

The same applies to some university tutors. For example:

‘My field of specialisation is History. Although I am not educationally prepared, I was assigned to supervise student teachers during their teaching practice experience’ (UT2).

Overall, some hindrances which are inherent in the partnership between school and university were constructed. These were: hindrances related to tools, distribution of student teachers, university tutors, course load, length of teaching practice, administrative processes, number of student teachers, working with more than one teacher education institution and training. These hindrances could lead to different points of views among partners in terms of teaching and learning to teach.

6.9.4 Different points of views

There were different points of views about teaching and learning to teach held by the participants. This was highlighted by all the interviewees. The gap between theory and practice was emphasized by all the interviewees. For example, the head teacher stated:

There are considerable differences in points of views in identifying who is a good teacher between school and university. The university tutors depend on theories and research in identifying a good teacher, whereas teachers at the school depend on their long experience in teaching and the situations they experienced in identifying a good teacher (HT).
The university tutors see theories as important and that they must find their way in classroom practice. For example, the partnership coordinator stated:

We are doing our best to provide teachers at the school with theories and the findings of the research studies. The experiences gained from the cooperating teachers at the school are not enough for student teachers to learn about teaching. Theories should be linked to classroom practice (PC).

This was made clear by a cooperating teacher who stated:

There is a big difference in points of views between the university tutor and the cooperating teacher. The university tutor asks the student teacher to apply some theories in the classroom practice. There is a difficulty in linking some theories to classroom practice. The cooperating teacher, based on his experience, gives the student teachers a range of ways of teaching which could be used in the classroom effectively. When the university tutor visits the student teacher, he asks him not to use these ways of teaching and instead asks him to apply the theories he has learned in the university. In this case, the student teacher faces contradictory points of views between the university tutor and the cooperating teacher (CT2).

Two reasons for these contradictory points of views were identified. For example, the partnership coordinator mentioned:

‘Out of my experience, some teachers do not read and do not want to learn from the university. They just memorize and recall the curriculum to their pupils’ (PC).

Another reason as stated by a cooperating teacher:

‘In my point of view, the university tutor is not aware of the reality and the emerging problems in the classroom’ (CT1).

Going beyond the teaching material was also another contradiction between the university tutors and the cooperating teachers as mentioned by a student teacher:
There is a big difference. The university tutor wants me to apply what I have learned in the university whereas the cooperating teacher wants me to teach what is in the school curriculum even though the school curriculum is completely different from the university curriculum (ST1).

He added:

‘The university tutor wants me to go beyond the school textbook while the cooperating teacher wants me to stick to it when teaching’ (ST1).

This indicates the different points of views between the school community and the university community in teaching the curriculum.

Another source of contradictory points of views was the way of managing the classroom. For example a student teacher said:

The cooperating teacher asked me to divide the time of the period over the activities of the lesson. He emphasized having a sense of humour during the lesson. When the university tutor visited me, he criticized this way and asked me to divide the time over the activities and to be serious with pupils (ST3).

Overall, theorising, going beyond the school curriculum content and the way of managing the classroom by the student teacher were sources of contradictory points of views between the university tutors and the cooperating teachers at the school.

6.9.5 Dealing with different points of views

Dealing with contradictory points of views was an issue of concern for all the interviewees. They dealt with these contradictory points of views in different ways. For example:

‘I feel that there is still a big difference and lack of agreement in points of views between university tutors and cooperating teachers. Therefore, I feel upset as a result of these different points of views’ (ST2).

‘According to your wisdom and diplomacy, you can choose what is useful for you and your pupils’ (ST2).
Another student teacher further stated:

Sometimes I say I wish I didn’t start the teaching practice. I complain. I have come to be trapped. I want them to teach me how to master teaching not to be conspired against or to meet the requirements of someone and neglect those of the other. This is something harmful to me as a student teacher. The university tutor has 70 marks. If I don’t apply what he wants, he blames me and tells me that he will reduce my score. This is also for the cooperating teacher. Therefore, I try to meet the requirements of both sides so when they want to assess me they do this in the light of what I heard from both of them (ST1).

Being in the school for most of the time of the teaching practice experience and the lack of visits from the part of university tutors reduced the intensity of the contradictory points of views and consequently its negative effect was minimal. For example, a student teacher mentioned:

‘Despite the fact that there are contradictory points of views between the university tutor and the cooperating teacher, their negative effect was mild. This is because of being with the cooperating teacher most of the time’ (ST4). He added that, ‘I ignore this contradiction in their views’ (ST4).

Some ways of dealing with contradictory points of views included:

‘I discuss the contradictory points of views with the cooperating teacher and guide him to refer to some references to read and then we can meet to discuss’ (PC).

‘I understand the value of the point of view of the university tutor. Therefore, I ask her to help and guide me to link theory to classroom practice’ (CT1).

However, some cooperating teachers still see that some theories are difficult to be linked to classroom practice. For example, a cooperating teacher stated:

‘I found that some theories are not applicable in the classroom practice. I met the university tutor and discussed this issue with him and asked him not to assign student teachers to use them’ (CT2).
To sum up, feeling of frustration, working for own interest, ignoring, discussion, and stressing the inapplicability of some theories were identified as ways of dealing with contradictory points of views.

6.9.6 Bringing the partnership-related findings together and making sense of the data

Most of the participants expressed their feeling that the partnership between the Faculty of Education and the schools is neither effective nor productive. This could be attributed to the hindrances inherent in the partnership between the two different institutions. According to the findings of the study, there was a lack in communication not only between the schools and the university but also between the MOE and the MOHE. This is in agreement with Yamagata-Lynch & Smaldino (2007) in their study on evaluating and improving K-12 school and university partnerships. For example, those in charge of curriculum design in the MOE changed the curriculum without either explaining the reasons for changing or consulting the educationalists at the university about the introduced change. This was asserted by the partnership coordinator at the university. This is in disagreement with the fact that reforming schools requires coincident reform in teacher education (Newell, 1996). One reason for the lack of communication was the restricted view of the university and the LEA administration of the importance of the partnership between school and university in teacher education. This restricted view resulted in lack of funding due to the lack of awareness that when partners engage in partnership activity they cross boundaries and engage in a new activity system which requires new rules, tools and division of labour. This lack of communication widens the gap between school and university in terms of teaching and learning to teach. Therefore, there were different points of views between the university tutors and the cooperating teachers. Student teachers were asked by their university tutors to link some theories and strategies they had learned in the teacher education programme to classroom practice. However, these theories and strategies were considered irrelevant by their cooperating teachers. This widens the gap between theory and practice (Dodd, 2001; Burn, 2007; Laursen, 2007; Yamagata-Lynch & Haudenschild, 2006). The university tutors asked their student teachers to link theory to classroom practice because of their awareness of the important role
played by theory in shaping and guiding teachers’ work in the classroom (Blaise, 2006).

Another conflicting point of view was that student teachers were asked by their university tutors to give school pupils additional information about the subject taught beyond the school textbook. However, this was strictly rejected by their cooperating teachers who asked them to stick to the content of the textbook. This clearly indicates the narrow conception of the curriculum advocated by the school community which emphasizes the traditional view of the curriculum as equal to the textbook. This is in contrast to the modern view of the curriculum supported by the university tutors that the curriculum is broader than the textbook. These contradictory points of views between the university tutors and cooperating teachers resulted in frustration of the student teachers and put them in a conflicting situation. Similar findings were revealed by Bullough & Draper (2004) and Cartaut & Bertone (2009) who found that the lack of agreement between university tutor and cooperating teacher put student teachers in contradictory positions. However, the negative effect of these contradictory points of views was mild for some student teachers because they spend most of their time with the cooperating teacher. This is consistent with Cheng (2005) who argues that student teachers spend more time with their cooperating teachers than anyone else.

Another reason for the lack of communication was centralisation on the part of the LEA. The Faculty of Education had no right to choose the partner schools which were selected by the LEA. This administrative process had serious consequences because this resulted in letting student teachers practice teaching in some schools which were not suitable for teaching practice and had a lack of facilities. Therefore, student teachers’ learning about teaching was negatively affected. It was evident in the findings that the reasons behind that were to reduce teachers’ burden and to cover the lack of teachers at the school. The centralisation resulted also in a delay in allocating student teachers to their schools for more than one month. This delay could be attributed to the bureaucratic paper work inherent in this administrative process (Edwards & Mutton, 2007). Given the fact that the period of teaching practice is only fifteen weeks, not the whole duration was made use of because of the delay and the time needed for student teachers to get familiar with school facilities, classes to be
taught to and observing experienced teachers. Therefore, there was not enough time for them to practice and learn about teaching in the school context. This is supported by McIntyre (1990) in his attempt to identify the endemic problems inherent in the PGCE programme at Oxford University. Furthermore, student teachers were required to attend lectures at the university, submit assignments and have examinations during their teaching practice experience. This negatively affected their learning about teaching in the school. The intensive course resulted in tiredness of the student teachers because they needed to meet the requirements of both school and university at the same time. This is evident in the previous literature (Burn et al., 2003; and Furlong, 1990) both of whom recognise that the PGCE course is very compressed and imposes several demands on student teachers. In addition, this was made clear by Haggarty (1990) that:

> Interns are also short of time. We ask them to work extremely hard throughout the year both at OUDES and in school not just in their teaching and seminars but in addition we ask them to read, reflect and write throughout the year. The pressures of a highly structured programme based in two quite separate institutions for many weeks of the year cannot be underestimated (p.78).

Another activity was school working with more than one teacher education institution in training student teachers. Each teacher education institution has its plan and timetable for training their student teachers and supervising them and in spite of the fact that the school had no choice to take part in the partnership activity system, this resulted in confusion in the work in the school. A similar finding was found by Edwards & Mutton (2007) who found that different demands of different higher education institution partners were a common complaint. In addition, lack of training of both university tutors and cooperating teachers was revealed by the findings of the study. It was surprising that some cooperating teachers who worked with student teachers were not educationally prepared. More surprisingly, a university tutor mentioned that she was not educationally prepared. It could be argued that although they have long experience in teaching either in the university or in the school, it is not enough for them to supervise student teachers unless they are educationally prepared to help student teachers to learn in the school about teaching. Therefore, enough training is required for both university tutors and cooperating teachers to be able to carry out their tasks and to work in complementary roles (Cartaut and Bertone, 2009).
6.9.7 Recommendations for the partnership between school and university

Some recommendations for the partnership between school and university to be successful were given by all the interviewees. This reflects the desire of all partners for the partnership to be effective. Recommendations given by the university staff included:

I always call for effective partnership between the university and the school in teacher education. I tried to spread this view to the Local Education Authority managers. However, this needs support from both the Ministry of Education and the Ministry of Higher Education. They have to believe in the importance of the partnership and work effectively to develop such partnership. For effective partnership between school and university in teacher education there should be a great commitment from all partners to carry out their roles (PC).

‘It is assumed that they give us the opportunity to select the partner schools according to their suitability and cooperation in terms of teaching practice’ (PC).

‘The communication between school and university has to be actualized through holding meetings to discuss all the issues surrounding the partnership’ (UT1).

Another recommendation given by the partnership coordinator was about increasing the period of teaching practice through two stage schools. He stated:

One term is not enough for student teachers to learn about teaching and apply what they have learned in the university in the school context. Therefore, the teaching practice should be carried out through two terms. In the first term, student teachers have to join intermediate schools and, in the second term, they have to join secondary schools. This helps them to gain different experiences and enable them to be able to teach in each one of these stages in the future (PC).

‘There should be some educational research centres to help in supervising, evaluating and conducting educational research to reform the educational institutions in the KSA’ (PC).
Another recommendation emphasized the link between theory and practice. For example, a university tutor mentioned, ‘For teaching to be successful and to achieve the aims of teaching, theory should be linked to the classroom practice’ (UT1).

Student teachers were also recommended the following:

‘The crowded roads make me nervous especially when millions of pilgrims come to Makkah city to perform Hajj. Therefore, the university has to give us the chance to select the nearby schools’ (ST2).

‘The student teachers have to be sent to their schools immediately with the beginning of the term’ (ST3).

‘The more the student teacher is motivated, the more he is active and the less he is frustrated, stressed and enforced to do something’ (ST1).

‘Enough time is required for both the university tutor and the cooperating teacher to carry out their roles’ (ST3).

‘The student teacher should not take any courses during the teaching practice’ (ST1).

It is important for student teachers to learn not only about teaching but also about the facilities in the school. This was recommended by a student teacher who mentioned:

The student teacher should learn about teaching in the school context. However, learning about administrative issues, counselling and supervision are also important elements. I have been told by the school teachers and head teacher that I can go once I finish my classes (ST3).

Converging the different points of views between the university and the school in terms of identifying good teaching was also recommended by a student teacher who stated, ‘Why they do not meet and try to agree upon what is different so that if they want to assess us, this is done according to the agreed upon criteria’ (ST1).

In terms of school staff, the following recommendations were revealed:

Providing training courses for cooperating teachers was recommended by a cooperating teacher who stated:
There should be some training courses for cooperating teachers at the Faculty of Education. These training courses should not be restricted to educational courses but some training in computer and English language (CT2).

These training courses can be useful for the cooperating teachers to carry out their roles to help student teachers learn in the school context.

Funding the partnership was also recommended. For example, the head teacher mentioned, ‘I hope there is financial support from the part of the university to the partner schools to support student teachers’ learning’ (HT).

‘The LEA supervisors could play an important role in participating in the partnership between school and university in teacher education. They could cooperate with the cooperating teachers and university tutors’ (CT2).

This indicates the importance of involving all partners who have a direct impact on the partnership between school and university in teacher education.

Finally, a direct partnership between school and university to minimise the centralisation of the LEA was recommended. For example, a cooperating teacher stated, ‘There should be a direct partnership between school and university in teacher education’ (CT2).

Overall, some recommendations were given by all the interviewees. These include: believing in the importance of the partnership, selecting the partner schools by the Faculty of Education, holding meetings among partners, increasing the period of teaching practice, establishing educational research centres, linking theory to classroom practice, giving student teachers the opportunity to choose the school, attaching the student teachers to their schools from the beginning of the term, motivating student teachers, being full time at the school during the teaching practice, providing enough time for the university tutors and cooperating teachers to carry out their roles, learning about school administration and facilities, converging different points of views, providing training courses for cooperating teachers, funding, actualising the role of LEA supervisors in the partnership, and establishing a direct partnership between school and university in teacher education.
Although there were some hindrances and contradictory points of views inherent in the partnership between school and university, it provided all partners with a real opportunity for professional development.

6.10 Professional development through the partnership between school and university

Some aspects of professional development for student teachers, cooperating teachers and university tutors were constructed from the qualitative data. In terms of student teachers’ professional development, this was highlighted by seven interviewees. For example:

‘Sometimes I lack knowledge about subjects or forget some information because of being away from subject matter for approximately a year. The school teachers helped me in bridging the gap in subject matter’ (ST3).

‘I only learned how to set a behavioural objective at the school when I joined the teaching practice experience’ (ST2).

‘I only learned how to use the tools in the school when I approached a teacher and asked him how to use the tool’ (ST1).

This indicates the important role of cooperating teachers in helping student teachers not only in learning about teaching in the school but also in subject matter.

Confidence and classroom management were another aspect of professional development for student teachers as stated by a student teacher:

At the beginning, I was worried about classroom management because when I was a student at the school I noticed that some students make discipline problems. When I joined the teaching practice these worries disappeared. The teaching practice experience helped me in controlling myself and consequently classroom management (ST4).

Being in the school for teaching practice helped student teachers to be psychological prepared to overcome the practice shock and consequently raise their confidence.
Another aspect of professional development as stated by the head teacher was:

‘I assigned the student teachers to get familiar with the job of the head teacher, the pupils’ counseling and the deputy head teacher. This helps the student teachers to get experiences in these aspects’ (HT).

It could be argued that student teachers had the opportunity to reflect upon what they have been learning in the teacher education programme including teaching practice experience in the school because they discussed the situations and lived experiences with their cooperating teachers. The same finding was revealed by Pedro (2005) who found that student teachers were able to reflect upon what they had learned in university when they went to school for teaching practice experience. In addition, some student teachers gained psychological preparation by overcoming the shock of teaching practice and consequently increasing their confidence as teachers. This is in agreement with Cheng (2005) whose study revealed that teaching practice helped student teachers to be psychologically prepared for teaching. Furthermore, they got familiar with some administrative duties and the school context. This finding is supported by Cheng (2005). This could be attributed to their work in a realistic environment in which they could learn about teaching. Moreover, some student teachers were given training on how to use the tools available in the school. In addition, professional development regarding subject knowledge and classroom management was learned. This indicates that teaching practice is a real opportunity for student teachers to develop their knowledge and skills, not only about teaching and learning to teach but about the school context as well.

As far as the professional development of cooperating teachers is concerned, this was highlighted by three interviewees. For example, a student teacher stated, ‘They respect the student teacher and think that his knowledge is up to date and could be beneficial to the teachers at the school especially because some teachers graduated from the university a long time ago’ (ST1). In addition, a cooperating teacher said:

The teacher at the school has experience in teaching in a way that she has used to. When the student teachers come to school, they bring with them the recent knowledge about teaching which could be beneficial for pupils and cooperating teachers alike (CT1).
It is clear that the recent knowledge of student teachers about both subject matter and teaching was made use of by the cooperating teachers. This is consistent with Cheng (2005) who found that experienced teachers made use of the recent knowledge of student teachers through working with them during the teaching practice experience period. This could possibly be because the university provided the student teachers with recent knowledge about the subject matter and teaching. Having graduated many years ago, cooperating teachers found the student teachers’ knowledge up-to-date which could be made use of. This was made clear by Hodkinson & Hodkinson (2005) that: “Experienced teachers can also learn through working with student teachers. Student teachers sometimes bring additional subject expertise to a department. Also some student teachers brought computer expertise that older teachers lacked” (p. 116).

With regard to the university tutors’ professional development, this was highlighted by three interviewees. For example, the partnership coordinator stated:

‘My visits to the trainees at the school provided me with experience which enabled me to bridge the gap between theory and practice’ (PC).

‘My visits to different schools helped me in experiencing different styles of teaching and consequently comparing them and use the best to help our student teachers’ (PC).

A university tutor added:

‘In every visit to the student teachers at the school, I gain experience, awareness and understanding of all matters related to the teaching practice’ (UT1).

It could be argued that the school has different teachers. They also differ in their teaching styles and views about good teaching (Leask & Moorhouse, 2005). Visiting the school to supervise student teachers enabled the university tutors to experience these different styles of teaching and consequently help student teachers by providing them with knowledge about alternative ways of teaching. Another kind of professional development of university tutors was enabling them to get access to the real teaching environment at school and try to find ways of bridging the gap between theory and practice. This is in agreement with Bell et al. (2009) who highlight that the teaching practice provides university professors with a great opportunity to interact
with the school community and reflect upon the content and credibility of teacher education programmes.

6.11 Assessment

Two categories were constructed under the topic of assessment. These were: attitude towards assessment and recommendation for assessment. These are presented below.

6.11.1 Attitude towards assessment

Eight interviewees highlighted their attitude towards assessment. The distribution of the marks to assess the student teacher during teaching practice in which is 10 out of 100 marks were allocated to the head teacher, 20 marks for the cooperating teacher and 70 marks for the university tutor was seen unfair. For example, the head teacher stated:

The teaching practice component is carried out in the school context. The student teacher spends more than five hours daily with the school community. It is unfair for most of the mark to be devoted to the university tutor who just visits the school twice or three times a term (HT).

Visiting the student teacher twice or three times a term is not enough to assess him or her properly. This was also supported by a student teacher who mentioned:

This is a problem. The student teacher is the only person who is harmed by this. The university tutor visits the school occasionally. Therefore, it is unfair for the university tutor to be devoted 70 marks to assess the student teacher because he could build an untrue image about the student teacher from few visits (ST4).

On the other hand, this distribution of the marks was seen as fair for two reasons. For example, the partnership coordinator mentioned:

The current distribution of the assessment marks is fair because there is a bias in assessment by the head teachers and cooperating teachers in the
school. Therefore, the university tutor was given the main part of the mark to control the process (PC).

This was made clear by a cooperating teacher who stated, ‘Some teachers are biased to the student teacher and try to give them the full marks to help them to get a job in the future’ (CT2). The second reason as mentioned by student teacher:

There is a problem with the assessment. Thirty marks are given by the university to the school. This is exploited by the school to oblige the student teacher to conform to the demands of the school administration and this hinders the student teacher in learning about teaching in the school community (ST2).

Another attitude towards assessment was the lack of coordination among the university tutor, the cooperating teacher and the head teacher in terms of assessing the student teacher as mentioned by a student teacher, ‘There is a lack of agreement between school and university in assessing the student teacher and this hinders me’ (ST2). This was also supported by the head teacher who stated:

There is no agreement between the university tutor, the cooperating teacher and the head teacher in assessing the student teacher. Either of them gives the mark from his point of view. The university tutor does not consult either the head teacher or the cooperating teacher in assessing the student teacher (HT).

The assessment criteria are not up-to-date as mentioned by a university tutor, ‘The items of assessment have not been changed for 27 years’ (UT2).

The fairness of the distribution of the marks of assessment and the lack of coordination among the university tutor, the head teacher and the cooperating teacher were seen as attitudes towards the assessment. Therefore, it could be argued that another point of contradiction between the university community and the school community was that the university considers its role in teacher education as the main role and the role of the school is complementary. This is supported by Bullough & Draper (2004) in their study of power and position in the relationship between school mentor, university mathematics supervisor and student teacher. This appeared clearly
in the process of assessment in which most of the marks (70 marks) were devoted to the university tutor whereas only 20 marks were devoted to the cooperating teacher and 10 marks to the head teacher. That was because some cooperating teachers favored student teachers who cooperated with the school administration in the school work by giving them full marks for their teaching practice as mentioned by the partnership coordinator. Another reason could be because university tutors are considered as experts in evaluating and assessing student teachers’ work compared to the cooperating teachers (Ni Aingleis, 2008).

6.11.2 Recommendations for assessment

Some recommendations were given to develop the process of assessment. These recommendations were highlighted by seven interviewees.

‘I suggest the distribution of the marks should be as follows: 25 marks for the cooperating teacher, 15 marks for the head teacher and 60 marks for the university tutor’ (UT1).

‘Most of the marks should be allocated to the head teacher and the cooperating teacher because the student teacher spends most of the time of teaching practice in practicing teaching in the school’ (HT).

Although the school plays an important role in training student teachers and assessing them, it was recommended by some that the total marks should be given to the university. For example, a student teacher stated:

   In my point of view the total marks of assessment should be devoted to the university tutor because the school exploits the student teachers and overburdens them. Now, 20 marks are allocated to the cooperating teacher. How can he assesses me without attending my class to observe me, seeing my preparation notebook or even asking me a question? I do not know who my cooperating teacher is until now (ST2).

Other recommendations included:

‘I hope the assessment is done by the school and allows pupils to participate in assessment by designing a questionnaire to them to assess the student teacher’ (ST1).
'The student teacher has to know the result of his pupils which could be used as a tool to assess the student teacher’s work’ (CT2).

‘Some items in the criteria of assessment should be omitted, added or modified. The marks of some items of assessment should be reduced’ (UT2).

Responses to the open-ended question of the questionnaire revealed that:

‘The result of assessment has to be discussed with the student teachers to reflect upon their mistakes’ (ST).

Overall, several recommendations were highlighted for improving the process of assessment. These include: reconsidering the distribution of the marks, devoting most of the marks to the head teacher and the cooperating teacher, allocating the total marks to the university tutor, involving the school pupils in the process of assessment, considering the achievement of the school pupils in assessing the student teachers, developing the criteria of assessment and discussing the results of assessment with the student teachers to make use of their mistakes. It could be argued that assessment of student teachers’ teaching competence is a shared responsibility by all partners in both school and university (McIntyre, 1990).

6.12 Conclusion

In this chapter, the qualitative data obtained from the interview, open-ended questions of the questionnaire and the documentary evidence were presented and discussed under ten main topics: expectations about a good teacher, expectations about learning to teach, expectations about teaching, history and background, objects, learning at the university, learning at the school, learning through the partnership between school and university, professional development and assessment. This chapter highlighted the importance of qualitative research in exploring in-depth participant perspectives to give detailed information about the issues surrounding the partnership between school and university in teacher education and the complex relationships among different elements of AT.

According to the findings of the current study, there were several endemic problems inherent in the teacher education programme activity system either in the university,
the school, or in the partnership between school and university, in preparing prospective teachers. These endemic problems constituted an obstacle to achieving the aims of the programme. However, these problems are just signs of greater contradictions inherent in the partnership between school and university in teacher education. These contradictions are revealed and discussed in the next chapter using AT as an analytical tool.

To conclude, it is clear that the partnership between school and university in teacher education is not just about a set of academic processes to be carried out by all partners. There is another important key player which is the administration in both school and university and the partnership between the two different institutions. The administrative and academic activity sub-systems are overlapping in both university and school and work in a way that could support or hinder student teachers’ learning through the partnership system. In the next chapter, this argument is expanded and further discussion is given using AT as an analytical tool to analyse the partnership activity system.
CHAPTER 7

Further discussion using AT as an analytical tool

7.1 Introduction

In chapters 5 and 6 the quantitative and qualitative findings of the current study were presented, discussed and related to the previous literature and the context of the study in an attempt to address the following research questions:

1. How do administrative and academic activity systems work in the university to support student teachers’ learning?
2. How do administrative and academic activity systems work in the school to support student teachers’ learning?
3. How does the partnership between the university and the school work to support student teachers’ learning?

Furthermore, the findings are combined and AT is used as an analytical tool to explore the complexities of the partnership activity system. Various interactions, complex relationships and contradictions inherent in student teachers’ learning through the partnership between schools and the university in teacher education are revealed by this analysis in an attempt to answer the fourth research question:

4. What are the contradictions inherent in student teachers’ learning?

In addition, the main findings related to answering each research question are summarised.

7.2 Answering the research questions

The findings showed that student teachers learn about teaching in different contexts: university, school and through the partnership between school and university in teacher education. The findings related to answering each research question are as follows:
7.2.1 The university context

The findings indicated how administrative and academic activity systems work in the university to support student teachers’ learning. Some tools were available to student teachers to learn about teaching in the university and also helped university tutors to carry out their work at the university to support student teachers’ learning. These included the library, learning resources center, course material and lesson plans. In addition, theories were considered by the participants as tools to learn about teaching in the university. However, not all classes were well-equipped which resulted in lack of access to these resources. Although the course materials were helpful in supporting student teachers’ learning, some important courses were omitted by the university administration which were Micro-teaching and Educational Research Methods. In addition, the large number of student teachers had a negative impact on making use of the available tools and consequently resulted in theoretical learning about teaching without opportunities for practice. Furthermore, university tutors were knowledgeable about teaching and this was reflected on student teachers’ learning by helping them to understand uses of pedagogy, to develop teaching skills, to understand the relationship between theory and practice. However, there were two important issues related to the university tutors. First of all, there was a lack of specialist university tutors in each field of specialisation which affected student teachers’ learning. The second issue was related to the old age of some university tutors. Although they had long and rich experience, they were using old fashioned-ways of teaching which were mainly based on the lecture mode without using advanced teaching tools. Another hindrance within the university context was the short time for lectures which deprived student teachers of the opportunity of discussing all their ideas with their university tutors.

7.2.2 School context

The findings of the current study revealed how administrative and academic activity systems work in the school to support student teachers’ learning. A variety of tools were available at the school to help student teachers learn about teaching such as educational aids. However, not all partner schools were well-equipped. Although the lesson plan was an academic tool available in the university that helped student teachers to learn about teaching in that community, it was also used by student
teachers at the school and helped them to teach school pupils. In addition, different kinds of support were given by the cooperating teachers to the student teachers. These included: enabling student teachers to observe them, transferring their experience to student teachers, visiting student teachers’ classes, motivating student teachers, providing them with feedback, training them in using some educational tools and support from teaching assistants. Furthermore, the school administration supported student teachers by familiarizing them with the school community, allocating them specific classes, supporting them when problems emerged, making school facilities available to them and dealing with them respectfully. However, some hindrances in the school context to student teachers’ learning were constructed. Teachers at the school were very busy and over-burdened working with school pupils. This resulted in some teachers considering student teachers to be ‘regular teachers’ who have to carry out the same job and sometimes to cover the lack of teachers at the school and reduce teachers’ burden. Another hindrance was the view of school pupils of student teachers as not ‘proper teachers’ and consequently making teaching difficult for them. The inability of some student teachers to manage the classroom properly led to the underachievement of some school pupils. In some cases their parents went to the schools to complain and asked for their children not to be taught by student teachers. This put the school administration in an embarrassing situation and resulted in a negative attitude towards student teachers. However, this was not the case with all schools and a cooperating teacher noted that some parents recognized that their children received very good tuition from student teachers.

7.2.3 The partnership between school and university in teacher education

The findings revealed how the partnership between the university and the school worked to support student teachers’ learning. Student teachers had the opportunity to gain access to the school context and interact with school communities which supported their learning about teaching in that context. In addition, some tools were provided to student teachers from the university and school such as meeting with university tutors and cooperating teachers. Another kind of support was represented in the cooperation of the partnership coordinator whenever problems arose at the school.

However, the partnership between school and university in teacher education was not always seen as effective. This could be attributed to some hindrances which were
inherent in the partnership between the two different institutions. There was often a lack of visits to student teachers at the school by their university tutors due to their huge commitments at the university which resulted in lack of meetings with cooperating teachers and consequently little evidence of working together to support student teachers’ learning. In addition, the excessive centralisation of the system caused many obstacles which hindered student teachers’ learning. The partner schools were selected by the LEA. This process resulted in a lack of communication with the Faculty of Education and consequently in a delay in placing student teachers in their schools. This resulted in the period of teaching practice experience being less than the intended fifteen weeks and did not give enough time for student teachers to learn about teaching in the school context as evident in the data. Furthermore, the course was very compressed which put student teachers under pressure to meet the different demands of different institutions. Another hindrance was the large number of student teachers which made it difficult to place them in partner schools. Some schools were working with more than one teacher education institution with different requirements and this sometimes led to confusion regarding student teachers’ work in the school. An additional obstacle was represented in the lack of training of some university tutors and cooperating teachers who were not educationally prepared.

In addition, some student teachers received contradictory points of views about teaching and learning held by their university tutors and the cooperating teachers. For example, they were asked by their university tutors to put some theories into classroom practice which were considered by their cooperating teachers as irrelevant. Furthermore, they were asked to go beyond the school textbook which was strongly rejected by the school teachers. These contradictory points of views caused frustration for some student teachers. Some students tried to find a compromise whereas some other students ignored the contradictory views because they were working most of the time with their cooperating teachers.

Despite these hindrances, the partnership between school and university provided many opportunities for professional development for all partners. In terms of student teachers, the teaching practice experience helped them in bridging the gap in subject matter knowledge, being psychologically prepared, managing the classroom, getting familiar with the school administrative processes, and training in using tools. With
regard to cooperating teachers, recent knowledge about subject matter and teaching brought in by student teachers was made use of by the cooperating teachers at the school which was reflected positively on their professional development. As for university tutors’ professional development, the teaching practice enabled them to visit the school and experience different types of teaching. This resulted in increasing their experience and understanding of the teaching practice and consequently helping student teachers to learn about teaching. In addition, they had the opportunity to interact with school communities and try to find ways of bridging the gap between theory and practice.

7.3 The analysis of the partnership activity system

The study concentrates on the partnership between school and university in teacher education and within each administrative and academic activity sub-system. These are defined by their institutional nature. The activity systems analysis resulted in the identification of two object-directed activity systems that interact with one another and affect student teachers’ learning. One activity system was initiated by student teachers as the subject of the activity and the other initiated by the university and schools as represented by the partnership coordinators, university tutors, cooperating teachers and head teachers as the subject of the activity. Based on Engeström’s activity theory model, figures 7.1 and 7.2 summarise these activity systems. The findings shown in these figures were constructed from the responses of the participants in the study.
Figure 7.1: Student teachers’ professional development activity system

**Subject**
Student teachers

**Tools**
Administrative tools (e.g. timetable for student teachers to go to school for teaching practice) & academic tools (e.g. lesson plans, meetings, discussion and theory)

**Objects**
To become a qualified teacher  
To link theory to classroom practice  
To raise their grade  
To obtain a job  
To get over the teaching practice shock  
To help school pupils learn

**Rules**
Administrative rules (e.g. partnership agreement) & academic rules (e.g. course requirements)

**Community**
Partnership community (partnership coordinators, university tutors, cooperating teachers, head teachers, pupils and parents)

**Division of labour**
Responsibilities & roles of student teachers (e.g. teach to classes, attend lectures, take exams and submit assignments).

**Outcomes**
- Some aspects of professional development  
- Difficulty in linking theory to classroom practice  
- Frustration  
- Tiredness  
- Completion of the course  
- Decline in pupils’ achievement
In figure 7.1, student teachers are *the subject*. These student teachers chose to take part in the teacher education activity system to achieve the following *objects*: to become qualified teachers, link educational theory to classroom practice, raise their grades, obtain a job, to get over the teaching practice shock and to help pupils learn.

*The tools* available that helped student teachers learn about teaching included both administrative tools such as the timetable for student teachers to go to school for teaching practice experience and academic tools such as lesson plans, meetings, discussion and theory.

*The rules* that regulate how student teachers participate in professional development activity included both administrative rules such as partnership agreements and academic rules such as course requirements.

*The community* comprised university tutors, partnership coordinators, cooperating teachers, head teachers, school pupils and parents.

*The division of labour* was represented by the responsibilities and roles assigned to student teachers through the partnership between school and university. For example, student teachers were allocated some classes in the school to teach, they were also required to attend lectures at the university, submit assignments and attend examinations during the period of teaching practice.

*The outcomes* of this professional development activity system were both positive and negative. A positive outcome was that the student teachers did achieve professional development and begin to learn how to teach. Negative outcomes included difficulty in linking theory to classroom practice, frustration, tiredness, finding it difficult to complete the course and some decline in pupils’ achievement when being taught by the student teachers.

The other object-directed activity system as shown in figure 7.2 is the university-school partnership activity system.
Figure 7.2: School-university partnership activity system

**Object**
- To qualify good teachers
- To link theory to classroom practice
- To cover the lack of teachers
- To reduce teachers’ burden
- To get a good reputation

**Tools**
Administrative tools (e.g., timetable for student teachers to go to school for teaching practice) & academic tools (e.g., lesson plans, meetings, discussion and theory)

**Subject**
Partnership coordinators, university tutors, cooperating teachers and head teachers

**Rules**
Administrative rules (e.g., partnership agreement, number of tutor visits) & academic rules (e.g., criteria of assessment)

**Community**
Partnership community (student teachers, pupils, parents, Partnership coordinators, university tutors, cooperating teachers and head teachers)

**Division of labour**
Responsibilities & roles (e.g., placement, supervision, partnership liaison and assessment)

**Outcome**
- Some aspects of professional development
- Sustain funding
- Difficulty in linking theory to classroom practice
- The work at school goes smoothly
- Continuing the work with contradictory activity systems
In figure 7.2, the subject is made up of partnership coordinators, university tutors, cooperating teachers, and head teachers. The university and the school carry out the teacher education programme for the following objects: to qualify good teachers, link theory to classroom practice, cover the lack of teachers at the school, reduce teachers’ burden at the school and get a good reputation.

The tools available that helped in student teachers’ learning about teaching included both administrative tools such as a timetable for student teachers to go to school for teaching practice experience and academic tools such as lesson plans, meetings, discussion and theory. The rules included both administrative rules such as partnership agreement and academic rules such as the criteria of assessment. The community involved student teachers, university tutors, partnership coordinators, cooperating teachers, head teachers, school pupils and parents.

The division of labour included the responsibilities and roles of the partnership coordinators, university tutors, cooperating teachers and head teachers. For example, making placement arrangements, liaison between schools and university, supervising student teachers and assessment. The positive outcomes for the school and the university included development of some aspects of professional expertise, sustaining funding for teacher education and helping the school to run smoothly by covering the lack of teachers at the school by student teachers. With regard to the negative outcomes, they included: difficulty in linking theory to classroom practice, and continuing the work with contradictory activity systems.

By examining the activity systems in figure 7.1 and 7.2, it is clear that there were some similarities in student teachers’ objects and those of university and school. These similarities included: qualifying good teachers and linking theory to classroom practice. However, the findings of the study indicate that some objects of student teachers for joining the teacher education programme were not in alignment with those of the university and the school. This misalignment resulted in various sources of tensions representing obstacles for student teachers to learn about teaching through the partnership between school and university and consequently a change in their activities. The misalignment between the objects of student teachers and those of the university and the school for facilitating student teachers’ learning created several
inner contradictions. The inner contradictions inherent in student teachers’ learning according to Engeström’s four levels of inner contradictions (see table 2.1 for the definitions or Helsinki website: http://www.edu.helsinki.fi/activity/pages/chatanddwr/activitysystem/) are as follows:

**Primary contradiction:**

An overarching primary contradiction arises from the tensions which arise as a consequence of having to recruit many student teachers in order to make the training course viable and the time and resource that needs to be allocated to each individual student teacher and the school teachers who are supporting their training. This leads to tensions because different participants attach different value systems to particular elements within the activity. For example, Student teachers were often expected to use ideas and approaches that they learned about as part of the university component of the teacher education programme to classroom practice. However, they faced difficulties when trying to do so because of the adherence of the school teachers to current practices and resistance to change. The ideas and theories brought to their practice by students were seen by some cooperating teachers as being irrelevant and inapplicable to classroom practice. Student teachers faced a situation where there were contradictions between their cooperating teachers and university tutors. This finding was also reported by Yamagata-Lynch & Haudenschild (2006) in their study of contradictions and tensions in teacher professional development.

Another primary contradiction was apparent in the relationship between the division of labour and object. Although the school plays a major role in teacher education (McIntyre, 1995), the university as represented by the partnership coordinators and the university tutors considered its role in teacher education as being the major role and the role of the school as represented by the cooperating teachers and head teachers as complementary. This was evident in the process of assessment. Here, the participants encountered more than one value systems attached to an element within an activity (the process of assessment) that brings about conflict.

A third kind of primary contradiction was evident in the administrative processes between the rules and object which was due to the lack of communication between schools and university. The partner schools were imposed on the Faculty of Education
due to the extreme centralisation of the LEA. This was not welcomed by the Faculty of Education who would prefer to choose partner schools themselves.

*Secondary contradiction:*

One type of secondary contradiction was identified whereby student teachers encountered a new element of an activity, and the process for assimilating the new element into the activity brought about conflict. This was evident in the relationship between the division of labour and the object. Student teachers were allocated to the partner schools for teaching experience and during the same period they were required to attend lectures at the university and submit assignments. They also were required to sit examinations during the period of teaching practice. Student teachers thus found it difficult to meet the requirements of both the school and of the university. This secondary contradiction was also revealed by Yamagata-Lynch & Haudenschild (2006) who noted that “School districts and universities do not account for new responsibilities introduced to teachers from sustained and intensive professional development programs that bring hardship to meet other daily teaching responsibilities” (p.25).

*Tertiary contradiction:*

A tertiary contradiction was evident in the relationship between the object and outcome. This contradiction arises due to the differences between the central activity and desired outcomes of ITE (concerned with training a new generation of teachers) and the central activity and desired outcomes of schools (teaching pupils). Although student teachers aimed to help school pupils learn, their inexperience and the problems arising due to the other contradictions discussed above and because of school pupils making teaching difficult for student teachers because they did not consider them to be ‘real’ teachers, resulted in a decline in the achievement of the pupils. The school teachers thus needed to re-teach topics that had been taught by the student teachers and consequently considered them as an unwelcome burden. The same finding was revealed by Roth & Tobin (2002) who found that there was a tertiary contradiction between the outcome of the student teachers’ activity system and that of the more advanced activity system of the regular teachers. Therefore, some
regular teachers considered student teachers a “necessary evil” because they had to re- teach after them.

**Quaternary contradiction:**

Quaternary contradictions are those that emerge between the changing central activity and its neighbouring activities in their interaction (Center for Activity Theory and Developmental Work Research, 2003-2004). Roth & Tobin (2002) gave an example to clarify this, “(e.g., a teacher, as the object of research on teaching feels like a “lab rat” or “guinea pig”)” (p.114). According to the findings of the current study, student teachers expected to learn about teaching in the school through the teaching practice experience. However, they felt upset when they found that the teachers in the school gave them their classes to reduce their teaching burden and to cover the lack of teachers in the school rather than help them to learn about teaching.

Clearly different levels of inner contradictions were inherent in the partnership between the Faculty of Education and its partner schools. This could be because ITE is a very complex process in any context. In the Oxford Internship scheme, the desire to establish and maintain effective ITE partnerships between schools and the university on the part of senior administrators and academics in both the university and the schools helped to promote negotiation between all partners and to facilitate the work of the group researching the development and implementation of the scheme. As a consequence, contradictions inherent in student teachers’ learning were identified and used to challenge and develop students’ ideas and provide new opportunities for student teachers’ learning (Pendry, 1994). In the KSA context, these contradictions could be attributed to challenges and obstacles inherent in the current form of the partnership activity system. These include a lack of awareness of the importance of the partnership, lack of communication and lack of negotiation between partners. Given these conditions and the absence of ambitious administrative and academic initiatives and research, it was not surprising that few new opportunities for student teachers’ learning were identified in the current study.

Figure 7.3 shows the contradictions inherent in student teachers’ professional development activity system with crooked lines indicating where the contradictions occurred.
Figure 7.3: Contradictions inherent in student teachers’ professional development activity system

**Object**
To be a qualified teacher
To link theory to classroom practice
To obtain a job
To raise the grade
To get over the teaching practice shock
To help school pupils learn

**Outcome**
- Some aspects of professional development
- Difficulty in linking theory to classroom practice
- Frustration
- Tiredness
- Completing the course
- Decline in pupils’ achievement

**Tools**
Administrative tools (e.g. timetable for student teachers to go to school for teaching practice) & academic tools (e.g. lesson plan, meetings, discussion and theory)

**Subject**
Student teachers

**Rules**
Administrative rules (e.g. partnership agreement) & academic rules (e.g. course requirements)

**Community**
Partnership community (partnership coordinators, university tutors, cooperating teachers, head teachers, pupils and parents)

**Division of labour**
Responsibilities & roles of student teachers (e.g. teach to classes, attend lectures, exams and submit assignments).
7.4 Conclusion

In this chapter the main findings of the study were combined and further discussion was given to provide richer answers to the research questions, relate the findings to the previous literature and the context of the research using AT as an analytical tool to analyse the partnership activity system. The chapter highlights how AT is a useful analytical tool in exploring different participant perspectives and the contradictions found in relation to how administrative and academic activity systems work in the university, school and school-university partnership as it seeks to support student teachers’ learning about teaching. Several levels of inner contradictions were revealed as a result of the activity system analysis. These resulted from a misalignment between the objects of student teachers joining the teacher education programme and the objects of the school and university in teacher education. These contradictions were identified by participants in the activity systems as being detrimental to the development of a successful partnership in ITE between school and university. However, they can also be seen as a potential target on which to focus effort to change and develop the ITE activity system (Engeström, 2001).

It could be argued that the important role of the administration in working with academics in supporting student teachers’ learning was obvious in the way that the systems work both in the university, school and through the partnership between school and university in teacher education. Adopting the extreme centralised mechanism on the part of the university administration and the LEA resulted in many obstacles which hindered partners from carrying out their roles properly. For example, how can we expect student teachers to learn about teaching in the school context in just nine weeks if there is a delay in placing them in the partner schools? How can they learn if they are exploited to cover the lack of teachers in the school? In addition, the lack of awareness and the restricted view of the importance of the teaching practice experience and the idea of boundary crossing made the situation more problematic in a way that negatively affected the funding of the partnership. Therefore, before looking at the academic process we need to consider the essential role of administration in facilitating and supporting the academic work. For comprehensive understanding of the partnership between school and university in ITE, different parts of the teacher education activity system that interact with one another and affect teacher education need to be considered.
The third generation of activity theory was very helpful in understanding the interactions, complex relationships and contradictions inherent in student teachers’ learning through the partnership between university and school in teacher education. However, the findings revealed that, within the university and school activity systems, there are two interacting and overlapping activity sub-systems sharing the same rules, community and division of labour and the interaction between them needs to be taken into consideration. Figure 7.4 presents a new way of understanding the interaction between administrative and academic activity sub-systems within university-school partnership activity system. The initial objects of both administrative and academic activity sub-systems need to be taken into consideration as initial objects of the whole activity system. In addition, the subject of the whole activity system should include both administrators and academics as actors of the activity. For example, had I not involved the partnership coordinator and head teachers, I would have never known that a hidden object of the LEA in accepting student teachers was to cover the lack of teachers in the school. In addition, it was important to reveal the restricted views of the university administration which did not acknowledge the vital role of the partnership between school and university in ITE.

The implications, recommendations and suggestions for further research which could be helpful in developing teacher education programmes in general and partnerships between school and university in particular are discussed in the next chapter.
Figure 7.4: The interaction between administrative and academic activity sub-systems within university-school partnership activity system
CHAPTER 8

Implications, recommendations, suggestions and conclusion

8.1 Introduction

The study yielded several findings about how administrative and academic activity systems work in the university, school and through the partnership between school and university to support student teachers’ learning. In addition, different kinds of inner contradictions inherent in student teachers’ learning were revealed. Drawing on the findings of the study, some implications and recommendations for all partners which could lead to effective partnership between school and university in teacher education are given in this chapter. Furthermore, some ideas for further research in this vital field are suggested. Finally, the chapter concludes with the way ahead for the future. It is worth noting that some difficulties were encountered during the conduct of this study and these are also discussed.

8.2 Difficulties in conducting the study

Three types of difficulties were encountered whilst conducting the study. The first one was related to the approach, methodology and data collection procedures of the study. The qualitative stance and AT are new approaches in the Saudi context. I spent a lot of time reading and getting familiar with using them in educational research. In addition, I had to introduce these approaches to the participants who were familiar with the scientific paradigm. In terms of methodology, I had only three months to conduct the field study. The case study involved the Faculty of Education and twelve partner schools and it was difficult to involve all the partner schools due to a lack of time given that three different methods of data collection were implemented. With regard to data collection, it was not easy to collect the data from the participants, because different groups were asked to participate in the study. These groups include the partnership coordinators, university tutors, student teachers, cooperating teachers and head teachers. I needed to distribute the questionnaires to the sample drawn from the study population. In addition, arrangements for carrying out interviews with volunteer interviewees of
every group of participants had to be made. This process required much time and effort. Therefore, I collected the data from the participants taking into consideration the two factors of time and effort. In addition, I involved some participants in interpreting the results by discussing the findings with them via telephone. This was done because it was difficult to go back to the KSA to meet them again. Instead, I obtained their email addresses and their telephone numbers as alternative ways of keeping in contact with them.

The second type of difficulty was related to the context in which the current study was carried out. During the period of the teaching practice experience there was a two-week vacation which made it difficult to make full use of the time allocated for the field study. The female student teachers were reluctant to participate in interviews and have them recorded. This could be attributed to the culture of the context but not to the principles of Islam. This was very clear because some female university tutors and cooperating teachers participated in the interview and had it recorded without any hesitation. However, female student teachers were very conservative and did not wish to allow a stranger to record their voice, thinking that this may affect their reputation in the future. This is in spite of being assured that all the data will be kept confidential and used only for the purpose of research.

The third type of difficulties was related to logistical issues. The study was conducted in the KSA context, which required the researcher to travel from the UK to the KSA. This involved considerable physical as well as financial difficulties. Another difficulty is that the schools did not provide the teachers with email accounts. Therefore, I had to ask them for their own personal email accounts. However, some of them did not have email accounts.

8.3 Implications of the study

The findings of the study indicated that there are many endemic problems inherent in the teacher education activity system and the partnership between school and university in teacher education. The findings of the activity systems analysis also revealed that these problems are symptoms of greater contradictions between schools and the university and within each administrative and academic activity sub-systems. There are implications arising from the study which, if addressed by all partners working together, could improve teacher education in Saudi Arabia. Addressing these implications could
help in developing teacher education programmes in general and partnerships between school and university in terms of student teachers’ learning in particular. These implications are as follows.

**8.3.1 Implications for policy makers and administrators**

The study revealed that there was a lack of awareness of the importance of the partnership between schools and the university in teacher education on the part of policy makers and administrators not only in the university, LEA and schools but also in the MOE and MOHE. The study found that there was an extreme centralisation inherent in partnerships between school and university in teacher education. It is this centralisation which could be the reason for the lack of communication between the two different activity systems and the lack of awareness that the partnership activity system is a new system which requires and involves new roles, tools, objects, community and division of labour. Hodkinson & Hodkinson (2005) in their study of improving school teachers’ workplace learning concluded that: “School management processes and national policy impact on teacher learning directly and indirectly” (p.120). Administrators are responsible for planning, organisation, coordination, guidance and controlling of the work of all partners in ITE. They are responsible for funding the course and making sure that the course is running within the allocated budget. They are also responsible for providing appropriate training courses for all partners to help them understand their roles and carry out their tasks properly. Therefore, an effective administration is crucial for effective teacher education and partnership between school and university. Without effective administration we should not expect any change in the academic process and the way Faculties of Education work. This was made clear by Beck and Shanks (2005) who concluded from their study of teacher education reform in an American context that:

> Organisational leaders must support different roads for faculty in their work, culture, and learning. If this change in culture does not happen, faculty should not be blamed for resisting change. Defensive behaviour will abound if faculty are fearful of change. Organizational routines will live in the status quo if faculty do not see the possible success of change (p.343).

**8.3.2 Implications for university tutors and cooperating teachers**

The university is the place in which student teachers learn theories about teaching and the ‘ideal’ way to teach. However, the teaching practice component of teacher education programmes is implemented in schools where student teachers are expected to learn
from the experience of cooperating teachers and to link this to what they have learned in
the university. For student teachers to build up and link their theoretical knowledge and
situational knowledge, joint work between university tutors and cooperating teachers is
required with enough time to carry out their tasks and to build rapport to support their
work (Beck and Shanks, 2005). For the partnership between school and university in
teacher education to be stronger, the role of teachers at school should not be confined to
supervising student teachers, but should be extended to making use of their expertise in
deciding the content of the teacher education programme. As Bullough and Kauchak
(1997) emphasize “It is not enough for university faculty to spend increased amounts of
time in partnerships supervising student teachers without engaging in ongoing and
vigorous conversations and study with teachers about teaching and teacher education”
(p.230). Moreover, experienced teachers could be invited to attend university courses to
receive training in how to develop teacher education programmes through developing
the skills of student teachers.

8.3.3 Implications for parents

Despite the importance of situational knowledge (McIntyre, 1995; Edwards & Protheroe,
2003; Haggarty & Postlethwaite, 2003; Burn, 2007; Hobson et al, 2009; Buitink, 2009;
and Skinner, 2010), the findings of the study indicate that cooperating teachers and
university tutors think that there was reluctance on the part of parents for their children
to be taught by student teachers. This could be attributed to their lack of awareness of
the importance of training student teachers in school and the fact that student teachers
are the prospective teachers and will join schools in the future to teach their children.

As far as student teachers’ learning in the school is concerned, parents are part and
parcel of the school community and could play an important role in developing the
educational process by working side by side with school administration and staff.
Therefore, there is an urgent need of establishing dialogue and trust between teachers
and parents (Holden, 2004). This could lead to greater understanding of their concerns
and discussions about these. This was made clear by Holden (2004) who stated that:
“Good debate is healthy and controversy is preferable to apathy, even if the end result
may be a compromise for both sides” (Holden, 2004, p.257).
8.3.4 Implications in terms of AT

AT was used as a theoretical framework of the study. AT with its principles shaped all my planning, research questions and methods of data collection. It was a very useful analytical tool for exploring the interactions and complex relationships between school and university in teacher education. It draws the attention to the notion of boundary crossing and contradictions as a motive force of change and development (Engeström, 2001). Using AT in the Saudi context in particular is an important contribution in my attempt to understand teacher education and the partnership between school and university in preparing prospective teachers, taking into consideration different parts of activity system that have a direct impact on teacher education such as school and university and within each administrative and academic activity sub-systems.

8.4 Recommendations

Based on the implications of the study and on the understanding constructed by the researcher and the participants, some recommendations for developing ITE programmes emerge. I am not going to present the recommendations for each partner in separate sections because all partners work together with complementary roles and need to be aware of their roles and the roles of others to avoid any problems which could lead to greater contradictions.

The Oxford Internship scheme was presented and discussed in the literature review chapter as a successful (though still developing) collaborative ITE partnership between a university and schools in the UK context. Some potential implications for the Saudi context were outlined taking into consideration the differences between the UK and Saudi contexts. It could be recommended that the Faculty of Education at Umm Alqura University could launch an ambitious collaborative scheme with all partner schools. Such a scheme would need effective and innovative administration in the university, LEA and schools. The administration would need to work in partnership with academics to develop the systems needed for success. In addition, the scheme would need to be well planned based on negotiation between all partners in both schools and university. As well as recognising the need for innovation in academic processes, partnership must take into account the important role of administrators in facilitating and supporting the academic work. This was clearly evident in Oxford Internship scheme and the important roles of Harry Judge and Donald McIntyre in that scheme. Furthermore, collaborative
partnerships are not a cheap option and need sustained funding to operate fully. Therefore, the allocated budget for the Faculty of Education should include the required funding to support the recommended scheme.

The findings indicated that there were restricted views of the university and school administrators of the essential role of the partnership between them in preparing prospective teachers. Therefore, the university, the LEA and the school administration systems need to be aware of the importance of the partnership between school and university in teacher education and the boundary crossing through the partnership between these different activity systems which require sustained funding, enough time, tools, rules and division of labour to carry out the new task.

The current study revealed that there was a lack of communication at higher levels of administration between the MOE and the MOHE. Thus, there should be clear communication channels not only between the university and schools but also between the MOE and the MOHE. For example, any change in curriculum at the school should be discussed with the educators at the university and vice-versa. This creates a consistency in what student teachers learn at the university and what they are going to teach in the school. This could help in bridging the gap between different points of views.

Student teachers’ expectations about teaching and learning to teach were influenced by their history and background. Student teachers’ expectations, values, formal and informal theories need to be examined by their university tutors and cooperating teachers both in the university and at the school during teaching practice experience to reinforce the appropriate ones and modify the inappropriate ones. Therefore, enough visits and feedback are required from the university tutors and cooperating teachers to their student teachers.

The findings showed that there was an extreme centralisation inherent in the way the partnership activity system works. More flexibility for the partnership between school and university is required from administration in both school and university. This could mean placing student teachers in their schools from the first day of the teaching practice period and consequently making use of the full duration of the teaching practice experience. It was also evident in the data that the teaching practice period is too short.
Student teachers are in the school to learn about teaching and to apply what they have learned in their teacher education programme. Furthermore, they need to become familiar with the school context, facilities and administrative processes which requires much time. A related issue is that the partner schools should be selected and evaluated annually by the Faculty of Education according to their suitability, willingness and the expertise of their staff. This could help student teachers learn about teaching effectively.

The finding that student teachers were not considered by school pupils as ‘proper teachers’ resulted in discipline problems in classrooms. This could be addressed through providing greater guidance on classroom management strategies to student teachers and through the normal class teachers providing additional support for the students when they are teaching pupils that are known to be more difficult to manage.

According to the findings of the study, the Educational Diploma course was very intensive and student teachers had to meet many demands of both school and university. In order to be able to focus on developing their teaching skills, student teachers need to be full time in the school during their teaching practice experience rather than having to divide their time and effort between schools and the university. It is worth noting that the Oxford Internship PGCE course was intensive as well. However, student teachers now spend 24 out of the 36 week course full time in the partner schools. This is an important feature of the scheme because this gives student teachers many opportunities to learn in the school context by testing their ideas and making use of the experience and situational knowledge of experienced teachers. A similar length of school based placement could usefully be a feature of the ITE system in Saudi Arabia – as long as well developed structures for student teachers to learn from their experiences in school are in place, and students are not simply expected to demonstrate their teaching ability.

It is therefore important to note that the study also found that the cooperating teachers and university tutors were overburdened, suggesting that more time should be given to them to work with student teachers and carry out their complementary roles in ways that really do support student teachers’ learning in school. Moreover, student teachers should not be used to reduce teachers’ workload and cover the lack of teachers in the school.
The findings revealed that the university considers its role in ITE as the main role and the role of school as complementary. This was evident in the process of assessment of student teachers by allocating 70% of the marks available to university tutors. In the Oxford Internship scheme, the process of assessment of interns’ teaching performance is a shared responsibility to be carried out by both university tutors and mentors. This sharing of assessment responsibility could also be implemented in the KSA context. In addition, much of the assessment in the Oxford scheme is intended to be formative and thus to help and support student teachers to learn about teaching. In Saudi Arabia assessment is mainly summative in nature and used to make judgments about student teachers rather than promote further learning.

Lack of training was evident according to the findings of the study. This highlights the need for in-service training courses to be offered for both co-operating teachers and university tutors. Such courses should include workshops about the findings of ITE research studies and develop strategies for partners to work together to support student teachers’ learning. In addition, sufficient meetings, workshops and discussion are required for all partners to clarify their roles and to solve any emerging problems. This was evident in Oxford Internship scheme where twelve teachers were seconded by the LEA to work with university tutors in planning for the scheme. In addition, the role of the development group was vital in conducting research to identify the challenges, tensions and contradictions inherent in the partnership between the schools and university in ITE and considering them as a source of change and development.

8.5 Suggestions for further research

The findings of the study could lead to suggestions for further research in the following areas. First of all, an ethnographic study about the partnership between school and university could be conducted to gain in-depth understanding of the nature of the partnership and interactions between the two different activity systems using different methods of data collection such as questionnaires, interviews and classroom observation. This is because no ethnographic studies have been ever done in the Saudi context about this area of research.

Secondly, a comparative study could be carried out comparing partnerships between schools and universities in the Saudi context with the partnerships between schools and universities in developed countries such as the UK taking into consideration the
different contexts. In this respect, the Oxford internship scheme (e.g. Benton, 1990; McIntyre, 1997) and the Exeter model of ITE (Skinner, 2010) could be used as examples of guiding frameworks for successful partnership between schools and universities in the UK context.

Thirdly, another study could be conducted on the partnership between primary schools and universities because the context of the primary schools could be different from that of the secondary schools in which the current study was conducted and consequently the nature of interaction and complex relationships between the two different activity systems could be different.

Fourthly, the findings revealed that the teachers in school are overburdened and under pressure which negatively affected student teachers’ learning during the teaching practice period. Therefore, a study could be conducted to reveal the reasons for the pressure and how to reduce teachers’ work load because that could reflect positively on student teachers’ learning. Finally, it was revealed that there was a lack of training for both university tutors and cooperating teachers. Therefore, a research study needs to be carried out to reveal the training needs of both partners which could help in bridging the gap in their different points of views.

8.6 The way ahead

Partnership between schools and universities is essential for teacher education. School experience is part and parcel of teacher education programmes and is the time in which students learn essential teaching skills. During their teaching practice experience, student teachers have the opportunity to learn about teaching by applying what they have learned in the teacher education programme at the university. In addition, they can make use of the knowledge and skills of experienced teachers at the school. Furthermore, the interaction with the school community of teachers, pupils, head teacher and parents also contributes to their professional development. However, lack of communication between school and university due to the restricted views of the administration of both institutions could make these potential benefits hard to achieve. Therefore, there is an urgent need to raise the awareness of all partners including administrators in the university, LEA and schools of the importance of the partnership between school and university in ITE. This could be done through organising meetings, seminars, workshops and conferences and inviting representatives of all partners to
attend. By doing so, all partners will have an opportunity to discuss their ideas and exchange their experiences. It is likely that tensions could arise as a result of different points of view about teaching and learning to teach of different participants from different activity systems. Such tensions could be a driving force for change and development of the partnership between school and university in ITE (Engeström, 2001).

At a personal level, my study at Exeter University has enabled me to experience an unfamiliar educational system. This helped in developing my research skills and knowledge about teacher education reform in general and the partnership between school and university in particular. For example, AT and the use of a qualitative research approach are new in the Saudi context and were very useful for in-depth exploration of participants’ perspectives and the complex relationships inherent in the partnership activity system. In addition, I had the opportunity to explore and discuss the Oxford Internship scheme as a successful model of partnership between schools and university in ITE in the UK context. The task now is to disseminate the knowledge generated in this thesis and make it available to academics, administrators, policy makers and others who are interested in developing effective ITE partnerships in Saudi Arabia. This could be done through publication, attending conferences, workshops, meetings and teaching at the university. Moreover, the study suggested some areas for further research concerning partnerships between schools and universities to be conducted. In particular, research in the KSA designed to promote expansive learning opportunities for student teachers through the active and constructive exploration of the issues related to the partnership between school and university in ITE. Of course, issues of boundary crossing will be evident in this process – contradictions and conflicts of view are to be expected and will need to be approached as an expansive learning opportunity.

The use of activity theory as the theoretical framework for the study was very useful in analysing the partnership between schools and the university in teacher education and within each administrative and academic activity sub-systems. It is this analysis which helped in exploring the contradictions inherent in student teachers’ learning through the partnership between the two different activity systems. Finally, it is worth noting that these contradictions could be considered as a source of change and development because the identification of these contradictions could help in solving them and
consequently support student teachers’ learning. This was made clear by Haggarty and Postlethwaite (2009) who stated that:

The expectation is that the crossing of boundaries between systems will be problematic: some notions accepted in one will be contested in another. However, this contestation can be the seed bed for new notions that could not be generated in either activity system alone, so the difficulties can be seen as opportunities for expansive learning rather than as signs that one or other activity system is dealing in ideas that are irrelevant to the task in hand (p.6).

Using AT in the KSA context has given rise to new knowledge about ITE in this context by taking into consideration the interaction between the university and schools in teacher education and within each administrative and academic activity sub-systems taking into account the idea of boundary crossing through the partnership between the two different activity systems. Without clear understanding of this interaction, the contradictions will not be solved and will continue. Student teachers are the future of education and therefore they should have enough opportunity and support to learn about teaching to be able to carry out their role in the future.
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Appendix 1

Student teachers’ questionnaire

Dear participant

Thank you very much for your participation in responding to this questionnaire which is one of the tools of collecting data for the current study. This study aims at exploring participant perspectives of how administrative and academic activity systems in the university, the school, and the school-university partnership work to support student teachers learning and what contradictions are inherent in student teachers learning. The questionnaire consists of several sections. Each section discusses the factors which probably affect student teachers’ thinking and practice and how student teachers learn to teach. In each section there is a small number of questions (e.g. 2-1, 2-2) which show the kind of things which the question is about. Please put a tick (√) in the box which represents your response to the item. The abbreviations used refer to the following:

SA = strongly agree
A = agree
N = neutral
D = disagree
SD = strongly disagree

There is then a box below each question. This is space for you to give your own thoughts about this aspect of teacher education. We are particularly interested in the things you put in these boxes as the ways that these expand upon the examples we have given in the “tick box sections” are really important. All information given by you will be kept confidential and will be used only for educational research purposes.

All best wishes
Dhaifallah Alzaydi
PhD student, School of Education, University of Exeter.
1-Demographic information:

1-1. sex:  □ Male    □ Female

1-2. specialization: …………..

2- What do you think a good teacher is like?

2-1. a good teacher is knowledgeable about the subject matter.    [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]
2-2. a good teacher is able to link theory to classroom practice.    [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]
2-3. a good teacher is aware of pupils’ characteristics.    [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]
2-4. please add any other thoughts about who is a good teacher:

3- What from your personal history has helped to shape your view about a good teacher

3-1. my experience as a learner.    [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]
3-2. my personal values about teaching.    [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]
3-3. my parents views about a good teacher.    [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]
3-4. what from your personal history would you like to add:

4- What are your expectations about teaching

4-1. teaching is a demanding job.    [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]
4-2. pupils learn from discussion.    [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]
4-3. pupils at school respect student teachers.    [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]
4-4. please add any other expectations:

5- What are your expectations about learning to teach

5-1. I learn by observing experienced teachers.    [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]
5-2. I learn by reading books about teaching.    [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]
5-3. I learn from lectures at the teacher education programme.    [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]
5-4. I learn by practicing teaching at school.    [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]
5-5. I learn from discussion with other teachers.    [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]
5-6. please add any other expectations:
5-7. From any of these help you learn?

5-8. What problems may you face?

5-9. What have you already learnt to do well?

5-10. How did you learn to do this?

6. The university and the school are different institutions and have different views about teaching and learning to teach. Among these differences are:

6-1. The university lecturers teach some theories that school teachers find inappropriate for classroom practice.
   □ strongly agree □ agree □ neutral □ disagree □ strongly disagree

6-2. School teachers consider student teachers as regular teachers but university tutors think that student teachers are in school to learn about teaching.
   □ strongly agree □ agree □ neutral □ disagree □ strongly disagree

6-3. The university lecturers rely upon theory derived from educational research in identifying good teaching, while teachers depend upon their own classroom experience and that of their colleagues.
   □ strongly agree □ agree □ neutral □ disagree □ strongly disagree

6-4. Are there any differences you would like to add?

6-5. Are these differences a problem for you? □ Yes □ No
6-6. How do you deal with these differences?

7-How do you feel you are supported / hindered by the partnership between school and university?

7-1. the teaching practice experience gives me the opportunity to reflect upon what I have learned at the university.  
7-2. the teaching practice experience helps me develop my teaching skills.  
7-3. the university considers its role in teacher education as the main role and the role of the school is complementary.  
7-4. Do you feel you are supported / hindered in any other way by the partnership between school and university? If so how?

8- What do you hope to achieve from joining the teacher education programme at the university and the practical component at the school?

8-1. to be a qualified teacher.  
8-2. to relate educational theories to classroom practice.  
8-3. to make use of the experience of cooperating teachers at the school.  
8-4. what are other objects if any would you like to add?

8-5. which were the hardest goals to achieve and why?

9- What do you think the university wants to achieve by training student teachers?

9-1. to graduate qualified teachers.  
9-2. to attain good reputation.
9-3. what are other objects if any do you think the university wants to achieve?


10- What do you think the school wants to achieve by training student teachers?

SA A N D SD
10-1. to ensure recruiting qualified teachers.  
10-2. to get pupils learning well.  
10-3. what are other objects if any do you think the school wants to achieve?


11- Learning in the university:

11-1. what are the “academic tools” available to you in the university that help you to learn about teaching? (you can choose more than one):
- assignments  
- lesson plan  
- library  
- framework for reflection  
- meeting with a tutor.
  other (please specify in the box below)

11-2. what are the “academic tools” that you learnt to use in the university that help you to teach pupils in school? (you can choose more than one):
- information technology (IT)  
- lesson plan  
- methods of assessment  
- theories of learning.
  other (please specify in the box below)

12- What are the administrative tools in the university that help you learn? (you can choose more than one):
- a timetable for you to go to the school and practice teaching.
- time for university tutors to come to school to observe you.
  other (please specify in box below)
13- Learning in the school:

13-1. what are the “academic tools” available to you in the school that help you to learn about teaching? (you can choose more than one).
☐ meeting with supervising teachers  ☐ observing experienced teachers  
other (please specify in the box below):

13-2. what are the “academic tools” that you learnt to use in the school that help you to teach pupils? (you can choose more than one):
☐ lesson plan  ☐ teaching assessment  ☐ IT  ☐ worksheets  
other (please specify in the box below):

14- What are the administrative tools in the school that help you learn? (you can choose more than one).
☐ Time for cooperating teachers to meet with you.  
☐ access to resources for preparing teaching (e.g. photocopying, etc…).
☐ principal who can support you in dealing with parents and pupils.  
other (please specify in the box below):

15- Who helped / hindered you to learn about teaching in the school?

16- Who helped / hindered you to learn about teaching in the university?

17- How do you feel you are supported / hindered at the school?
17-1. school pupils usually consider student teachers not as regular teachers and therefore they make a lot of discipline problems.
☐ strongly agree  ☐ agree  ☐ neutral  ☐ disagree  ☐ strongly disagree
17-2. cooperating teachers concentrate more on pupils’ learning than student teachers’ learning.
☐ strongly agree ☐ agree ☐ neutral ☐ disagree ☐ strongly disagree

17-3. resources in the school are sufficient to support student teachers learning.
☐ strongly agree ☐ agree ☐ neutral ☐ disagree ☐ strongly disagree

17-4. the school assigns the student teacher with extra work that is not related to learning to teach.
☐ strongly agree ☐ agree ☐ neutral ☐ disagree ☐ strongly disagree

17-5. the student teachers enjoy all the privileges provided by the school administration to the regular teachers.
☐ strongly agree ☐ agree ☐ neutral ☐ disagree ☐ strongly disagree

17-6. teachers in school feel that they can learn from student teachers.
☐ strongly agree ☐ agree ☐ neutral ☐ disagree ☐ strongly disagree

17-7. teachers in school regard student teachers as an unwelcome burden.
☐ strongly agree ☐ agree ☐ neutral ☐ disagree ☐ strongly disagree

17-8. the school teachers consider the student teachers as a chance to reduce their burdens of teaching.
☐ strongly agree ☐ agree ☐ neutral ☐ disagree ☐ strongly disagree

17-9. the school principals regard student teachers as an unwelcome burden.
☐ strongly agree ☐ agree ☐ neutral ☐ disagree ☐ strongly disagree

17-10. the student teachers enjoy access to all facilities in the school.
☐ strongly agree ☐ agree ☐ neutral ☐ disagree ☐ strongly disagree

17-11. the number of pupils at the student teachers’ class is normal.
☐ strongly agree ☐ agree ☐ neutral ☐ disagree ☐ strongly disagree

17-12. cooperating teacher helps student teacher understand uses of pedagogy related to his / her lessons.
☐ strongly agree ☐ agree ☐ neutral ☐ disagree ☐ strongly disagree

17-13. cooperating teacher helps student teacher develop his / her teaching skills.
☐ strongly agree ☐ agree ☐ neutral ☐ disagree ☐ strongly disagree

17-14. cooperating teacher helps student teacher address gaps in subject knowledge in school context.
☐ strongly agree ☐ agree ☐ neutral ☐ disagree ☐ strongly disagree

17-15. cooperating teacher helps student teacher evaluate lessons he / she has taught.
☐ strongly agree ☐ agree ☐ neutral ☐ disagree ☐ strongly disagree

17-16. cooperating teacher helps student teacher plan lessons he / she is assigned to teach.
☐ strongly agree ☐ agree ☐ neutral ☐ disagree ☐ strongly disagree
17-17. school makes it possible for student teachers to observe experienced teachers.
☐ strongly agree    ☐ agree    ☐ neutral    ☐ disagree    ☐ strongly disagree

17-18. school makes it possible for student teachers to discuss ideas about teaching with experienced teachers.
☐ strongly agree    ☐ agree    ☐ neutral    ☐ disagree    ☐ strongly disagree

17-19. Do you feel you are supported / hindered in any other way by the school community? If so how?

18- What supports or hinders you at the university?
18-1. the number of students at the lecture hall is normal.
☐ strongly agree    ☐ agree    ☐ neutral    ☐ disagree    ☐ strongly disagree

18-2. the university provides all educational aids needed by the students.
☐ strongly agree    ☐ agree    ☐ neutral    ☐ disagree    ☐ strongly disagree

18-3. the university provides appropriate halls for teaching.
☐ strongly agree    ☐ agree    ☐ neutral    ☐ disagree    ☐ strongly disagree

18-4. the library provides all the references needed by students.
☐ strongly agree    ☐ agree    ☐ neutral    ☐ disagree    ☐ strongly disagree

18-5. the student teachers study some courses during the student teaching experience.
☐ strongly agree    ☐ agree    ☐ neutral    ☐ disagree    ☐ strongly disagree

18-6. university teachers help student teachers understand uses of pedagogy related to their lessons.
☐ strongly agree    ☐ agree    ☐ neutral    ☐ disagree    ☐ strongly disagree

18-7. university teachers help student teachers develop their teaching skills.
☐ strongly agree    ☐ agree    ☐ neutral    ☐ disagree    ☐ strongly disagree

18-8. university teachers help student teachers understand relationship between theory and practical teaching.
☐ strongly agree    ☐ agree    ☐ neutral    ☐ disagree    ☐ strongly disagree

18-9. university tutors have enough time to visit student teachers in schools.
☐ strongly agree    ☐ agree    ☐ neutral    ☐ disagree    ☐ strongly disagree
18-10. Do you feel you are supported / hindered in any other way by the university community? If so how?

19- routine.
19-1. do you meet the cooperating teacher daily at the start of the school day?
☐ Yes       ☐ No

19-2. how often do you meet the university tutor?
☐ Daily    ☐ once a week  ☐ once every two weeks ☐ once a month ☐ once a term
☐ other (please specify).............

19-3. how often do you meet both your cooperating teacher and university tutor together?
☐ Daily    ☐ once a week  ☐ once every two weeks ☐ once a month ☐ once a term
☐ other (please specify).............

19-4. how often does the cooperating teacher attend your classes?
☐ Daily    ☐ once a week  ☐ once every two weeks ☐ once a month ☐ once a term
☐ other (please specify).............

19-5. how often does the university tutor attend your classes?
☐ Daily    ☐ once a week  ☐ once every two weeks ☐ once a month ☐ once a term
☐ other (please specify).............

19-6. the paperwork student teacher has to do for the university helps to develop his/her teaching.
☐ strongly agree    ☐ agree    ☐ neutral    ☐ disagree    ☐ strongly disagree

19-7. the paperwork student teacher has to do for the school helps to develop his/her teaching.
☐ strongly agree    ☐ agree    ☐ neutral    ☐ disagree    ☐ strongly disagree

19-8. the amount of teaching student teachers do is sufficient to help them develop their teaching.
☐ strongly agree    ☐ agree    ☐ neutral    ☐ disagree    ☐ strongly disagree

19-9. the length of teaching practice is sufficient to develop student teachers’ teaching.
☐ strongly agree    ☐ agree    ☐ neutral    ☐ disagree    ☐ strongly disagree

20- Learning to teach.
20-1. I discuss every lesson with the cooperating teacher before teaching it.
☐ strongly agree    ☐ agree    ☐ neutral    ☐ disagree    ☐ strongly disagree

20-2. I get enough feedback from the cooperating teacher about my teaching.
☐ strongly agree    ☐ agree    ☐ neutral    ☐ disagree    ☐ strongly disagree

---
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20-3. what kind of feedback do you get?

20-4. I get enough feedback from the university tutor about my teaching.

☐ strongly agree ☐ agree ☐ neutral ☐ disagree ☐ strongly disagree

20-5. what kind of feedback do you get?

21- Assessment.

21-1. Have you been shown the criteria of evaluation at the beginning of the student teaching experience?

☐ Yes ☐ No

21-2. Have you been able to discuss these to understand them clearly?

☐ Yes ☐ No

21-3. Are there any other aspects you would like to add?

22- How do you see your cooperating teacher’s role?

22-1. He / she attends my class to observe me.

☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

22-2. He / she supports me to solve any problem.

☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

22-3. Student teachers are clear about what they should do to advance their learning in school.

☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

22-4. Student teachers are clear about what they can expect the cooperating teacher to do.

☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

22-5. Are there any other roles you would like to add?

23- How do you see your university tutor’s role?

23-1. He / she attends my class to observe me.

☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

23-2. Student teachers are clear about what they should do to advance their learning in school.

☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

23-3. Student teachers are clear about what they can expect the university tutor to do.

☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐
23-4. Are there any other roles you would like to add?

24- How do you see the role of school administration?

SA  A  N  D  SD
24-1. admit student teachers in the schools.
24-2. organizing the course.
24-3. monitoring the work.
24-4. providing appropriate place for student teachers to have discussion about their teaching.
24-5. providing appropriate teaching aids.
24-6. helping student teachers to solve any problem.

24-7. Are there any other roles you would like to add?

25- How do you see the role of teacher education programme administration?

SA  A  N  D  SD
25-1. organizing admission to the course.
25-2. managing the liaison with partner schools.
25-3. funding the course.
25-4. monitoring the work.
25-5. placing student teachers in the schools.
25-6. managing the assessment procedures.
25-7. support student teachers to solve any problems.
25-8. liaising with school when there are problems.
25-9. training school staff to support student teachers’ learning.
25-10. handling complaints.
25-11. organizing quality assurance.

25-12. Are there any other roles you would like to add?

Thank you very much for the time taken to complete this questionnaire. For in-depth information, the researcher will conduct an interview with you. If you wish to participate, please give the details below:

Name:
Telephone number:
Email address:
Appendix 2

Partnership coordinators and university tutors’ questionnaire

Dear participant
Thank you very much for your participation in responding to this questionnaire which is one of the tools of collecting data for the current study. This study aims at exploring participant perspectives of how administrative and academic activity systems in the university, the school, and the school-university partnership work to support student teachers learning and what contradictions are inherent in student teachers learning. The questionnaire consists of several sections. Each section discusses the factors which probably affect student teachers’ thinking and practice and how student teachers learn to teach. In each section there is a small number of questions (e.g. 2-1, 2-2) which show the kind of things which the question is about. Please put a tick (√) in the box which represents your response to the item. The abbreviations used refer to the following:
SA = strongly agree
A = agree
N = neutral
D = disagree
SD = strongly disagree
There is then a box below each question. This is space for you to give your own thoughts about this aspect of teacher education. We are particularly interested in the things you put in these boxes as the ways that these expand upon the examples we have given in the “tick box sections” are really important. All information given by you will be kept confidential and will be used only for educational research purposes.
All best wishes
Dhaifallah Alzaydi
PhD student, School of Education, University of Exeter.
1-Demographic information:

1-1. Sex: □ Male □ Female.

1-2. Job: □ University tutor □ Partnership coordinator.

1-3. Years of experience: □ less than 10 years □ from 10-20 years □ more than 20 years.

2- What do you think a good teacher is like?  

SA A N D SD

2-1. a good teacher is knowledgeable about the subject matter.
2-2. a good teacher is able to link theory to classroom practice.
2-3. a good teacher is aware of pupils’ characteristics.
2-4. please add any other thoughts about who is a good teacher:

3- What from your personal history has helped to shape your view about a good teacher?  

SA A N D SD

3-1. my experience as a learner and a lecturer.
3-2. my personal values about teaching.
3-3. what from your personal history would you like to add:

4- What are your expectations about teaching?  

SA A N D SD

4-1. teaching is a demanding job.
4-2. pupils learn from discussion.
4-3. pupils at school respect student teachers.
4-4. please add any other expectations:

5- What are your expectations about learning to teach?  

SA A N D SD

5-1. the student teacher learns by observing experienced teachers.
5-2. the student teacher learns by reading books about teaching.
5-3. the student teacher learns from lectures at the teacher education programme.
5-4. the student teacher learns by practicing teaching at school.
5-5. the student teacher learns from discussion with other teachers.
5-6. please add any other expectations:

6- The university and the school are different institutions and have different views about teaching and learning to teach. Among these differences are:

6-1. the university lecturers teach some theories that school teachers find inappropriate for classroom practice.

6-2. school teachers consider student teachers as regular teachers but university tutors think that student teachers are in school to learn about teaching.

6-3. the university lecturers rely upon theory derived from educational research in identifying good teaching, while teachers depend upon their own classroom experience and that of their colleagues.

6-4. Are there any differences you would like to add?

6-5. Are these differences a problem for you? □ Yes □ No

6-6. How do you deal with these differences?

7-How do you feel the student teacher is supported / hindered by the partnership between school and university?

7-1. the teaching practice experience gives the student teacher the opportunity to reflect upon what he/she has learned at the university

7-2. the teaching practice experience helps the student teacher develop his/her teaching skills.

7-3. the university considers its role in teacher education as the main role and the role of the school is complementary.
7-4. Do you feel the student teacher is supported / hindered in any other way by the partnership between school and university? If so, how?

---

8- What do you think the student teacher wants to achieve from joining the teacher education programme at the university and the practical component at the school?

8-1. to be a qualified teacher.  
8-2. to relate educational theories to classroom practice.  
8-3. to make use of the experience of cooperating teachers at the school.  
8-4. what are other objects if any would you like to add?

---

9- What do you think the university wants to achieve by training student teachers?

9-1. to graduate qualified teachers.  
9-2. to attain good reputation.  
9-3. what are other objects if any do you think the university wants to achieve?

---

10- What do you think the school wants to achieve by training student teachers?

10-1. to ensure recruiting qualified teachers.  
10-2. to get pupils learning well.  
10-3. what are other objects if any do you think the school wants to achieve?

---

11- Learning in the university:

11-1. what are the “academic tools” available to the student teacher in the university that help him / her to learn about teaching? (you can choose more than one):
☐ assignments ☐ lesson plan ☐ library ☐ framework for reflection ☐ meeting with a tutor.
11-2. what are the “academic tools” that the student teacher learnt to use in the university that help him / her to teach pupils in school? (you can choose more than one):
☐ information technology (IT)  ☐ lesson plan  ☐ methods of assessment  ☐ theories of learning
other (please specify in the box below)

12- What are the administrative tools in the university that help the student teacher learn? (you can choose more than one).
☐ a timetable for the student teacher to go to the school and practice teaching.
☐ time for university tutors to come to school to observe the student teacher.
other (please specify in the box below)

13- Learning in the school:

13-1. what are the “academic tools” available to the student teacher in the school that help him / her to learn about teaching? (you can choose more than one).
☐ meeting with supervising teachers  ☐ observing experienced teachers
other (please specify in the box below):

13-2. what are the “academic tools” that the student teacher learnt to use in the school that help him / her to teach pupils? (you can choose more than one):
☐ lesson plan  ☐ teaching assessment  ☐ IT  ☐ worksheets
other (please specify in the box below):

14- What are the administrative tools in the school that help the student teacher learn? (you can choose more than one).
☐ Time for cooperating teachers to meet with the student teacher.
access to resources for preparing teaching (e.g. photocopying, etc… ).
principal who can support the student teacher in dealing with parents and pupils.
other (please specify in the box below):

15- Who helped / hindered the student teacher to learn about teaching in the school?

16- Who helped / hindered the student teacher to learn about teaching in the university?

17- How do you feel the student teacher is supported / hindered at the school?
17-1. school pupils usually consider student teachers not as regular teachers and therefore they make a lot of discipline problems.
strongly agree agree neutral disagree strongly disagree

17-2. cooperating teachers concentrate more on pupils’ learning than student teachers’ learning.
strongly agree agree neutral disagree strongly disagree

17-3. resources in the school are sufficient to support student teachers learning.
strongly agree agree neutral disagree strongly disagree

17-4. the school assigns the student teacher with extra work that is not related to learning to teach.
strongly agree agree neutral disagree strongly disagree

17-5. the student teachers enjoy all the privileges provided by the school administration to the regular teachers.
strongly agree agree neutral disagree strongly disagree

17-6. teachers in school feel that they can learn from student teachers.
strongly agree agree neutral disagree strongly disagree

17-7. teachers in school regard student teachers as an unwelcome burden.
strongly agree agree neutral disagree strongly disagree
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17-8. the school teachers consider the student teachers as a chance to reduce their burdens of teaching.
☐ strongly agree ☐ agree ☐ neutral ☐ disagree ☐ strongly disagree

17-9. the school principals regard student teachers as an unwelcome burden.
☐ strongly agree ☐ agree ☐ neutral ☐ disagree ☐ strongly disagree

17-10. the student teachers enjoy access to all facilities in the school.
☐ strongly agree ☐ agree ☐ neutral ☐ disagree ☐ strongly disagree

17-11. the number of pupils at the student teachers’ class is normal.
☐ strongly agree ☐ agree ☐ neutral ☐ disagree ☐ strongly disagree

17-12. cooperating teacher helps student teacher understand uses of pedagogy related to his / her lessons.
☐ strongly agree ☐ agree ☐ neutral ☐ disagree ☐ strongly disagree

17-13. cooperating teacher helps student teacher develop his / her teaching skills.
☐ strongly agree ☐ agree ☐ neutral ☐ disagree ☐ strongly disagree

17-14. cooperating teacher helps student teacher address gaps in subject knowledge in school context.
☐ strongly agree ☐ agree ☐ neutral ☐ disagree ☐ strongly disagree

17-15. cooperating teacher helps student teacher evaluate lessons he / she has taught.
☐ strongly agree ☐ agree ☐ neutral ☐ disagree ☐ strongly disagree

17-16. cooperating teacher helps student teacher plan lessons he / she is assigned to teach.
☐ strongly agree ☐ agree ☐ neutral ☐ disagree ☐ strongly disagree

17-17. school makes it possible for student teacher to observe experienced teachers.
☐ strongly agree ☐ agree ☐ neutral ☐ disagree ☐ strongly disagree

17-18. school makes it possible for student teacher to discuss ideas about teaching with experienced teachers.
☐ strongly agree ☐ agree ☐ neutral ☐ disagree ☐ strongly disagree

17-19. Do you feel the student teacher is supported / hindered in any other way by the school community? If so, how?

18- What supports / hinders the student teacher at the university?
18-1. the number of students at the lecture hall is normal.
☐ strongly agree ☐ agree ☐ neutral ☐ disagree ☐ strongly disagree
18-2. the university provides all educational aids needed by the students.
   ☐ strongly agree ☐ agree ☐ neutral ☐ disagree ☐ strongly disagree
18-3. the university provides appropriate halls for teaching.
   ☐ strongly agree ☐ agree ☐ neutral ☐ disagree ☐ strongly disagree
18-4. the library provides all the references needed by students.
   ☐ strongly agree ☐ agree ☐ neutral ☐ disagree ☐ strongly disagree
18-5. the student teachers study some courses during the student teaching experience.
   ☐ strongly agree ☐ agree ☐ neutral ☐ disagree ☐ strongly disagree
18-6. university teachers help student teachers understand uses of pedagogy related to their lessons.
   ☐ strongly agree ☐ agree ☐ neutral ☐ disagree ☐ strongly disagree
18-7. university teachers help student teachers develop their teaching skills.
   ☐ strongly agree ☐ agree ☐ neutral ☐ disagree ☐ strongly disagree
18-8. university teachers help student teachers understand relationship between theory and practical teaching.
   ☐ strongly agree ☐ agree ☐ neutral ☐ disagree ☐ strongly disagree
18-9. university tutors have enough time to visit student teachers in schools.
   ☐ strongly agree ☐ agree ☐ neutral ☐ disagree ☐ strongly disagree
18-10. Do you feel the student teachers is supported / hindered in any other way by the university community? If so, how?

19- routine.
19-1. does the student teacher meet the cooperating teacher daily at the start of the school day?
   ☐ Yes ☐ No

19-2. how often does the student teacher meet the university tutor?
   ☐ Daily ☐ once a week ☐ once every two weeks ☐ once a month ☐ once a term
   ☐ other please (specify)...........

19-3. how often does the student teacher meet both cooperating teacher and university tutor together?
   ☐ Daily ☐ once a week ☐ once every two weeks ☐ once a month ☐ once a term
   ☐ other please (specify)...........

19-4. how often does the cooperating teacher attend the student teacher’s classes?
   ☐ Daily ☐ once a week ☐ once every two weeks ☐ once a month ☐ once a term
   ☐ other please (specify)............
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19-5. How often does the university tutor attend the student teacher’s classes?
☐ Daily ☐ once a week ☐ once every two weeks ☐ once a month ☐ once a term ☐ other please (specify) .......... 

19-6. The paperwork student teacher has to do for the university helps to develop his/her teaching.
☐ strongly agree ☐ agree ☐ neutral ☐ disagree ☐ strongly disagree 

19-7. The paperwork student teacher has to do for the school helps to develop his/her teaching.
☐ strongly agree ☐ agree ☐ neutral ☐ disagree ☐ strongly disagree 

19-8. The amount of teaching student teachers do is sufficient to help them develop their teaching.
☐ strongly agree ☐ agree ☐ neutral ☐ disagree ☐ strongly disagree 

19-9. The length of teaching practice is sufficient to develop student teachers’ teaching.
☐ strongly agree ☐ agree ☐ neutral ☐ disagree ☐ strongly disagree 

20- Learning to teach.
(Item 20-1 and question 20-2 are to be answered by the university tutor).
20-1. The student teacher gets enough feedback from the university tutor about his/her teaching.
☐ strongly agree ☐ agree ☐ neutral ☐ disagree ☐ strongly disagree 

20-2. What kind of feedback does the student teacher get?

21- Assessment.
21-1. Has the student teacher been shown the criteria of evaluation at the beginning of the student teaching experience? ☐ Yes ☐ No 

21-2. Has the student teacher been able to discuss these to understand them clearly?
☐ Yes ☐ No 

21-3. Are there any other aspects would you like to add?

22- How do you see the cooperating teacher’s role?
22-1. He / she attends the student teacher’s class to observe him/her.

22-2. He / she supports the student teacher to solve any problem.

22-3. Student teachers are clear about what they should do to advance their learning in school.

22-4. Student teachers are clear about what they can expect the cooperating teacher to do.
22-5. Are there any other roles you would like to add?

23- How do you see the university tutor’s role?

23-1. He /she attends the student teacher’s class to observe him/her.
23-2. student teachers are clear about what they should do to advance their learning in school.
23-3. student teachers are clear about what they can expect the university tutor to do.

23-4. Are there any other roles you would like to add?

24- How do you see the role of school administration?

24-1. admit student teachers in the schools.
24-2. organizing the course.
24-3. monitoring the work.
24-4. providing appropriate place for student teachers to have discussion about their teaching.
24-5. providing appropriate teaching aids.
24-6. helping student teachers to solve any problem.

24-7. Are there any other roles you would like to add?

25- How do you see the role of teacher education programme administration?

25-1. organising admission to the course.
25-2 managing the liaison with partner schools.
25-3. funding the course.
25-4. monitoring the work.
25-5. placing student teachers in the schools.
25-6. managing the assessment procedures.
25-7. support student teachers to solve any problems.
25-8. liaising with school when there are problems.
25-9. training school staff to support student teachers’ learning.
25-10. handling complaints.
25-11. organizing quality assurance.
25-12. Are there any other roles would you like to add?

Thank you very much for the time taken to complete this questionnaire. For in depth information the researcher will conduct an interview with you. If you wish to participate please give the details below:

Name:
Telephone number:
Email address
Appendix 3

Head teachers and cooperating teachers’ questionnaire

Dear participant
Thank you very much for your participation in responding to this questionnaire which is one of the tools of collecting data for the current study. This study aims at exploring participant perspectives of how administrative and academic activity systems in the university, the school, and the school-university partnership work to support student teachers learning and what contradictions are inherent in student teachers learning. The questionnaire consists of several sections. Each section discusses the factors which probably affect student teachers’ thinking and practice and how student teachers learn to teach. In each section there is a small number of questions (e.g. 2-1, 2-2) which show the kind of things which the question is about. Please put a tick (√) in the box which represents your response to the item. The abbreviations used refer to the following:
SA = strongly agree
A = agree
N = neutral
D = disagree
SD = strongly disagree

There is then a box below each question. This is space for you to give your own thoughts about this aspect of teacher education. We are particularly interested in the things you put in these boxes as the ways that these expand upon the examples we have given in the “tick box sections” are really important. All information given by you will be kept confidential and will be used only for educational research purposes.

All best wishes

Dhaifallah Alzaydi
PhD student, School of Education, University of Exeter.
1-Demographic information:

1-1. Sex: □ Male □ Female.


1-3. Years of experience: □ less than 10 years □ from 10-20 years □ more than 20 years.

2- What do you think a good teacher is like?

2-1. a good teacher is knowledgeable about the subject matter. □ □ □ □ □
2-2. a good teacher is able to link theory to classroom practice. □ □ □ □ □
2-3. a good teacher is aware of pupils’ characteristics. □ □ □ □ □
2-4. please add any other thoughts about who is a good teacher:

3- What from your personal history has helped to shape your view about a good teacher?

3-1. my experience as a learner and a teacher. □ □ □ □ □
3-2. my personal values about teaching. □ □ □ □ □
3-3. what from your personal history would you like to add:

4- What are your expectations about teaching?

4-1. teaching is a demanding job □ □ □ □ □
4-2. pupils learn from discussion. □ □ □ □ □
4-3. pupils at school respect student teachers. □ □ □ □ □
4-4. please add any other expectations:

5- What are your expectations about learning to teach?

5-1. the student teacher learns by observing experienced teachers. □ □ □ □ □
5-2. the student teacher learns by reading books about teaching. □ □ □ □ □
5-3. the student teacher learns from lectures at the teacher education programme. □ □ □ □ □
5-4. the student teacher learns by practicing teaching at school. ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐
5-5. the student teacher learns from discussion with other teachers. ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

5-6. please add any other expectations:


6- The university and the school are different institutions and have different views about teaching and learning to teach. Among these differences are:

6-1. the university lecturers teach some theories that school teachers find inappropriate for classroom practice.
   ☐ strongly agree ☐ agree ☐ neutral ☐ disagree ☐ strongly disagree

6-2. school teachers consider student teachers as regular teachers but university tutors think that student teachers are in school to learn about teaching.
   ☐ strongly agree ☐ agree ☐ neutral ☐ disagree ☐ strongly disagree

6-3. the university lecturers rely upon theory derived from educational research in identifying good teaching, while teachers depend upon their own classroom experience and that of their colleagues.
   ☐ strongly agree ☐ agree ☐ neutral ☐ disagree ☐ strongly disagree

6-4. Are there any differences you would like to add?


6-5. Are these differences a problem for you? ☐ Yes ☐ No

6-6. How do you deal with these differences?


7-How do you feel the student teacher is supported / hindered by the partnership between school and university?

7-1. the teaching practice experience gives the student teacher the opportunity to reflect upon what he/she has learned at the university. ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

7-2. the teaching practice experience helps the student teacher develop his/her teaching skills. ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

7-3. the university considers its role in teacher education as the main role and the role of the school is complementary. ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

7-4. Do you feel the student teacher is supported in any other way by the partnership between school and university. If so, how?
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8- What do you think the student teacher wants to achieve from joining the teacher education programme at the university and the practical component at the school?

- 1. to be a qualified teacher.
- 2. to relate educational theories to classroom practice.
- 3. to make use of the experience of cooperating teachers at the school.
- 4. what are other objects if any would you like to add?

9- What do you think the university wants to achieve by training student teachers?

- 1. to graduate qualified teachers.
- 2. to attain good reputation.
- 3. what are other objects if any do you think the university wants to achieve?

10- What do you think the school wants to achieve by training student teachers?

- 1. to ensure recruiting qualified teachers.
- 2. to get pupils learning well.
- 3. what are other objects if any do you think the school wants to achieve?

11- Learning in the university:

11-1. what are the “academic tools” available to the student teacher in the university that help him / her to learn about teaching? (you can choose more than one):
- assignments
- lesson plan
- library
- framework for reflection
- meeting with a tutor
- other (please specify in the box below)
11-2. what are the “academic tools” that the student teacher learnt to use in the university that help him / her to teach pupils in school? (you can choose more than one):
- information technology (IT)
- lesson plan
- methods of assessment
- theories of learning
other (please specify in the box below)

12- What are the administrative tools in the university that help the student teacher learn? (you can choose more than one).
- a timetable for the student teacher to go to the school and practice teaching.
- time for university tutors to come to school to observe the student teacher.
other (please specify in the box below)

13- Learning in the school:

13-1. what are the “academic tools” available to the student teacher in the school that help him / her to learn about teaching? (you can choose more than one).
- meeting with supervising teachers
- observing experienced teachers
other (please specify in the box below):

13-2. what are the “academic tools” that the student teacher learnt to use in the school that help him / her to teach pupils? (you can choose more than one):
- lesson plan
- teaching assessment
- IT
- worksheets
other (please specify in the box below):

14- What are the administrative tools in the school that help the student teacher learn? (you can choose more than one).
- Time for cooperating teachers to meet with the student teacher.
- access to resources for preparing teaching (e.g. photocopying, etc…).
- principal who can support the student teacher in dealing with parents and pupils.
other (please specify in the box below):

15- Who helped / hindered the student teacher to learn about teaching in the school?

16- Who helped / hindered the student teacher to learn about teaching in the university?

17- How do you feel the student teacher is supported / hindered at the school?

17-1. school pupils usually consider student teachers not as regular teachers and therefore they make a lot of discipline problems.

17-2. cooperating teachers concentrate more on pupils’ learning than student teachers’ learning.

17-3. resources in the school are sufficient to support student teachers learning.

17-4. the school assigns the student teacher with extra work that is not related to learning to teach.

17-5. the student teachers enjoy all the privileges provided by the school administration to the regular teachers.

17-6. teachers in school feel that they can learn from student teachers.

17-7. teachers in school regard student teachers as an unwelcome burden.

17-8. the school teachers consider the student teachers as a chance to reduce their burdens of teaching.
17-9. the school principals regard student teachers as an unwelcome burden.
☐ strongly agree ☐ agree ☐ neutral ☐ disagree ☐ strongly disagree

17-10. the student teachers enjoy access to all facilities in the school.
☐ strongly agree ☐ agree ☐ neutral ☐ disagree ☐ strongly disagree

17-11. the number of pupils at the student teachers’ class is normal.
☐ strongly agree ☐ agree ☐ neutral ☐ disagree ☐ strongly disagree

17-12. cooperating teacher helps student teacher understand uses of pedagogy related to his / her lessons.
☐ strongly agree ☐ agree ☐ neutral ☐ disagree ☐ strongly disagree

17-13. cooperating teacher helps student teacher develop his / her teaching skills.
☐ strongly agree ☐ agree ☐ neutral ☐ disagree ☐ strongly disagree

17-14. cooperating teacher helps student teacher address gaps in subject knowledge in school context.
☐ strongly agree ☐ agree ☐ neutral ☐ disagree ☐ strongly disagree

17-15. cooperating teacher helps student teacher evaluate lessons he / she has taught.
☐ strongly agree ☐ agree ☐ neutral ☐ disagree ☐ strongly disagree

17-16. cooperating teacher helps student teacher plan lessons he / she is assigned to teach.
☐ strongly agree ☐ agree ☐ neutral ☐ disagree ☐ strongly disagree

17-17. school makes it possible for student teachers to observe experienced teachers.
☐ strongly agree ☐ agree ☐ neutral ☐ disagree ☐ strongly disagree

17-18. school makes it possible for student teachers to discuss ideas about teaching with experienced teachers.
☐ strongly agree ☐ agree ☐ neutral ☐ disagree ☐ strongly disagree

17-19. Do you feel the student teacher is supported / hindered in any other way by the school community? If so, how?

18- routine.
18-1. does the student teacher meet the cooperating teacher daily at the start of the school day?
☐ Yes ☐ No

18-2. how often does the student teacher meet the university tutor?
☐ Daily ☐ once a week ☐ once every two weeks ☐ once a month ☐ once a term ☐ other (please specify)............
18-3. how often does the student teacher meet both cooperating teacher and university tutor together?
☐ Daily ☐ once a week ☐ once every two weeks ☐ once a month ☐ once a term ☐ other (please specify)………..

18-4. how often does the cooperating teacher attend the student teacher’s classes?
☐ Daily ☐ once a week ☐ once every two weeks ☐ once a month ☐ once a term ☐ other (please specify)………..

18-5. how does the university tutor attend the student teacher’s classes?
☐ Daily ☐ once a week ☐ once every two weeks ☐ once a month ☐ once a term ☐ other (please specify)………..

18-6. the paperwork student teacher has to do for the university helps to develop his/her teaching.
☐ strongly agree ☐ agree ☐ neutral ☐ disagree ☐ strongly disagree

18-7. the paperwork student teacher has to do for the school helps to develop his/her teaching.
☐ strongly agree ☐ agree ☐ neutral ☐ disagree ☐ strongly disagree

18-8. the amount of teaching student teachers do is sufficient to help them develop their teaching.
☐ strongly agree ☐ agree ☐ neutral ☐ disagree ☐ strongly disagree

18-9. the length of teaching practice is sufficient to develop student teachers’ teaching.
☐ strongly agree ☐ agree ☐ neutral ☐ disagree ☐ strongly disagree

19- Learning to teach.
(Items 19-1, 19-2, and question 19-3 are to be answered by the cooperating teacher).
19-1. the student teacher discusses every lesson with the cooperating teacher before teaching it.
☐ strongly agree ☐ agree ☐ neutral ☐ disagree ☐ strongly disagree

19-2. the student teacher gets enough feedback from the cooperating teacher about his/her teaching.
☐ strongly agree ☐ agree ☐ neutral ☐ disagree ☐ strongly disagree

19-3. what kind of feedback does the student teacher get?

[Blank]

20- Assessment.
20-1. Has the student teacher been shown the criteria of evaluation at the beginning of the student teaching experience? ☐ Yes ☐ No
20-2. Has the student teacher been able to discuss these to understand them clearly?
☐ Yes ☐ No
20-3. Are there any other aspects would you like to add?

21- How do you see the cooperating teacher’s role?

21-1. He / she attends the student teacher’s class to observe him/her.  
21-2. He / she supports the student teacher to solve any problem.  
21-3. student teachers are clear about what they should do to advance their learning in school.  
21-4. student teachers are clear about what they can expect the cooperating teacher to do.  
21-5. Are there any other roles you would like to add?

22- How do you see the university tutor’s role?

22-1. He / she attends the student teacher’s class to observe him/her.  
22-2. student teachers are clear about what they should do to advance their learning in school.  
22-3. student teachers are clear about what they can expect the university tutor to do.  
22-4. Are there any other roles you would like to add?

23- How do you see the role of school administration?

23-1. admit student teachers in the schools.  
23-2. organizing the course.  
23-3. monitoring the work.  
23-4. providing appropriate place for student teachers to have discussion about their teaching.  
23-5. providing appropriate teaching aids.  
23-6. helping student teachers to solve any problem.  
23-7. Are there any other roles you would like to add?
24- How do you see the role of teacher education programme administration?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24-1. Organising admission to the course.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24-2. Managing the liaison with partner schools.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24-3. Funding the course.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24-4. Monitoring the work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24-5. Placing student teachers in the schools.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24-6. Managing the assessment procedures.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24-7. Supporting student teachers to solve any problems.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24-8. Liaising with school when there are problems.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24-9. Training school staff to support student teachers’ learning.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24-10. Handling complaints.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24-12. Are there any other roles you would like to add?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thank you very much for the time taken to complete this questionnaire. For in-depth information, the researcher will conduct an interview with you. If you wish to participate, please give the details below:

Name:
Telephone number:
Email address:
## Appendix 4

### Student teachers’ interview schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Areas to explore</th>
<th>Possible questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subject - community</strong></td>
<td>What do you think a good teacher is like?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What from your personal history has helped to shape your view about a good teacher?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How comfortable do you feel as part of the university community?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How are you supported / hindered in the university in learning about teaching?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What from your background helps / hinders you in learning about teaching in that community?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How comfortable do you feel as part of the school community when you go for teaching practice?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How are you supported / hindered in the school in learning about teaching?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What from your background helps / hinders you in learning about teaching in that community?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subject - Object</strong></td>
<td>What do you hope to achieve from joining the teacher education programme at the university and the practical component at the school? Why?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How does your background affect your views of object?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community - Object</strong></td>
<td>What do you think the university wants to achieve by training student teachers? Why?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How does the university community relate to your view of object?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What do you think the school wants to achieve by training student teachers? Why?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How does the school community relate to your view of object?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tools - object</strong></td>
<td>Are the tools suitable for the objects? Why?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subject – Tools</strong></td>
<td>How does your background affect the tools available to you to learn about teaching?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tools - Community</strong></td>
<td>How does the community affect the tools available to you to learn about teaching?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>University – school partnership</strong></td>
<td>The university and the school are different institutions and have different views about teaching and learning to teach. What are your views about these differences? How do you deal with these differences? How do you feel when there are different points of view? What do you do? How do you feel you are supported / hindered by the partnership between school and university?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Questions drawn from the questionnaire</strong></td>
<td>Some questions that have arisen from participants’ answers to the questionnaire or answers that need more clarification.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix 5

### Partnership coordinator and university tutors’ interview schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Areas to explore</th>
<th>Possible questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subject - community</strong></td>
<td>What do you think a good teacher is like?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What from your personal history has helped to shape your view about a good teacher?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How comfortable do you feel as part of the university community?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How are you supported / hindered in the university in helping student teachers to learn about teaching?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What from your background helps / hinders you in supporting student teachers in that community?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How comfortable do you feel as part of the school community in terms of teacher education?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How are you supported / hindered in the school in helping student teachers to learn about teaching?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What from your background helps / hinders you in supporting student teachers in that community?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subject - Object</strong></td>
<td>What do you think the student teacher wants to achieve from joining the teacher education programme at the university and the practical component at the school?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What do you think the university wants to achieve by training student teachers? Why?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What do you think the school wants to achieve by training student teachers? Why?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How does your background affect your views of object?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community - Object</strong></td>
<td>What do you think the university wants to achieve by training student teachers? Why?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How does the university community relate to your view of object?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tools - object</td>
<td>What do you think the school wants to achieve by training student teachers? Why? How does the school community relate to your view of object? Are the tools suitable for the objects? Why?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject - Tools</td>
<td>How does your background affect the tools you can help student teachers to develop?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tools - Community</td>
<td>How does the community affect the tools available to the student teacher to learn about teaching?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University – school partnership</td>
<td>The university and the school are different institutions and have different views about teaching and learning to teach. What are your views about these differences? How do you deal with these differences? How do you feel when there are different points of view? What do you do? How do you feel the student teacher is supported / hindered by the partnership between school and university?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questions drawn from the questionnaire</td>
<td>Some questions that have arisen from participants’ answers to the questionnaire or answers that need more clarification.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Appendix 6

## Head teacher and cooperating teachers’ interview schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Areas to explore</th>
<th>Possible questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Subject - community** | What do you think a good teacher is like?  
What from your personal history has helped to shape your view about a good teacher?  
How comfortable do you feel as part of the school community?  
How are you supported / hindered in helping student teachers to learn about teaching?  
What from your background helps / hinders you in supporting student teachers in that community? |
| **Subject - Object** | What do you think the student teacher wants to achieve from joining the teacher education programme at the university and the practical component at the school?  
How does your background affect your views of object? |
| **Community - Object** | What do you think the university wants to achieve by training student teachers? Why?  
How does the university community relate to your view of object?  
What do you think the school wants to achieve by training student teachers? Why?  
How does the school community relate to your view of object? |
<p>| <strong>Tools - object</strong> | Are the tools suitable for the objects? Why? |
| <strong>Subject - Tools</strong> | How does your background affect the tools you can help student teachers to develop? |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Tools - Community</strong></th>
<th>How does the community affect the tools available to the student teacher to learn about teaching?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **University – school partnership** | The university and the school are different institutions and have different views about teaching and learning to teach. What are your views about these differences?  
How do you deal with these differences?  
How do you feel when there are different points of view?  
What do you do?  
How do you feel the student teacher is supported / hindered by the partnership between school and university? |
| **Questions drawn from the questionnaire** | Some questions that have arisen from participants’ answers to the questionnaire or answers that need more clarification. |
Appendix 7

A student teacher’s interview transcript

The researcher: What do you think a good teacher is like?

Yousef: A good teacher attempts to explain the lesson to his students in the best way possible so that students are able to reach and understand the information in the lesson by themselves easily. A good teacher is innovative and encourages discussion and cooperative learning among his students. I wish every teacher does the same thing to be a good teacher in front of his pupils and community. A good teacher is knowledgeable about subject matter and expands his knowledge through research using the internet and books so as when he is asked by his students they realise how knowledgeable he is.

The researcher: What from your personal history has helped to shape your view about a good teacher?

Yousef: Out of my experience when I was a school student and particularly in the primary school my father was a mathematics teacher who was interested in teaching. He was using a new way of teaching, which is learning by fun let the student play and learn at the same time. This makes the student more active and enthusiastic especially in the primary stage because pupils like playing and therefore they will never forget what they have learned. This is the good teacher in my point of view. In addition, there was in the secondary school a Biology teacher who made me love Biology. Now I completed my study in the Biology department. His way of teaching was attractive and interesting so the lesson wasn’t boring. He was using learning resources to explain the lesson in a simple way to make it understandable. This is unlike some other teachers who give redundant information. He amused us. He had a logical sequence of presenting ideas in away that attracted our attention and stimulated our thinking and senses to be able to understand the lesson.

The researcher: How are you supported / hindered in the university in learning about teaching?

Yousef: The university is a different institution from the school. What I have learned in the university is different from what I have learned in the school. Knowledge in the university is wide and big and there is enough time to go to library. For example, the
structure of human body, we have learned at the school that the human being is created when the sperm penetrates the egg and then the egg is fertilized and then split till the bones and skin and flesh are created to form a baby. In the university, there is a course called embryology, which gave me detailed information about how the embryo is formed, cells, split of cells and its development and its origin. The educational diploma has helped me how to convey information by using suitable teaching methods. I am supported at the university by the library and the learning resources centre. Through the internet you gain new information day after day. When the student teacher finishes the lecture with understanding the information and goes to the central library, deals with the topic, opens a book and reads new information in it, he can innovate in addition to the information he previously had. I am a member in the discussion salon and student union in the university of Umm Alqura and therefore I am provided with an email account given to union members only to participate in discussion because some students wish to participate in electronic learning through salons whereas some students don’t wish to take part because they don’t have money or they don’t have computers and the internet in their homes. In terms of courses of educational diploma, what is hindering the student teacher is the time of the lectures which isn’t suitable because time of lecture is distant from one another so one lecture is at 1 pm and the other is at 7 pm which isn’t comfortable for the student because he has family commitments and personal affairs. It will be better for the student teacher if he has enough time to go to the library to catch up with what he has missed. What is also hindering is the lack of specialist teacher educators in methodology of Biology and I am taught instead by a teacher educator who is specialised in methodology of Physics. It is better for students in specific specialisation to be taught by methodology teacher educator of the same specialisation because this will help me as a student teacher to understand how to teach during the teaching practice.

The researcher: What from your background helps / hinders you in learning about teaching in that community?

Yousef: What is supporting is that some university teaching staff members teach in an attractive way using overhead projector and data show. One of them was specialised in parasites. He showed us its symptoms, its split, its types and its symptoms in human being. By watching and talking, the information is fixed. In educational diploma some university lecturers give presentations about how to teach and how to meet individual differences among pupils.
The researcher: How comfortable do you feel as part of the university community?

Yousef: I am comfortable because the more one knows the higher status one reaches.

The researcher: How comfortable do you feel as part of the school community when you go for teaching practice?

Yousef: I am comfortable at the school to the degree that teachers consider me as a brother and colleague. They respect the student teacher and think that his knowledge is up to date and could be beneficial to the teachers at the school specially that some teachers graduated from the university a long time ago.

The researcher: How are you supported / hindered in the school in learning about teaching?

Yousef: What is supporting is that the school is well equipped with learning resources. Classrooms are provided with projectors. There are well equipped labs which are available for me to practice in the school what I have learned in the university. What is hindering is that there are some head teachers and teachers who look at student teachers as a chance to reduce the teachers’ burden and cover the lack of teachers at school. They don’t take into consideration that I am still studying at the university while practicing teaching at the school. The head teacher wants to comfort the cooperating teacher and overburden the student teacher by giving him more periods than he should be given. This makes the student teacher physically and psychologically tired. The head teacher wants the student teacher to obey what he is told. In my school all teachers are cooperative. However, the head teacher was partial with some teachers specially my cooperating teacher. He increased my teaching load and reduced the cooperating teacher’s teaching load to the extent that my periods have become more than his. I teach 10 periods whereas he teaches only 6 periods. This reduces the burden of the cooperating teacher provided that the cooperating teacher meets the interests of the head teacher and helps him in school affairs and administrative duties. This is a vested interest for the head teacher.
The researcher: What from your background helps / hinders you in learning about teaching in that community?

Yousef: My previous experiences while attending for previous teachers who taught for me and how they exerted no effort to help students learn. In addition, in the university, the university staff members face difficulties to obtain their higher degrees to give you information that you live by and cope with the age.

The researcher: So your previous experiences either in the university or the school helped you to learn about teaching.

Yousef: It helped me how to obtain the information and convey it in a correct way. For example, in mathematics, there is a simplified way of triangle measurement which is easy for the student to understand.

The researcher: What do you hope to achieve from joining the teacher education programme at the university and the practical component at the school? And Why?

Yousef: I completed the BA in Biology. However, based on observing teachers who obtained the educational diploma I realised that it helps them organise the material and convey it to the students. The educational diploma helps me to be educationally qualified. It increases my opportunity to be employed because this is preferred by the ministry of education. The teacher who is educationally qualified is better for teaching than the teacher who isn’t educationally qualified.

The researcher: How does your background affect your views of object?

Yousef: My father was a teacher and obtained the educational diploma. He guided me to join the course to be a good teacher. In addition, my brother is a teacher and obtained the educational diploma as well. Some of my colleagues started teaching without obtaining the educational diploma. When I asked them about their way of teaching I realised that they face difficulty in teaching compared to my father and my brother.
The researcher: What do you think the university wants to achieve by training student teachers? And Why?

Yousef: Qualifying student teachers to be successful teachers whose pupils will grow up and join the university in the future.

The researcher: How does the university community relate to your view of object?

Yousef: Both university staff and colleagues encourage me a lot. Some university staff told me that the educational diploma is the way to succeed in teaching. The university community do agree to my point of view.

The researcher: What do you think the school wants to achieve by training student teachers? And Why?

Yousef: Theory should be linked to practice. The school aims at qualifying the student teacher to be a successful teacher through practicing teaching. A negative aim is reducing teachers’ teaching load and don’t know that I am here to learn from them. However, there are some schools consider the student teacher as a welcomed guest and let him learn from their experience.

The researcher: How does the school community relate to your view of object?

Yousef: A negative view. Teachers say that “you are now a teacher and have a specific task to do”. I said to the cooperating teacher that I have come to the school to learn from you not to replace you. There is a difference between learning from you and comforting you. This is there point of view that the student teacher come to the school to reduce their teaching load.

In my school the cooperating teacher says to me “I am very busy”. I only see him once or twice a week. When I started the teaching practice I asked him once about how to plan a lesson and about the pupils. He said to me “they are all ok” whereas there is another Biology teacher who is studying for his master’s and who was very cooperative with me on a daily basis although he wasn’t my cooperating teacher. He was encouraging me. I asked him to teach the pupils Physiology and show them the blood cells during the school activity class and encouraged me. I attended for him observation
lessons. His way of teaching was attractive. He is creative. He discussed me in his way of teaching and said to me “how about following the same methods”? He started to teach me. There was another Biology teacher who was just reading and some of his students got bored and slept. Also I felt a sleep like pupils because there is neither interaction nor way of learning about teaching. When I talked to the distinguished teacher about him he laughed and said to me “your fingers aren’t the same and every teacher has his own style”.

**The researcher: Are the tools suitable for the objects? And Why?**

**Yousef:** At the university the tools are suitable but not accessible. For example, learning to present using the power point and how to use the lab is only through observation. This means that learning is only theoretical and not so much practical. This is because the large numbers of students.

At the school tools are available but I do not know how to use them because I haven’t been taught how to use them. I had to learn how to use teaching aids and learning resources at the university before I go to school. However, I have learned how to use some of them through practice at school.

**The researcher: How does your background affect the tools available to you to learn about teaching?**

**Yousef:** It affected positively through using the lab and also through the use of some tools by university lecturers such as the microscope. Consequently, this has helped me to teach pupils at the school.

**The researcher: How does the university community affect the tools available to you to learn about teaching?**

**Yousef:** I wasn’t encouraged to use teaching aids at the university. The university lecturers concentrate on old fashioned tools which could be out of use and this hinders me to use new tools. They only guide me but they don’t train me in how to use it. In addition, there are a large number of students. There should be at last three students share one machine.
The researcher: How does the school community affect the tools available to you to learn about teaching?

Yousef: When I came from the university I didn’t have any experience about how to use teaching aids while at the school there are modern tools which are different from those in the university. By participating with one of the teachers at the school I learned how to use the tool. In the university I learned about educational aids theoretically but not practically. The university lecturers didn’t teach me how to use the teaching aids whereas at the school I have to use them. I only learned how to use the tools in the school when I go to a teacher and ask him how to use the tool. Now I regret and wish that I had learned how to use it in the university before I come to this situation. Moreover, some pupils make discipline problems they may stop some of the machines and consequently I can’t learn. Some pupils don’t want to study and are interested in other things. I saw some pupils trying to throw the projector with shoes. Furthermore, one of the teachers found some of the plugs were taken off and when we asked, who is the doer? They say “we don’t know”. Some of them move or raise their hands in front of the projector to distort the picture. Occasionally, they talk to each other especially when the light is turned off.

The researcher: The university and the school are different institutions and have different views about teaching and learning to teach. What are your views about these differences?

Yousef: University learning is intensive and full of theories and principles mostly inapplicable in the school. There are some theories which can’t be applied in school because they change over time. There is a big difference. The university tutor wants me to apply what I have learned in the university whereas the cooperating teacher wants me to teach what is in the school curriculum even though the school curriculum is completely different from the university curriculum. The university tutor wants me to go beyond the school textbook while the cooperating teacher wants me to stick to it when teaching. I am torn; yes I am torn. Shall I give detailed information which may not be understood by the students or may not be found in the textbook?
The researcher: How do you deal with these differences?

Yousef: I try to teach what is essential. I try to meet the requirements of both university tutor and cooperating teacher. I want to reach a compromise which is beneficial for the pupils.

The researcher: How do you feel when there are different points of view?

Yousef: I feel upset and nervous because one asks me to do something while another asks me not to do it. Why they don’t meet and try to agree upon what is different so that if they want to assess us, this is done according to the agreed upon criteria.

The researcher: What do you do?

Yousef: Sometimes I say I wish I didn’t start the teaching practice. I complain. I have come to be trapped. I want them to teach me how to master teaching not to be conspired against or to meet the requirements of someone and neglect those of the other. This is something harmful to me as a student teacher. The university tutor has 70 marks if I don’t apply what he wants, he blames me and tells me that he will reduce my score. This is also for the cooperating teacher. Therefore, I try to meet the requirements of both sides so when they want to assess me they do this in the light of what I heard from both of them.

The researcher: How do you feel you are supported / hindered by the partnership between school and university?

Yousef: University and school are partners in qualifying me as a new teacher. The university has provided me with the knowledge and the school is providing the field to practice what I have learned to be a successful teacher. The partnership supports me by various teaching experiences such as visiting library, attending computer training courses and reading newspapers about teaching. This helps me to learn. I hope that assessment is done by the school and allows pupils to participate in assessment by designing a questionnaire to them to assess the student teacher. The partnership between school and university is neither useful nor successful. The school members have to know that the student teacher has come to the school to learn about teaching. What also hinders me is the far distance of the school. In addition, some schools aren’t suitable for
teaching practice. However, the university tutor compels the student teacher to go to that school. For me the school is 30 kilometres far from my house approximately more than half an hour. Although I have a car, I am not the only person driving on the road. To reach the school I have to cross several districts. The distribution of student teachers is random and not suitable because they don’t take my opinion into consideration. Some schools have pupils who don’t speak Arabic very well. These pupils attend the school just to get the certificate while there are some schools in modern districts in which pupils are characterized by love of knowledge and work. What also hinders is that the school presses on me with marks. Therefore, I feel afraid of being hindered and consequently work for my own interest. The head teacher says to me that “the university tutor is my friend so do whatever I ask otherwise I will tell him that you are careless” therefore I feel nervous. My head teacher doesn’t motivate me and presses on me hard. When I say to him, “why do you do this”? He says “the work will continue either with or without us”. Why doesn’t he motivate the student teacher? He uses the language of threat and warning and says to me “I will make you do the teaching practice again”. He overreacts with regards to simple mistakes. Some head teachers consider the student teacher as an unwelcome person who come to the school for a short period of time and will leave. In my school the head teacher says “this room is for student teachers”. Why doesn’t he say to the teachers at the school these are student teachers could you work with them and let them benefit from your experience. How can I sit in an isolated room and don’t know what is going on around me. Now I and my colleagues don’t sit in that room and instead I sit with some teachers and deputy head teacher who welcomed me more than the head teacher. Now I have gained wide experience as I hear from them and try to correct my mistakes through observing them. They look at us as students who just want marks. They say “we have been teachers for many years and don’t want student teachers to hear what is going on among us”. Some head teachers allow student teachers to sign in the teachers’ attendance sheet and say to them “you are our colleagues” whereas our head teacher asks us to sign in attendance sheet other than that allocated for school teachers. Why don’t we sign in that attendance sheet?

The researcher: Do you think teachers at the school enjoy more privileges than student teachers?

Yousef: Yes. We aren’t followed by university tutors. We were sent to the school and were told that the university tutor would visit and assess us. Why don’t university tutors
encourage the school staff to cooperate with student teachers? If a student teacher comes to you instil in him the spirit of persistence, work and faithfulness even if there are problems, bias or racism in the school. As long as there are student teachers who want to work don’t make them feel these and make them learn from your experience. Let these be hidden from the student teacher. Display for the student teacher that he is a regular teacher and not a burden in the school. We need from the university tutors to follow us. Why aren’t the non-cooperating schools removed from the list of partner schools? The university tutor visits only once. He promised to visit me once more but he didn’t. He also didn’t attend my class.

The researcher: You mentioned that the student teacher studies some courses in the university during the teaching practice, how do you see that?

Yousef: The student teacher shouldn’t take any courses during the teaching practice. I take 12 hours, 8 hours for courses and 4 hours for teaching practice. I study 5 courses at the university and I should present research work. However, I have some research work which I haven’t finished yet because I go to the school early at 6.30 in the morning and finish at 1 pm. I finish the school exhausted then I take a break for one hour and afterwards I go to the university to study till 8 pm. The teaching practice is exhausting and the student teacher shouldn’t take any courses during it. When I come back from the university I am very tired, how can I prepare my lessons for tomorrow’s work in the school? The mind can’t stand this.

The researcher: You mentioned that school pupils usually consider student teachers not as regular teachers and therefore they make a lot of discipline problems, how do you see that?

Yousef: The pupils say that “you are a student teacher”. Is there any shame in this? Sometimes the trainee teacher is better than the main teacher. Pupils look at you as a student like them who is examined. They look at you as if not a regular teacher, not all students. This makes me nervous and sometimes I reprimand the pupil and at last I am the one to be blamed. There shouldn’t be a lot of argument among pupils that we are student teachers.
The researcher: Would you like to add anything?

Yousef: I hope there is a term for the student teachers to study how to carry out the teaching practice and apply methods of teaching.

The researcher: Do the courses offered by the Faculty of Education give you that?

Yousef: Not all courses because methods of teaching Physics are different.

The researcher: Do you discuss what you experience in the school during university lectures?

Yousef: Yes we do with the university tutor. However, the university tutor tries not to arouse problems. He says “be patient and let it go”. I don’t want him to reprimand the school staff but to cooperate with me and the school staff. They have to know that I am at the school to train.

The researcher: Is there a clear division of labour in the partnership between school and university such as your role, university tutor’s role, the cooperating teacher’s role and head teacher’s role?

Yousef: At the beginning of teaching practice we attended a meeting with the university tutor and raised some general points such as dealing with pupils and facing problems at the school. Why don’t the student teacher, the university tutor, the cooperating teacher and the head teacher meet to make the roles clear? This student trainee is in your hands. We want to qualify him to be able to teach to future generations. The more the student teacher is motivated the more he is active and the less he is frustrated, stressed and enforced to do something.

The researcher: Would you like to add anything?

Yousef: I hope that my message is communicated to every university tutor; head teacher and cooperating teacher to care for the student teacher to qualify him because he will be a teacher in the future like them. Unless the student teacher is qualified, he will be a burden in the future.

The researcher: thank you very much.
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