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ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to advance knowledge about foreign and second language (L2) teaching by studying preservice teachers' pedagogical reasoning in a peer coaching program utilizing research from general teacher education. Peer coaching can enhance teaching and teacher supervision because it provides opportunities to discuss, analyze, and reflect on problems of professional practice.

Each week during a ten-week practicum, twelve student teachers received training in clarity skills. Six of these student teachers received an added peer-coaching component. Data in the form of teaching videos, weekly journals, satisfaction questionnaires, pre- and post-observation conference transcripts, focus-group interviews, and follow-up interviews were first analyzed quantitatively (frequencies) and then inductively with grounded theory coding to provide student teachers' perspectives on supervision, L2 teaching, and clarity skills.

Clarity skills were perceived as valuable for foreign language teaching because they enhanced student teachers' presentations of grammatical topics, organization of communicative activities, and classroom management.
techniques. Peer-coached teachers used clarity skills to a greater extent, exhibited more in-depth discussions of the use of clarity skills for L2 teaching, and showed more pedagogical reasoning in post-observation conferences than non-peer coached teachers: evidence of the value of peer coaching as a vehicle for skills acquisition and teacher reflection.

Although a noted problem in student teaching supervision is the lack of defined roles for members of the supervisory triad, specific roles emerged in this study. The cooperating teacher (CT) was pivotal for the success of student teachers' interaction with pupils, classroom management, and adaptation of content to relevant aspects of pupils' learning needs. The university supervisor (US) provided consistent feedback that was specifically geared toward student teachers' teaching concerns, such as the amount of target language use and creating real-life activities for L2 practice. US feedback assisted student teachers in setting goals for improvement. The CT was found to leave student teachers without specific feedback after the initial weeks of the practicum. The peer coach fulfilled all functions of peer coaching (collegiality, technical feedback, adaptation to students, analysis of application, support) in situations where peer coaches had teaching concerns for which assistance was needed, suggesting that peer coaching programs and schedules be arranged according to the specific needs of student teachers.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

There is a striking parallel in the changes we expect to take place in the education of our children and what we will need to achieve in the education of their teachers. We need to help both students and their teachers to become users of knowledge, to develop habits of mind that include a problem-solving orientation, to be able to view things from multiple perspectives, and to build the skills of collaboration and self-assessment. We expect both teacher and student to become researchers to continuously use the skills of inquiry and examination and reflection (Levine, 1996, p.621).

These past two decades have been times of reform in teacher education during which investigations, discussions, and debates about what teachers should know and should be able to do have never been more energetic (Shulman, 1986). Today’s teachers face greater challenges than those of earlier years because their task is to educate their students for “thinking work rather than low-skilled factory tasks” (Darling-Hammond & Sclan, 1996, p.67). The current need for students to be educated for cognitive tasks necessitates that teachers work to help each one of their students achieve higher levels of success. Schools are no longer luxuries for a select group but rather an essential requirement for all types of learners who will enter into working society. As an essential part of society, schools need restructuring to ensure that
students receive an education that prepares them for cognitively demanding

Each of the major reform groups committed to teacher education (The
Holmes Group, National Council of Accreditation of Teacher Education,
Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium, National Board for
Professional Teaching Standards) commonly embraces in its school
restructuring and reform agenda that teachers understand their subject matter in
ways such that they make it accessible to diverse learners. They also
recommend that teachers have the ability to reflect on their teaching in a
collaborative manner, ever revising their instruction and instructional content to
provide for each individual student's success and to shape an environment that
favors and sustains improved school conditions. Likewise, the number of
induction programs placing first year teachers into working relationships with
veteran teachers has tripled since the 1970s as an effort to socialize novices
into the teaching profession and to help them address problems of teaching

A common belief among non-educators and preservice students is that
the act of teaching is the act of giving information to students who consume it.
During preservice teacher education, it is not uncommon for preservice students
to envision their future teaching as the acts of telling and of explanation as they
stand before groups of students who anticipate instruction delivered in lecture
format (Darling-Hammond & Cobb, 1996). Field experiences in the teacher
education process often encourage the traditional view of teaching that many preservice students hold (Carter & Anders, 1996); the reaction of these field experience students is to teach as they were taught.

The danger with this traditional view of the teacher’s role and impact is that preservice students tend not to recognize that others learn differently than they and thus will adopt a teaching methodology of directly telling and demonstrating the requisite information without seeking alternative modes of instruction that are successful with learners of all types (Holmes, 1986). One reason that such pedagogical mistakes do occur is that reasoning in the field of education does not normally take place in public as it does in other professions such as medicine and law. As a result, teachers are unaccustomed to thinking about and planning instruction and instructional content with their colleagues and they work without receiving the professional review of other teachers (Rentel & Pinnell, 1989).

Working in isolation perpetuates a profession in which teachers will resort to familiar methods and not adopt a problem-solving perspective as they approach the teaching act and endeavor to make the subject matter meaningful for their students. The professional literature has included at least one reason why teachers do not respond creatively or in accordance with the pupils and subject matter at hand. By the time preservice teachers reach field experiences, they typically carry with them over twelve years of observation of their own teachers and instructional methods (Lortie, 1975). These influential school
experiences manifest themselves in preservice teachers’ reluctance to change and their reliance on recipes intuited from their own lives in schools. Unchanging beliefs about what comprises good teaching prevent preservice teachers from understanding and managing the changeable conditions of teaching (Griffin, 1989).

This isolation and independence characteristic of the teacher’s work has caused both educators and non-educators alike to ask whether or not teaching can be regarded in its fullest status as that of a true profession. According to Griffin (1989), because teaching is a profession without an accepted body of codified knowledge as a resource for teachers to use, the work of the teacher is regarded by many as unspecialized and a task that any educated person is capable of performing (Griffin, 1989). Carried out in such an isolated non-theory driven manner safeguards what has been deemed the “folkways of teaching” (Buchmann, 1987). As a result, teaching occurs without teachers working to the “limits of their potential” (Jarvis & Taylor, 1990), actively seeking pedagogical alternatives and strategies validated by research and practice in response to the purposes and requirements of the lesson and its subject matter, but rather by simply relying on one familiar and comfortable method (Schwartz, 1996).

Shulman (1987) has lamented that teaching is carried out without a knowledge base that has been “discovered, invented, and refined” (p.12) by members of the teaching profession and so has called for research into effective teaching practices to focus on the collection, collation, and interpretation of the
practical knowledge of teachers in order to establish a literature base codifying the principles of teaching. This imperative, together with the realization that effective teaching research of the 1960s and 1970s essentially identifies the phenomenon that is called pedagogical content knowledge (Jarvis and Taylor, 1990), calls for the direct observation of teachers in practice. Furthermore, new approaches to teacher testing are responding to this imperative by including a practical component in the form of classroom observation to assess four domains of teaching knowledge: the organization of content knowledge for student learning, creating an environment for student learning, teaching for student learning, and teacher professionalism (Danielson, 1996). Research based on the observation of teaching will help the field of teacher education understand processes that teachers engage in as they reason about their teaching and learn to teach skillfully (Fenstermacher, 1986).

One responsibility of teacher education today is to portray teaching as an unfixed, flexible, and complex activity and to create within teacher education students a sensitivity to the dynamic nature of teaching. Without this sensitivity, teachers develop unskilled habits that encourage feelings of ineffectiveness and incompetence and that do not promote learning (Griffin, 1989). If the nature of teaching as active and variable is represented in teacher education, then teachers can no longer be seen solely as the givers of information nor can the students be viewed as receptacles to be filled with this information. Instead, what the late 1990s hold for teacher education is a role modification for teachers, who
are now expected to engage in intellectual activities in response to the changing demands of the classroom. Today’s classrooms are in need of teachers who are trained to be deliberate and thoughtful as they plan for and respond to the purposes and demands of their lessons (Griffin, 1989).

The goal of teacher education is not to impose a determined methodology on future teachers but to instruct them to reason sensibly about their teaching (Fenstermacher, 1978; 1986). How teachers do learn to convert their knowledge of the subject matter into appropriate examples and exercises for a diverse body of learners, in other words, how teachers acquire pedagogical content knowledge, is an important yet often weak portion of teacher education (Murray & Porter, 1996). Recent inquiry in teacher education supports a more encompassing view of what it means to be a teacher of diverse learners and focuses on teacher thinking and learning. In preparing prospective teachers for full participation in the profession, an uncompromising focus on research-oriented approaches does not emphasize the particular and the context-dependent nature of teaching. Likewise, a highly individualistic view of teaching does not highlight the requirement of mastery of specific areas of knowledge and teaching skills learned in the tradition of teacher training (Pennington, 1990). For foreign and second language teaching to be recognized as a field in itself, professional programs of foreign and second language teacher training need to develop a comprehensive repertoire of classroom skills as well as the skills of
analysis to apply appropriately these abilities as demanded by each classroom situation (Pennington, 1990).

The Current State of Teacher Education

The teacher education enterprise is responsible for the quality of teachers who are sent out into today's classrooms and for their performance in practice (Imig & Switzer, 1996). The traditional path to becoming a teacher culminates in the student teaching experience. This practicum experience provides prospective teachers with the opportunity to connect theory and practice but is also unfortunately noted for enlarging the gap between these two aspects of teacher education and teaching (McIntyre, Bird, & Foxx, 1996). Prospective teachers need to be supervised closely and carefully during these beginning teaching experiences and must be shown a variety of pedagogical methods and taught how to include new knowledge and ideas into their everyday planning and teaching (Darling-Hammond & Sclan, 1996).

The domain of knowledge for which a teacher is responsible is extensive. It includes an understanding of child and/or adolescent development, pedagogy, the structures of the subject matter(s) to be taught, and a collection of assessment alternatives (Shulman, 1987). According to Goodlad (1990), it is difficult for teachers and teacher educators to know enough about pedagogy, about subject matter, or about how to comprehend the conditions in which they function in their everyday work (Goodlad, 1990 in Zimpher & Sherrill, 1996). Therefore, teacher education not only faces the challenge of delivering this vast
knowledge base to prospective teachers in the period of time available for
teacher training and development, but it also must do so in pedagogically
powerful ways so that when novice teachers enter schools for the first time, they
are able to cope with problems of professional practice or seek sources of
assistance.

One explanation for teacher education's not being equipped to produce
individuals dedicated to continuous learning (Zimpher & Sherrill, 1996) is that
teacher education has not emphasized the "collective aspects of socialization
stating that teacher education students are rarely put into structured group
experiences (Howey, 1996). Teacher education reform proposals, such as the
Holmes Group (1986), call for extended and more intensive field experiences for
prospective teachers (Howey, 1996). At the same time, the effectiveness of field
experiences is questioned (Cruickshank & Armaline, 1986; McIntyre, Bird &
Foxx, 1996).

In an effort to provide intensive field experiences that familiarize
prospective teachers with the extensive knowledge base of teaching, the Holmes
Group (1986) includes in their reform of teacher education both a long
preservice period spent in the classroom as well as opportunities for preservice
teachers to participate in activities as a "community of learners" (Howey, 1996).
Such a community orientation to teacher education supports teachers’
engagement in collegial activities aimed at their inquiry and problem solving
focused on both individual needs and those of the group of specific preservice students (Levine, 1996). With these educative complements to traditional teacher education in the form of extended field experiences, prospective teachers are expected to have acquired a more extensive range of teaching strategies, to teach reflectively, to assess whether or not what they are doing is effective, to understand how to improve their teaching, and to make better teaching decisions (Darling-Hammond & Cobb, 1996).

When teacher education students are involved in field experiences, the university supervisor, as the representative of the teacher education program, assists the prospective teacher in the analysis of and reflection on the acts of teaching. Models of teacher supervision within the framework of clinical supervision range from a directive approach in which the university supervisor is the authority on teaching, to a self-help or explorative approach (Gebhard, 1990). In the latter approach, the supervised and supervisor engage in a very flexible and collaborative model of supervision in which the supervisor is viewed as a visiting teacher (Fanselow, 1990) who wants to learn more about teaching in general as well as about his or her own teaching.

In order to be aware of and be engaged in the ever developing knowledge base of teaching, schools and colleges of teacher education must find new ways to structure occasions and activities for teachers to work together, such as team planning and teaching, collective reflection, and opportunities to share knowledge (Darling-Hammond & Sclan, 1996). Researchers and theorists
in colleges of education who have called for the improvement of both foreign language teaching and foreign language teacher education have advocated that teacher educators employ more diverse and effective forms of student teacher supervision, such as peer supervision on the preservice level (Hammadou & Bernhardt, 1987). One such technique is peer coaching, which has been used successfully in staff development efforts on the inservice level for teacher training and recently has been applied to preservice teacher education to help teachers refine their repertoire of skills or master new teaching techniques (Joyce & Showers, 1980-1996; Pavelich, 1992; Pierce & Miller, 1994). Creating occasions for teachers to reflect on and analyze their teaching collaboratively, such as in peer coaching, is one way to utilize the body of general effective teaching research. For, when peer coaching is organized around research findings in the planning and reflective stages, dialogue is grounded in knowledge that defines the teaching profession and the focus is on the improvement of instruction (Danielson, 1996).

Peer Coaching

Peer coaching is an alternative form of teacher supervision that was first introduced into teacher education by Joyce & Showers (1980) when their research on teacher change showed that teachers transfer only 10% of their training when provided with theory presentation alone, but transferred 90% of skills training when coaching supplemented the training program (Moffet, St. John, Isken, 1987; Showers, 1984). As a form of staff development used in other
professions in addition to teaching, peer coaching has been applied to the inservice level to improve teacher effectiveness, while at the same time to reduce the aforementioned problems of teacher isolation, teachers’ reliance on the folkways of teaching, and inadequate and short term programs of teacher training (Swan et al., 1988). Peer coaching provides teachers with feedback on a specific skill and the personal facilitation and support to continue in the coaching process (Neubert, 1994), thus encouraging improvements in their teaching.

When engaged in peer coaching, teachers are organized into communities of teacher learners working toward the goal of mutual problem solving. Though models of peer coaching vary, most include Joyce’s (1980) five components of presentation of theory, observation of the skill in use, skill practice, feedback, and coaching for application. The typical peer coaching cycle usually involves the essential components of clinical supervision: a pre-observation conference during which the observed teacher sets the focus for the observation; classroom observation; and a post-observation conference during which the peers analyze the teacher’s application of the skill(s).

Garmston (1987) describes three purposes for peer coaching that are applied to teaching situations according to the degree of challenge that a teacher faces in a particular teaching situation. Technical coaching requires peers to assist each other in transferring a new skill into their teaching. Collegial coaching focuses on the refinement of a skill that is already part of one’s
teaching repertoire. Challenge coaching engages peers in the resolution of a problematic situation in one's teaching context.

In the teacher education community, some believe that it is every teacher's responsibility to grow professionally and it is a colleague's responsibility to assist other teachers in this growth process (Elliot & Chidley, 1985). One assumption underlying peer coaching is that teachers are each others' best resource for expertise in improving teaching and schools, credibility, and support (Mello, 1984; Carnegie Task Force, 1986). A defining tenet of peer coaching is that teachers are central for the improvement of education and are the evaluators of whether or not they have created the conditions for learning to occur (Neubert, 1988). In addition to purposes of coaching, there are two forms of peer coaching. Expert coaching occurs when a more knowledgeable peer coaches another teacher's development and use of a particular skill. Reciprocal coaching occurs if both teachers have equal knowledge of the skill or set of skills that the teachers are applying (Garmston, 1987). In either form of coaching, the role of the coach is to focus on the application of the skill(s) with the goal of improving one's teaching and not to focus on the overall teaching performance of the individual teacher (Neubert, 1988).

To date, the literature demonstrates that when engaged in peer coaching, teaching effectiveness is improved (Elliot & Chidley, 1985; Munro & Elliot, 1987), coached teachers apply new skills more accurately and transfer new skills at a greater rate than uncoached teachers (Showers, 1984), and teachers make
positive gains in their attitudes toward teaching, acceptance of others, collegiality, and in their perceptions of themselves as teachers (Swan et al., 1988). The purposes of many studies of peer coaching conducted on the inservice level vary according to the context and need for coaching.

Studies range in purpose from: (1) coaching programs for new teachers that aid them in moving into their professional roles; (2) easing the culture shock and isolation that the workplace can provide (Moffet, St. John, Isken, 1987); (3) coaching for teaching assistants’ effectiveness on the college level (Barnett, 1983); and (4) coaching programs for principals and superintendents (Gibble & Lawrence, 1987) that were intended to improve their skills of teacher observation and of post-observation conferencing. The focus for improvement in each study ranges according to the needs of the educators. Cooperative learning, reading strategies, and effective teaching skills are among the many areas for which coaching programs have evolved. Peer coaching is a vehicle by which teacher educators can aid teachers to put teacher effectiveness research into use. Brandt (1982, p. 12) has quoted Berliner (1982) as saying that the only way that this research can be used is when someone works with teachers in their classrooms. It is the element of feedback within the peer coaching cycle that encourages teacher reflection and analysis leading to better teaching (Munro & Elliot, 1987).

Today’s teachers are expected to find ways to connect with the diverse needs of learners (Darling-Hammond & Sclan, 1996; Griffin, 1989; Holmes,
1986). No longer is it enough to cover the curriculum or to prepare instruction and instructional content in a fixed way with the hope of reaching all students. Careful supervision of preservice teachers by teacher educators who offer suggestions and feedback regarding pedagogy and subject matter during the student teaching practicum experiences is essential to their success. Such advice and recommendations cannot serve as the basis for preservice teachers’ learning unless teacher educators allow their students to exploit their pedagogical methods, content, and educated judgement during the process of these early teaching experiences.

**Teacher Clarity**

Research on effective teaching is one source of the knowledge base on teaching and teacher education that informs professional educators about instruction and teacher characteristics that lead to improved delivery of content and student understanding (Cruickshank, 1990). A noted gap in the foreign language teaching profession has been underutilization of findings from the general teacher education knowledge base (Richards, 1990). Research on teacher effectiveness (Porter & Brophy, 1986) has provided the teaching profession with teacher traits, knowledge, and skills that are positively correlated with greater student learning. Effective behaviors related to the acts of teaching include establishing and maintaining momentum, encouraging pupil participation, monitoring and attending to pupils, and using both higher- and lower-order questions (Cruickshank, 1990). Teacher clarity skills have
comprised part of the general effective teaching research since the time that clarity was identified as the most promising teacher effects variable (Rosenshine and Furst, 1971).

The construct of teacher clarity has been researched vigorously for over 20 years since it was discovered to be the most promising teacher effects variable by Rosenshine and Furst (1971) in their review of 51 process product studies. Early inquiry into teacher clarity demonstrated the promise of this line of research and presented researchers with many problems in defining the clarity construct (Kennedy & Cruickshank, 1986). Early attempts to understand the construct of teacher clarity left researchers without a definition of this high-inference construct, specifically which teacher behaviors would be included under it. Following the early studies was a series of mapping studies (Bush, 1976; Bush, Kennedy, Cruickshank, 1977; Cruickshank, Myers, Moenjak 1975; Kennedy, Cruickshank, Bush, Meyers, 1978; Hines, 1981), with the purpose of specifying the high-inference and undefined construct of teacher clarity in terms of low-inference teacher behaviors as perceived by students on different educational levels (Metcalf & Cruickshank, 1991).

With the teacher clarity construct reduced to specific low-inference teacher behaviors such as giving students time to practice, repeating important points, and informing students of lesson objectives, further studies demonstrated that the majority of low-inference teacher clarity behaviors seemed to be stable over time, subject matter, and different groups of learners (Williams, 1983).
Additionally, it was found that use of clarity behaviors are strongly and positively correlated with student achievement (Hines, 1981; Williams, 1983; Metcalf, 1989), that teachers can be taught to communicate clearly (Gloeckner, 1983; Larsen, 1985; Metcalf, 1989), and that teacher clarity is not constrained by a teacher’s age, gender, content area and grade level taught (Hamilton, 1988). Research has also shown that a useful clarity training program can be developed when the purpose of teacher education is to increase both the quality and quantity of teacher clarity behaviors (Gloeckner, 1983; Metcalf, 1989). Preservice students who received clarity training outperformed untrained peers on low-, intermediate-, and high-inference levels of the clarity construct (Gloeckner, 1983; Metcalf, 1989).

Statement of the Problem

Foreign language teacher educators have not been found to exploit all of the supervisory possibilities in order to facilitate the preservice teacher’s transition from student to teacher and have been urged to explore and employ new supervisory efforts (Gebhard, 1990). Peer coaching is not as common on the preservice level of teacher education as it is in inservice teacher education. The use of peer coaching among preservice students began as a solution to problems that are found with traditional teacher supervision. These problems include lack of reflection encouraged by the traditional supervisory triadic relationship and lack of communication among cooperating teachers and student teachers.
As an enhancement to typical teacher training, it has become reasonable to include peer coaching on the preservice level while preservice students are experiencing their training with the rationale that coaching will facilitate the recall of teaching strategies presented in methodology classes and transfer of training will more likely occur (Neubert, 1994). Early exposure to peer coaching helps broaden teacher education and the student teaching practicum because preservice students become exposed to others' teaching. The benefits that preservice students gain from peer coaching are parallel to those that inservice teachers gain. They are noted in the areas of lesson planning and skill application, collegial support and personal facilitation, and reflection (Neubert, 1994).

Many programs of teacher training have evolved to improve teacher effectiveness. Rather than being a short term solution to teacher training, peer coaching improves upon many efforts of staff development with its continual emphasis on skills application and peer support. As a vehicle for teaching improvement in a peer coaching study that focused on the effective teaching skill of teacher clarity, Bowman (1995) found that peer-coached preservice teachers in the experimental group demonstrated clarity skills more than nonpeer-coached preservice teachers and that peer coaching provided the experimental group with a focus for observation and feedback. With peer coaching programs in use, schools become learning places for teachers (Drew, 1989). Peer coaching is a long term strategy to help teachers meet the needs of their
learners by engaging in practice, observation, and reflection, allowing them to
grow and learn interdependently (Little, 1982).

In 1990, Jarvis and Taylor issued the call for teacher educators in both
general teacher education and in specific fields to bridge the existing gap
between general teacher education and content specific teacher education,
defining an appropriate relationship between them, so that the inquiry occurring
in general teacher education may have an impact on the preparation of foreign
language teacher education students. This call was repeated by foreign
language teacher educators (Hammadou, 1991; Richards, 1993) because the
field of foreign/second language teaching has “achieved a sense of autonomy
with its own... research agenda (Richards, 1990, p. 3). Traditionally, its
theoretical basis of instruction has been comprised of topics including linguistics,
second language acquisition, pedagogical grammar, discourse analysis,
interlanguage, syntax, phonology, language testing, and syllabus design. Absent
from this list is the research from general teacher education known in the
teacher education community as teacher effectiveness research (Porter &
Brophy, 1986). The present research study aims to utilize general teacher
effectiveness research in the particular field of foreign language education
because teachers teach specific content to specific groups of learners (Sparks,
1992), thus creating a need for content specific programs of staff development in
teacher education.
The proposed study investigates: (a) the value of and need for clarity skills in foreign/second language teaching as perceived by student teachers who have participated in peer and nonpeer-coached preservice training as part of their student teaching practicum; (b) the nature of pre- and post-observation conferences of both groups; and (c) the satisfaction of the members of the two groups toward their experiences in their respective supervisory sections of the student teacher seminar. Having investigated how peer coaching is beneficial to the development of preservice teachers’ pedagogical content knowledge, the purpose of the study is to advance knowledge about the area of foreign language teaching. Based on the data collection and analysis, this study will result in a cohesive set of propositions for use by foreign language methods instructors and student teacher supervisors in their implementation of peer coaching with foreign language teacher education students.

Research Questions

More specifically, the following research questions guided this study.

1. In a peer coaching program implemented within a foreign language student teaching practicum, which clarity behaviors do peer-coached and nonpeer-coached student teachers tend to implement on a consistent basis in their teaching?
   
a. In what ways do peer-coached and nonpeer-coached student teachers make use of the clarity skills (i.e., target or source language)?
2. To what extent do peer-coached and nonpeer-coached student teachers perceive clarity skills useful for foreign/second language teaching?

3. In a peer coaching program implemented within a foreign language student teaching practicum, what are the similarities and differences in the planning discussions of peer-coached student teachers during pre-observation audiotaped conferences and in written plans by the nonpeer-coached student teachers?

4. What are the similarities and differences of audiotaped post-observation conference discussions of student teachers who participate in the peer-coached section and those who do not participate in the peer-coached section?
   a. What is the content of these discussions?
   b. How is the nature of peer interaction beneficial to student teachers’ acquisition of pedagogical content knowledge as classified according to raters’ coding using the categories of Shulman’s (1987) Model of Pedagogical Reasoning?

5. In a peer coaching program implemented in a foreign language student teaching practicum, what are the attitudes of the student teachers in the peer coaching program and those who do not participate in the peer coaching program as reported by the student teachers on an open-ended questionnaire and in weekly journals?
a. To what extent do student teachers report feeling supported with their new responsibilities as student teachers by the cooperating teacher, supervisor, peers involved in the practicum experience?

b. To what extent do student teachers report feeling assisted with lesson planning by the individuals involved in their supervision group (cooperating teacher, supervisor, peer)?

c. To what extent do student teachers report feeling assisted with technical feedback?

d. To what extent do student teachers report feeling assisted in adapting the clarity training model to their classes?

e. To what extent do student teachers perceive personal growth to have occurred during the practicum?

f. How do student teachers rate their student teaching experience?

6. In what ways are the findings of this study applicable to foreign language methods instructors and student teacher program developers in Foreign Language Education?

Definition of Terms

The following terms are operationally defined in order to maintain a clear and mutual understanding throughout this study:

Clarity skills are a cluster of teacher behaviors that result in students' gaining knowledge or understanding of a topic if they possess adequate interest, aptitude, opportunity, and time (i.e., points out what is important for students to
learn, explains instructional content, provides for student assimilation and synthesis of content, and assesses and tries to ensure student understanding (Cruickshank & Kennedy, 1986). These skills are grouped as low-, moderate-, and high-inference manifestations of clarity. Low-inference skills are those “whose magnitude is usually determined by counting...the number of times that specific behaviors are observed. The crucial feature of a low-inference variable is that it requires little inference...or judgement beyond observation of what is directly sensed or perceived” (Cruickshank & Kennedy, 1986, p. 44). Low-inference variables are grouped into moderate-inference categorical descriptors, e.g., explains instructional content includes the low-inference behaviors of repeats important points and use of examples. High-inference teacher clarity is not observed directly by counting the number of occurrences, but is inferred by means of observers’ ratings of one’s clarity skills use (See Appendix A).

Effective teaching skills are specific teacher behaviors present or operative when pupils are succeeding, as validated by a body of research referred to in the teacher education community as Effective Teaching Research (Cruickshank, 1990). Teacher clarity is one behavior included in this research.

A foreign language student teacher is an individual who has successfully completed at least 90% of the language content to be taught as well as at least 90% of the professional component of a teacher education program.

The foreign language student teaching practicum is a period of ten weeks during which a student teacher of a foreign language is placed with a
practicing foreign language teacher in a school setting. During this time the student teacher gradually assumes the teaching responsibilities of the regular classroom teacher and attends a weekly two-hour student teaching seminar class conducted by the college supervisor.

**Pedagogical content knowledge** is a practical form of subject matter knowledge that teachers have that allows them to represent their subject matter in ways that make it comprehensible to their students (Shulman, 1987).

**Peer coaching** is the process in which student teacher dyads use the essential components of clinical supervision with a focus on the mastery of a particular skill or set of skills in order to help each other grow professionally (Glatthorn, 1987).

The **Post-Observation Conference** is an arranged time when student teachers meet with peer coaches or supervisors to discuss and to analyze classroom data collected during the classroom observation of a lesson and to offer constructive feedback.

The **Pre-Observation Conference** is an arranged time prior to the classroom observation of a lesson when the student teacher and peer coach discuss the purposes and planning for the lesson.

**Assumptions**

In order to carry out the present study, the following assumptions are stated: (a) The student teaching practicum is an essential component of the teacher education program; (b) Generic theories of teacher clarity apply to
foreign language classroom teaching; (c) It is possible to identify student teachers’ uses of clarity skills; (d) Student teachers are capable of acting as coaches for each other and providing feedback during the practicum; (e) Peer coaching can be used as a means for clarity training; (f) The subjects in this study responded honestly to the self-report data.

Limitations

This study was subject to the following limitations: (a) The possibility that one or more student teachers would change their teaching behavior to please the researcher based on knowledge gained about the other seminar group of student teachers; (b) The practicum experience limited data collection to a ten-week period; (c) The availability of student teacher placements did not allow student teachers to be randomly placed in peer and nonpeer groups. Assignment was subject to the availability of school placements and cooperating teachers willing to accept student teachers; (d) Self-report data formed the basis of much of the data collected in this study.

Delimitations

The present study was conducted under two delimitations. The first is the delimitation of investigation of effective teaching skills to that of teacher clarity: Findings may not be generalizable to other teaching skills reported on in the literature. A second delimitation was the focus on one group of student teachers at one particular university. The findings may not be typical of all student teaching cohorts in similar settings.
Conclusion

The present chapter explained the purpose of and need for this research endeavor. The following four chapters are organized such that: Chapter Two includes a review of literature related to the pertinent areas of teacher supervision, clarity skills, and peer coaching; Chapter Three explains the qualitative research orientation and set of research procedures followed to be able to complete this study; Chapter Four answers the six research questions posed in Chapter One that guided this investigation. Findings on the use of teacher clarity skills in the foreign/second language classroom, the acquisition of pedagogical content knowledge by the student teachers, and their satisfaction with their supervision process are presented and discussed; Chapter Five, the final chapter, presents the implications that the findings of this study hold for foreign and second language teaching and presents the researcher’s conclusions regarding those findings.
CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Schools no less than universities are places in which teachers can learn. Unfortunately, that learning typically has been lonely and catch-as-catch-can. It has been more a matter of daily survival in a difficult job than progress toward professional improvement. America's children need schools in which teachers can learn, thoughtfully investigate and improve professional practice (The Holmes Group, 1986, p. 5).

In the past, teaching was conceptualized as the individual endeavor of enacting a prescribed repertoire of practices. This production model (Smylie & Conyers, 1991) view of teaching implies that teachers who use research based pre-planned routines create the conditions for student gains and success. A more recent view portrays teaching as a complex, dynamic, intellectual, and interactive activity that does not proceed linearly but rather is subject to change and is context dependent (Griffin, 1986; Smylie & Conyers, 1991). This movement from a more prescriptive portrayal of teaching to a more analytical one evolved from the realization that teaching is a diverse profession because of the variance among settings and teachers and students in those settings (Elliot, 1989 in Ducharme & Ducharme, 1996). Current reform efforts in programs of teacher preparation and teacher induction have emphasized a focus on providing teachers with approaches and methods that assist them in developing
a reflective and problem solving stance toward their teaching (Darling-Hammond & Cobb, 1996). In settings where teachers do not have the ability to reflect on their work with students or the insight about the influences of context, processes, and content on their teaching, some teachers are lead “to despair of their competence and others to develop habits of teaching that, inevitably, are counterproductive to successful teaching and satisfying learning” (Griffin, 1986, p. 278).

Effective teaching research of the 1960s and 1970s discovered and codified a number of general teaching principles that allow teachers to cope with the uncertainties and complexities of teaching (Shulman, 1986). The goal of effective teaching research is to improve the performance of all teachers. This line of research focuses only on delivery of instruction, not on the content of instruction (Feiman-Nemser & Parker, 1986). Although a spotlight on effective teaching principles allows teachers to focus on certain aspects of their teaching and gives them strategies to deal with the complexities of a given moment or teaching sequence, the study of teaching has begun to include attention to the content and subject matter knowledge of teachers in order to promote practices and establish a case literature for teaching and teacher education (Shulman, 1986; Grossman, Wilson, Shulman, 1986; Porter & Brophy, 1986, p. 81; Ball & McDiarmid, 1990; Gudmonston, 1990).

The present chapter presents a review of the literature pertinent to effective teaching research, clarity, supervision, peer coaching, and pedagogical
content knowledge. The reader is encouraged to follow the argument that teaching can be studied thoroughly when teachers are placed in situations that allow them to learn from both the content and processes of instruction. A teacher’s content is both general and specific. It includes knowledge generated from general teacher education research that is considered and applied in particular subject areas. In this chapter, knowledge gained for use by the teaching profession in general on the topics of clarity, supervision, and peer coaching is reviewed. The sections of this chapter include: pedagogical content knowledge; effective teaching research; teacher clarity; supervision; limitations of the traditional model of supervision; peer coaching; studies of peer coaching applied to inservice teaching; studies of peer coaching applied to preservice teaching.

Pedagogical Content Knowledge

According to Jarvis and Taylor (1990), when research is conducted on effective teaching, it is identifying the same phenomenon that is called pedagogical content knowledge (Shulman, 1987). This domain of knowledge is specific to the educator and to teaching. It entails the knowledge of ways to represent content in order to make it comprehensible to others, the students (Shulman, 1987). Knowledge of the subject matter is a prerequisite for the acquisition of pedagogical content knowledge. In possession of pedagogical content knowledge, the teacher understands which aspects of the content are central for future comprehension of the subject by the students and which are
peripheral (Jarvis and Taylor, 1990). The study of novice teachers' pedagogical content knowledge sheds light on the nature of teaching; here, the nature of foreign and second language teaching.

As noted by Gebhard (1993), student teachers learn from both the content and process of supervision. The study of the content and process of student teacher supervision will contribute to the knowledge base of how student teachers acquire pedagogical content knowledge. In the field of foreign and second language teacher education much investigation remains to be carried out in the areas of both effective teaching and student teacher supervision.

**Effective Teaching Research**

Effective teaching research as outlined by Cruickshank (1990) organizes efforts in this area into seven clusters. These are: (1) teachers' traits; (2) what the teacher knows; (3) what the teacher teaches; (4) how the teacher teaches; (5) teacher's management of the classroom; (6) what the teacher expects; (7) how the teacher reacts to pupils. The category "how the teacher teaches" has become the main focus of effective teaching research. Efforts to describe this category have produced numerous effective behaviors related to the act of teaching.

Research on effective teaching has employed two lines of inquiry in its attempts to provide the teaching profession with answers as to what comprises successful teaching. The first period of effective teaching research took place prior to the 1960s and focused on identifying teacher traits and characteristics.
that were considered praiseworthy by school administrators and supervisors (Cruickshank, 1990; Richards, 1990). This line of inquiry, which was based on rating scales, was found to be incapable of providing a general consensus on what the primary characteristics of effective teachers are (Marsh & Wilder, 1954, cited in Cruickshank, 1990). Noting this lack of consensus, Howsam (1960) concluded that different individuals were unable to closely agree on the evaluation of teaching when defined by teacher traits and characteristics (Cruickshank, 1990).

With the dawn of the 1960s a different approach to research on effective teaching sought identification of specific behaviors that teachers exercise when their students are succeeding. This approach was the result of several efforts within the teacher education profession: (1) motivation to counter the findings of the Coleman Report of 1966, which stated that teachers and schools account for “only a small amount of the differences in pupil academic achievement” (Cruickshank, 1990, p. 22); (2) observation instruments focusing on classroom interaction had begun to appear; (3) the emergence of several models for guiding research to study direct and indirect relationships among the many variables within the classroom environment (Cruickshank, 1990).

One early effort in this second approach to research on effective teaching was a review of 50 studies by Rosenshine and Furst (1971) which had as its purpose to identify teacher behaviors linked to the success of pupil learning. Their findings listed teacher clarity as the first in a series of “most promising
teacher behavior variables...found to be consistently associated with pupil learning” (Rosenshine & Furst 1971, in Cruickshank 1990, p. 69). Teacher clarity is defined as a cluster of teacher behaviors that result in learners gaining knowledge or understanding of a topic (Cruickshank & Kennedy, 1986).

Teacher Clarity

Teacher clarity studies concentrate on the role of the teacher in the process of teaching and learning (Civikly, 1992). In their summary of findings that link teacher behaviors to student achievement, Brophy and Good (1986) document clarity as a teacher behavior that is included in the instructional moves of structuring, soliciting, and reacting (pp. 362-364). Teacher talk makes up about two thirds of class time and the more meaning students can make of their teachers' verbal input, the more likely they are to recall the material and apply it. When teachers do not display clarity behaviors, the responses from their students include confusion, frustration, rejection, and passive acceptance of vague ideas (Chilcoat & Vocke, 1988; Chilcoat, 1987).

Research on teacher clarity has resulted in a list of behaviors that seem to facilitate student learning. Teacher clarity behaviors have been the subject of research endeavors at The Ohio State University since the mid 1970s (Cruickshank, Myers, Moenjak, 1975; Bush, 1976; Bush, Kennedy, & Cruickshank, 1977; Cruickshank, Kennedy, Bush, & Myers, 1979; Hines, 1981; Gloeckner, 1983; Larsen, 1985; Hamilton, 1988; Metcalf, 1989; Bowman, 1995). Two types of research are associated with studies on clarity (Civikly, 1992).
These studies have endeavored to operationally define the construct of teacher clarity in terms of low-inference behaviors and to correlate them with student outcomes (Hamilton, 1988).

One type of clarity research investigates students' perceptions of teachers' clarity. Early research on clarity generated a list of over 1,000 behaviors of clear teachers elicited from junior high school students (Cruickshank, Myers, & Moenjak, 1975). Later efforts by Bush (1977) edited this list and through factor analysis identified five items that distinguished clear teachers from unclear teachers: (1) provides students with individual help; (2) explains and provides time for students to think about the topic; (3) explains work to be done and how to do it; (4) repeats questions and explanations if not understood by students; (5) asks students before they begin work if they understand how to proceed.

Further investigation on clarity skills identified specific, observable behaviors that defined the construct of teacher clarity as well as discriminated between clear and unclear teachers. Hines (1981) determined that the same low-inference teacher behaviors that were found to be leading discriminators of teacher clarity for teachers on the junior high level also discriminated well and therefore defined teacher clarity on the college level. Reliability estimates were .75 for low-inference behaviors and .97 for high-inference clarity. Findings showed that teacher clarity can be operationalized in terms of low-inference
behaviors and are generalizable across two educational levels: junior high and college.

One recommendation in the teacher clarity studies is that the stability of teacher clarity be investigated (Hines, 1981). The consistency of teacher clarity across different groups of students, subject matter, and teaching occasions was investigated with 52 preservice teachers who taught Reflective Teaching (Cruickshank, 1987) lessons to groups of their peers in intact education courses at several universities (Williams, 1983). Students of teachers who used the clarity skills throughout their lessons on both teaching occasions received higher test scores on tests of lesson content than teachers who were rated as unclear. The data showed that, over time, students' achievement scores and satisfaction ratings of teachers who were rated as using the clarity behaviors increased while the scores for those teachers who did not use the clarity skills decreased. The outcome of this study showed that stability of teacher clarity is observable for low-inference behaviors.

A further question about teacher clarity is whether or not teachers can be trained to use low-inference descriptors of teacher clarity (e.g., repeats important points, uses examples, demonstrates). A teacher clarity training unit was developed and used in a ten-hour training program with a group of preservice teachers in a methodology course (Gloeckner, 1983). The experimental group and the control group taught the same Reflective Teaching lesson to peers and were rated on the quality of clarity in the lesson. Following this training, the
experimental group was observed to use teacher clarity skills and to receive higher observer ratings on their clarity skills use than the control group. The large differences in post-treatment scores for trained teachers showed that a clarity training program can be developed.

When the effects of the Teacher Clarity Training Unit (Gloeckner, 1983) were tested in a Reflective Teaching lesson with a different control group and the same experimental group, the trained teachers were not rated by trained observers as using the low-inference clarity behaviors more than the teachers in the control group. Learners of experimental group teachers did not report that they were more satisfied with the teaching they received than the control group students reported, nor did they receive higher scores on tests of lesson content than the control group learners. Preservice teacher education students may need, therefore, continuous supervision and coaching after the initial training program in order to ensure that they transfer the new skills frequently and appropriately to their teaching because training intended to change specific teacher behaviors is an intricate endeavor (Gloeckner, 1983).

Another training agenda, The Clarity Training Program, was developed over a 15-month period to determine whether preservice teachers could be trained to make clearer presentations (Metcalf, 1989). The Clarity Training Program provided four measures of clarity: a lower-inference frequency; a mean rating of teachers' use of low-inference behaviors; a mean rating of teachers' use of moderate-inference behaviors; a single, global rating of teachers' overall
clarity. Seventeen lower-inference clarity skills falling under the categories of: (1) logical organization of instruction and instructional content; (2) emphasis on important aspects of instruction and instructional content; (3) explains or demonstrates work by use of examples; and (4) provides for students' understanding and assimilation of instructional content were validated through this research endeavor as leading to instructional clarity. There was an increase in the frequency of trained teachers' use of clarity skills from pretest to posttest conditions. Observed instances of moderate-inference behaviors were found to occur more frequently in the experimental group, but this number of occurrences between groups was not found to be statistically significant. Two factor analyses of the tests of learner achievement revealed a significant but minimal difference in learner achievement between students of trained and untrained teachers. Students of trained teachers did better than the students of untrained teachers. Although highly significant differences resulted in the ratings of trained versus untrained teachers' overall clarity, Metcalf (1989) did not find that the Clarity Training Program enabled teachers to increase learner satisfaction. The empirical evidence in this study suggests that the Clarity Training Program is helpful for the development of complex teaching skills within the limited time available during a quarter long methods course.

Continued use of the Clarity Training Program further suggests that it can be incorporated as a classroom component for preservice teachers in methods courses. In Metcalf and Cruickshank (1991), the Clarity Training Program was
used in four sections of a general methods course. Sections of the methods
courses received four one and a half hour training sessions. Resultant data
found significant differences in favor of trained preservice teachers. They were
rated by observers as making clearer presentations because of their more
frequent use of teacher clarity behaviors and because they produced more
student learning than their untrained peers on the student tests of achievement
included with the Reflective Teaching lessons. No evidence was found to
support the hypothesis stating that teachers trained with the Clarity Training
Program would produce greater learner satisfaction.

The findings from Metcalf (1989) were supported in a replication study
(Metcalf, 1992) at a different university. Training with the Clarity Training
Program enabled the preservice teachers to implement a broader range of the
low-inference behaviors than their peers in the control group. The ratings of
trained teachers were also significantly higher on moderate-inference and
overall clarity ratings than the scores of untrained preservice teachers. Analysis
of covariance revealed that trained preservice teachers produced greater
student learning than their untrained peers.

In addition to the above mentioned studies that demonstrate that low-
inference behaviors are trustworthy measures of the high-inference construct of
teacher clarity, Cruickshank and Metcalf (1991) report that when preservice
teachers are trained in clarity skills and then observed in laboratory teaching
assignments, the training not only supported more regular use of low- and
moderate-inference clarity skills, but also facilitated preservice teachers' employment of the skills in ways that made their presentations more clear. Student performance on reflective teaching lesson tests showed that students of experimental group teachers learned more of the material in the Reflective Teaching lesson than students of teachers in the control group, as they received higher scores on reflective teaching tests of lesson content.

Further research on teacher clarity moved the research site from the laboratory to the K-12 classroom. Hamilton's (1988) ratings of tapes of teachers in a national teaching competition supported the idea that low-inference teacher behaviors that define the teacher clarity construct can be observed and measured in actual teaching situations. Trained raters with experience in the subject areas of the videotaped teachers were able to observe and record all 25 of the low-inference behaviors of the clarity instrument on the videotapes across various subject matters and grade levels. Inter-rater reliability was found to range between .86 and .97. Findings did not yield statistically significant differences between the teacher clarity construct and teachers' age, gender, or subject matter. Analysis of variance did produce a statistically significant effect between teachers' own grade point average and their implementation of both low-inference and high-inference clarity skills.

Also in the naturalistic setting of the K-12 classroom, Giebelhaus (1993) used the bug in the ear (BIE) device to ensure the immediate provision of feedback from cooperating teachers to student teachers. Cooperating teachers
provided feedback using the BIE on student teachers' use of 14 discrete clarity skills substantiated in the above mentioned research as observable and measurable. The analysis of covariance produced statistically significant differences between the pretest and posttest measures of the 22 elementary student teachers' use of only one of the 14 clarity skills: asks questions. This skill comes from the moderate-inference cluster of "assesses and tries to ensure understanding." Other skills that approached statistical significance in the study were: informs students of lesson objectives; repeats important points; use of examples; repeats points students do not seem to understand; allows time for students to ask questions; provides opportunities for students to practice.

Student teachers' immediate response rates to cues given by cooperating teachers were between 83% and 100%. The student teachers and cooperating teachers reported that the BIE device was helpful in providing feedback when the student teachers taught a difficult lesson or when the content of the lesson was material that the student teacher had not taught previously (Giebelhaus, 1993).

In a study on message clarity (Smith, 1982), preservice teachers enrolled in a methods course were placed in experimental and control groups with the experimental group receiving training in identification and remediation of the use of vagueness terms. Vagueness terms are defined as utterances that "occur when a teacher tries to present material he or she cannot remember or never fully understood" (Hiller 1971, in Smith, 1982, p.162). The experimental group
reduced the number of vagueness terms in a second observed and rated lesson while the control group's use of such terms remained stable.

The implications these studies (Hines, 1981; Gloeckner, 1983; Hamilton, 1988; Metcalf, 1989; Metcalf & Cruickshank, 1991; Metcalf, 1992) hold is that preservice teachers can be trained to make clearer presentations. Teacher educators should, therefore, concentrate on low-inference clarity behaviors that can be observed and counted in the methodology portion of the teacher education curriculum.

Most of the investigations of clarity skills have been conducted among preservice teachers enrolled in teacher education courses who have received training to use them in laboratory teaching environments. Stated in the research literature on teacher clarity are suggestions that studies be conducted in natural settings of K-12 classrooms (Hamilton, 1988). Bowman (1995) conducted a clarity study among peer-coached and nonpeer-coached preservice teachers involved in an early field experience. Those preservice teachers who participated in peer-coaching dyads implemented clarity skills significantly more than nonpeer-coached preservice teachers at the .05 level. Findings support that clarity training is useful to preservice teachers and that they can be trained to be clearer instructors by using low-inference skills generated by the mapping studies on clarity. Recommendations based on this study support those of Hamilton (1988) by encouraging the investigation of clarity skills to take place in K-12 classrooms among student teachers in content-specific areas other than
general elementary education. If this line of inquiry is followed, then Shulman's (1987) call for codifying the wisdom of practice, mentioned in chapter one, should be initiated with a special focus on clarity skills of teachers of differing content areas.

In summary, teacher clarity skills were found to be a promising teacher effects variable (Rosenshine and Furst, 1971). Since then research on teacher clarity skills has been carried out in two ways (Civikly, 1992): student perception studies and direct or video observation. The high-inference clarity variable has been operationally defined in terms of several observable low-inference descriptors that can be measured and tallied. Tools used to measure the teacher clarity skills include self-inventory, testing, and observational instruments.

The literature suggests that more clarity studies be carried out in natural K-12 settings, during the student teaching practicum, and in classrooms of various content areas. The history of research on teacher clarity skills has shown that preservice teachers can be trained to use low-, moderate-, and high-inference clarity skills, that students of trained teachers produced more learning of content presented by their teachers, and that clarity skills use is not contingent upon subject matter, grade level, teacher age, or gender.

Supervision

Traditional models of student teaching bring three individuals into relationships with each other: the student teacher, the university supervisor, and the cooperating teacher. The typical student teaching internship takes place at
the end of the preservice teacher’s participation in a teacher education program and is considered the culminating experience of preservice teacher education.

One model developed to assist student teachers and their supervisors is clinical supervision. The clinical supervision model was developed by Cogan and associates during the 1950s at Harvard University. Specifically, clinical supervision entails the systematic study and the analysis of teaching and learning events using a carefully planned program. It is a “field based approach to instructional supervision” (Sullivan, 1980, p.7) adapted to the needs of the student teacher and supervisor. Clinical supervision may thus be defined as “the rationale and practice designed to improve the teacher’s classroom performance” (Cogan, 1973, p. 9). A defining tenet of the clinical supervision model is that teaching can only be improved by providing the teacher with direct feedback regarding the areas that are of concern to that individual (Sullivan, 1980).

Cogan (1973, pp. 10-12) outlines the process of clinical supervision to be a developmental one consisting of the following phases:

1. establishment of the teacher-supervisor relationship
2. lesson planning by teacher and supervisor
3. planning the strategy of the observation
4. classroom observation
5. analysis of the teaching-learning process
6. planning the strategy of the conference
7. conference
8. renewed planning

Applications of the clinical supervision model may vary; giving emphasis to certain phases, adding new procedures, or eliminating some phases entirely. Adaptations of the model depend on the successful evolution of the teacher's and supervisor's working relationship (Cogan, 1973) or the stages of development and concerns of the student teacher. Different sources of clinical supervision remain similar with regard to the general importance placed on planning, observation, and evaluation (Sullivan, 1980).

In sum, clinical supervision is a flexible model of supervision allowing both student teacher and supervisor to take the roles of decision makers as they participate in conferencing, data gathering, and analyzing data. Analysis of classroom data and the development of the teacher-supervisor relationship form the basis of clinical supervision. The expected advantages of clinical supervision are the improvement of teaching, the development of the teacher, and the initiation of the student teacher into the education profession and teacher certification (Sullivan, 1980).

New teacher standards make use of the clinical supervision cycle and have incorporated observations and conferences into performance-based assessments (Danielson, 1996). New standards that have been adopted by the State Department of Education in Ohio now require that schools provide beginning teachers with a mentoring program for assistance during their entry
level year. Such mentoring programs are nested within professional
development and are aimed to provide supervision that focuses on problems of
professional practice. For example, the Pathwise Assessment Criteria as part of
the Praxis Series for beginning teacher assessment (Educational Testing
Service, 1992) enhance typical traditional supervisor-supervised teacher
relationships by placing a mentor together with a new teacher to address
domains of teaching such as *Organizing Content Knowledge for Student
Learning* and *Teaching for Student Learning*.

**Limitations of the Traditional Model of Supervision**

The student teaching internship is typically intended to be the culminating
activity of a teacher education program. It is a time to put one's knowledge of
teaching into practice in context under the guidance of a classroom teacher. In
other words, it is a time when theory meets practice and novice meets
experienced practitioner. Ideally, the two settings of the university and the
classroom become a valuable combination, allowing the novice to practice and
receive feedback from mentors representing both settings. Although cooperating
teachers and preservice teachers surveyed in the Study of the Education of
Educators (Edmundson, 1990) viewed the student teaching internship as the
most worthwhile part of preservice education, many studies indicate that field
placements and student teaching internships are not free from problems that
cause them to be questioned.
Richardson-Koehler (1989) found four conditions of student teaching that interfered with the supervision of student teachers by their university supervisors. The first dealt with teachers’ beliefs about learning to teach. Findings indicated that cooperating teachers believed that they learned to teach from their own experience and that their practices and ideas originated from trial and error experiences or from themselves rather than from help of other teachers. Instead of working cooperatively with student teachers, cooperating teachers with this attitude preferred that novices infer and discover teaching methods on their own.

Secondly, the cooperating teachers’ traits and teacher behaviors that were transmitted to the student teacher also created barriers to the student teacher’s acquisition of pedagogical content knowledge during the internship. The student teachers in this study reported that 80% of their practices came directly from the cooperating teacher’s influence. Within two weeks of placement with their teachers, student teachers had begun to dismiss the influence of most of their preservice pedagogical training, preferring instead to infer what good practice was based on their observations. Although this percentage dropped to 40% later in the internship, the student teachers reported that 40% of the origins of their practice came from themselves, as their cooperating teachers had indicated earlier. This led the student teachers to believe that each teacher and classroom is unique and presentation of content should be arranged and
organized by doing “whatever feels right to the individual teacher” (Richardson-Koehler, 1988, p. 33).

A third barrier to the supervision relationship in this study was an unwillingness on the part of the cooperating teachers to engage in reflection of their and their student teachers’ practices. The final barrier identified was that the roles and responsibilities of the university supervisor were left undefined for members of the supervisory triad. The supervisor carries out supervisory duties in the cooperating teacher’s classroom, a setting of which he or she is not normally an ongoing part. If the university supervisor’s role is not defined, understood, or agreed upon by members of the supervisory triad, then this lack of understanding can create situations that lead to student teachers’ confusion and inability to realize the full potential of their own work as teachers.

Other barriers to supervision listed in the literature on supervision include a lack of communication among the three members of the supervisory triad, lack of support for internships on the part of the university, and the precarious position of the university supervisor (Hoover, O’Shea, & Carroll, 1988). At times, the cooperating teacher may believe that his or her practices are under the scrutiny of the university supervisor rather than the student teacher’s. In many practicum situations cooperating teachers are not trained in supervision. Without training, the cooperating teacher sometimes feels unprepared for supervision (Meade, 1991; Metcalf, 1991).
In addition to the above limitations found in supervisory settings are several other factors characteristic of the university and university supervisor that make effective supervision a goal that is difficult to reach. Often, university supervisors are responsible for so large a number of student teachers that it makes it difficult and almost impossible to provide the guidance, support, and feedback necessary to monitor the growth and progress of each student teacher (Meade, 1991; Giebelhaus, 1993). The time that university supervisors and cooperating teachers have available in their daily and weekly schedules for the supervision of student teachers can be limited by duties such as the teaching responsibilities and graduate study of the university supervisor. Cooperating teachers typically do not receive a reprieve in regular duties when they accept a student teacher into their classrooms (Meade, 1991). Mentoring a student teacher provides cooperating teachers with an additional teaching responsibility, increasing their work loads. This added responsibility is one of the reasons that student teachers sometimes do not receive enough feedback during their internship or practicum experience (Edmundson, 1990).

Hindrances such as the ones listed above leave student teachers without the supervision activities and opportunities that help them learn how to improve their teaching and has led many teachers to say that teaching is an isolated activity (Cogan, 1973). Student teachers have been found to become more custodial and dogmatic and less flexible in their instructional approaches (McIntyre & Morris, 1980, p.193; Bunting, 1988, p.42; Metcalf, 1991, p.30). As a
result, they tend to depend upon survival strategies to help them through their experiences (Bunting, 1988). The result of these noted problems in supervision leads student teachers to teach as they were taught and prevents positive change in their instruction (Cogan, 1973; Hammadou, 1993).

In the field of foreign language teacher education, an additional hindrance is found in supervision. It is common that school administrators and university supervisors who observe and evaluate foreign language inservice and preservice teachers are often not proficient in the language being taught by the foreign language teacher and student teacher. This lack of familiarity with the foreign language, culture, and with foreign language specific pedagogy may cause misunderstandings between supervisors and supervised teachers. One suggestion in the foreign language teacher education literature to help solve the problem of student teacher training is peer supervision, with the expectation that novices' skills in observation and analysis of teaching will transfer to the inservice setting and provide an added source of support for teachers of second and foreign languages (Hammadou & Bernhardt, 1987).

Collaborative professional development can be used as a cover term for strategies that bring teachers together to work in peer-oriented systems (Glatthorn, 1987). Peer review, peer supervision, and peer coaching are three such strategies. Peer review has been defined as a process in which teachers help colleagues establish instructional improvement on goals and then provide valuable classroom feedback on progress toward those goals (Elliot & Chidley,
Peer coaching is similar to peer supervision but focuses on a particular skill or set of skills for teachers to transfer to their teaching (Glatthorn, 1987). It is the process where two teachers meet regularly for problem solving using planning, observation, feedback, and creative thinking for the development of a specific skill (Joyce & Showers, 1980). What distinguishes peer coaching from peer supervision is that peer coaching tends to be more intensive in that the focus is on the preservice teachers' learning the theoretical foundation of a specific skill followed by the observation, practice, and mastery of it (Glatthorn, 1987). The goal is the transfer of this skill to everyday teaching in context.

When peer coaching is employed, it carries out several functions: (1) Peer coaching provides companionship to the participants and reduces the sense of isolation that teachers tend to feel; (2) Each of the peers provides the other with objective, technical feedback as the new model of teaching is practiced. This feedback is non-evaluative in nature; (3) There is a continual emphasis on the application of the new model of teaching that keeps the peers focused; (4) The peer coach provides analysis of students' responses to the
teacher's implementation and practice of the new skill in order to help the coached peer adapt the new model to the needs of particular groups of students; (5) The peer coach provides support in order to assist the coached individual during early endeavors (Glatthorn 1987; Ackland, 1991).

Peer coaching can be carried out by means of three types of coaching according to the needs of the teachers. These are technical, reciprocal, and challenge coaching (Garmston 1987; Ackland, 1991). Technical coaching is intended to help teachers transfer training in the specified skill to their classroom teaching. The purpose of this form of coaching is to encourage and strengthen collegiality and increase professional dialogue among practitioners. According to Showers (1996), participation in technical coaching allows teachers to: (1) Practice new skills more frequently and develop greater mastery in using them; (2) Use skills more correctly; (3) Continue to use the skill appropriately and retain knowledge for longer amounts of time; (4) Teach new skills to their students; (5) Understand the purposes and uses for new skills more clearly (Showers. 1996, p. 14).

Collegial coaching aims to help teachers refine their teaching practices, encourages professional dialogue, strengthens collegiality, and helps teachers to think more systematically about their work (Garmston, 1987; Ackland, 1991). The ultimate goal of this type of coaching is for the coached individual to engage in self coaching. By focusing on areas the observed teacher chooses for observation and analysis, collegial coaching encourages the teacher to make
applications to future teaching practices. Collegial coaches are trained to facilitate the thought processes that ground the teachers’ judgements as they apply new skills in their teaching.

Challenge coaching is used when there is a need to resolve a problematic situation in instruction (Garmston, 1987; Ackland, 1991). The process of challenge coaching begins with the identification of a persistent problem in goal attainment. It is not unlikely that the actual process of peer coaching includes a combination of technical, collegial, and challenge coaching (Ackland, 1991).

In addition to the three purposes for the use of peer coaching, there are two forms of peer coaching by which this form of teacher supervision is utilized. Coaching by experts occurs when a specially trained teacher with expertise in a particular skill or model of teaching is the one to carry out observations and provide feedback to the teacher. The second form, reciprocal coaching, results when two teachers jointly carry out the processes of observation, analysis, and feedback for each other (Ackland, 1991).

The characteristics of peer coaching are, therefore, threefold. Peer coaching is a non-evaluative form of supervision that allows teachers to engage in self-analysis, it is based on the observation of classroom practice followed by constructive feedback, and its goal is to improve instructional routines and procedures (Ackland, 1991). In this strategy of collaborative professional development, the role of feedback is critically important, and Garmston (1987)
has claimed that feedback can only lead to improvements in instruction if it is objective and given in a nonthreatening way.

Benefits of Peer Coaching

The benefits of peer coaching have been noted on both the inservice and preservice levels. Novice teachers and student teachers alike benefit from participating in peer coaching as a result of receiving more attention, time, and functional help than a regular supervisor has the ability to provide (Karant, 1989). The peer support of having a partner with whom to discuss instruction, can be easier than discussing the same matters with a supervisor (Alfonso, 1977; Sparks & Bruder, 1987; Peterson & Hudson, 1989). As an alternative to traditional supervision, peer coaching promotes conversation between people with similar jobs and the result can be “honest, helpful, mutually beneficial interaction,” and “healthy substantive discourse” (Hyman, 1990, p. 55). Dialogues that occur in peer coaching make practitioners aware of new ideas that their colleagues can provide, bring the work of teachers to a conscious level, and create a new realization among teachers that they can look to their peers as resources (Chrisco, 1989, p. 32).

Inservice Applications of Peer Coaching

Traditional inservice education has been criticized for providing workshops that meet only for one session. This lack of providing follow-up activities and support for teachers as they try to transfer skills and methods into their daily practices is a shortcoming of traditional inservice (Leggett & Hoyle,
This type of supervision seldom addresses the individual concerns teachers may have as they begin to incorporate new methods into their classrooms. The ongoing nature of observation, analysis, and feedback of peer coaching improves upon traditional inservice education by its focus on a specific skill and the one to one interaction and assistance that peers provide and receive (Leggett & Hoyle, 1987). When teachers work collaboratively in peer coaching the result is the improvement of an oft-mentioned problem inherent in the work of teachers. That is, teachers feel less isolation in their work when they have the opportunity to engage in adult-to-adult interaction on a regular basis (Alfonso, 1977; Leggett & Hoyle, 1987; Chrisco, 1989; Hyman, 1990). An additional benefit is that peer coaching shows teachers that they can contribute to the improvement of instruction (Alfonso, 1977).

Peer coaching is a cyclical process implemented as a follow-up procedure to (inservice) training. Berliner (in Brandt, 1982, p.12) found that his efforts to disperse research findings on effective teaching practices in presentation format at teacher workshops had very little influence on teachers’ everyday methods. In an interview with Brandt (1982), Berliner recommended that K-12 schools design inservice training in such a way that fewer speakers are used and more on-site assistance for effective teaching is made available to teachers.

Teachers can learn new skills and refine their teaching practices under the proper conditions. In a study of high school English teachers (Joyce &
Showers, 1982), the researchers stressed that development of a skill alone does not ensure the transfer of it to one’s practice. There is a greater chance of transfer when teachers participate in coaching. The researchers emphasize the importance of overlearning a skill, which requires a period of practice in context until it can become a natural part of the teacher’s instructional repertoire. The elements of the coaching process that help assure that this overlearning occurs are companionship, technical feedback, analysis of application, adaptation to students, and personal facilitation (Joyce & Showers, 1982).

Joyce and Showers (1980) outlined the components of skills training for teachers. These are: presentation of a theory or description of a skill or strategy; modeling or demonstration of skills or models of teaching; practice in simulated and classroom settings; structured and open-ended feedback; coaching for application. For training to augment the likelihood that teachers will be able to transfer newly learned skills to the classroom, the researchers (Joyce & Showers, 1980) recommended that several of these components be combined. When the goal of the training program is for mastery of a new approach or technique, rather than merely the refining of skills, Joyce and Showers (1980) recommended the use of coaching to strengthen the impact of training and to ensure successful transfer to the classroom.

The ongoing nature of the peer coaching cycle allows teachers to practice the target skill until one achieves executive control (Joyce & Showers, 1982). That is, teachers regularly engaged in the acts of making observations, giving
feedback, and making adaptations to their teaching practice the target skill until it is an automatic part of their teaching repertoire. When coaching is added to teacher training, coached teachers practice the target skill more frequently, use the new skill more appropriately in terms of their intended learning outcomes, and retain knowledge about the skill for a longer time. In data gathered through interviews, lesson plans, and classroom performances, teachers exhibited more accurate understandings of the purposes and uses of new skills (Showers, 1985).

In a study that trained teachers in models of classroom management and mastery learning (Servatius & Young, 1985), it was shown that teachers who received both training and coaching implemented the trained skills with more consistency and more correctly than those only receiving training. The successful execution of these skills was attributed to several factors associated with the coaching strategy: (1) Teachers felt accountable during coaching and in their continued efforts to implement the skill, as they would be observed regularly by colleagues; (2) Peers provided support and companionship; (3) The specific feedback that peer coaching provided helped teachers implement the models with success in the classroom. The authors concluded that coaching is the best way to guarantee the proper application of teaching skills to one's classroom. One veteran teacher in this study reported that her participation in this study was the first opportunity she had in eleven years to receive purposeful feedback on a regular basis.
The importance of ongoing feedback for the transfer of training is noted in an inservice study on effective questioning (Licklider, 1995). In this coaching program, teachers improved on every aspect of effective questioning. In particular, teachers improved from 5% effective use to 37% effective use of wait time and from 72% to 95% on probing for clarification. Teachers who participated reported gaining a greater willingness to observe a colleague and to try new techniques. The teachers stated that participating in peer coaching as a coach was a greater aid in transferring the skill to one's own teaching because of the preparation they engaged in while planning to offer feedback to their peers. Of all aspects of this inservice program, these 11 teachers and two principals believed that practice, observation, and feedback, the core activities of peer coaching, were the most useful for their transfer of training in effective question use. An additional outcome is that these teachers more strongly valued inservice education after having participated in this program.

Inservice teacher education does not always take into consideration the learning needs of adult learners (Wood & Thompson, 1980, p. 376), nor does it always consider their individual concerns (Leggett & Hoyle, 1987). Many inservice programs are single events that do not provide teachers with sufficient feedback or follow-up practice and supervision. Inservice teacher education has been described as suffering from “poor planning and organization” and is “impersonal and unrelated to the day-to-day problems of participants” (Wood & Thompson, 1980, p.375). Adults learn best under certain conditions: The training
they receive should be relevant to their professional and personal needs and provide reliable feedback. Additionally, adults should have the ability to choose the objectives, topics, and assessment procedures involved in the training (Wood & Thompson, p. 376).

One suggestion for administrators who may wish to use peer coaching in their schools is to allow the participating teachers to choose the focus for skill development. In a program where teachers were able to choose their focus for improvement from among the effective teaching research, teachers reported that the feedback given to them by a peer resulted in their greater insight into what was actually occurring in their own classrooms (Leggett & Hoyle, 1987). The feedback given to these teachers related to their own concerns and the result was the opportunity to engage in nontenchanting self evaluation that helped them discover and investigate their own strengths.

Valencia and Killion (1988) considered the needs of their adult learners in a K-12 peer coaching program focused on curricular revision of the reading and writing processes. All 35 teachers who volunteered were allowed to choose instructional approaches from a list provided by inservice coordinators. One group of teachers experienced peer coaching and a control group only received the inservice component on reading and writing. The teachers in the experimental group appreciated making their own choices, employing new strategies, and discussing their uses with colleagues. The students of coached teachers’ made gains while the control groups’ students did not make such
gains. The gains of the experimental group were only significant in the writing component.

A peer coaching study that concentrated on adult learning investigated whether including a clinical supervision component in a writing process teaching model would (a) increase teachers' use of the writing process and (b) result in teachers' having positive attitudes toward writing (Hosack-Curlin, 1988). All teachers in the study experienced peer coaching but the experimental group also received training in the clinical supervision cycle of planning, observation, and feedback. The experimental group surpassed the control group on the components of publishing student work, engaging in student centered writing conferences, and implementing peer coaching. Ninety-two percent of the teachers in the experimental group employed the writing process strategies at a steady and habitual rate. Fifty percent of the control teachers reached a mechanical use of the writing strategies.

As the previously mentioned study intimates, different teachers apply new knowledge according to their individual levels of familiarity with the knowledge and/or skill as well as their comfort with applying it. Teaching is an interactive, ever changing, and complex activity that requires teachers to have under their control an understanding of the students, the content area, the learning objectives, and classroom management (Joyce & Showers, 1982, p.5).
According to Zimpher and Sherrill (1996), teacher education cannot prepare teachers for every situation that they will encounter daily in their classrooms, but
it can provide teachers with “workable procedures” (p. 281) to deal with the uncertainties and unpredictable situations that they meet. Peer coaching implemented with the clinical supervision activities of planning (pre-observation conference), observing, and debriefing (post-observation conference), is a strategy that helps teachers focus on teaching effectiveness. The research on peer coaching stresses the importance of the clinical supervision cycle for the success of peer coaching (Skoog, 1980; Hendrickson et al., 1988; Valencia & Killion, 1988; Neubert, 1988; Garmston, 1989). In a survey of teachers across several states who had participated in peer coaching, differences among programs were reported in the coaching models, depth of skills, and time spent in coaching. The aspect that was common to all was that each program required participation in the core activities of clinical supervision (Garmston, 1989).

When one subscribes to a view of teaching as a complex activity that changes according to the needs of students and teachers, the focus of inservice education should not be imposed upon groups of teachers. The nature of inservice should aim to meet the needs of all participants and give teachers decision-making power about what inservice should include. An Illinois school district changed its methods of developing inservice education by allowing the teachers to plan the learning activities and to organize teacher work groups for problem solving (Smylie & Conyers, 1991). Similarly, when clinical supervision models were adapted to teachers' conceptual levels, 22 elementary school teachers in a peer-coached experimental group increased the number of
occasions in which they helped another teacher and were helped by another in
instances separate from their peer coaching episodes (Phillips & Glickman,
1991). Smylie and Conyers (1991) reported that teachers expressed interest in
their own learning and professional development, began to form teacher work
groups on their own without the need of administrative organization, and were
able to suggest topics for future staff development and solutions to their teaching
challenges.

Phillips and Glickman (1991) found that the teachers in their study
reported the desire to participate in the peer coaching program during the
following school year. In addition to their renewed interest, 17 teachers who did
not participate in the study reported interest to join the program in the next peer
coaching cycle. These teachers had the decision-making power to choose their
peer coaches, the focus of the observations, and their own plans for
improvement. Thus, when inservice teacher education programs are developed
to focus on the needs expressed by the participating teachers, the teachers
found that the schools in which they taught were places in which they could
learn. That schools serve as learning places for teachers is a goal for reform of
the teaching profession as pronounced by the Holmes Group (1986).

Another benefit of using the clinical supervision model to frame peer
coaching programs is the trust that it helps build among teachers (Koballa et al.,
1992). In the pre-observation conference teachers learn a great deal about the
classroom in which they will complete their observations. The observed teacher
has the opportunity to explain the expectations and purposes for his or her teaching. The post-observation conference is a time for sharing suggestions. The collaborative nature of peer coaching carried out within the clinical supervision cycle creates a trusting relationship in which evaluation is not the focus. The clinical cycle allows teachers to analyze their lessons, not only teach them (Neubert, 1994; Neubert & Stover, 1994).

In another effort of staff development, peer coaching led to teachers’ ability to move beyond the provision of technical feedback to a more complex level of mutual problem solving and collective lesson planning as reported by Leggett & Hoyle (1987). The teachers in this study found peer coaching to be a helpful tool for continued self evaluation, productive and relevant input, instructional improvements made in a nonthreatening way, and an enhancement to their teaching effectiveness because it is a process that allows teachers to know what happens in their classrooms through an additional pair of eyes (Leggett & Hoyle, 1987).

When teachers came together to work in groups by observing and analyzing their teaching jointly, they were engaged in risk taking and accepting more complex supervisory roles in their daily work lives (Phillips & Glickman, 1991). Some peer coaching programs developed out of the need for teachers to assume more responsibility, such as when many new teachers are hired in one district (Raney & Robbins, 1989). When peer coaching served as the means to increase the number of teachers available to act as supervisors, they solved the
problem of not being able to reach a supervisor when there was a need for feedback, such as in many contexts where supervisors could only respond to teachers in emergency situations (Alfonso, 1977). Peer coaching allows teachers to adopt a more professional responsibility to the teaching profession, making the study of teaching the concern and duty of entire teaching staffs (Raney & Robbins, 1989; Elliot & Chidley, 1985). When the teacher has the ability to choose the focus of observations and data collection by peers, that teacher is in control of his or her own professional development (Robbins, 1992).

In a high school inservice program where teachers served as staff developers with peer coaching, action plans and monthly goal sheets for one's improvement were created by the teachers (Munro & Elliot, 1987). The focus was on effective teaching behaviors. Of the 38 action plans developed, 97% of the teachers said that they had met their instructional goals. Another 88% reported that peer coaching had made a significant impact in their teaching and 94% of all participants stated that peer coaching was more helpful for achieving instructional objectives than direct classroom supervision.

The Collegial Interaction Process (Anastos & Ancowitz, 1987) was an effort of four veteran elementary school teachers to increase teaching effectiveness through the use of video and self analysis. This peer coaching endeavor was found to meet teachers' needs for professional development by allowing them to become "spectators of their own work" (p. 42), giving them the opportunity to examine their work in greater detail as they watched their teaching
performances on video. Teachers believed that they were able to further develop their own teaching repertoires by watching others.

Peer coaching assisted a group of Vermont high school English teachers to articulate the knowledge and skills necessary for their daily work as teachers (Chrisco, 1989). These teachers wanted an inservice program that would serve as a professional growth experience in a nonthreatening environment. They developed their own program using clinical supervision and peer coaching and allowed it to evolve slowly and naturally. These English teachers claimed that their participation in this program expanded their roles as teachers and noted the importance of the pre-observation conference as the vehicle that helped them understand and clarify their purposes and goals in their teaching.

In a three year study in which foreign language teacher trainers observed and co-taught with elementary foreign language teachers to help the trainers improve their teacher education programs and to increase school and university collaboration, methods and materials were shared (Rhodes, 1992). Educators on both of these levels reported growth in professional development by having engaged in joint planning, team teaching, teaching demonstrations, and their sharing of materials. Teacher trainers reported that their ability to teach elementary foreign language methods classes greatly improved and that they had changed their instructional goals for these classes based on their time spent with elementary practitioners. These teacher trainers were then able to work with other trainers on the college level and share their practical learnings.
The need for professional development opportunities continues as teachers progress in their careers. Teachers need to be knowledgeable of new methods and findings. In the Triad Inservice Model (Miller, 1996), two groups of elementary school teachers engaged in training on how to integrate peer coaching and cooperative learning into their teaching. The focus was on the teacher as researcher. This focus helped teachers understand that they have choices in teaching methods and gave them the ability to defend their choices. These teachers believed that this inservice challenged them more as teachers and created changes in their lives and work as teachers. They reported an increase in motivation to teach, confidence, and enthusiasm. Plans, information, and materials were shared and they felt compelled to analyze their own work and the work of others. The reported success of this program by the teachers may be in part due to the support of the administrators and resource persons involved in creating the program.

As stated above (Chrisco, 1989; Phillips & Glickman, 1991; Smylie & Conyers, 1991), when teachers are given more decision-making power over their own professional development, more challenge in their teaching tasks, and expanded roles in the school culture, they have expressed a greater commitment to the school and the goals of inservice (Darling-Hammond & Sclan, 1996). Peer coaching allows the teacher to name her own focus and goals for development because it is not focused on the overall performance of the teacher, but on certain skills that challenge the classroom teacher or skills to which the teacher
calls the attention of a colleague (Neubert, 1988). Problems and challenges that
teachers face in the complexity of the teaching environment incite 50% of new
teachers to leave the teaching profession within five years (Gilman, 1987). The
focus on teaching effectiveness in peer coaching helps these teachers by
supporting them in challenging moments: the moments when they are
experimenting with new techniques. Teachers are more likely to have failures
with new techniques in their earliest attempts with them (Robbins, 1992). The
support that peer coaching offers helps teachers move past these initial
difficulties, persist with their attempts, and try new activities again, even if the
first attempt was not successful (Robbins, 1992). Teachers’ competence in a
skill precedes their commitment to it (Showers, Joyce, Bennett, 1987).

Research has shown that teachers who are given new roles as coaches,
who are placed in new working conditions such as cohort groups, and who feel
supported by their peers become more committed to the teaching profession and
find renewed interest and motivation to stay in teaching (Anastos & Ancowitz,
1987; Gilman, 1987). Principals cannot tend to the daily in-class needs of
teachers because administrative duties keep them out of the classroom (Lyman
& Morehead, 1987), but teachers may rely on their peers to tend to their needs.
In the Keystone Project, teachers were trained in mastery learning and the
writing process during a four week summer program (Leggett & Hoyle, 1987).
Their summer training allowed them to return to their schools as either cadre or
demonstration teachers, giving workshops to both groups (cadre) and individuals
(demonstration). In this program, the number of teacher participants grew from 30 in 1984 to 82 in 1987. Teachers claimed that their participation in this program helped them feel less isolated as teachers. Their expanded roles as cadre or demonstration teachers gave them more responsibility by engaging in problem solving with other teachers, which they stated provided them with more professional satisfaction.

The capacity of peer coaching to increase the number of teacher trainers at individual schools is advantageous in certain situations and times of need. One California school district used peer coaching to help new teachers understand the implementation of a new curriculum, ease the loneliness of the teacher's work space, and to help teachers make the transition from the academic setting to the reality of everyday teaching (Moffet, 1987). Teachers described their coaches as helpful, understanding of their status as novice teachers, and available when they needed them (p. 75). The practitioners who acted as coaches filled the supervisory needs of a district that faced "a high turn over and steady infusion of new teachers" (p. 34). These coaches, who enacted the role of expert coaches, were able to review with the novices information learned in the university, as reported by the teachers. This application of peer coaching is one example of the need for peer coaching to facilitate the recall of strategies learned in university methods courses (Neubert, 1988).

The restructured role of the teacher involved in peer coaching moves that teacher into a teacher educator role and expands one's teaching repertoire and
one's professional role. The value of peer coaching in the training of more teacher educators for one school site reduces the burden placed on many supervisors who cannot possibly reach each supervisee as necessary. The 49 teachers who participated in the Teachers Teaching Teachers Program in Indiana (Gilman, 1987, p. 7) stated that peer coaching was successful because the needs of the participants were established, each participant felt accountable to the coach to continue applying the target skills, feedback was specific and desired, and the coach was close to the classroom site.

For professional collaboration among teachers to occur, the traditional social organization of schools has to change (Showers, 1985). When teachers were asked by the Carnegie Foundation (1990) about the importance of and their ability to meet with colleagues, 59% of teachers reported that time available for meeting with colleagues was not a normal circumstance in the workplace (Darling-Hammond & Sclan, 1996). In a 1987-88 survey 10% of teachers surveyed said that they were pleased with the amount of opportunities to meet collaboratively with other teachers (Choy & Bobbitt, et al., 1993 in Darling-Hammond & Sclan, 1996), suggesting that 90% had a different viewpoint.

According to Bryant and Haack (1977), the traditional supervision model in public schools has left teachers alone to teach without the benefit of regular guidance and feedback (Bryant & Haack, 1977). In an average teaching year, the typical teacher participates in only three days of inservice work and many times these are only provided a day at a time with the content delivered by
inspirational speakers (Joyce & Showers, 1983) rather than someone who can assist a teacher with classroom applications. Teacher isolation is a serious logistical and organizational concern that leads many teachers to rely on familiar and ineffective teaching methods. This isolation may be a more serious problem on the secondary level than among elementary school teachers who have the benefit of common planning time (Rothberg, 1985).

Many programs and studies on peer coaching were undertaken to improve the traditional social organization of schools so that teachers could collaborate in safe and nonthreatening work groups (Mello, 1984; Kurth, 1985; Rorshach, 1985; Rothberg, 1985; Mohlman-Sparks, 1996; Sparks & Bruder, 1987; Munro & Elliot, 1987; Batesky, 1991; Avila, Garza, Molina, & Mendiola, 1991; Majhanovich & Gray, 1992; Galbraith & Anstrom, 1995; Calderon, 1995). Studies in which there were control and experimental groups, with the latter experiencing peer coaching, found that peer-coached teachers achieved program goals to a greater extent than the control group teachers. This may be because of the accountability that teachers reported feeling toward the target skills and to their coaches as well as the collegial relationships that were formed.

In an elementary peer coaching study on teacher effectiveness (Sparks & Bruder, 1987), teachers responded that peer coaching was helpful in observation, advice, and feedback. Collegiality, the mutual sharing of ideas among teaching peers, was also reportedly enhanced by the peer coaching strategy. Before the study only 18% of the teachers said that they would turn to a
colleague for help with an instructional need. After experiencing peer coaching, 45% reported that they were more willing to seek help from a colleague. Another positive finding from this study is that when teachers met, they talked more about lessons than individual students. Teachers also reported becoming more willing to try something new in their classes or to attempt a technique a second time if it was not successful during the first implementation: from 13% before peer coaching to 59% during the program.

The increase in frequency of observation and feedback may lead to improved instruction and instructional growth. Munro and Elliot (1987) found that teachers involved in peer coaching were observed six times as often as teachers who did not participate in their program. Without such regular collaboration from peers, trial and error methods rather than informed choices become the basis for teacher decision making as claimed by Valencia & Killion (1988). In this study, a reading coordinator and a language arts coordinator provided an inservice program for the implementation of a process approach to reading and writing. The reading and language arts coordinators furnished an inventory of techniques for the teaching of reading and writing. Teachers chose the strategies they worked on as none was imposed upon them by the coordinators. As training progressed, the teachers reported the desire to have more time for small group sharing in each meeting. The researchers reported that with regular collaboration among peers, mutual problem solving became the basis for
informed teacher decision making rather than individual trial and error methods (Valencia and Killion, 1988).

Perhaps the teachers who benefit most from forming peer-coaching workgroups are those teachers who experience the greatest isolation. Isolation may be even a more serious problem for teachers who are the only teacher of a particular subject area in their building or if their content area is not understood by other teachers in the same school site (Batesky, 1991). Those who teach limited English proficient (LEP) students and teachers who serve linguistically and culturally diverse students (LCD) are often isolated individuals. Forty bilingual and English as a Second Language (ESL) teachers in a Texas school district serving K-5 LEP students with test scores below the district average were trained in cooperative learning, mastery learning, whole language, and learning styles techniques (Avila, Garza, Molina & Mendiola, 1991). The component named as most valuable to the teachers was the opportunity to observe and give/receive feedback. They reported feeling more successful in their teaching because they learned from this experience that other ESL and bilingual professionals in similar teaching situations encountered the same problems and had the same concerns.

The education of LCD students is viewed as an area specific to very few specialized teachers. Mainstream classroom teacher colleagues often do not understand the domain of the LCD teacher, of LCD students, or of the needs of said students. As a result, isolation and a non-collaborative environment often
exist between these two groups of professional educators. In a study that implemented challenge coaching in order to form relationships between LCD teachers and their mainstream peers (Galbraith & Anstrom, 1995), teachers claimed that their collaboration aided them in the mutual understanding of each others’ roles and that all were better able to serve the LCD population of students more effectively.

Another way that teachers of LEP students can collaborate is by matching a native speaker and a non-native speaker of a target language together. In a two-way bilingual program in Texas where the 13th largest population of LEP students in the nation attend school, twelve native speaking teachers of Spanish and twelve non-native speaking teachers engaged in a coaching relationship (Calderon, 1995). Both groups of teachers noted that the opportunities to grow and learn were substantial. They were able to expand their teaching repertoires, had more positive attitudes toward change, found lesson planning to be less difficult, and enjoyed having a peer present to clarify, monitor, and assist their teaching. During the course of this program, teachers were able to make more focused observations of each other and they gained greater understanding of how to implement this unique bilingual program. The teachers reported an appreciation for being provided with the opportunity to set their own focus for observations.

Another setting in which an expert coaching situation is helpful is that of immersion teaching. Student teachers in a French immersion teacher education
practicum were paired with employed teachers on site at the immersion school (Majhanovich & Gray, 1992). The expert role of the experienced teachers helped the practicum students with materials development and with their competence when they delivered lessons to students in French. This role of expert coach may be critical to the success of practica experiences that involve foreign language proficiency (Majhanovich & Gray, 1992).

Hammadou and Bernhardt (1987) outline characteristics that distinguish language teachers from teachers of other content areas. One characteristic is that language teachers cannot augment their content area knowledge of the language, i.e., practice the language, as easily as other content area teachers can increase their subject matter knowledge. Language teachers cannot make trips to local libraries to increase this content area knowledge. To maintain a proficient grasp of practical language use, the role of peer coach may enhance the content knowledge of language use of foreign language teachers and help them maintain a proficiency level that allows them to adapt to the classroom language needs of their learners. A coaching relationship such as the one described in Majhanovich and Gray (1992) appears to be helpful to novice teachers who may never have had the opportunity to use a foreign language for classroom interaction with students on a daily basis.

The professional dialogue that occurs in teacher collaboration with peer coaching stimulates more in-depth thinking about one’s teaching and the teaching of a peer (Licklider, 1995). The pre-observation and post-observation
conference meetings are opportunities for teachers to function at the levels of inquiry, analysis, and synthesis when reasoning about their work. Teachers are able to make teaching decisions more thoughtfully during the peer coaching cycle, strengthening their cognition. When two teachers of differing teaching styles acted as coaches for each other, they found that they were able to move closer to a balance between styles, one being strictly analytical and curriculum based and the other, a very global and intuitive approach (Garmston, Linder, Whitaker, 1993). The purpose of their collaborative work was to improve teaching effectiveness by becoming more reflective practitioners. Teacher education is thus extended into the inservice setting when teachers collaborate in cohort settings (Howey, 1996).

One danger in education is that teachers are evaluated with holistic descriptors that state nothing in particular about their effectiveness. When focused observations do not occur, teachers are described with words such as enthusiastic, warm, motivating (Jarvis & Taylor, 1990). These descriptions do not inform a reader of decisions teachers consider during classroom interaction and instruction. When teachers focus their attention on the acts of teaching in peer coaching conferences, they are often able to link both content area and pedagogy in their discussion. According to Shulman (1987), linking the areas of content and pedagogy is a powerful form of teacher education. Teachers engaged in discussion of the content and process of their work create a shared technical language and culture (Little, 1982). They develop a language for
describing, analyzing, and interpreting their teaching. The potential of this discussion is that teachers refine their pedagogical content knowledge. Until teachers participate in this type of professional dialogue, they may not be able to articulate their “vast reservoirs of knowledge” (Tobin & Espinet, 1990, p.241).

In order to facilitate teachers' participation in collaborative and reflective dialogue about teaching, it is recommended that school administrators support the use of peer coaching dialogues by exhibiting their own involvement in facilitating the peer coaching process. For example, principals could work with a teacher in a peer-coaching relationship or they could serve as substitutes for their teachers’ classes while these peers observe each others’ teaching and reflect on it together (Joyce & Showers, 1987; Licklider, 1995). Without the encouragement of the administration, teachers may not be able to make this a habitual process (Bird, 1983).

Teacher concerns

In order for peer coaching to be as effective as it was found to be in the above studies, several conditions indicated by the practitioners and researchers should be considered and met during the implementation of this supervision alternative. Teachers may be reluctant to participate in peer coaching because they do not like to leave their own classrooms and students. In order to successfully implement peer coaching, a great deal of administrative support is needed to provide time for the practitioners to leave their classrooms and to leave their students in trustworthy care. Thus, school administrators should plan
carefully and hire qualified substitute teachers for the time that teachers will spend outside of their own classrooms in observations and conferences (Anastos & Ancowitz, 1987; Sparks & Bruder, 1987; Chrisko, 1989).

The need to be flexible in the implementation of programs is also significant as teachers fear that involvement in peer coaching will place too many demands on their time (Sparks & Bruder, 1987). Peer coaching works when inservice teachers are allowed to participate voluntarily (Chrisko, 1989) and when teachers have control in setting the time for meetings and observations. English teachers involved in a collaborative inservice study (Chrisko, 1989) stated that the exercises of setting their own goals for the inservice professional development program, setting their own time line to meet with others as they worked toward their goals, and choosing their own methods of accomplishing goals were what helped them achieve their goals. This reported satisfaction may be explained by information stated earlier regarding the needs of adult learners: “Adults will commit to learning something when the goals and objectives are considered realistic and important...job related” (Wood and Thompson, 1980, p. 376).

In addition to concerns about the time necessary for peer coaching, teachers have cited the principal and/or building administrator as the main reason for success in the implementation of peer coaching. In a study investigating 20 public school districts with staff from 24 separate schools, the schools were categorized in terms of the frequency of their implementation of
peer coaching (Gordon, Nolan & Forlenza, 1995). In the low-implementation schools, teachers reported that the administration needed to give more than verbal support for the program to continue. Though the administrations appeared to understand the program concepts and goals, their lack of active support was a reason for the teachers to not follow up with peer coaching on an ongoing basis.

In high-implementation schools, the reason repeatedly given for program success was the active involvement of the building principal and superintendent. Although participants from low-, moderate-, and high-implementation schools increased their knowledge of effective teaching strategies, it was only in the high-implementation schools where teachers were focused on self-evaluation and, as reported by the teachers themselves, a problem-solving orientation was more prevalent. Teachers in the high-implementation schools reported that the peer-coaching program was successful because principals and administrators worked with them to help overcome the logistical problems of time and class coverage for teachers to engage in planning, observation, and post-observation conferencing (Gordon, Nolan & Forlenza, 1995). Overcoming logistical problems is a central factor for maintenance of peer coaching programs, as very few teachers are likely to continue the process unless they have time and human resources that free them to locate information to conduct their needed research, to gather materials, and to observe other teachers (Joyce & Showers, 1987).
Preservice Applications of Peer Coaching

Success of peer coaching on the inservice level has led to the recent applications of peer coaching in preservice teacher education. The five functions of peer coaching (collegiality, technical feedback, analysis of application, adaptation to students, personal facilitation) are tools that have been found to improve the problems inherent in traditional teacher education (Pavelich, 1992; Neubert, 1992; Pierce & Miller, 94;). These problems include preservice teachers’ inabilitys to transfer skills and methodologies from the academic setting to practica situations, field experiences that serve as only superficial rites of passage to becoming a teacher (Knowles & Cole, 1996), preservice teachers’ initial failures in field experiences, cooperating teachers who are unprepared and untrained to work with student teachers, and situations in which the goals of the university preservice program do not match those of the K-12 setting.

The 1996 Handbook of Research on Teacher Education (Sikula, Ed., 1996) presents a synthesis of findings and presents recommendations on the ideal structures of teacher education. One suggestion for the structure of the academic setting is to create learning communities in cohort arrangements (Howey, 1996; Murray & Porter, 1996; Arends & Winitzky, 1996). The rationale given for the use of cohort groups in teacher education is that by recognizing the collective nature of socialization into teaching, teacher education is broadening the possibilities for understanding the scope of options for teacher education students (Howey, 1996). Teaching is a complex and diverse profession because
of its' teachers and students. Placing students in cohorts helps decrease the
individualism and isolation that typifies the teaching profession (Ducharme &
Ducharme, 1996). When presented with opportunities to be part of a diverse
group and to listen to another's viewpoint or to a peer's approach to a unique
teaching situation, one is more likely to understand the nature of learning
(Howey, 1996).

Arrangements other than pairing two peers from the same class or cohort
are possible with peer coaching on the preservice level. Cohorts can be peers at
the same level of preservice teacher education or cohorts can be formed by
placing peers with a teacher education student who has one more year of
experience in the academic setting. In a special education certification program
where students who were closer to the completion of their certificate program
coached preservice teachers in a ten-week practicum, each of the coached
preservice teachers stated that their peer supervisor's feedback was beneficial
and that they enjoyed good communication with the peer supervisor (Lignugaris-
Kraft & Marchand-Martella, 1993). The purpose of grouping a more experienced
peer with a beginning teacher education student in the above study was
intended to assist the latter with the acquisition of interactive teaching skills and
to discover whether or not these preservice teachers would report finding this
alternative supervision situation satisfying.

When groups of practicum students are placed in the same school
setting, the beneficial outcomes are not only received by the student teachers,
but also by the cooperating teachers. The pupils receive additional attention from the larger number of student teachers, the opportunities for team teaching are greater, and more materials and idea sharing occurs. Problem solving in context makes these cohort arrangements more beneficial to practicum students because the learning experience is direct and live, not second hand (McIntyre, Bird, Foxx, 1996).

When a group of student interns from the University of Saskatchewan were placed in the same school setting, they reported an appreciation for the extra resources and opportunities to participate in more than one classroom, thus increasing their learning (Barnett & Bayne, 1992). Working with a group of professional teachers gave them the opportunity to see more teaching methods at work, to understand the operation of a school more fully, and to enjoy a larger support system. Planning occurred collaboratively as did teaching and debriefing. Interns and professionals recognized that the process of teacher education does not end with one’s final practicum, which helped the interns realize that they do not have to complete every goal they set by the end of these particular ten weeks.

The practicing teachers who participated in this study (Barnett & Bayne, 1992) also reported that this project was a learning experience and exercise in collegiality. Interns were able to progress through three developmental levels with the help of the cooperating teachers. First, the cooperating teachers gave the students only descriptive feedback so that they could concentrate on only a
few teaching skills at a time. Next, the cooperating teachers helped the interns analyze their teaching. Finally, the interns reflected on their teaching effectiveness. In most traditional practicum experiences, student teachers do not reach this third level of reflectivity and affective involvement in their teaching (Piland & Anglin, 1993). According to Barnett and Bayne (1992), placing preservice teachers with practitioners in this field experience fulfilled two purposes: (1) The practicum allowed the novices to experience teaching in a supportive environment, encouraging the interns to reflect on teaching procedures; (2) The practitioners were provided with the opportunity for inservice and professional growth experiences.

Teacher education programs have typically included a series of clinical and laboratory experiences, offering both direct and vicarious teaching experiences to prospective teachers. The field experience in teacher education is the object of much discussion. Although there is a call to include more field experiences in teacher education because they are seen as the most important part of the process of becoming a teacher (Edmundson, 1990; McIntyre, Bird & Foxx, 1996), the effectiveness of field experiences is also under greater examination (Armalone & Hoover, 1989). On the preservice level it has been assumed that if preservice teachers have the appropriate field placement, then they will be able to transfer skills directly to their classroom practicum experiences (Peterson & Hudson, 1989). Preservice teachers have not previously had the benefit of being in their own classrooms or the opportunities
to apply the pedagogy learned in teacher education classes prior to these internships and practica where what they have been learning can be practiced in context. Peer coaching has been applied on the preservice level as a means of facilitating the transfer of skills learned in classroom and laboratory settings to their early experiences in field placements (Peterson & Hudson, 1989).

The use of teacher education students as coaches has occurred in special education programs. Five undergraduate preservice teachers who were experiencing difficulties mastering skills in an earlier practicum and had low grade point averages in the teacher education program were paired with successful teacher education students with high grade point averages (Morgan, Gustafson, Hudson & Salzberg, 1992). The focus of this study was on effective instructional behaviors in the teaching of reading. The peer supervision was frequent and on-site. With frequent peer supervision, the formerly unsuccessful student teachers were able to decrease their ineffective teaching behaviors immediately and gradually increased their effective teaching behaviors. Additionally, these effective teaching behaviors were transferred to their experiences in math teaching. This study encourages the use of peer coaching and suggests that its' use will generalize to other content areas.

Peer coaching has been applied in preservice internships because of both the successes on the inservice level and the above mentioned lack of transfer of training. A rationale provided for the early exposure of teacher education students to peer coaching is that the initial contact with this alternative
form of supervision will allow them to experience the benefits of collaboration
and establish a basis for future coaching efforts on the inservice level and to
enjoy a long term career in education. An earlier mentioned reason for
implementing peer coaching on the inservice level is to help new teachers recall
methods learned in the university setting (Moffet, 1987). This need to assist new
teachers and the finding that 50% of teachers leave the profession within five
years of college graduation (Gilman, 1988) are reasons to consider educating
preservice teachers in methods of supervision and problem solving while at the
university.

Recommendations for peer coaching on the preservice level often stem
from the problem of transfer. The collaborative dialogue that occurs in planning
and debriefing sessions promotes the recall of methodologies and strategies
learned in methods courses. Peer coaching can begin as early as the methods
courses in which teacher education students plan and present lessons to their
classmates and professors (Neubert, 1994).

Several preservice studies have been implemented in the student
teaching practicum as well. In a study training preservice teachers in effective
teaching for students with specific learning disabilities, data were collected
during a baseline phase and an intervention phase of peer coaching (Peterson &
Hudson, 1989). Using knowledge provided by Joyce and Showers (1980),
teacher educators added a coaching component to a six-week learning
strategies practicum. After an intervention phase when the university supervisor
engaged in feedback sessions on specific observable teaching behaviors extrapolated from teacher effectiveness research studies (i.e., gives specific academic praise, circulates to assist students), the researchers found that student teachers increased their effective teaching behaviors and decreased ineffective teaching behaviors. On the first day of treatment the three student teachers had demonstrated 14, 17, 19 positive teaching behaviors and 10, 15, and 10 negative teaching behaviors. On the last day of the treatment, they demonstrated 48, 50, 76 positive teaching behaviors and only 1, 2, and 0 negative teaching behaviors.

Present in the teacher education literature is the notion that transfer of training from the academic environment to the practicum will occur if teacher education provides ways to identify and address student teachers’ needs and concerns, something that the student teaching internship does not consistently do (Wynn, 1988). The Wynn Method recommends use of self-identified teaching concerns, peer coaching, self-analysis, goal setting, and reflection. In a study where the experimental group was placed in a peer-coached setting and the control group received all of the above components except peer coaching, the peer-coached group scored significantly higher on overall teaching performance than the uncoached group (Wynn, 1988). Student teachers needed help in transferring instructional skills to the practicum setting and found the peer seminar useful because of the immediate feedback they received. They were able to learn new teaching ideas by watching others in the same situation.
A possible hindrance to the transfer of training is that preservice teachers view supervision from the university supervisor and cooperating teacher as more evaluative in nature than they view that of a peer. In an elementary practicum, 34 student teachers carried out reciprocal peer coaching (Anderson, Caswell & Hayes, 1994). The study investigated how the students felt when observed by a supervisor, a peer, and when they observed a peer. Seventy-three percent of the student teachers, reported feeling anxious and nervous while awaiting the supervisor's arrival and while the supervisor observed and took notes. Twenty percent said that they found the supervisor's feedback useful. When observed by a peer, the reactions changed: 34% said that the peer's feedback was helpful; another 34% stated that their peer coaching sessions resulted favorably for them in their situations, improving their teaching; Nine percent of the peers reported feeling nervous in peer observations; One individual referred to it as a competitive situation. When observing a peer, 22% stated that it was an enjoyable experience and another 22% referred to it as a positive learning experience. Overall, 90% of the student teachers in this study reported the peer-coaching sessions beneficial and hoped it would continue for future students.

Although teacher educators have noted that transfer of training of teaching skills by preservice teachers in field experiences is at times problematic, field experiences are considered the most popular aspect in teacher education: They place prospective teachers in the actual teaching environment, introduce teacher education students to functioning school
cultures, allow these students to learn by practice and first hand experience, and provide opportunities for linking theory with practice (McIntyre, Bird & Foxx, 1996). Although prospective teachers often report the field experience as the most beneficial aspect of preservice teacher education, the improvement of field experiences is a topic of concern for teacher educators.

In facing the complexities that the teaching day entails, preservice teachers have been found to become authoritarian and less flexible (Theis-Sprinthall, 1984) in their practice experiences. The dynamics of the classroom sometimes leave the preservice teacher unsure of what to observe and how to observe another teacher (Feiman-Nemser & Buchmann, 1986 in Majhanovich & Gray, 1992). The schedules of university professors who are occupied with publishing duties, teaching, and service at the university and in the community sometimes leave preservice teachers with only the supervision of cooperating teachers. One result of this non-interface between university and school settings is that the goals of the university program may remain unknown to the cooperating teachers and theory is thus not linked to practice. A problem noted in supervision literature is that cooperating teachers normally do not receive preparation for their work with student teachers, and cooperating teachers do not engage in reflective discussions with their student teachers (Meade, 1991; Metcalf, 1991; Richardson-Koehler, 1988). Each of the following studies reported on in the final section of this chapter used a form of peer coaching to improve on these noted problems in teacher education practica.
In order to improve the effectiveness of traditional supervision, 15 of 29 preservice teachers in their first practicum experience in the special education teacher education sequence received traditional supervision. The other 14 were engaged in peer coaching (Pierce & Miller, 1994). The practicum students in the control group were able to increase their mean effective teaching behaviors by 79% and decrease their ineffective behaviors by 21%. The experimental group increased effective teaching behaviors by 65% and decreased ineffective behaviors by 35%. The lesson plans of the experimental group were completed with much more detail and thoroughness than those of the control group. Clearer lesson plans may be the result of the pre-observation conferences and renewed planning in the post-observation conferences. Both of these supervision situations were deemed by the researchers to be appropriate for increasing teaching effectiveness and this study suggests that peer coaching may be most effective when added as an extra component to the traditional supervision of practica experiences.

In a situation where student teachers were involved in an alternative certification program and completing their practicum as employed teachers in the K-12 schools, those who served as cooperating teachers were the colleagues alongside whom the student teachers taught (Ludlow, Faieta, & Wienke, 1989). The purpose of this study was to train those who acted as cooperating teachers in skills such as observation, feedback, active listening, and problem solving for working with their peers. The teachers in the experimental group who received
training rated themselves as stronger in these skills than untrained teachers. Additionally, the student teachers who were paired with experimental group cooperating teachers rated their teachers higher on these skills than the student teachers in the control group had rated their cooperating-teacher peers. Both the student teachers and the cooperating teachers viewed the training the cooperating teachers received as an enhancement to traditional supervision.

One tool that has been helpful for teaching practice in both inservice settings and as a component for preservice practica and seminar use is the video camera. One peer-coaching study deliberately assessed the effectiveness of using a video camera as an enhancement to the peer coaching of students involved in a special education practicum in direct instruction (Morgan, Menlove, Salzberg & Hudson, 1994). In order to help teacher education students with low grade point averages in their major field of special education improve their grades, peer coaches in this study were chosen by matching a high achieving teacher education student who had already completed this practicum with another student who had low scores in the teacher education program. The focus of the coaching sessions was on the use of teaching behaviors that the lower achieving students had trouble acquiring in the academic setting.

Both groups of student teachers reported that coaching was beneficial. The use of video to review teaching effectiveness was viewed favorably by both the student teachers and the teacher education faculty. Coached teachers were able to improve their teaching effectiveness in direct instruction and improved
teaching behaviors generalized to lessons on spelling mastery. The higher achieving students who acted as coaches reported that they learned useful skills for their future careers.

After having found that a cooperating teacher was not providing a student teacher with feedback, Pavelich (1992) carried out a peer coaching study with both elementary and secondary student teachers during a 16 week internship. Of the eight cooperating teachers in this study, only five were found to be helpful to their student teachers as facilitators and supporters of the student teachers' work. Both student teachers and cooperating teachers reported satisfaction and benefits resulting from this peer-coaching experience: Student teachers reported that additional input from a peer, who was in a similar teaching situation and who could relate to the internship from the same preservice perspective, was helpful as a means of support. Interns stated that the feedback from the peer was valuable and helpful in increasing their teaching effectiveness. Cooperating teachers in the study reported that the reduced amount of time they spent in observation of the student teacher allowed them to address other important concerns, such as parental contacts, that they would not normally have been able to attend to without the additional support of the student teaching peer.

Bowman (1995) conducted a peer coaching study with early field experience students in elementary placements. The design used was a pretest-posttest control group including 32 preservice teachers and 24 cooperating teachers. Preservice teachers were randomly assigned to the treatment groups
and were trained in the uses of clarity skills. The experimental group received additional training by means of demonstration, practice, and peer coaching.

Findings indicated that the peer-coached group demonstrated greater clarity skills and exhibited greater variety of content in post-observation conferences than the control group at the .05 level. The peer-coached group engaged in more in-depth discussions and were able to build on each other's suggestions and recommendations for lesson planning. A progression from concern about classroom management issues during the first week of the field placement to a concern for students' learning styles in week four, and consequently to concern with lesson improvement in week seven, demonstrated how peer coaching helped early field experience students to examine teaching in detail and to engage in mutual problem solving. Preservice teachers in the experimental group exhibited greater satisfaction with the early field experience, but significance was not found at the .05 level. Bowman (1995) recommends that future studies in peer coaching be carried out during the student teaching practicum and in other content areas.

In summary, peer coaching is one application of collaborative professional development (Glatthorn, 1987) that has its roots in staff development. Successes of peer coaching on the inservice level have created interest in the implementation of peer-coaching programs on the preservice level. As noted above, many more studies have been completed on the inservice level than in preservice teacher education. Recommendations are given in the
literature to use peer coaching in the student teaching internship in order to provide student teachers with opportunities to engage in mutual problem solving and reflection, improve upon existing characteristics of field experiences, and to facilitate the recall of strategies and methods learned in teacher education classes while practicing in the school environment. It is reasoned that if teachers learn to implement the skills used in peer coaching on the preservice level, they will have valuable tools and strategies to use once they become employed teachers.

Programs of peer mentoring and induction programs exist on the inservice level for new teachers because teachers need additional assistance when coping with new work environments and with the realities of teaching (Karant, 1989; Moffet, 1989). If peer coaching is used on the preservice level, newly hired teachers are likely to enter the profession with necessary observation and conferencing skills and dispositions. Administrators of inservice programs may not find it necessary to implement formal programs of introduction to school culture for new groups of teachers. Teachers familiar with the core activities and purposes of peer coaching are likely to arrive to their teaching placements ready to collaborate, assist others, and ask for assistance when it is needed.

Conclusion

The above review of research has shown that peer coaching is a beneficial strategy to help both inservice and preservice teachers improve their teaching skills and dispositions. With this documented evidence and in an effort
to understand the nature of foreign/second language teaching for preservice teachers, the present study investigated how peer coaching implemented during the foreign language student teaching practicum would benefit foreign language student teachers in their acquisition of pedagogical content knowledge. The following chapter outlines the methodology used in this study.
CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

Practitioners simply know a great deal that they have never even tried to articulate. A major portion of the research agenda for the next decade will be to collect, collate, and interpret the practical knowledge of teachers for the purpose of establishing a case literature and codifying its principles (Shulman, 1987).

The primary purpose of this study was to investigate the nature of the interaction of student teachers in the two settings of peer-coached and nonpeer-coached supervisory groups. The outcome of the data analysis and interpretation was to study how this interaction impacts the development of pedagogical content knowledge and provides a basis for foreign language methods instructors and student teaching supervisors concerning the use of peer coaching within their teacher education programs.

In order to understand student teachers’ acquisition and development of pedagogical content knowledge related to the processes of supervision, a qualitative research methodological approach was selected. In particular, case study and grounded theory methodologies were used to contribute to the development of knowledge in the areas of foreign language teaching and pedagogical content knowledge for novice foreign/second language teachers via
peer-coached and nonpeer-coached methods of supervision. The use of qualitative strategies aligns with the more recent views of teaching as a complex and dynamic process rather than one to be evaluated solely in terms of learning outcomes (Freeman, 1996). The qualitative design of this study was chosen to accompany this view of teaching and centered on the perspectival worlds of the student teacher research participants.

In contrast to the interpretive and inductive goals of the present research study, much of the research investigating the acts of teaching has been carried out from a positivistic point of view. In this orientation to research the investigator’s goal is to establish a “cause and effect” relationship between two phenomena (Johnson, 1992, p. 32). In positivistic studies the investigator remains distant from the phenomena studied. The perspective taken by the researcher is that of an “outside observer attempting to discover lawful relationships among observable features” (Shulman, 1986, p.8) in classroom teaching. The process-product tradition of research is an example of positivistic educational research. The findings drawn from process-product research take the form of general propositions that describe teaching behaviors associated with gains in student achievement (Erickson, 1986; Shulman, 1986; Yarger & Lee, 1996). The study of teaching from this positivistic standpoint of process-product studies has been called insufficient because it reduces the environment of the classroom to “discrete events and behaviors which can be noted, counted, and aggregated for purposes of generalization across settings and individuals”
(Shulman, 1986, p. 20). According to the interpretive standpoint, the process-product view of classroom interaction is one-way and inadequate (Erickson, 1986, p. 130).

The interpretivist is interested in the reciprocal relationship of the teacher and his or her environment, not in controlling the context variables (Shulman, 1986). According to the researcher who works from the interpretivist standpoint, human behavior, here teaching behavior, cannot be understood “without reference to the meanings and purposes attached by human actors to their activities” (Lincoln & Guba, 1996, p. 106). Whereas the process-product researcher studies teacher effectiveness as defined by student achievement, the post-positivistic study of teaching is the study of social organization and local meanings, an interaction between the researched and the research environment (Erickson, 1986). Recent conceptualizations of teaching portray it as “a process whose features may change from individual to individual, context to context (Eisner, 1985 in Woods, 1996, p. 21). Current research in education focuses on the teacher’s behavior in relation to content, students, and the teaching context (Woods, 1996; Lee & Yarger, 1996).

The relationship between the researcher and the research participants from an interpretivist standpoint contrasts with that of the positivistic objective investigator. The interaction between the researcher and research participants in an interpretivist study “creates the data and shapes the findings” (Lincoln & Guba, 1996, p. 32). The interaction between the researcher and research
sample in the present study was the result of teacher collaboration. As a foreign language teacher educator, the researcher used qualitative methods such as interviews and journal writing in order to learn more about her own profession via the initial teaching experiences of prospective teachers. The following section explains the qualitative methodological approaches used for the purpose of discovering and reporting the emic viewpoint on beginning teaching experiences of student teachers of foreign/second languages.

The case study method was chosen because it allowed the researcher to “focus holistically on an entity,” uncovering and understanding the dynamic nature of the entity, “discovering systematic connections among experiences, behaviors, and relevant features of the context” (Johnson, 1992, p. 84). One guiding principle of qualitative research is to “represent faithfully and accurately the social worlds or phenomena studied” (Attheide & Johnson, 1996, p. 489). Case studies are specific, chosen because they are expected to produce knowledge and to promote understanding of the phenomenon being studied (Stake, 1996). Knowledge is gained from “understanding particulars” (Stake, 1978 in Patton, 1990). Cases themselves are not the primary interest; rather, they occupy a secondary role such that they become the vehicle by which the researcher is allowed to gain knowledge.

The case study identifies, investigates, and describes a “bounded system” in terms of the goals of the study (Johnson, 1992; Merriam, 1988, in Hammadou, 1993). Inspired by the need for a more enhanced usage of effective
teaching research in foreign/second language teacher education, the effective
teaching skill of clarity was chosen as the focus in the student teaching seminars
of both peer and nonpeer-coached groups. This was conducted to gain insight
as to how student teachers gained more knowledge and skill regarding clarity
and to understand how pedagogical content knowledge was developed by these
two groups. The bounded system of the case studies of the participating student
teachers, therefore, included peer coaching, clarity skills, and pedagogical
content knowledge, the last of these recognized by Jarvis and Taylor (1994) to
be the same phenomenon identified when research into effective teaching is
conducted.

Grounded theory methodology, an inductive approach to theory
generation and confirmation (Patton, 1990), was chosen because its purpose is
"to build theory that is faithful to and illuminates the area under study" (Strauss &
Corbin, 1990, p.24). The researcher does not begin a grounded theory study
with a theory in order to prove it. It is the area of interest from which a study is
conceived. During the course of inquiry into the topic, that which is relevant to
this area of interest is uncovered and developed in a provisional manner
(Strauss & Corbin, 1996). Data collection and analysis related to the topic verify
the theory as it is developed. Both systematic methods of data coilection and
analysis bring the researcher close to the phenomena under study so that the
findings are "grounded in the empirical world" (Patton, 1990). Use of qualitative
methodologies in this way have contributed to what is known about the domain of foreign language teaching and its key participants.

A grounded theory makes use of concepts that are generated by grouping and labeling similar data (Strauss & Corbin, 1990). This process of labeling data conceptually by stating relationships found among the data begins the interpretive work of grounded theories (Strauss & Corbin, 1996). Grounded theories are interpretive, and interpretations contain the points of view of the research participants (Lincoln & Guba, 1996; Strauss & Corbin, 1996). Grounded theory research has as its goal to understand this emic viewpoint (Schwandt, 1996) of the “perspectives and the voices of the people studied” (Strauss & Corbin, 1996, p.274). Studies of teacher education, from this post-positivistic standpoint, view teacher education as a matter of local (contextual) meaning and of social organization (Erickson, 1986; McIntyre & Foxx, 1996).

Local meanings are necessary in order to understand human behaviors and perspectives. In this study the local meanings that were sought are related to effective foreign language teaching and pedagogical reasoning. Qualitative data are the means that provide insight into local meanings, human perspectives, and subjects’ purposes for their activities (Lincoln & Guba, 1996). Qualitative research endeavors conducted for the purpose of interpreting local meanings do not set out to verify or not to verify earlier findings. They are meant, rather, to occupy their own temporal space as part of a continuous process of studying the phenomena of interest (Lincoln, 1995). Qualitative methodologies
used in the above mentioned manner in this study combined to form one particular understanding of foreign language teaching.

Sample

The case study methodology that framed this research provided the examples of everyday actions that took place during the preservice teachers’ practicum experiences for analyzing their comments about the meaning of these teaching actions (Erickson, 1986). Like the case study framework, specific research subjects were selected purposefully: They were included in this study because of the position in qualitative research that specific individuals involved in the topics of interest facilitate the development of knowledge of this area because the subjects are of interest to the researcher’s particular purpose for the study (Erickson, 1986; Patton, 1990).

For Erickson (1986), interpretive research is a matter of working through a process of discovering particulars before anything can be said in general about a topic. Interpretive study concentrates on concrete and specific examples from which broader meaning may arise: “the primary purpose of qualitative research is particularizability rather than generalizability” (Erickson, 1986, p. 130). Samples chosen deliberately to study certain people impact the findings of the study (Patton, 1990). The researcher is therefore advised to limit her generalizations to those contexts in which the people, details of the situation, time period, and purposes of the study are similar. This study describes and analyzes a particular setting at a particular time such that conclusions made can
only be those to which the data apply (Patton, 1990; Bogdan & Biklen, 1992), that is, the particular cohort of novice foreign and second language teachers.

The units of analysis in the proposed study were the teaching activities and the comments and perspectives on these activities made by twelve individual student teachers involved in a ten-week practicum in the teaching of foreign/second languages. Six of these student teachers received training in the peer coaching strategy of supervision and participated in interactive dyads with another student teacher from the practicum in addition to having received traditional university supervision. The second group of six student teachers received traditional university supervision. Selection of student teachers placed in the peer-coached group depended on the availability of placements in the secondary schools. Individuals were assigned to the peer-coached group based on the practicum placement they received as allocated by the participating university’s Office of Professional Practice. Two student teachers who happened to be placed in the same school or in neighboring schools were assigned to serve as each other’s peer coach. Peer coaches were not assigned based on the languages they taught. The remainder of the individuals were assigned to the nonpeer-coached group.

One of the requirements that the foreign language teacher education program at the participating university has for its student teachers is that they engage in a variety of urban and suburban field experiences during their degree program. Therefore, a student teacher placed in an urban setting for student
teaching was so placed because he or she had not received a recent urban placement in another field experience in foreign language or general education. A balance was sought between urban and suburban placements for these preservice teachers, irrespective of the students' preferences when these placements were needed.

For some of the student teachers, the student teaching practicum was the final component in the foreign language teacher education program. Others were nearing the completion of the program, having finished at least 90% of both the required target language and professional education courses, the minimum requirements for approval as a student teacher in this particular program. It is by means of purposeful sampling, then, that the participating student teachers were chosen. Each individual and each dyadic case represent information from multiple sources of data to serve for in-depth study (Patton, 1990) of the novices' supervised practicum experience.

The case study methodology chosen for this study allowed for in-depth study of instrumental cases. In an instrumental case study, a particular case is investigated to provide insight into a particular question and is observed for analysis (Stake, 1994). The present study does not represent a single case. Instead, each individual in the nonpeer-coached group and each dyad of peer-coached student teachers represents a separate case. This study is a collective case study: a number of cases investigated jointly, inquiring into peer coaching, and foreign/second language teaching, the phenomena of interest (Stake, 1994).
Research Participants

Two groups of six student teachers served as the research participants in this study. Each student teacher received traditional supervision. In addition, the six participants in the peer-coached group were paired as peers based on the placements that the Office of Professional Practice had made for them. Resulting pairs of peer coaches were named based on the proximity of the schools in which student teaching placements were made. Student teachers during this quarter of the school year were college seniors, members of the Masters of Education Program (M.Ed.), or already college graduates who sought teacher certification at the graduate level. Appendix B provides a summary of biographical information of the twelve student teacher research participants.

The Peer-Coached Group: One matching of placement sites placed Pat, a student teacher of Spanish, with Kelly, a student teacher of German and ESL. They student taught in the same suburban district, each one at one of the two high schools in the district. Maria and Sally were named as peers because each had received her placement at the same diocesan city high school where they both taught Spanish. Cindy and Anne each received placements in the same suburban district: Anne taught French in one of the middle schools and Cindy was placed in one of the two high schools to teach Spanish. Of the six student teachers, only Maria is a native speaker of the language that she taught.

Pat was an M. Ed. student who was responsible for teaching Spanish I and II. She holds a college degree in Journalism received in 1995. Pat began
her own study of Spanish in high school. Her work experience prior to the M.Ed.
program included working at a television station as a photographer and video
editor, as well as having substitute taught in foreign language departments in the
public schools local to the research setting. Pat had traveled and studied abroad
for six months in Spain. In addition to Spanish, she had studied beginning levels
of French and Dutch and beginning and intermediate levels of German.

Kelly completed her four year baccalaureate program in her final quarter
of student teaching. She was responsible for teaching German I, II, and III and
ESL classes. Kelly spent a year abroad as an exchange student during both high
school (1991-92) and college (1994-95). She described several experiences as
both a paid and a volunteer tutor of ESL and German in local school districts. In
addition to her studies in German, Kelly also studied Spanish for one semester.

Maria is a native speaker of Spanish from Puerto Rico. In her student
teaching placement, Maria was responsible for teaching Spanish II, III, and IV.
She completed one year of university study in Puerto Rico before having
relocated to the United States. As a native of Puerto Rico, Maria had studied
English since kindergarten. Maria had no formal teaching experience prior to her
student teaching, although she had tutored Spanish on an informal basis. Maria
was enrolled in the senior year of her baccalaureate program and had four
general education requirement courses to fulfill after having completed this
quarter of student teaching.
In her student teaching placement, Sally was responsible for teaching Spanish I and II. Her study of Spanish had begun in high school where she completed Spanish I - III. At the time of this study, Sally was enrolled in the traditional baccalaureate program. Previously to having declared Spanish Education as her major, Sally had been an Exercise Science major. Her only experience in teaching was as a tutor to individual high school students during the same year that she completed her methods courses and student teaching. Sally had spent one quarter of an academic year of college in Mexico.

Cindy was a Music Education major before having changed her course of study to Spanish Education. Most of her paid tutoring experiences occurred in music and choir camps although she did some home tutoring in Spanish. Cindy was responsible for teaching Spanish I, II, and III. Prior to her university studies, Cindy studied Spanish for five years in middle school and high school. Cindy had no travel or study abroad experiences in high school or college.

Anne was a student teacher of seventh and eighth grade French and in the M.Ed. program. Prior to college she studied French for seven years and German for two years. She was a French major in college and received her bachelor's degree in 1997. During high school and college she attended three study abroad programs in Grenoble (1990), Aurillac (1991), and Lyon (1994), France. She had some volunteer tutoring experiences during her senior year in college.
Nonpeer-Coached Group: The six student teachers in this group also had received placements in diocesan and public schools in the area local to the research site. Only two of the student teachers, Max and Ana, are native speakers of the foreign languages that they taught.

Max is a native speaker of Japanese who completed both a bachelor's degree in psychology and a master's degree in Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL) in the United States. At the time of this study he was enrolled in the certification program, separately from the M.Ed program. Max completed his student teaching practicum in both a public suburban high school and a diocesan Catholic school. At the diocesan school he taught Japanese I and at the public school, Japanese II/III and ESL. In both middle and high schools in Japan he had studied English for six years. Prior to his student teaching, Max had formal experience teaching Japanese on the high school level in same city as the university/research site.

Tracy was placed in a middle school setting where she taught Spanish to sixth (exploratory) and seventh grade students (full year). Before having changed her major to Spanish Education, Tracy had pursued a major in Elementary Education. Her own language studies began with middle school exploratory classes in French, German, Latin, and Spanish. In high school she had studied Spanish for four years. She had neither study abroad experiences nor tutoring experience. She completed her baccalaureate program with her student teaching practicum.
Sharon was enrolled in the M.Ed. program, completing it with her student teaching in French. She was placed in an inner city high school where she taught French I - IV. She received a bachelor’s degree in French Literature in 1992. Her studies of French had begun in middle school, continued throughout high school, and included spending two undergraduate academic years in Paris. Before having begun her M.Ed. studies, she had also worked in the accounting field and had paid tutoring experiences in both school and home settings.

Chip student taught Spanish II and III in an inner city high school. He studied Spanish for seven years before entering college. Chip had no study abroad experiences in a Spanish speaking country nor had he tutored students in Spanish. He began college as a pre-med major. Chip was enrolled as a traditional student in Foreign Language Education and completed his bachelor’s degree after having finished his student teaching practicum.

Ana is a native speaker of Arabic from Lebanon who was enrolled in the certification program. In 1987, she had completed a bachelor’s degree in English Education in Lebanon. In school she had 13 years of instruction in English as a Foreign Language. She had experience as an English teacher in Lebanon on both the elementary and high school levels. For her student teaching experience, Ana was placed in two high school English as a Second Language (ESL) classes and two middle school sixth grade classes to teach Arabic. Both the middle and high schools where she completed her placements are public schools.
Lori was a graduate student in Arabic and enrolled in the certification program at the same time. She had experience as a teaching assistant on the university level in Arabic and in ESL. Her years of studying languages began in middle school with one semester of Spanish and continued throughout high school with four years of French. Her undergraduate majors were French and Arabic. Lori had studied abroad for a year in Cairo and had experienced three home stay/study opportunities in France. In addition to her experience as a teaching assistant of university level Arabic and ESL, Lori had both paid and volunteer tutoring experiences in Arabic, English, and French. Her student teaching placements were in both a public middle school, for seventh and eighth grade French, and a public high school, for French III and IV.

Gaining Access

Negotiation of entry to the participants and research project carried out in a “careful” fashion aids the researcher in establishing “the grounds for trust and rapport” (Erickson, 1986, p.142). According to Punch (1996), research participants are stakeholders in the research. The methods and purpose of the research should not threaten the participants, for participants tend to allow the researcher the necessary access to their emic point of view when the researcher is “open and honest with them” (Punch, 1996, p. 89).

The researcher’s institutional background is also of important consideration to gatekeepers and research participants. Gaining access to the setting was achieved, for this study, by the researcher’s position of graduate
teaching assistant and university supervisor within the department through which the student teachers progressed. The student teachers and researcher had come into contact earlier in the teacher education program in a field experience class taught by the researcher. The researcher had not provided supervision in this earlier class, as it was an unsupervised field experience. The researcher had no need to negotiate access to the schools in which the student teachers were placed in order to complete observations and conferences; her position as student teacher supervisor within the university department granted her such access.

When research results in a product for the eventual use of one's profession, after much reflection on both the part of the subjects as well as the researcher, the subjects are related to the researcher in a more collaborative sense. The researcher in such a context is more of a person who has come to learn from the subjects rather than an expert who stands in judgement of the subjects' work. Fanselow (1990) calls for observing teachers to act as “visiting teachers” (p. 184) rather than acting out the role of the expert. In this sense the researcher explained to subjects that current calls for more collaboration among teachers extended to this research situation. The role of the researcher was that of another teacher, not of an authoritative figure governing an amateur's first teaching experience. The topics of foreign language teaching, peer coaching, and student teacher supervision were presented to the subjects as topics of ongoing interest, reflection, and professional development for the researcher in an
effort to alleviate problematic situations that can occur when theory and practice are too profoundly divided.

Ethical Considerations

In qualitative research, a concern for ethical procedures permeates all aspects of a study. This ethical concern is owed to the nature of qualitative research as the study of meanings and purposes persons connect to the activities of their daily lives (Guba & Lincoln, 1996). It becomes the duty of the researcher to protect the research subjects from any psychological or physical harm or danger resulting from their participation in the qualitative study (Bogdan & Biklen, 1992). Consonant with the general principles for ethical research participation and research relationships as outlined by Bogdan and Biklen (1992), the following guidelines were maintained in this study:

1. The purposes and reasons for carrying out this research project were told to the research participants.

2. Research subjects were told that they were to enter into the research voluntarily. The researcher included the subjects who communicated their understanding of the nature and requirements of the study and their participation in it.

3. Subjects were informed that they could withdraw their participation if they felt uncomfortable at any time during the course of the study.

4. The identities of all subjects were protected with pseudonyms in the written report.
5. Informed consent documents were read and signed by the participants. Signed forms were witnessed by another graduate student/teaching assistant who also served the researcher as a researcher aide in this study.

Data Collection

All interpretive studies result from the researcher's having spent time in the acts of watching, listening, asking, recording, and examining (Schwandt, 1996). The goal of the qualitative researcher is to gather particular information about incidents of human behavior and experience that allow for more precise consideration of the conditions in which the research participants find themselves (Bogdan & Biklen, 1992). For the description of meanings of the incidents to the participants, data were collected by means of several processes in order to conduct an in-depth study of each foreign/second language pre-service teacher's case as it related to the phenomena of interest.

Videotapes: Every week of the practicum, each student teacher in both the peer and nonpeer-coached groups videotaped at least one teaching lesson. These videotapes provided the basis for the analysis of the student teachers' implementation of the clarity skills. Video technology allows for additional viewings that live observation cannot provide. The use of video recording allowed the foreign language teacher raters to capture the character of the physical setting, the interaction of the participants, and aspects of nonverbal behavior, e.g., gestures (Johnson, 1992). The use of video to observe the
effective teaching skill of teacher clarity allowed the definition or the adaptation of this skill in the foreign language classroom to emerge.

*Audiotapes:* These were collected weekly from each student teacher participant in the study. The peer-coached dyads observed one of their peer's lessons per week. After this observation, the peers held a post-observation conference that was audio-recorded. Before the observation took place, the peers briefly discussed the upcoming lesson, their expectations, and purposes of their planning in a short pre-observation conference included on this tape. These audiotapes were the data source that provided the researcher and the coders with evidence of the student teachers' use of peer coaching and how it is beneficial to their recognition of effective teaching and acquisition of pedagogical content knowledge.

The nonpeer-coached student teachers also audio-taped one post-observation conference per week with their university supervisor, not with the researcher. These conferences provided data to investigate how their supervision experience was beneficial to their recognition of effective teaching and the acquisition of pedagogical content knowledge. The data from these audiotapes provide the response to research questions three and four.

*Written plans:* In place of the audiotaped pre-observation conference that the peer-coached group held, the nonpeer-coached group provided a written account of their expectations for and purposes in planning the lesson that they
had videotaped. These accounts were compared to the pre-observation conference for planning of effective teaching.

In addition to the interests of researchers and theorists present in this study in the areas of pedagogical content knowledge and teacher clarity, the foreign/second language student teaching participants were also given the opportunity to express the meanings they associated with their everyday actions and experiences as language teachers (Guba & Lincoln, 1996). Qualitative data can provide rich insight into how subjects perceived their everyday actions (Holstein & Gubrium, 1996). In addition to the audiotapes, videotapes, and written plans, data were also collected by means of journals, questionnaires, and interviews. These separate sources of data were used to generate categories that served as the basis for a theory of effective foreign language teaching.

*Journal Entries:* Each of the student teachers in both groups were required to write one journal entry per week on a topic of their choice related to the supervision process. These entries provided the data that served as a member check for the satisfaction questionnaires in order to understand which learning opportunities were most salient to each individual and to each group with respect to their supervision (peer or nonpeer) process. Journals gave the preservice teacher the opportunity to write on a host of topics and to "reflect on all the complex dimensions of preservice development" (Carter & Anders, 1996).

*Questionnaires:* Each student teacher completed an open-ended satisfaction questionnaire based on the functions of peer coaching (See
Appendix C). These data provided the researcher with information from the participants about implementing a peer coaching program, suggesting adaptations and changes to the seminar. The questionnaires were also used to study how the process of peer coaching was beneficial to the acquisition of pedagogical content knowledge.

*Focus Group Interviews:* The final meeting of the respective peer-coached and nonpeer-coached seminars was used to pose questions that emerged during the completion of this study. This meeting provided the researcher with the opportunity to pursue themes found during coding procedures of self-report data on topics relevant to the study; supervision, peer coaching, clarity skills implementation. In this meeting student teachers were asked clarification questions and invited to expand their commentaries on these and other topics they deemed worthy of mention. The focus group interviews were audiotaped and provided pertinent information regarding the phenomena under study that may not have been captured in the instruments.

*Follow-up Interviews:* In addition to the above methods of data collection, members of the peer-coached supervisory group participated in one individual follow-up interview two to three weeks after having left their practicum settings. One major concern in qualitative research is if researchers did discover, understand, and report on the participants' perspectives in an accurate fashion (Altheide & Johnson, 1996, p.488). The follow-up interview is one method the researcher uses to check whether or not she has learned the information that is
significant to the participants and that which is not significant (Bogdan & Biklen, 1992). This interview experience also served as an opportunity to ask questions of the participants after they had taken leave of the school setting and during which they could have reflected on their experiences. The follow-up interviews were conducted two to three weeks after the participants had completed their practicum experiences because this span of time was deemed long enough for the student teachers to have reflected and the field experience was recent enough to recall with accuracy.

Instrumentation

In order to conduct this study several instruments were developed in response to the research questions posed. The first two research questions guiding the study are:

1. In a peer coaching program implemented within a foreign language student teaching practicum, which clarity behaviors do peer-coached and nonpeer-coached student teachers tend to implement on a consistent basis in their teaching?
   a. In what ways do peer-coached and nonpeer-coached student teachers make use of the clarity skills (i.e., target or source language)?

2. To what extent do peer-coached and nonpeer-coached student teachers perceive clarity skills useful for foreign/second language teaching?
In response to the first two research questions, a Clarity Observation Instrument (See Appendix D) adapted from Bowman (1995) was used to tally the low-inference clarity behaviors that the student teachers made use of during their lessons. The instrument used by Bowman (1995) included seven skills: informing students of lesson objectives, repeating important points for students to learn, use of examples, repeating points that students do not seem to understand, asking individual and group questions, providing opportunities for questions, and providing opportunities for practice. This clarity skills instrument is a modification of the instrument used by Hines (1981) and later modified by Larsen (1985), Hamilton (1988), and Giebelhaus (1993). Use of this instrument found that low- and moderate-inference behaviors could be determined in videotapes of preservice teachers regardless of the grade level of their students and content area they taught. Hamilton (1988) reported reliability of this instrument to range between .75 on low-inference behaviors and .91 on moderate to high ratings. Bowman (1995) trained raters using the Metcalf Clarity Training Manual (1989) and reliability of the clarity instrument was established at 84.3%.

For the purposes of this study the three clarity skills rephrases, summarizes, and demonstrates were added to the clarity instrument. These were included in the original clarity instrument (Hines, 1981) and by Giebelhaus (1993). These three clarity skills were included in this study because of their
likelihood of occurrence within the naturalistic setting of the foreign language classroom, as recommended by the researcher.

Raters for this study were trained using Metcalf's Clarity Training Manual (1989). Raters read the descriptions of the ten skills that were included on the clarity observation instrument for this study in the Clarity Training Manual (Metcalf, 1989). The three raters together brainstormed ways that teachers of foreign/second languages would be likely to implement the clarity skills in their classrooms. The next part of the training included viewing the research subjects' sample videos. These samples did not serve as part of the final rated video data. Together the three raters viewed the sample videos while referring to the clarity observation instrument. Raters also discussed the manifestations of the clarity skills while watching these initial videos. The training ceased when the raters reported feeling readiness to rate the videos individually. The time spent in training and practice on clarity skills use amounted to approximately four hours.

When engaged in observing the videotaped examples of the student teachers' lessons, raters noted which behaviors were implemented, with what frequency during the teaching episodes, and what the student teachers did to make use of the behaviors. On the basis of these observations, the frequency of use for each skill was tallied. The total number of occurrences of each skill assigned by raters was used to perform a correlational analysis for each of the ten identified skills. A rank-order correlation coefficient, Spearman rho, was calculated for each pairing of raters for each of the ten skills, utilizing a
nonparametric procedure (NONPAR CORR). The inter-rater reliability coefficient for each skill was then calculated following the algorithm suggested by Hatch & Lazaraton (1991, p. 453).

The third and fourth research questions concerned the planning, observation, and post-observation feedback that both peer-coached and nonpeer-coached groups experienced. These research questions ask:

3. In a peer coaching program implemented within a Foreign Language student teaching practicum, what were the similarities and differences in the planning discussions of peer-coached student teachers during pre-observation audiotaped conversations and written plans by the nonpeer-coached student teachers?

4. What were the similarities and differences of audiotaped post-observation conference discussions of student teachers participating in both groups?

The third and fourth research questions were answered based on Shulman's (1987) Model of Pedagogical Reasoning in order to classify the content of the pre- and post-observation conferences. This model contains the categories of comprehension, transformation, instruction, evaluation, reflection, and new comprehension (See Appendix E). It was created based on the belief that pedagogical reasoning is acquired in a cyclical progression. This process begins
and ends with the pedagogical reasoning category of comprehension. This new comprehension, or understanding, is inextricably bound with judgement and action as pedagogical reasoning is shaped (Shulman, 1987).

The fifth research question concerns the student teachers' responses regarding each supervision alternative and the benefits it offered each group of subjects. The fifth question reads as follows:

5. When a peer coaching program is implemented in a Foreign Language student teaching practicum, what are the attitudes of the student teachers in a peer-coaching program and those not participating, as reported by the students on an open-ended questionnaire?

This research question was answered with the use of an open-ended satisfaction survey. The Peer Coaching Satisfaction Survey indicated the level of satisfaction reported by both groups of student teachers regarding the functions of peer coaching. It is an adaptation of the instrument used by Bowman (1995) and was used to give the student teachers the opportunity to respond in their own words to the questions regarding the functions of coaching and to give an overall rating to the practicum (See Appendix C). This instrument made use of the functions of peer coaching; collegiality, technical feedback, analysis of application, adaptation to students, personal facilitation. Each seminar group was asked to reflect upon their supervisory experience according to these five categories. This instrument was pilot tested with a group of foreign language
student teachers during the quarter prior to the present study. The researcher found that the group of student teachers who pilot tested this questionnaire asked the researcher to explain in greater detail each of the functions of peer coaching, the topics about which the student teachers were asked to write. When the instrument was used with the group of research participants in this study, the researcher included definitions of each of these five functions on the questionnaire, in addition to providing an oral description of each. The student teachers in this study, therefore, did not ask the researcher to explain each of the five topics when completing the questionnaire.

Data Analysis

Data from the seven methods of data collection were in both oral and written forms. Data analysis regarding clarity skills and pedagogical reasoning was conducted in two stages. In the first stage, the instances of the student teachers' use of clarity skills from the ratings of the four videotaped teaching episodes were counted and averaged. These data are summarized in Appendix F. Instances of coded statements of pedagogical reasoning present in the pre-observation conferences, written tasks, and the post-observation conferences were counted and organized by category (See Appendix I). The summaries of quantitative data exhibit the differences in amount of clarity skills used and in pedagogical reasoning for each group of student teachers.
The second stage of data analysis used qualitative methods of inductive coding to: (1) discover the value of clarity skills for foreign language teaching as perceived by the twelve student teachers; (2) discover how peer interaction was beneficial to preservice teachers’ pedagogical content knowledge. The goal of this qualitative stage was to learn more about the nature of foreign language teaching in the student teaching practicum. Data analysis for research question five, regarding the attitudes of the student teachers about the functions of peer coaching, was conducted qualitatively.

The goal of data analysis is to organize the data collection and description in a manageable form to facilitate the interpretation of the data (Patton, 1990). Each set of data explained in detail below were analyzed both through the use of three instruments as explained above, as well as by inductive analysis (Erickson, 1986) as part of grounded theory methodology.

**Videotaped Data:** These data were analyzed using the Clarity Observation Instrument adapted for this study from Bowman (1995). Two raters and the researcher used the instrument to mark the clarity behaviors used by the two groups of student teachers and to tally the number of the instances of each behavior. In addition to noting which behaviors both groups used, the raters noted how the student teachers implemented the clarity behaviors (e.g., use of first language or target language, in writing or orally). Videotapes from four weeks of the quarter were viewed. The choice of weeks two, five, seven, and
nine was made to represent the development of student teachers' teaching skills. Such information revealed patterns of use of clarity behaviors of foreign/second language student teachers from each of the two supervision settings.

**Audiotaped conferences:** The case study methodology chosen for this study allowed the researcher to exemplify how the concerns of theorists are present in the case (Stake, 1994). These conferences were, therefore, transcribed and then analyzed by coding the interaction using the six categories of Shulman's (1987) Model of Pedagogical Reasoning (See Appendix E). After the analysis of each group of pre- and post-observation conferences, the researcher searched for patterns and generalizations within and across cases. In this stage of data analysis the issues of interest are known in advance because the instrumental case study method takes advantage of instruments and coding schemes that have already been produced (Stake, 1994).

**Document Analysis:** Documents enrich what the researcher sees and hears and provide a more abundant context for one's observations. Documents can support or challenge the researcher's perceptions and also advance the researcher's understanding of the phenomena under investigation (Glesne & Peshkin, 1992). The documents of this study were the materials that the student teachers produced in written form. These included the journal entries, open-ended questionnaires, and the written pre-observation task of the nonpeer-
coached group. Analysis of documents also served to generate questions that the researcher pursued in other stages of the research (Patton, 1990). An appropriate time for the researcher to pursue such questions was during the focus group interview.

The method chosen for analysis of the written information provided by this study's subjects was that of inductive analysis (Erickson, 1986). With the use of inductive analysis to review the documents, the researcher allowed the categories, themes, and patterns to emerge from the data (Patton, 1990) rather than establishing them on an a priori basis. These data sources provided the researcher the opportunity to look for key linkages that connect many items of data as similar instances of the same phenomenon (Erickson, 1986). This process allowed the researcher to begin the interpretive process and make assertions based on the similar instances of the phenomena of interest across the journals, questionnaires, and pre-observation written task.

Although the focus group interview is not a written document produced by the subjects, it was transcribed into written form. Data collected via this method were also analyzed by means of inductive analysis as described above. More specifically, the inductive analysis resulted from the procedure of grounded theory methodology. After the initial analysis of the clarity behaviors, peer coaching, and pedagogical content knowledge was completed, all data in document form were reviewed and analyzed with grounded theory coding
procedures. Coding is the activity of breaking down the data, conceptualizing it with labels, and putting it all back together in different ways (Strauss & Corbin, 1990).

The coding was performed after the data were first analyzed to give results for clarity skills use, satisfaction with peer coaching and traditional supervision, and levels of pedagogical reasoning. In inductive analysis, concepts are generated and named because concepts are the building blocks of a theory (Strauss & Corbin, 1996). In response to the literature claiming that foreign language teaching does not make use of research from general teacher effectiveness studies, the documents (conference transcripts, interview transcripts, questionnaires, and journals) were again analyzed to conceptualize the data in order to produce building blocks to contribute to theory development.

The process of analyzing data is likened to the shape of a funnel (Bogdan & Biklen, 1992). In the beginning stage of analysis, all data were included in the analysis and possibilities were open. The ongoing inductive analysis allowed themes, categories, and patterns found in the researched cases to emerge. At first, no presuppositions were made about the pertinent attributes and dimensions. The inductive process was the researcher's attempt to comprehend the many interrelationships among patterns and themes in the data (Patton, 1990). A grounded theory is a theory that has been meticulously induced from diverse data sources. For the developing theory to be related intimately with the
student teachers' daily realities (Strauss & Corbin, 1996), the researcher collected data that provided information on the everyday occurrences of the research participants' teaching experiences.

In order to contribute to the knowledge base on teaching and supervision in foreign language education, concepts were named and systematically related by means of the coding process of open, axial, and selective coding (Strauss & Corbin, 1990; 1996). In open coding the data are reviewed closely. The researcher analyzed comments and paragraphs in the written documents in order to conceptualize them. This process was completed by repeatedly asking “What is this? What does this incident/comment represent?” (Strauss & Corbin, 1990). Phenomena were named broadly with similar instances grouped under broad labelings. The process of open coding was facilitated by using coding categories outlined by Bogdan & Biklen (1992). These categories are listed below and each category is further explained by the use of an example code from this research project:

1. Setting/Context codes provide basic information on the setting in which research subjects functioned. An example would be the students’ descriptions of the foreign/second language departments in which they worked.

2. Situation codes capture how the subjects view themselves in terms of the settings and topic: “here to teach.”
3. Perspective codes relate the ways of thinking that are not as broad as the overarching definitions that subjects mention. These can include rules or norms or general viewpoints: “taking care of business.”

4. Subjects’ thinking about people and objects refer to how the subjects understand the people and instances around them in every day life: “peer as cheerleader.”

5. Process codes refer to periods and phases that a subject suggests or about which she provides information: “the first three weeks.”

6. Activity codes name normally occurring types of behavior in which a subject engages or mentions: “trying new strategies.”

7. Event codes refer to regularly occurring happenings in the daily lives of the subjects: “materials sharing.”

8. Strategy codes describe the means by which people accomplish tasks: one example is “stating objectives.”

9. Relationship/Social Structure codes refer to relationships subjects mention pertinent to the study such as their patterns of behavior in relation to others in the study or to those who are pertinent to the study: an example is “circle of friends.”

10. Methods codes are pertinent to the researcher’s procedures such as the use of “negative examples” in qualitative research.
In this process of open coding, categories were not only named but were
developed in terms of their attributes and dimensions (Strauss & Corbin, 1990;
1996). It is the process of naming the attributes or properties of categories along
a dimensional continuum that begins to narrow the funnel of collected data to a
more specific level.

After the initial open coding, the researcher engaged in axial coding by
putting the data back together and relating subcategories to the categories
named in open coding. Categories were specified in terms of their particular
features. These resultant subcategories gave the initial named phenomena
precision. In axial coding, the researcher's task is to continue to ask questions.
In place of the broader questions posed during open coding, the researcher
asked how one category could be related to another (Strauss & Corbin, 1996).
Provisional relationships found by the researcher were then continually verified
by close scrutiny of the data. By visiting and revisiting the data, the researcher
conducted the search for properties and dimensions of categories, to ultimately
find patterns and themes among the separate sources of data. It was during
axial coding when the process of linking similar instances of a phenomenon took
place (Strauss & Corbin, 1990). Linkages were made in terms of attributes and
dimensions of the named phenomena and how these attributes and dimensions
related these phenomena. In each of the readings of the data made by the
researcher, similar instances of actions and interactions mentioned by the
student teachers were noted and labeled. For example, when student teachers mentioned instances of receiving feedback from a supervisor or peer, similar characteristics of the feedback were noted as well as the dimensional (Strauss & Corbin, 1990) specifications as to whether or not the feedback was detailed or vague, frequent or infrequent. Linkages stated in terms of the characteristics of the phenomena, the products of axial coding, form the foundations on which the researcher can make her assertions (Erickson, 1986). Patterns found via these linkages are the generalizations that the researcher can pose within and among the cases studied. Axial coding is, thus, the process of specifying the categories in terms of the subcategories that bring it about, such as context, intervening conditions, strategies that are related to how the phenomena is carried out, and the consequences of such strategies (Corbin & Strauss, 1996).

The third phase of coding is called selective coding. In this phase the researcher revealed the core category and related other categories to it. The core category is the story line. In this final stage the researcher grounded the theory by relating categories at more specific levels, the level of the categories' properties and dimensions. The theory was grounded by its verification against the data, the sources of all categories. Theoretical sensitivity (Corbin & Strauss, 1990; 1996) authorizes the researcher to make the connections and linkages, the very essence of inductive analysis. The story line remained provisional until inductive analysis was completed by searching the body of data for negative
examples (Erickson, 1986) or for alternative explanations. Constant and consistent interplay between data sources and researcher interpretation was carried out in order to strengthen the validity of the final written account.

In sum, grounded theories are grounded in particular contexts and the resulting theories are "fluid" and make statements of plausible relationships that are "traceable to the data that gave rise to them" (Strauss & Corbin, 1996, p. 279). As such, these developing understandings are located in history and can be generalized only to the situations that specify a phenomenon in terms of the actions and interactions that bring it about as well as the consequences that result from them (Patton, 1990).

Credibility of the Research

In order for qualitative research to be judged credible, Patton (1990) maintains that the researcher must address the following three topics:

1. Methods used in order to secure validity, integrity, and accuracy of the resultant findings;

2. The qualifications, experiences, and perspectives that the researcher possesses in order to carry out the study;

3. The paradigmatic assumptions that undergird the study.

The first of these three criteria for credibility relate to the trustworthiness of the data and is explained in terms of triangulation of data, methods, and analysts:
Trustworthiness

The triangulation approach in carrying out a qualitative study increases both the reliability and validity of the data gathered. Triangulation strengthens the design of a study, and by way of a combination of methods, data sources, and analysts, the researcher is more assured that the study's findings are not the result of a single method or investigator's biases (Patton, 1990). In this study, three forms of triangulation were used: methods triangulation, triangulation of data sources, and analyst triangulation.

Methods triangulation: Triangulation of methods involved collecting data via quantitative and qualitative methods (Patton, 1990). In this study, triangulation of methods refers to the two manners in which teacher clarity skills were examined. According to the first research question in this study, not only did the raters tally the number of times each clarity skill was used, but they also observed the behaviors used by the student teachers to implement the skill. Both types of methods were used to attend to the call that more general teacher education research should be carried out in specific disciplines (Jarvis & Taylor, 1994). Clarity skills, a quantified phenomenon in general teacher education research, were first counted. Then, the teaching actions used by the student teachers in their application of the clarity skills were described because, according to Jarvis and Taylor (1990), research on general teacher behaviors is lacking in the content specific area of foreign/second language teacher
education. Description of how they implemented this behavior is needed to understand the student teachers' interpretation of clarity skills in their foreign/second language classrooms.

**Triangulation of data sources:** Within qualitative methods, different means of gathering data were planned. The overall credibility of findings is strengthened by consistency found in patterns of data from different sources and plausible explanations for differences in the data from multiple sources (Patton, 1990). The triangulation of findings from the observations, focus group interview, questionnaire, and audiotapes led to the corroboration of these findings (Glesne & Peshkin, 1992). No single method led to a consistent portrayal of the phenomena under study: Each source captured different information. Based on this understanding of the relationship between triangulation and trustworthiness, several different data sources derived from varying points of time during the length of the study checked the stability of information received. These different sources of data provided the patterns as well as the explanations for discrepancies in data (Patton, 1990). By way of a combination of data sources, the researcher took advantage of the effectiveness of each type of data collection method and minimized the debilities of any single approach to data collection (Patton, 1990). When assertions are made from several instances of data in more public settings, such as in focus group interviews or supervision conferences, and more private forms of data collection, such as in follow-up interviews, journals, and questionnaires, “the researcher can be more confident”
(Erickson, 1986, p. 148) of the assertions because they do not emanate from a singular data source (Erickson, 1986). Complementary qualitative data sources (Gutiérrez-Almarza, 1997) were used to capture the student teachers’ understanding of foreign and second language teaching. The three forms of triangulation, depicted below in Figure I, were the strategies used in this study to minimize bias in the data.

**Analyst triangulation:** This method of triangulation was employed by means of the use of coders for the data generated. Use of coders in addition to the researcher helped protect the study from researcher subjectivity (Glesne & Peshkin, 1992) thus strengthening the triangulation of the data. First, a coder worked with the researcher using the six categories in Shulman’s (1987) Model of Pedagogical Reasoning to classify the student teachers’ commentaries in the review of the audiotaped conferences and the nonpeer-coached written pre-observation task. Pre- and post-observation conferences of the peer-coached group and the post-observation conferences and written tasks of the nonpeer-coached group were read by the researcher and another graduate teaching assistant from the same Foreign Language Education Program in which the researcher worked; a colleague with a background in foreign language teaching and teacher education similar to the researcher’s.
The audiotaped pre- and post-observation transcripts of the peer-coached and non-peer-coached groups were coded by both researcher and research aide together.

Placement of comments made by student teachers into the categories of Shulman’s Model of Pedagogical Reasoning (1986) were agreed upon by both analysts. Next, the coder assisted the researcher in generating codes for the emergent themes present in the documents the student teachers produced. The researcher and a fellow graduate student research aide together read the journal entries and questionnaires and developed a coding system by having
chosen examples of journal entries and questionnaires from each group of student teachers. The use of codes helped to develop a more specific focus in the study (Glesne & Peshkin, 1992).

The coder who worked with the researcher to analyze observation conference transcripts had knowledge of Shulman’s (1987) Model of Pedagogical Reasoning as part of her own graduate studies in the College of Education at the participating university. Training sessions were conducted to review audiotaped post-observation conferences in order to become familiar with and have experience in the classification of data according to the six categories in Shulman’s (1987) Model. Coders chosen for the clarity rating portion of this study were experienced foreign language teachers who had received training in clarity skills with use of the Clarity Skills Training Manual (Metcalf, 1989).

Triangulation leading to greater trustworthiness of findings and assertions made on the topic of foreign language education coincide with the other important qualitative research concerns of generalization and validity. A combination of purposeful sampling and a case study framework allow the researcher to generalize exclusively to similar situations. The findings in this study are applicable only to situations where there are similar preservice teachers in similar training conditions. Patton (1990) suggests using the term “extrapolation” rather than “generalization,” for extrapolations are “speculations
on the likely applicability of findings to other situations under similar, but not identical conditions” (p. 489).

Extrapolation and generalization in turn suggest for whom the findings make sense and are worthwhile. Patton (1990) recommends that a researcher’s concern for validity must be handled in terms of the audience who will receive the findings. Insofar as assertions made in qualitative studies of this type are valid and relevant for audiences to whom the findings will be presented and to whom they are useful, the findings have pragmatic validity (Patton, 1990). The reason for the use of purposeful sampling and the attention given to the conditions and context of the sample in this study are consonant with this researcher’s concern for pragmatic validity.

The second criterion that the researcher must address in order to preserve the credibility of the research endeavor relates to the qualifications, experiences, and perspectives that the researcher possesses: In qualitative research, the researcher serves as the instrument by means of which the research is undertaken. It is well documented that every researcher brings to the research project his or her own preconceptions and understandings (Denzin, 1989 in Patton, 1990; Bogdan & Biklen, 1992; Lincoln, 1995; Lincoln & Guba, 1996). The trustworthiness of the data is closely related to the trustworthiness of the researcher’s collection and analysis of the data (Patton, 1990). Because the researcher is closely connected to all aspects of the study, the inclusion of
information about the experience, training, and perspectives that the researcher brings to the study are important.

The researcher/researched relationship in qualitative research unfolds over time and contact with one’s subjects is continuous. The researcher’s interest in the topic involved in the study requires that the researcher enter to some degree into the subjects’ world, here, the teaching environment. Based on this emerging nature of the relationship, the researcher had to respect the subjects’ schedules, available time, and willingness to participate in the study at various points throughout its duration because subjects should have the chance to express their opinions about decisions regarding their participation (Bogdan & Biklen, 1992). In this study, the researcher deferred to the subjects’ willingness and schedules regarding times for meetings beyond the normal weekly seminar. Times that called for this participation included scheduling the focus group interviews for both supervisory groups of pre-service teachers and follow-up interviews for the peer coaching group as well as scheduling supervisory visits.

By exhibiting to the subjects an understanding of their time availability and constraints, the researcher endeavored to increase the subjects’ comfort level with this project so that they would feel encouraged to share insights and perspectives with the researcher (Bogdan & Biklen, 1992). Opportunities arose during the course of this investigation for the researcher to repeat to the research participants that a goal of this study was teacher collaboration. This
opportunity presented itself during the weekly supervision seminar on campus with the entire group of twelve student teachers. Another opportunity for the researcher to present herself as a classroom teacher interested in learning more about foreign language and supervision was in the focus group and follow-up interviews. By maintaining the visiting teacher (Fanselow, 1990) relationship among the research participants as explained earlier, the researcher aimed to avoid resentful feelings that may exist between teachers and teacher educators when no attempt is made to show the connections between theory (supervision and effective teaching) and actual practice (the student teachers' practicum experiences).

This second manner by which the credibility of the researcher affects the research study and findings includes the researcher's background. Though nature of the interaction among the researcher and the research participants regarding the ongoing nature of access was collaborative as explained above, the subjects were familiar with researcher's background as a foreign language educator who had experienced similar training. The shared backgrounds of the researcher and her research subjects increased the likelihood that the subjects' perspectives and insights were discerned and valued by the researcher (Freeman, 1996) because the sources of these perceptions were familiar to the training and work of the researcher. This familiarity of the researcher is called theoretical sensitivity by Strauss and Corbin (1990 and 1996). Theoretical
sensitivity refers to the acuity of the researcher to perceive pertinent meanings from irrelevant ones in the data (Strauss & Corbin, 1990). The sources of theoretical sensitivity are familiarity with professional literature, and professional and personal experience (Strauss & Corbin, 1996). Thus, the researcher’s background as a foreign language student and educator assisted her in finding important pieces of information in the data and using her disciplinary knowledge in the processes of data analysis that led to grounded theory building. Those who work using grounded theory methods build theoretical explanations and are obligated to add to the knowledge base of their professions (Strauss & Corbin, 1990).

The third criterion that demonstrates the credibility of a qualitative study is the explanation of the paradigmatic assumptions that undergird the study (Patton, 1990). In addition to earlier justification of the use of case study methods and grounded theory, this project can also be justified in terms of the current standards in qualitative inquiry. Interpretive research evolved out of the search for meanings and perspectives of individuals who were less likely to be heard and approached for their perspectives (Erickson, 1986). In this study it is the preservice teachers’ voices that were sought during and after their last full practicum experience before officially entering the foreign language teaching profession. Instead of giving the experienced teacher’s perspective, it is that of the novice that was sought in order to add to the case literature of which the
teaching profession is in need (Shulman, 1986). With this research agenda in mind, two recent criteria toward which research should aim is to give both voice to the research participants and to carry out research in a communitarian fashion that ultimately is used for the benefit of the discipline (Lincoln, 1995).

Recent interest in feminist research and in action research has placed an emphasis on ethics and politics so that participants who do not customarily have the opportunity to voice their concerns and perspectives are given the opportunity to do so. By means of grounded theory methodology, the voices of the research participants are brought forth in the context of their own particular interpretations (Strauss & Corbin, 1996). The researcher has the obligation to bring these voices forth. The researcher created the conditions for the preservice teachers to voice their opinions, giving their perspectives on the supervision process and initial foreign/second language teaching experiences. She collected these perspectives in the forms of oral and written self-report data: questionnaires; journals; focus group interviews; follow up interviews; audio-taped conferences. The research participants’ comments and perspectives were not only considered by the researcher, but these comments and perspectives form part of the “construction of the account” (Woods, 1996, p.126). Voices are the products of the social communities and are commonly created among the members of these communities (Freeman, 1995). The goal of this research study was to bring forth the voices of the preservice teachers, a group not often heard
from in research reports, giving their perspectives on their commonplace experiences in foreign language teaching and in student teacher supervision.

Qualitative methods assist educators in becoming more aware of what affects their work and their interactions with others (Bogdan & Biklen, 1992). Quality research in education is that which is carried out and is addressed to the practicing community, serving the purposes of that community, rather than only those of theorists and policy makers (Savage, 1988 in Lincoln, 1995). This research project did strive toward this criterion of community by distributing findings to the research participants and to research aides. Used for pedagogical purposes in teacher education (Bogdan & Biklen, 1992), this community criterion resembles pragmatic validation (Patton, 1990) mentioned above. The criteria of voice and community recognize and authenticate that relationships exist between the researcher and the participants in the research (Lincoln, 1995).

These two criteria of voice and community evolve from the interpretive research paradigm. Within this paradigm, it is the everyday occurrences on which the researcher focuses to bring forth particular details of everyday practice (Erickson, 1986). These commonplace and everyday happenings, which are given or understood by the participants, become the objects of inquiry. Inquiry that is carried out systematically via grounded theory techniques bring forth local meanings and emic points of view of the research participants.
(Schwandt, 1996; Strauss & Corbin, 1990; 1996). Interpretive research of this type is valuable because it engenders more than surface meanings and it becomes the basis for the collection of practical knowledge that has been called for as part of the current research agenda for education and teacher education (Shulman, 1986).

Conclusion

A qualitative design has been chosen for this study because qualitative research uses the natural setting as a direct source of data, is descriptive, and is concerned with processes rather than outcomes (Bogdan & Biklen, 1982). Qualitative researchers analyze specific cases to understand the particular situations as well as to understand something of the world in general (Glesne & Peshkin, 1992). In this study the particular is peer coaching and how this form of alternative supervision can help in the understanding of student teachers' acquisition of pedagogical content knowledge as they strive to become language teachers. Each of the cases studied are likely to contribute to basic knowledge in this area and offer information that will be helpful in understanding the other cases represented in this sample.
CHAPTER 4

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

If we want to understand how and why teachers learn what they do from a given learning opportunity, we have to investigate both what the experience was like and what sense teachers made of it (Feiman-Nemser & Remillard, 1996, p. 80).

During the student teaching practicum, prospective teachers typically practice and apply the theories of teaching presented throughout the teacher education program. In foreign and second language teaching, the theoretical basis of instruction comprises a number of topics: linguistics, second language acquisition, pedagogical grammar, discourse analysis, interlanguage, syntax, phonology, language testing, and syllabus design. Thus, the field has “achieved a sense of autonomy with its own knowledge base...and research agenda (Richards, 1990, p. 3). However, nowhere in this list of topics composing the theoretical basis of foreign and second acquisition is there any reference to research in general teacher education, known as teacher effectiveness research (Porter & Brophy, 1986), which focuses on how teachers achieve their instructional goals (Richards, 1990). It is clear that neither content knowledge nor pedagogical knowledge alone constitutes teaching. Rather, according to Shulman (1987), teaching occurs at the nexus of content and pedagogy.
Advancing the view expressed by Shulman and other educators (Hammadou, 1990, 1993; Jarvis & Taylor, 1990; Richards, 1990), this study used effective teaching research from teacher education and applied it to foreign/second language education in order to contribute to and expand existing knowledge about foreign language teaching.

Teacher development and classroom observation of the twelve student teacher research participants focused upon low-inference skills of teacher clarity validated by general teacher effectiveness research. In addition to clarity skills, an alternative process of supervision was used to investigate the nature of foreign/second language teaching. Peer coaching placed six of the research participants in direct observation and analysis of a peer student teacher's classroom practices during a university required practicum lasting ten weeks. Peer coaching was the vehicle selected to implement general teacher education research because teacher effectiveness research is put into practice only when a teacher is observed and assisted in the classroom (Berliner, 1982).

This study investigated the following topics: (a) the influence of clarity skills training on foreign language student teachers who participated in peer- and nonpeer-coached preservice training as part of their culminating student teaching practicum; (b) the nature of pre- and post-observation conferences of both groups; (c) the degree of satisfaction expressed by members of the two groups with respect to the student teacher seminar. The purpose of the study was specifically to advance knowledge about the benefit of peer interaction in
developing student teachers' pedagogical content knowledge and generally to advance knowledge about foreign language instruction.

Six research questions guided this study. The first two questions addressed the use of clarity skills by the twelve student teachers. Clarity skills were the focus because research regarding teacher effectiveness indicates that the use of these skills is not contingent on the subject matter (Hamilton, 1988) and also to better understand the influence of general teacher effectiveness research in the specific content area of foreign and second language teaching.

The content of this chapter includes the listing of the six research questions and the findings for each. Following each findings section is a discussion addressing the answers provided for these six research questions.

Findings that address the first two questions were based on the observational data rated by the researcher and two other foreign language teachers as well as the comments and explanations of clarity skills used by the twelve student teacher research participants. The data were provided in four videotaped episodes of classroom teaching that each student teacher submitted to the researcher. The perspectives of the student teachers that served as data were taken from their journal entries, questionnaire data, and focus group interviews.

Research Question One

1. In a peer coaching program implemented within a foreign language student teaching practicum, which clarity behaviors do peer-coached...
and nonpeer-coached student teachers tend to implement on a consistent basis in their teaching?

a. In what ways do peer-coached and nonpeer-coached student teachers make use of the clarity skills (i.e., target or source language)?

Seventeen clarity skills were grouped under four categories in The Clarity Training Manual by Metcalf (1989). The twelve student teacher research participants were introduced to all 17 of the skills during the weekly university teacher education practicum seminar sessions. The following ten clarity skills were included for rating the videotaped teaching episodes:

1. Informs students of lesson objectives;
2. Repeats important points for students to learn;
3. Examples are used;
4. Demonstrates;
5. Repeats things students do not understand;
6. Rephrases;
7. Summarizes;
8. Asks questions;
9. Provides students with opportunities to ask questions;
10. Provides students with opportunities to practice.

These ten skills were chosen based on past research findings which have shown that: Students of teachers who have used these skills are perceived to
make clear presentations; These skills are observable by trained raters; Teachers can be trained to implement these clarity skills (Bush, Kennedy, & Cruickshank, 1977; Metcalf, 1989; Metcalf & Cruickshank, 1991; Giebelhaus, 1993; Bowman, 1995). The sixth clarity skill included in this project, *rephrases*, does not appear in the Metcalf (1989) Clarity Training Program, but it has appeared in another clarity research endeavor (Giebelhaus, 1993). The researcher included this skill because of the likelihood of its use by foreign and second language teachers.

An examination of raters' data from the four instances of videotaped observations shows that there are similarities and differences between the peer-coached and the nonpeer-coached groups' uses of clarity skills. Among similarities, the clarity skill *asks questions* was the skill most frequently used by five of the six student teachers in each group. Each of these ten student teachers had higher occurrences of this skill than of any other skill. The two student teachers (Maria and Ana) who did not use the skill *asks questions* most frequently, according to raters' data, used the clarity skill *examples are used* most frequently. For the five members of the peer-coached group who were found to use *asks questions* most frequently, the next most frequently applied skill was *examples are used*. The one peer-coached student teacher who did not use *asks questions* most frequently, relied on *uses examples* as the second most used clarity skill. The use of *asks questions* as the most used clarity skill by ten of the twelve student teachers intimates that they maintained a recitation-
based type of teaching over the course of the student teaching quarter. Other data sources reported on in later sections of this chapter show that student teachers wanted to provide opportunities for their students to become involved with using the foreign language in more interactive activities. Student teachers reported that they were challenged by creating occasions in which their students interacted with others in activities of language use. Among the nonpeer-coached group, four other skills were the second most frequently used skill: examples are used, provides practice opportunities, demonstrates, and asks questions.

The third skill in frequency of use among the peer-coached group was repeats important points for students to learn. The two peer-coached students teachers (Pat and Sally) who did not use repeats important points used the skills demonstrates and practice opportunities, respectively, with third highest frequency. Among the six nonpeer-coached student teachers, three clarity skills were the third most-used: provides opportunities for practice; demonstrates; examples are used. Each of these skills was used by two of the teachers in the nonpeer-coached group. Figure 4.1 below is a graphic organizer to summarize the three skills most frequently used by the six research participants in each supervisory group. Skills use is listed by individual in order to provide a summary of the skills that each student teacher in each of the two supervisory groups made use of in her/his teaching. Appendix F provides a summary of the frequencies of the ten clarity skills organized by supervisory group.
### Peer-Coached Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Most Used Skill</th>
<th>2nd Most Used Skill</th>
<th>3rd Most Used Skill</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anne</td>
<td>asks questions</td>
<td>examples are used</td>
<td>repeats imp. points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cindy</td>
<td>asks questions</td>
<td>examples are used</td>
<td>repeats imp. points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelly</td>
<td>asks questions</td>
<td>examples are used</td>
<td>repeats imp. points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maria</td>
<td>examples are used</td>
<td>asks questions</td>
<td>repeats imp. points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pat</td>
<td>asks questions</td>
<td>examples are used</td>
<td>demonstrates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sally</td>
<td>asks questions</td>
<td>examples are used</td>
<td>practice opportunities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Nonpeer-Coached Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Most Used Skill</th>
<th>2nd Most Used Skill</th>
<th>3rd Most Used Skill</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ana</td>
<td>examples are used</td>
<td>repeats imp. points</td>
<td>practice opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chip</td>
<td>asks questions</td>
<td>examples are used</td>
<td>demonstrates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lori</td>
<td>asks questions</td>
<td>examples are used</td>
<td>demonstrates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max</td>
<td>asks questions</td>
<td>demonstrates</td>
<td>examples are used</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharon</td>
<td>asks questions</td>
<td>examples are used</td>
<td>practice opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tracy</td>
<td>asks questions</td>
<td>practice opportunities</td>
<td>examples are used</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4.1 Summary of the three most frequently used clarity skills
The skills listed in Figures 4.1 and 4.2 (page 163) were the result of raters' observations of four videotaped teaching episodes of each student teacher research participant. An inter-rater reliability coefficient for each clarity skill of interest was calculated by means of the Spearman rho nonparametric correlation procedure. Inter-rater reliability ranged from .96 to .99 for the ten individual low-inference clarity skills that were observed for this study. Appendix G displays the mean correlations and inter-reliability coefficients for each of these ten skills.

**Discussion**

One purpose of this study was to investigate whether or not clarity skills that were the focus of research endeavors conducted in teacher education methodology courses and elementary school classrooms could be observed reliably and implemented in the specific field of foreign/second language education in natural classroom settings where prospective teachers were involved in a ten-week student teaching practicum. Data collected from observation of four teaching episodes of the twelve student teacher research participants yielded information to make the following four points. First, clarity skills were reliably observed and counted by several raters. The consistently high inter-rater reliability coefficients that resulted from the Spearman rho nonparametric procedure can be explained by the training and calibration of raters. Also, the small number of raters and small sample size of this study provided for more likelihood of agreement among raters and less room for error.
Although the small sample size does not allow the researcher to generalize the findings to the larger public, the high inter-rater reliability suggests that this study could be repeated with another group and similar reliability results would be found. Second, clarity skills were implemented in foreign and second language classrooms. This finding suggests that Hamilton’s (1988) claim, that clarity skills use is not contingent upon subject matter, be extended to include the content area of foreign/second language teaching, a content area that had not been included in other clarity research endeavors (Hines, 1981; Hamilton, 1988; Giebelhaus, 1993; Bowman, 1995).

The finding that asks questions was the most used skill by ten of the twelve research participants suggests that the student teacher research participants in this study conducted classes with a recitation methodology of teacher created questions and answers, with students' responses maintained at or less than the sentence level. This question and answer methodology may be typical of beginning level foreign and second language classes where the focus of instruction is on the acquisition of new vocabulary and grammatical structures and their practice and use in full sentences. Of the twelve student teachers, Sharon, Kelly, and Maria were observed teaching upper levels of German and Spanish, respectively. Asks questions was the clarity skill most used by Kelly and Sharon and the second most used skill by Maria. This finding regarding the use of asks questions and use of examples suggests that in the context of foreign/second language teaching, student teachers preferred methods such as
recitation, use of textbook examples, and their own teaching examples in both beginning and advanced levels of language teaching rather than discussion-based teaching.

An example of this noted recitation-based methodology included the student teachers' practice of introducing new vocabulary words with illustrated flash cards, showing the vocabulary item and consequently asking students questions using the new words:

**Anne:** *Comment vas-tu à l'école?*  
**Student 1:** *Je vais à l'école à pied.*

**Anne:** *Comment vas-tu à l'école?*  
**Student 2:** *Je vais à l'école à vélo.*

A similar finding regarding the prevalence of the skill *asks questions* was found in Bowman's (1995) peer coaching study focusing on clarity skills in an early field experience.

Another finding is the uniformity of the skills used by student teachers from the peer-coached group. For five peer-coached student teachers, *asks questions* and *examples are used* were the first and second most frequently used skills, respectively. For four of the peer-coached student teachers, *repeats important points* was third. Although the same five clarity skills comprise the list of three most used skills in both supervisory groups of student teachers, there was less uniformity among the nonpeer-coached group for the three most frequently used skills. This finding, coupled with the finding that peer-coached student teachers were observed to use more clarity skills than nonpeer-coached
student teachers, leads the researcher to surmise that clarity skills were often the topic of peer coaching pre- and post-observation conferences (See Appendix F).

One of the functions of peer coaching is the analysis of application of a skill or set of skills focused on in training (Joyce & Showers, 1983). Peer coaching conferences seem to have provided the student teachers the opportunities to analyze their implementation of clarity skills and to discuss which were pertinent to their goals as language teachers. The uniformity found in the summary of the three most used skills by peer-coached student teachers suggests that this uniformity may be a result of the content of peer-coaching discussions and what student teachers in the peer-coached supervisory group valued as pertinent clarity skills to foreign/second language teaching.

In sum, clarity skills were implemented in the teaching of foreign/second languages by student teachers in a ten-week final practicum experience. Thus, clarity skills appear to have relevance for foreign and second language teaching and this study extends the finding of Hamilton (1988), that the use of clarity skills is not constrained by the teacher’s subject matter. The most used clarity skill was found to be *asks questions*, which suggests that this particular group of student teachers relied on a recitation-based teaching methodology. In addition to these two findings, peer-coached student teachers used clarity skills more uniformly. The researcher surmises that this uniformity may be due to the peer-coaching discussions and seminars in which student teachers were involved.
Research Question Two

2. To what extent do peer-coached and nonpeer-coached student teachers perceive clarity skills useful for foreign/second language teaching?

During the ten-week practicum experience, participants expressed their thoughts on the acts of teaching, clarity, and supervision in two ways: orally, during the seminar meetings, in focus group, and follow-up interviews, and in their weekly journal entries, questionnaires, and a reflective essay. What follows is a summary of the viewpoints that emerged from the student teachers’ written and transcribed oral data regarding the use and the value of clarity skills in foreign/second language teaching. The viewpoints are categorized by theme and include the following: Some skills are a natural part of the teaching repertoire; Some clarity skills are particularly suited to foreign language teaching; Student teachers noted differences when clarity skills were utilized; Student teachers can proactively plan for use of clarity skills; There are various ways to implement clarity skills in the foreign/second language classroom; Supervision facilitated the use of clarity skills.

Clarity Skills as a Natural Part of the Teaching Repertoire

The student teachers were first introduced to clarity skills during the second seminar meeting of the academic term. At that point, only one of the student teachers (Sharon of the nonpeer-coached group) had assumed teaching responsibility for more than one language class. All other student teachers had
only begun to assume either partial or full responsibility for one class period of
the teaching day. Five student teachers representing both supervisory groups
(Cindy, Sharon, Maria, Tracy, and Anne) reacted with surprise at the attention
given to clarity skills as a deliberate focus for study in the seminar. Their
comments at that point in time seemed to express the view that clarity skills are
a natural part of a teacher’s actions:

*In a well planned out lesson, you are going to have to use clarity
skills. Most of these are natural anyway.* (Sharon);

*You can be using clarity skills without even knowing that you are. I
always walked around and checked students’ work even before
the fourth unit of clarity skills was introduced.* (Kelly);

*Sometimes you just don’t even know that you are doing them until
someone is watching you and says, ‘You did this.’ And I’d say, ‘I did
this? When? What did I say?’* (Maria).

As the quarter progressed and new clarity skills were introduced following
the Clarity Training Manual (Metcalf, 1989), the student teachers gained more
clock hours of practice in the classroom. The comments and reactions of the
student teachers became more specific regarding the usefulness of clarity skills
training and, in particular, the use of clarity skills for teachers of foreign/second
languages. One student teacher stated her own change of attitude regarding
clarity skills:

*When you presented the theory, I mean, just most of this seemed
natural. So, first we were like, “No kidding.” But, then you go up
there and you really start thinking about some of these things that
you don’t apply as much. And you think, “Maybe I should start
working on some of this. Like I never would have stated my
objectives and then all of a sudden I tried it and it worked. So, I'm going to do that. (Tracy, focus group interview)

Clarity and Foreign/Second Language Teaching

Data collected during the ten-week practicum showed that the student teachers reported a growing appreciation for the use of clarity skills in foreign and second language teaching. Not only did they express that the use of clarity skills was natural to the work of teachers, they found that some clarity skills are particularly suited to foreign/second language pedagogy: "You could throw in the tape and in a matter of a few minutes name five clarity skills. They just come naturally with foreign language" (Anne).

According to Hammadou & Bernhardt (1987), the subject matter of foreign/second language teaching is unlike any other subject area in that the content of what is taught is also the medium by which it is taught. The student teachers in this study were able to name specific clarity skills and specific ways in which to use the clarity skills for the teaching of foreign/second languages. In particular, the student teachers from both peer and nonpeer-coached groups found the clarity skills most useful when the focus of teaching was on grammar, pronunciation, and review:

I mean with grammar lessons, they need to be clear on those things. They're going to be lost if you don't catch them. And when I used the clarity skills, it was with grammar lessons when it was most effective, I think. But if you are focusing on pronunciation and review, it also works. But mostly with grammar. (Tracy, focus group interview)
I think that I used the chalkboard most when I start explaining grammar. When I explain the grammar on the board, I try to let the students understand. And if they are just puzzled, then I start giving them questions regarding those grammar points and repeat them. So the grammar is mostly, I guess, for using the clarity skills.

(Max, focus group interview)

The term skill-getting (Rivers, 1983) in foreign/second language teaching refers to the practice devoted to helping students learn and understand grammatical forms. One recommendation for foreign language teaching is to focus on meanings after having focused on grammatical concepts such that skill-using (Rivers, 1983), the use of grammatical concepts in communicative exercises with a focus on meaningful interaction, should be stressed only after the phase of skill-getting (Littlewood, 1980 in Shrum & Glisan, 1994). Six of the student teachers (Cindy, Sally, Kelly, Maria, Max, Tracy) made explicit comments about the usefulness and necessity of clarity skills in grammar teaching/skill-getting. In particular, the six noted that the clarity skills repeating, use of examples, informing students of lesson objectives, and summarizing were particularly helpful in teaching grammar. For example, Pat mentioned in her fifth week journal entry that when she checked for comprehension in the skill-getting phase and then monitored the students' work in the skill-using phase, she became more aware of what to say in her summaries. The transition from a focus on grammar to one on communication, where there is less teacher guidance and more open-ended work for students, also called student teachers' attention toward clarity skills use:
My main concern is that I am clear when I am in the skill-getting phase and that I explain myself thoroughly when I send them to do the skill-using phase. The activities make sense to me but may not always make sense when I explain them to my students. (Cindy, week two journal entry)

The clarity skill of informing students of lesson objectives was also reported as a helpful guide in grammar teaching. The act of stating the daily objectives served as a reminder to the student teacher of the purpose of the lesson and as a means for the student teacher to “focus on whether or not the students had gotten the skill” (Cindy, focus group interview).

Repetition was noted as important by four student teachers because of the uniqueness of learning another language. Cindy and Anne talked about repetition in their pre-observation and post-observation conferences as noted in their journal entries. Both stated that foreign language teachers must use the clarity skill of repetition often. They discussed why they repeated important words and points frequently. Anne said that she needed to repeat because her seventh and eighth grade learners were at a beginning level of language learning. Agreeing, Cindy noted her own need for frequent repetition in her first year classes, but not in the second and fourth levels of Spanish because of their greater oral comprehension. Class size also compelled the use of repetition. Cindy noted the need to repeat more often in larger classes “because of so many different types of learners and wanting to reinforce it for them all.”

Although the student teachers commented that repetition was important, they admitted that they did not always use it. Sally and Kelly mentioned that their
cooperating teachers often reminded them to repeat. Repetition was found necessary and relevant to the teaching of foreign/second languages not only during the initial grammar presentations, but also during the recycling and spiraling phases of grammar lessons:

I just realized from being a student teacher that the students do not understand or hear the first few times you explain a new concept and often they forget previous material after not using it for a while. Even though this lesson was on superlative and comparative it allowed me to resipral the concept of noun/adjective agreement along with the new material. (Sally, week 6 journal entry)

Repetition was reported as useful in conjunction with other clarity skills. Student teachers in both the peer-coached and nonpeer-coached groups mentioned the need to use clarity skills in clusters in order to make their points more obvious to their students. Pat mentioned in the peer group's focus group interview that what helped her was a “combination of clarity skills. I mean writing on the board, repeating important points, and checking comprehension all at the same time.” Other examples are:

Some of the skills like use of examples, things like that, might tend more toward a grammar presentation. But, I mean, students always need to know what is expected of them no matter what I am presenting or what the activities we're doing are. And so those kinds of clarity skills are important no matter what we are doing. And also just the writing on the board and everything else. If I didn't write down what we were going to do, then I would lose half the class...who thought speaking wasn't so important to them. (Sharon, focus group interview)

At times there needed to be so much repetition with something as use of examples or writing different things on the chalkboard and drawing arrows back when it was mostly a grammar lesson. But when you started thinking about it from the student’s point of
view, it just needs so much practice or review. I did all of this when I grouped the various groups of irregular preterite verbs. There was a “i” group and an “i” group and a “v” group. ... And I know that this was helpful for the students because they started to call out before I asked “What group is tener in?” (Sally, focus group interview).

The skill examples are used was noted as another clarity skill suited to the teaching of foreign languages. Student teachers expressed the concern throughout all data sources about personalizing material and making the material relevant to students’ lives. In the nonpeer-coached focus group interview the skill examples are used emerged as an aid to the student teachers to personalize the material presented:

Because when you only use the book, if you’re working out examples, it’s not their examples, you know? It’s examples from the book, the text. (Tracy, focus group interview)

Clarity and Pronunciation

Three student teachers also noted that clarity for pronunciation was important in their teaching and was used in conjunction with repetition. Each one of these three student teachers taught the language that he or she natively speaks. Maria is a native Spanish speaker from Puerto Rico who taught Spanish. Max is a native Japanese speaker who taught Japanese, and Kelly, an American, had two ESL classes. Maria noted her concerns as clear pronunciation of the phonemes /l/ and /sl/ and rapidity of her speech:

My pronunciation is now more clear and my speed is adapted to the learners. Being from the Caribbean my /sl/ and /l/ are different and this is something I was struggling with but finally I worked with it and it’s much better.
One strategy that Max made use of was slowing the rate of his speech and repeating more. This was the tactic that he said he deliberately chose with the hope that his students would learn more. For Kelly, repetition and clear speech were used more frequently in her ESL classes. Not only did her repetition occur more often in these classes, but she also found that her repetitions were slower and pronounced more distinctly.

Discussion

The preceding paragraphs provide the field of foreign/second language teacher education with information regarding the usefulness of clarity skills for foreign/second language teaching as perceived by the twelve student teacher research participants. The student teachers in this study provided statements that mirror the training literature (Joyce & Showers, 1980; 1983) regarding the importance of practicing skills in real (teaching) contexts. After having assumed partial responsibility for their CTs’ teaching schedules, the student teachers expressed a recognized need for clarity skills. With more time on task in teaching, student teachers were able to articulate which clarity skills they used, how, and why they perceived the need to implement them in their foreign/second language teaching context.

For foreign/second language teaching, this group of twelve student teachers viewed their teaching roles as facilitators of two types of classroom practice: grammar presentations and communicative use of the foreign/second language. Their comments suggest that clarity skills were useful to them in both
phases of foreign/second language teaching, particularly for grammatical presentations. Specifically mentioned as useful for grammatical presentations were the following clarity skills: repeating important points, use of examples, stating objectives, and summarizing. The emphasis on these clarity skills in grammatical presentations intimates that teacher talk is abundant when the focus is on grammatical concept attainment. In the teacher education literature (Civikly, 1992), it has been reported that teacher talk comprises two thirds of the amount of talk in classrooms. The data from this study suggest similar reliance on teacher talk, as student teachers reported finding clusters of clarity skills useful when presenting grammatical concepts.

Pat reported using a particular pattern of clarity skills. The focus on grammar presented conditions for the use of asks questions, and the focus on practice called for the use of examining students' work. She reported that employing these individual clarity skills during the two distinct phases of foreign language teaching helped her to know which information to include in her summaries. As will be reported in a later section, the use of summaries was among the least used clarity skills observed in the videos of the twelve student teachers. Pat's data appears to hold helpful information for those student teachers who were less likely to plan to use summaries in their lessons by suggesting that summaries do not need to be prepared previously to lessons, but can be negotiated interactively by the student teacher's careful monitoring of students' progress. Pat's input may provide helpful information for beginning
teachers who exhibit the tendency to plan for each part of the lesson preactively wishing to complete each part of the lesson, without attending to events that unfold during interactive teaching.

One clarity skill that received a great deal of attention from student teachers in their self-report data was *repeating important points*. Student teachers found this skill useful alone and in conjunction with other clarity skills for presenting grammar topics. The perceived need for repetition by the student teachers was a topic of discussion in peer coaching sessions. It also became progressively more relevant to some student teachers who reported not having employed it as much in the early phases of student teaching. They emphasized its use for grammar teaching in both initial grammar presentations and in recycling stages. Perhaps most useful to an observer of a foreign language teacher is the information these student teachers provided regarding why repetition is a much used skill. For example, when teaching a grammatical topic, the grammar itself is often not the only point of instruction. The foreign language teacher often has several goals in mind when he or she repeats: concept attainment of the grammatical structure, meaning, and pronunciation. The reasons of grammatical and vocabulary acquisition as well as proper pronunciation contribute to the need for frequent repetitions and abundant teacher talk in foreign/second language classrooms. An observer or evaluator lacking initial training in foreign language teaching may find the number of
occurrences of this skill, due to the unique nature of foreign language content, surprising.

_Repeat important points_ was found to be relevant by the student teachers in beginning level courses. The construct of target language proficiency has been suggested as the organizing principle for foreign language teaching (Hammadou, 1991). The data gathered in this study seem to suggest that the amount of repetition is dependent upon the target language proficiency of the learning group: beginning levels of foreign language instruction tend to include more teacher use of repetition.

Also of interest was the appearance in the self-report data of Max, Maria, and Kelly, who taught at least one class of their native language as a target language. They reported the need to make their repetitions for pronunciation purposes slow and carefully enunciated. Native speakers of the target language were the only individuals to report the need for slow and careful pronunciation of their repetition suggesting that native speakers may need to focus on the clarity skill of _repeating important points_ and adjust it for pronunciation to a greater extent than non-native speakers. Non-native speakers may tend to view the foreign language as an object more than the native speakers because the former were once beginning students of their target language in the formal setting. Thus, unlike native target language speakers, the non-native speakers may have intuitively understood the need for pronunciation in a distinct manner due to their own learning experiences. Unlike any other content area, the need for
repetition appears to have unique pertinence in foreign/second language
teaching, as the ability to pronounce and the meaning of the target language
content precedes the communicative use of these words and structures.

The student teachers’ reported perceptions of the use of clarity skills
included a topic of particular relevance in foreign/second language teaching: the
personalization of target language content. In recent foreign language methods
texts (Omaggio, 1993; Shrum & Glisan, 1994), the prospective teacher is
encouraged to create opportunities for language practice by asking students
questions using the vocabulary and structures so that they express their own
opinions and points of view (Omaggio, 1993, p. 246). Student teachers who said
they extended their uses of examples beyond the book examples suggested that
clarity skills use enabled them to personalize target language content and to
provide opportunities for more creative and communicative language practice.
This practice is a current goal of foreign language methods instruction
(Omaggio, 1993; Shrum & Glisan, 1994).

Although clarity studies were originally conducted in teacher education
laboratory experiences and elementary classrooms (Gloeckner, 1983; Metcalf,
1989; Cruickshank & Metcalf, 1992; Bowman, 1995), the data reported in this
section suggest that clarity skills research carried out in the general teacher
education studies is relevant for foreign/second language teaching and pertinent
when there is a focus on grammar teaching and communicative practice. The
student teachers found clarity skills to be of value in the initial, recycling, and
review phases of grammar teaching. When the focus of instruction was on grammar and pronunciation, *repeating important points* had particular relevance for foreign/second language teaching. Student teachers also noted that clarity skills could be applied to particular portions of a lesson such that *repeating important points, asking questions, and use of examples* related to goal achievement in grammar teaching and *examining students’ work* related to goals in the communicative phase of language teaching. Additionally, *use of examples* allowed teachers to reach a goal specific to language teaching, the personalization of content, which helps teachers to create realistic situations for language practice.

The previous section outlined that clarity skills can be implemented in the foreign/second language classroom context. This section has summarized the perceptions of the student teacher research participants on the particular uses of clarity skills for foreign language teaching. The next section reports on the clarity skills used less frequently by the student teachers and is followed by a section reporting on the research participants’ perceptions of the challenges they faced in the implementation of clarity skills in their classrooms.

**Less Frequently Used Clarity Skills**

Although one theme that emerged from the collected data from the student teachers was that some clarity skills were particularly suited to the teaching of foreign/second languages, rater data and their own commentaries showed that some of the clarity skills were not used at all by some student
teachers. In the written data of weekly journals and in focus group interviews, the research participants provided commentaries on the skills that they tended to use less in their lessons.

In the peer-coached group, only *rephrases* and *summarizes* had zero occurrences across the four instances of videotaped observation data. Both Anne and Sally were rated as not having used the clarity skill *rephrases*. This skill was observed to have occurred when a student teacher paraphrased an utterance. Only Sally was rated as not using the skill of *summarizes* at all during the four observational ratings. An overall view of the peer-coached group's rated observations showed that the following were the least used skills: *rephrases, summarizes, provides opportunities to ask questions, and informs students of lesson objectives.* (See Appendix F).

Across the four instances of rater data of the nonpeer-coached group, there were more clarity skills that were not observed in their teaching. The skill of *rephrases* was not used by four of the nonpeer student teachers: Lori, Max, Chip, and Sharon. The skill of *summarizes* was not used by three of the nonpeer student teachers: Tracy, Chip, and Lori. Neither Lori nor Sharon made use of *provides opportunities to ask questions*. Chip made no use of *informs students of lesson objectives*, and Ana made no use of *demonstrates or repeats important points*. The least used clarity skills by the individuals in the nonpeer-coached group were: *rephrases, summarizes, provides opportunities for students to ask*
### Peer-Coached Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Least Used Skill</th>
<th>2nd Least Used Skill</th>
<th>3rd Least Used Skill</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anne</td>
<td>rephrases</td>
<td>Ss ask questions</td>
<td>summarizes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cindy</td>
<td>summarizes</td>
<td>Ss’ understanding</td>
<td>Ss ask questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelly</td>
<td>states objectives</td>
<td>rephrases</td>
<td>summarizes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maria</td>
<td>rephrases</td>
<td>summarizes</td>
<td>states objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pat</td>
<td>Ss ask questions</td>
<td>rephrases</td>
<td>Ss’ understanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sally</td>
<td>summarizes</td>
<td>rephrases</td>
<td>Ss ask questions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Nonpeer-Coached Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Least Used Skill</th>
<th>2nd Least Used Skill</th>
<th>3rd Least Used Skill</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ana</td>
<td>Ss’ understanding</td>
<td>demonstrates</td>
<td>practice opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chip</td>
<td>rephrases</td>
<td>summarizes</td>
<td>states objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lori</td>
<td>rephrases</td>
<td>summarizes</td>
<td>practice opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max</td>
<td>rephrases</td>
<td>summarizes</td>
<td>states objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharon</td>
<td>practice opportunities</td>
<td>rephrases</td>
<td>Ss’ understanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tracy</td>
<td>summarizes</td>
<td>rephrases</td>
<td>Ss’ understanding</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Code: Ss Ask Questions = Opportunity for Students to ask questions  
Ss’ understanding = Repeats Points for Students to understand

Figure 4.2: Summary of the three least frequently used clarity skills
questions, repeats things students do not understand, informs students of lesson objectives, and demonstrates. Figure 4.2 below summarizes the skills used less frequently by members of the peer coached and nonpeer-coached groups. Use of skills is listed by individual in order to have a more exact summary of the skills that each individual in each of the two supervisory groups chose to use in his/her teaching.

Discussion

The finding that the student teachers used certain clarity skills very little or not at all is worth discussing. The use of the skill informs students of lesson objectives appears as one of the three least used skills in the case of four student teachers. It is not surprising that stating objectives should be one skill among the three least frequently used skills because of the appropriateness of when a teacher might state his/her lesson objectives. It would seem that informing students of lesson objectives is restricted to the beginning moments of the lessons and is bound by lesson sequence; unlikely to occur after the teacher begins the lesson. However, there were only four instances of informing students of lesson objectives on the summary of least frequently used skills. The appropriateness of stating objectives suggests that this skill should have had more instances on this summary of least used clarity skills than were found. This finding suggests that student teachers found that stating one’s objectives was not only a pertinent teaching act at the beginning of class, but also at other times during their lessons. For example, rater data for Cindy showed that she stated
objectives four times during the same lesson. In self-report data, Maria reported that objectives could be stated prior to individual activities instead of making a list of all lesson objectives at the beginning of class.

Similarly to stating objectives, the researcher expected to find use of *summarizes* among the least used skills. *Summarizes* is found in the summary of least used skills nine times. At first glance, this may seem to be an appropriate result because, like objectives, the use of summaries seems to be bound by lesson sequence. Four student teachers did not implement this skill in any of their four video-taped observed lessons. This finding intimates that the clarity skill *summarizes* presented a challenge to the student teachers. A possible explanation is the tendency of teachers to teach until the end of class without having planned time to include a summary. Student teachers in this study also reported the tendency not to complete their planned lesson in the class period. Their noted challenge of lesson completion suggests that these student teachers opted to attempt to complete planned activities rather than cease instruction and summarize the content of the class session.

The clarity skill *rephrases* was included in the list of skills for clarity training based on the likelihood that instruction given in a foreign language would lend itself to frequent rephrasings of meaning by the student teachers. This skill proved to be either the least or second least used skills by ten of the twelve student teachers. Six of the twelve were not observed to use this skill in their teaching videos. Three possible reasons are offered to explain this finding.
First, each of these teachers was observed teaching beginning levels of the language. The proficiency level of the students in their classes was not likely to be advanced enough to understand rephrasings of the material presented. For example, Anne, Lori, Max, Chip, and Sally, all of whom taught beginning levels, did not use the summary skill. Sharon noted, in a post-observation conference, the need for this skill in the L2 classroom. When she tried to explain a point to a student, she repeated it several times. She reported realizing that she needed to rephrase, not repeat:

I was repeating trying to make her understand. I was repeating the same thing again and again. That's why she doesn't get it the first time. She's probably not going to get it the third time.

Sharon reported that she was not able to rephrase for this student because she could not think quickly enough to change what she was saying.

Second, a prevalent method used by student teachers was showing flash cards when presenting vocabulary. It is possible that this method did not create the conditions for student teachers to implement the rephrasing skill. Third, it is possible that student teachers lacked the necessary vocabulary and grammatical competence to rephrase in the language of instruction. For example, at the end of the practicum, Sally reported that, in light of the proficiency needed for foreign language teaching, she would have to improve her own Spanish speaking skills. In foreign language education, the concern for teachers' subject matter knowledge is usually a concern about their language proficiency (Hammadou, 1991). Perhaps in her case, as in others, target language proficiency
constrained the use of rephrasing and may be the deciding factor about the type of instruction that occurs in classrooms.

Because beginning level foreign language classes require a less open-ended type of instruction, two other clarity skills received little use: provides opportunities for students to ask questions (four times on least used list) and repeating important points that students do not understand (five times on least used list). Again, the use of flash cards and pictures in texts to present vocabulary is a reason offered for its limited use. If students acquire meanings of words based on photos rather than a description of the words in the target language, or hearing words used in a sentence, students may be less likely to pose questions. In addition to this reason based on foreign language methodology, the prevalence of questions and recitation-based methods may have created a non-open ended type of classroom interaction pattern in which the opportunity to ask questions was not present.

In both supervisory groups, there were zero occurrences of some clarity skills. In the peer-coached group, neither Anne nor Sally used rephrases. Sally did not use summarizes. In the nonpeer-coached group, more clarity skills were left unused by student teachers in the four observed videotaped teaching episodes. The numbers in parentheses refer to the number of student teachers who did not implement each of these skills. These were rephrases (4), summarizes (3), informing students of lesson objectives (1), opportunities for students to ask questions (2), repeats important points (1), and demonstrates
(1). The peer-coached group may have used the skills more often because they had the opportunity to observe, analyze, and discuss them in peer-coaching sessions. Joyce and Showers (1980) stated that the collegial aspect of peer coaching results in the more frequent and more appropriate use of the target skill as well as a better understanding and longer retention of the skills. The list of clarity skills that nonpeer-coached student teachers did not use suggests that Joyce's and Showers' (1980) fifth step in the training process, coaching for application, was a facilitative condition in this study for the transfer of training in clarity skills to occur. This apparent need for a coaching component when the training period is short, such as an academic quarter, was echoed by Gloeckner (1983), who recommended the use of an additional coaching element.

In sum, a review of the use of ten clarity skills showed peer-coached student teachers having more instances of clarity skills' use than nonpeer-coached student teachers. This difference in clarity skills' implementation suggests that a coaching component be added to academic term length training programs to facilitate greater transfer of skills training for the classroom setting.

Additional concerns noted when the least frequently skills were reviewed included the following: target language proficiency of the student teachers and their ability to use the rephrasing skill; the stating of objectives at points during a lesson other than the start of class; the tendency of student teachers not to implement summaries in their lessons, possibly a result of their concern for completing lesson plans; finally, the finding that a recitation-based teaching
methodology and a vocabulary teaching method using photos may inhibit students' opportunities to ask questions and teachers' repetition of important points for students to understand. The following section summarizes the student teachers' self-report data and describes their perceived challenges in implementing clarity skills in the context of foreign/second language teaching.

Challenges of Implementing Clarity Skills

At the end of the practicum, all student teachers were asked what they needed to improve to be an effective teacher. From the peer-coached group, Kelly, Pat, and Cindy mentioned clarity skills use, specifically the skill of summarizing. Cindy also mentioned clarity as a necessary teaching skill for foreign language teaching and something that will be an everyday pursuit in her teaching. From the non-peer-coached group Ana, Tracy, and Lori mentioned the need to improve the clarity skills presented in the practicum seminar over the course of the quarter. Like the peer-coached students, Tracy specifically mentioned summarizes as a skill she needed to improve.

When student teachers' classroom responsibilities increased, their use of clarity skills appeared to decline. Two of the challenges they mentioned were time and the difficulties of student teaching in general. For example:

I began student teaching being more clear than I am now, unbelievable! I think some of the possible factors might be that I am exhausted and because I'm teaching all five classes now, I have less time to regroup. I'm overwhelmed. (Pat, journal entry week 7).
According to the self-report data in her journal and questionnaire responses, the use of clarity skills remained a challenge to Pat throughout the student teaching experience. She mentioned trying to deliberately integrate the clarity skills into her classes when writing out her lesson plans but consistently perceived it too much of an effort because of the other duties that student teaching called her to do:

I'm making a conscious effort to make use of clarity skills by writing them into my lesson plans. But too much time is needed for grading and that means that I have less time for planning. Clarity skills are still a mental block. (Pat, journal entry, week six)

Pat continued to mention clarity skills during weeks six and seven of the practicum. Although complimented by her university supervisor on her attempt to integrate the clarity skills into the written lesson plan, she reported that this method was not helpful for integrating the skills. The following are sections of a lesson plan with which she proactively planned her use of clarity skills’ and her perception about using this procedure. Both were taken from her weekly journal from week seven:

I physically tried to write the skills into my lesson plan today, but I felt stilted. It felt unnatural.

State objectives: Today we will continue to work with the subjunctive clarifying it further. What I want to clarify are the following two facts: (1) the causal verb expressions and (2) the realm of doubt connected to the subjunctive.

Have students summarize how to form subjunctive (conjugation) and have students summarize why we use subjunctive.
The rest of her commentary from the week seven journal entry explained fatigue and frustration, a reported feeling of having to “reinvent the wheel.” She stated that she wished she had a “cabinet full of prepared materials like her cooperating teacher” so that she could feel more at ease with and ready to address clarity skills integration in her lessons. Her comments of frustration with her ability to use the clarity skills in her lessons began in week five. When a clarity skill was used well, she reported it as an accomplishment of “effective teaching.”

Student teachers in the peer-coached group were concerned about having enough time to complete the planned lesson during the class period. Kelly contrasted her inability to finish her planned lesson in German classes to her ability to do so in ESL classes. The lack of time was frustrating and she reported that it affected her use of clarity skills:

> The big aspect that involves one to be able to be clear is having a calm composure. I have noticed that when I get flustered and upset, I am less clear because I just want to get through the lesson. Now in ESL I feel much freer and at ease and it is there that I find myself summarizing, pointing out important points, and using other clarity skills. (Kelly, journal entry, week five).

In the final meeting of the peer-coached group at the focus group interview, Kelly said that she improved her use of clarity skills, especially summarizing, yet she mentioned being “still frustrated with the time thing” because she just “wanted to get through the content.” Having recognized the difficulty of using several clarity skills in a single lesson, she reported the decision to apply “the
most useful clarity skills” in relation to her lesson objectives. For example, if the plan was to review material in a lesson, she would deliberately practice her use of summaries.

Objectives and summaries were the skills mentioned by student teachers throughout the practicum as being helpful but not skills that they reported were naturally a part of their teaching unless they made conscious efforts to include them: (1) Lori reported that she had often forgotten to mention her objectives at the beginning of class unless she wrote them down on the board. When she did have them prepared on the chalkboard, she found that they served as a “final run through” of her lesson for her. For Lori, stating objectives was not a natural tendency in her teaching throughout the practicum; (2) In the clarity sessions throughout the quarter Chip, Max, and Kelly mentioned time as the factor that hindered their uses of summarizing and setting objectives. “We forget because the clock is ticking;” (3) At the mid-point of the quarter, Cindy also stated that neither summary nor stating objectives were natural tendencies in her teaching. She felt that it was difficult to remember to inform the students of the lesson’s objectives because of the time required to complete the homework check that she performed at the beginning of each class. She reported summarizing to be the most challenging skill to include at that point during the practicum and said that she never considered it before it was introduced as a Unit Four Clarity Skill (Metcalf, 1989). She expressed the hope that summarizing and stating objectives along with the rest of the clarity skills would become natural when she
is a full-time Spanish teacher; (4) Another reason offered for the lack of the clarity skill of summarizing was Tracy's input on what she thought her students understood. If she felt that her students did understand and were reaching their goals, she reported that she would move on to the next topic/activity without a summary. She also mentioned that if she and/or her students were looking forward to the next activity, such as learning a song, she would opt to proceed without providing a summary of the previous activities.

Both Kelly and Pat mentioned classroom discipline as a condition that hindered the use of clarity skills. According to Kelly, it was a challenge to settle her students down at the beginning of class. She reported feeling that the time it took to obtain her students' attention prevented her from stating objectives. Kelly was the peer-coached member who was observed to state objectives only in one teaching episode. For Pat, disruptions and concern for discipline in general were reported as a hindrance for her use of clarity skills:

**Clarity skills for me are still not at 100%. If students were respectful of me 100% of the time, fully integrating clarity into my lesson plans would be easier.** (final journal entry)

**Discussion**

The foregoing data were included in addition to the data tallied by the observers of the four video-taped teaching episodes in order to explicate the difficulties the student teachers perceived in their attempts to use clarity skills as well as to add detail to the information in figure 4.2. The students' viewpoints on the usefulness of clarity skills to teaching included comments that pertain to the
nature of foreign/second language teaching. In contrast, their comments regarding the challenges for the daily use of clarity skills, other than rephrasing, pertain to the complexities of teaching in general.

The concerns student teachers exhibited in their self-report data about including homework verifications and reviews and the need to complete their lesson plans indicate that they were challenged to incorporate new skills within their agenda of new teaching responsibilities. The challenges that the context of student teaching offered the student teachers, which in turn hindered their use of clarity skills practice, included feeling rushed to complete lessons because of classroom routines such as verifying the completion of homework and feeling overwhelmed by the amount of daily work when teaching a full schedule of classes. Whether they reported on their success or lack of success with clarity skills use, the student teachers' data pointed to their practical learning about teaching rather than the theoretical learning presented in the university setting.

Pat's data suggested a backsliding type of behavior when it became time for her to assume total responsibility for her CT's schedule. For example, she and other student teachers tended not to implement objectives and summaries when teaching responsibility increased and when they responded to their perceived needs of finishing the lesson plans or the lack of class time remaining after having implemented classroom routines. In another section, these same two clarity skills are reported as valuable for the teaching process.
These conflicting reports on the use and value placed on clarity skills by student teachers and the need to complete lesson plans suggest that there may be more than one period during student teaching when student teachers are concerned about their own survival, and that the skills used early on may not be implemented when the amount of teaching responsibilities later increases. Caruso (1977) suggested, in another body of literature, that there are six stages through which student teachers pass: The fifth stage, labeled more confidence/greater inadequacy, occurs when student teachers assume total responsibility for their cooperating teacher’s schedule. Although Caruso states that survival is no longer a concern in the fifth stage, the term inadequacy suggests that challenges regarding the teaching task, classroom complexities, and workload remain in later stages of student teaching.

Two student teachers identified maintaining classroom discipline as a condition that prevented the use of clarity skills. They offered no evidence of how they tried to implement clarity skills but reported that the skills that were not originally a natural part of their teaching repertoire, objectives and summaries, were not used because of the challenge to maintain classroom discipline. The student teachers who said that classroom management issues hindered their use of clarity skills implied that the time needed to maintain discipline took precedence over the use of clarity skills.

When faced with conditions that hindered their use of clarity skills, student teachers reported having implemented strategies that aided them or
reminded them to use clarity skills. These strategies were mentioned in relation to objectives and summaries, two skills referred to as not natural to their teaching repertoires upon beginning student teaching or in any previous teaching practice. The strategies mentioned included writing objectives on the board or in their lesson plans, referring to written objectives in order to remain aware of what to summarize at the end of the lesson, and choosing the clarity skills that helped the student teachers reach the goals of their particular lessons. Their effort to use these strategies suggests that student teachers found value in clarity skills for the process of foreign language instruction, wanted to use clarity skills in their lessons, and gained knowledge of these procedures in the domain of the teacher’s knowledge base that Shulman (1987) refers to as the wisdom of practice.

The student teachers’ reports regarding their implementation of clarity skills and the strategies that allowed them to implement these skills emanated from their practice, as opposed to the simulated practice in the university-based portion of the teacher education in the seminar. Shulman’s (1987) critique of process-product research was that it ignored the complexities of teaching. Some current literature on teacher education (Darling-Hammond & Cobb, 1996; Feiman-Nemser & Remillard, 1996; Howey, 1996) urges teacher education programs to provide information and practice to help preservice teachers handle the dynamic nature of classroom teaching. The learnings the student teachers in this study gained about clarity skills happened in situ by considering their clarity
skills training in response to their unique teaching situations. The strategies reported above identify the student teachers' interpretation of the products of teacher education research on clarity such that novice teachers were able to contribute practical knowledge to the still currently evolving knowledge base on teaching.

Attention to Stating One's Objectives

The clarity skill of informing students of lesson objectives drew the attention of the student teachers in their journal comments and focus-group interview data. The number of instances when stating objectives was mentioned in the data sources of focus group interviews, journals, and questionnaires across both supervisory groups showed that this clarity skill became a strategy used by student teachers in order to maintain classroom management, to help ensure a smooth flow of lesson activities and transitions, and to keep students informed of lesson sequence.

While not initially a natural part of the teaching repertoire of both groups' research participants, the objectives seemed gradually to gain importance for several reasons: (1) To keep students on task: Sally noted that stating objectives helped students remain engaged in classroom work. Sally observed that if objectives were given,

It is worth the time spent on them because you get what you want the first time. Even though it seems like it takes up time in your lesson, it's really going to get you to the spot where you want to be with your class in a shorter period of time (Journal entry, week five);
(2) To let students know the day’s plan before they asked: Both Pat and Tracy reported that stating the objectives satiated the students’ need to ask, upon arrival to class, what was planned for them to do in each class period; (3) To serve as a check for achievement of goals: At times, when Chip found that the students had not achieved the daily goals stated in the objectives, he stated that he would be forced to interactively “reflect on his objectives and become concerned with the adaptation of the goals to his students;” (4) To help the teacher stay focused: Max found that stating objectives reminded him of his daily minimum goals, helped him to stay focused on what he wanted students to achieve, and kept his goals for the day realistic; (5) To help students stay focused: Ana found that once she realized the impact stating objectives had on her students, stating them and writing them on the board became a regular part of her teaching routine. Students were reminded of what occurred next in the lesson plan whenever they checked the blackboard.

Data showed that the student teachers realized the value of stating objectives and the benefit of planning to use the clarity skills in executing lessons for other clarity skills as well as for stating objectives. The peer-coached pairs noted that the pre-observation conference was an opportunity to plan preactively for clarity skills use because the peer coach could at that time bring the peer’s attention to the integration of clarity skills. This extra opportunity to focus on clarity was noted by each of the peer-coached individuals.
Kelly noted the importance of clarity skills when giving directions. She reported needing to allot time within her lesson plan for students to process and comprehend the directions for exercises and communicative activities. Kelly was concerned about pacing classes to complete her lessons. She mentioned that her oral and written directions needed more clarity than she was using. Her strategy was to devote extra time to the clarity of her explanations and directions. She reported spending time during the lesson planning stage to prepare examples of the activities and exercises for which she gave directions. This was especially important because Kelly noted that while in the act of teaching it was difficult for her to think of additional examples in response to students’ questions. Therefore, the part of her planning when she created examples to enhance students’ understanding of the topics in the text was crucial to the success of a lesson. In addition to her own planning for the use of examples, Kelly found her peer-coaching conferences helped her plan to state her objectives. She reported that her peer helped her find appropriate language with which to state her objectives to her students. She reported feeling that she stated them well for her peer and supervisor, but that she needed help doing so in terms her students could understand.

Three student teachers stated that they learned that planning for the use of clarity skills enhanced students’ understanding of their expectations. Pat had assigned students to make visuals for vocabulary practice and Sally had assigned a creative writing assignment. Each received student work that did not
meet their expectations in form or quality. During the last seminar meeting, Sally offered in retrospect a reason for this miscommunication: She attributed it to the optimism and enthusiasm of student teachers' thinking that the students understood their directions and wanted to do the assignment. Although Cindy did not unexpectedly receive poor quality of student work as Pat and Sally had, she expressed concern about how to explain a cultural portfolio project so that students could meet her expectations for this assignment. Each student teacher mentioned the need to model with several examples the work they assigned. Each reported a need for clarity skills to be applied to the explanations of directions and expectations in assigning work. After learning of the experiences of her peers, Cindy reported that she was able to plan for the use of modeling with examples in advance.

One student teacher specifically noted that the clarity skill repeats important points was related to her knowledge of the subject matter she taught. Sally stated that before teaching her lessons she had to continually access her content area knowledge and "think what the important points are that the students need to know. How can I use my knowledge to make the content clear to my students?" In her attempts to adapt the content to students' understanding, she reported that she had to keep content foremost in her thoughts of how to employ clarity skills.

Sally mentioned that stating her objectives in the target language was good practice for her own proficiency. In addition to teacher proficiency, stating
objectives was found to influence students’ responsibility, the quality of their
produced work, and vocabulary growth as noted by Ana, Sally, and Tracy:

One time when I stated the objectives I wrote it on the board. And what happened was we ran behind because I was over-prepared. And I wrote the homework on the board with the objectives. And the next day, they did it although we didn’t cover it, because it was on the board. (Ana, focus group interview)

And those that never paid attention before paid attention or at least had their plan books and wrote down what was going on, what their homework was. And then it was like by the third week I’d have it in Spanish, the words that they knew like repasar. They were like “repeat or review” and it was right. Vocabulary, vocabulario. They knew it. So they got extra vocabulary besides the survey vocabulary. (Tracy, focus group interview)

I really do see the need for stating objectives to keep the students on task and also to keep them doing what they need to do because I have already painfully experienced stating objectives and restating them and then receiving unsatisfactory work. But for the majority of the time, once you have stated what you want clearly, you generally are able to keep the class on task. And I have really been able to see a difference in students’ work when I have been clear from when I have not. (Sally, journal entry, week 4)

Differences Noted When Clarity Skills Were Used

The twelve student teachers also provided evidence that they noted differences in their lessons when they planned for and used the clarity skills of stating objectives, using examples, summarizing, and using a combination of clarity skills. The student teachers found that use of clarity skills helped them to maintain a disciplined classroom:

You have to be clear in giving instruction so that the class will be the least disruptive so that they understand. You wouldn’t have
any problem... Just being clear in giving directions helped me a lot in eliminating discipline problems, disruptive behavior. Just stating the objective at the beginning of class, they know what to do. (Ana, focus group interview)

Max, Sally, and Maria agreed with Ana on the reported relationship between discipline and clarity. Max reported feeling that he "had better control" as did Sally, who noticed that her students were on task when clarity skills were used. Maria found that when she used the clarity skills, her classes "would flow better and I could get done what I wanted that day" because the students were on task (focus-group interviews). More specifically, Maria mentioned that the use of objectives helped her classes make the transition to the computer lab on the assigned lab days more smoothly. The objective helped to focus her students, as mentioned in an above situation, and she noticed that they did not misbehave or become off task on the days when they moved to the computer lab to complete their writing assignments. Other student teachers agreed that the flow of the class was improved by using clarity skills. For example:

If you're going to speak in the target language and you're stating your objectives and maybe writing them on the board, that gives them a guide of what's going to go on activity after activity. And then when they come in, they won't ask you "What are we doing today? Are we singing? Are we playing a game?" It's written on the board so all they have to do is look. And it made the beginning of the period go by more smoothly than if they're all coming in asking "What are we doing?" (Tracy, focus group interview)

Kelly found that the use of summary had the same impact on her lessons that objectives had in the two above examples: "I have noticed that when I begin
class with a summary and then lead into what we are going to do today that
things do tend to flow much nicer" (Kelly, journal entry, week 6).

Ana reported feeling that her use of a combination of clarity skills would
assist her students in meeting their goals and in preparation for the final
examination at the end of the term:

...underlining certain things and repeating important things...
students focus on them. Test scores will be better because they
remembered what we wrote on the board, what the comparisons
and contrasts were. During final review they could remember what
we discussed. (focus group interview)

In addition to noticing the consequences clarity use has for their students,
the student teachers mentioned that their perceptions of their own teaching
improved when they planned for and used clarity skills. In particular, they
noticed that using a combination of skills helped them become better
 communicators of the content during the presentation of material:

I feel more confident about the actual presentation of new concepts
and it was partially due to the clarity training that we received. I now
look at the concept that I teach for things such as main points,
similarities and differences, and step by step processes. (Kelly)

My ability to communicate the subject matter in a logical manner
has improved a great deal this quarter. I stated the objectives so that
the students knew exactly what they would be learning and what
was expected of them. I introduced a topic and used examples and
repeated a lot during the period and I also summarized
periodically so that the students would have some reinforcement of
the material continually throughout the lesson.
(Cindy, final reflection/journal entry)

Another theme that emerged from the commentaries of the twelve student
teachers was the influence of supervision on their use of clarity skills.
Statements related to this influence ranged from the observer’s ability to point out to the student teacher which clarity skills were used and what s/he did to implement them, to a reported feeling of accountability by the student teachers to use the clarity skills in the presence of the observer(s). Many statements regarding the clarity skills and supervision also provided evidence that the university supervisors and peer coaches aided student teachers in their adaptation of clarity skills. This theme is addressed and supported by examples in a later section of this chapter.

The peer-coaching arrangement also contributed to one student teacher’s ability to notice that frequent summaries and statements of objectives given by her peer before separate activities were helpful for her to follow along with the lesson and learn content. Although Spanish was not a language spoken by Kelly, she reported that she was able to notice how student understanding was enhanced when these clarity skills were used:

What I liked best was the objectives being stated before each activity and the constant summaries. I was learning myself and it felt good (Kelly, journal entry, week six).

Discussion

The data and themes presented above support the helpfulness of clarity skills implementation in student teachers’ preactive and interactive decision making, and refer to how clarity skills were related to both teaching in general and foreign/second language teaching. First, in contrast to a previous section in which students’ struggles with objectives and summaries were reported, the
above section presented students' viewpoints on how objectives were useful to them. The consequences were manifested in students' on task behavior, engagement with the assigned work, and fewer student interruptions or off task behaviors. It is interesting to note here that informing students of lesson objectives was one of the skills that student teachers listed as having trouble integrating into their teaching because it had not been a natural part of their teaching repertoires. However, other student teachers used this skill as a strategy to keep students engaged in the assigned work and reported that they achieved their teaching goals in less time than it seemed to take when objectives were not mentioned. This finding indicates that student teachers may have adopted the use of some clarity skills in response to stressful events.

According to Abebe and Solomon (1997), discipline and working with unmotivated students are causes of stress during the student teaching practicum. Thus, in addition to using this skill as a means to organize the instructional content for students as outlined in the research on clarity skills (Metcalf, 1989; Cruickshank & Metcalf, 1992), in some cases stating objectives appeared to be a classroom routine used by student teachers in response to students' off task behavior in class. Also, these student teachers seemed to adapt this classroom routine to provide stability in their teaching methodology and provide students with a familiar daily routine, making the students aware of their expectations and plans. Although the use of routines is recommended in methodology textbooks for elementary school teachers (Cruickshank, Bainer, &
Metcalf, 1995), this routine seemed to have value for these secondary student teachers.

As a result of a clear statement of objectives, students appeared to be aware of the parts and purpose of the lessons, sometimes referred to as the itinerary (Saphier & Gower, 1987). After having provided the lesson's itinerary, student teachers reported students' acceptance of more personal responsibility, fewer oral interruptions and questions, and a smooth flow to lesson sequence. One student teacher mentioned that when objectives were written on the board, students might also realize what they should expect for the end of the year review and final exam.

Regarding interactive teaching, student teachers reported that listing objectives helped them focus on the goals set for the class in order to keep their comprehension check questions relevant to lesson goals and realistic for student achievement. This reported value suggests that novice teachers also needed to be reminded of the lesson's itinerary and to use their objectives as a strategy to stay focused on their goals. The objectives also seemed to guide the student teachers' interactive decision making skills for lesson adaptation, checking students' knowledge, and for maintaining the teacher's focus.

Second, student teachers' comments on the use of clarity skills not only contained evidence that clarity skills were of use for general teaching purposes, in which teachers of all content areas are involved, but also demonstrated that student teachers used the clarity skills in relation to the foreign/second language
subject matter that they taught. Student teachers mentioned the need to consider the subject matter when engaged in the preactive decision making process. In addition to objectives and summaries, preactive use of clarity skills appeared to be in the form of examples that helped student teachers anticipate students’ questions regarding assignments by providing them with an acceptable model.

This use of preactive planning for clarity skills based on an anticipation of students’ questions and concerns figures in the transformation category of Shulman’s Model of Pedagogical Reasoning (1987). This category of pedagogical reasoning describes the preparation of material and activities based on a familiarity of students’ conceptual understanding of the content. Shulman refers to novices’ learning to represent content to students as an overwhelming task. Student teachers who were involved in peer coaching often identified their peer coach as a source of assistance for the integration of objectives and examples. Thus, technical feedback was apparently provided not only for matters of general methodology or how to use the skills, but also for the integration of clarity skills specific to foreign language topics. For example, book examples were supplemented with student teachers’ created examples to explain grammar topics for instruction beyond the information given in the texts. Consequently, the student teachers examined their content knowledge in efforts to supply more material and to decide what to emphasize, repeat, and reinforce.
Some recent literature regarding the knowledge base for teaching criticized the process-product teacher education research of the 1970s for its disregard of how content influences the acts of teaching (Hammadou, 1990; Howey, 1996; Jarvis & Taylor, 1990; McDiarmid, 1990; Shulman, 1987). The data here suggest that, unlike what some critics say about the generic nature of teacher education research generated skills, such as wait time and time on task, clarity skills were skills that teachers used in response to a careful consideration of their subject matter.

The knowledge base of these beginning teachers appeared to be one of both content and process. The use of clarity skills seemed to connect the process of teaching with the foreign/second language content. Previous research states that clarity skills can be implemented by teachers regardless of subject matter. Student teachers’ comments on the usefulness of the clarity skills for their teaching revealed that planning for the use of clarity skills obliged them to carefully review the content to be presented in terms of its main points and logical ordering of content and examples presented. The data provided by the student teachers here suggest that clarity skills such as informing students of lesson objectives, repeating important points, use of examples, summarizing, and others were chosen by teachers because of the knowledge base they possessed in the content area. Furthermore, these clarity skills may be linked to the time spent in preactive planning such that future clarity studies carried out in specific content areas should focus on the depth and breadth of the teachers’
content knowledge to determine if differences in one’s knowledge base influence the use of clarity skills implemented.

As summarized above, data in the form of the student teachers’ reporting from the focus group interviews, weekly journals, and questionnaires provided evidence that the student teachers were able to integrate clarity skills into their teaching repertoires. A combination of rater data supported by instances of student teachers’ perceptions and experiences with the use of clarity skills demonstrates that these skills, validated by general teacher effectiveness research, were pertinent to the teaching of foreign and second languages. Findings on clarity skills in the foreign and second language classrooms of the student teachers in this study were related to how the clarity skills were implemented, the purposes they served according to student teachers, and the beneficial consequences as well as difficulties that resulted from the attempts to use clarity skills as perceived by the student teachers. For example, student teachers used the L1 and the L2 orally to implement clarity behaviors. At times, student teachers implemented the clarity behaviors in written form, such as stating objectives in the L2 while referring to objectives listed on the board to ensure students’ comprehension. Individual student teachers implemented the clarity skills in different ways. Appendix H provides a summary of the skills used by each student teacher as well as the method of implementation.

Clarity skills were reported to be useful for foreign/second language teaching in grammatical presentations particularly when a combination of clarity
skills was implemented, and were reported to aid student teachers in their maintenance of classroom management procedures. Lack of time for classroom routines and increased teaching responsibility were challenges present that hindered clarity skills' implementation by student teachers. As described in sections above, not all skills were used in every lesson and, at the end of the practicum, the student teachers reported the need to improve their use of clarity skills. The words of one peer-coached student teacher seem to justify the need for clarity skills training in the education of prospective teachers of foreign and second languages:

The emphasis on clarity skills was very important for us as teachers. Everything was interrelated and very important to use in the foreign language classroom... these were good because they gave us all the same skills to enhance. When I first began, I used some clarity skills but not all. As the quarter went on I was able to use the clarity skills that I didn't use before and enhance the skills that I already possessed. The clarity skills were something that all of the teachers needed to use and gave us something to build on through the entire quarter. I feel very good about what I have done with the clarity skills this quarter. I still need to work on some but ...I think that I have had a lot of growth regarding the clarity skills this term. (Cindy, week 10)

Research Question Three

3. In a peer coaching program implemented within a foreign language student teaching practicum, what are the similarities and differences in the planning discussions of peer-coached student teachers during pre-observation audiotaped conferences and in written plans by the nonpeer-coached student teachers?
The third research question in this study focused on the preactive planning for lessons by the student teachers. The nonpeer-coached student teachers were asked to write a pre-observation written task for their university supervisor (US) and the peer-coached student teachers held pre-observation conferences, each with the same directions. In place of the audiotaped pre-observation conference that the peer-coached group held, the nonpeer-coached group provided a written account of their purposes in and expectations for planning their lessons. These pre-observation conferences and written accounts were compared. The raters coded the transcripts and statements with the categories of Shulman’s Model of Pedagogical Reasoning (1987) and then the researcher used inductive analysis to further investigate the student teachers’ pedagogical content knowledge.

Pre-observation written tasks were collected by the US from the six members of the nonpeer-coached supervisory group each week of the practicum upon the US’s arrival for the required observation. This section synthesizes the similarities and differences in the uses and characteristics of the peer-coached student teachers’ pre-observation conferences and the nonpeer-coached student teachers’ written tasks.

The pre-observation written tasks showed that student teachers in the nonpeer-coached group made statements that were coded according to Shulman’s Model of Pedagogical Reasoning (1987). In the four weeks of data analysis, nonpeer-coached student teachers included statements referring to
two, three, four, and one of the six categories of Shulman’s model. Appendix I displays the categories of the model that were coded by raters as having appeared in the written tasks and audiotaped pre-observation conferences of the two supervisory groups of student teachers. For the nonpeer-coached group, coding showed that these student teachers treated the five categories of comprehension, instruction, transformation, evaluation, and reflection over the four weeks of data analysis.

The coded pre-observation conferences of the peer-coached group showed a more varied use of the six categories of Shulman’s Model of Pedagogical Reasoning (1987). In fact, the number of comments coded according to the categories of pedagogical reasoning by the peer-coached group greatly outnumbered those coded in the nonpeer-coached student teachers’ pre-observation written tasks. A total of 27 comments pertaining to Shulman’s six categories of pedagogical reasoning were coded in the written tasks by the nonpeer-coached group. In contrast, 247 comments were coded in the pre-observation conferences of the peer-coached student teachers.

For the four weeks of data analysis, five, six, five, and four categories of the Shulman Model were found in the pre-observation conferences of peer-coached student teachers. New comprehension, the sixth category of Shulman’s Model, was the only category not coded in the pre-observation written tasks that was present in the pre-observation conferences of the peer-coached teachers. According to Shulman, this category refers to learnings teachers make from their
own teaching experience regarding purposes, students, themselves, teaching, and the subject matter. In the conferences of these six peer-coached student teachers, statements of new comprehension related to student teachers' own content knowledge, knowledge of students' comprehension of content, and management of the order of classroom events. Examples are:

The second confusion for these prepositions is that they can either be followed by dative or accusative...It depends on the sentence whether it can be dative or accusative. And I'm beginning to understand the mechanics of this just through teaching it. (Kelly)

It is better for us to go over the homework first and then do the presentation on Spain. Because they keep wanting to ask him questions. I felt like a bad guy stopping it at half an hour. “Okay, it’s time to go over the homework.” And they’re like, “Yeah. Right.” Whereas seventh period was excellent. They went over the homework, got through it, and the reward was listening to him talk about Spain. So I learned my lesson that first time. (Pat)

The nonpeer-coached student teachers appeared to use the written tasks as an opportunity to request specific feedback and to provide concrete descriptive and narrative information. The peer-coached student teachers appeared to use the time not only to request feedback but also to plan, reflect, and be interactive. First, the student teachers in the nonpeer-coached group asked their US to focus her observations on specific aspects of their teaching about which they wanted feedback. For example:

Please pay attention to my clarity skills and transitions. (Lori, week 9)

I would like you to focus on students’ participation. (Ana, week 9)
Over the course of the four weeks of data analysis, the researcher found that the nonpeer-coached student teachers requested feedback from their US on the following processes of their teaching: classroom management strategies; transitions between activities; lesson sequence; lesson pacing; strategies to deal with lack of students’ participation and target language use; clarity skills; maintaining target language use in presentations on grammar and culture; momentum; amount of teacher talk; response to students’ cues.

The peer-coached teachers used the conference as a time to state a focus for peer observation and feedback, although to a lesser extent. Topics mentioned by peer coaches in their requests for feedback included: clarity skills; clarity of pronunciation; target language use; transitions; wait time.

A second use of the pre-observation written task by the nonpeer-coached student teachers was as an opportunity to provide the US with a description of their classes. At times, the descriptions provided information such as the number of students in a class and their grade levels. Other times, the descriptions referred to the behavior of the students and the student teachers’ expectations regarding their behavior:

This is one of my smaller classes, but loud and talkative when they want to be. I believe they will be good again with you in the room. (Tracy, week nine)

This class tends to be very talkative but very friendly with each other. The students seem to enjoy this topic, they’re very energetic and all seem to participate. I had trouble preparing this lesson using the clarity skills when teaching vocabulary. (Tracy, week seven)
In one instance of these descriptions, Tracy used the pre-observation written task to describe one student in particular:

    He is a very shy and timid person when answering questions. He never raises his hand when I go around the room for participation, he stumbles over the answer and just looks down.” (week five)

Third, these pre-observation written tasks were used to provide the US with the lesson plan for the scheduled class observation: steps they would follow, topics they would cover, and at times, examples of their lesson objectives:

    Teacher will ask student questions about chapter “Rex” in Le Petit Nicolas (Lori, week seven)

    Discuss how these verbs are different (allé, parti, sorti, venu) (Sharon, week seven)

    Students can use correct consonants when they count minutes. (Difference between hun and pun)
    Students can use correct consonants when they count money. (Difference between sen and zen as well as among hyaku, pyaku, and byaku) (Max, week nine)

By week seven of the data collection, two student teachers who wrote lesson plans as part of their pre-observation written task included the purposes of their lessons within their objectives:

    Students can see the difference of i-adjective and na-adjective. (Affirmative and negative form of adjective) (Max)

    Students will identify the animals with their habitats by working on a worksheet in order to check their comprehension. (Tracy)

This finding contrasts with the pre-observation conferences of the peer-coached student teachers who stated purposes and objectives during the first week of
data analysis. Purposes stated for the peer-coached student teachers' lessons included statements of overall purposes as well as the content to be covered:

My objectives are that the students be able to know and define what an indirect object is and be able to write out and speak using these forms of the indefinite and definite articles for indirect objects because the forms change in German. What we're concentrating on right now are the indirect objects, part of the dative. The new concept that I hope to get to today is the prepositions and to finish with the verbs that take the dative case. (Kelly, week five)

The lesson that you are going to observe is going to be about indirect object pronouns and it is a continuation of the lesson that I started yesterday. (Maria, week two)

At times, when student teachers stated the purposes for their lessons, they also included the rationale behind the choice of their activities and methods:

I want to do some spelling writing exercises, like either on the board or at their desks like a spelling bee thing where they have to conjugate the verb and then spell it correctly. This is important in French since there's so many letters that are silent. (Anne, week seven)

In contrast to the pre-observation written task of the nonpeer-coached student teachers, when the peer-coached student teachers explained the purposes, rationales, and plans for their classes, they did so in exact terms with specific plans of how they wanted to accomplish their goals in the delivery portion of their lessons. The pre-observation conferences appeared to function as a practice opportunity for the observed student teachers to recite their plans by listing activities and assignments. Statements regarding the activities they included ranged from general comments such as, "going over vocabulary
words," "reviewing the comparative and superlative," and "I will be discussing the homework, discussing any questions, answering any doubts or questions," to more specific comments telling their peer specifically how they planned to carry out instruction, achieve their goals, and complete activities.

Peer interaction seemed to elicit from the student teachers a more detailed explanation of their lesson plans. The language used by student teachers at times included reciting the exact words they planned to use in their examples while teaching. Examples are:

Then I'm going to ask the questions, "Was haben wir gestern gelernt?" "Was haben wir gestern gemacht?" Now they know the word 'gestern' and hopefully they'll get that. If they don't, I'll say "What is an indirect object?" Or first, "What is a direct object?" and then an indirect object. Write an example up on the board. Next step. "We talked about special words that take an 'n' when used as an indirect object. Der Herr, der Junge..." (Kelly)

I'll pass out cards to every single student which will have a noun on it and I'll ask a question like "Quién compró la guitarra?" and the student will say the correct response using the direct object pronoun, "la compré." (Cindy)

As part of this practice use of the pre-observation conference, statements coded as pertaining to the comprehension category of Shulman's Model of Pedagogical Reasoning (1987) were found to explain the content of the foreign language to their peer coach who did not teach the same language. Explanation of content took place either when student teachers followed the lesson plan recited by their peer and asked her questions about content, or when, in
preparation for one's lesson, the student teacher explained an important feature of the lesson to be observed:

For this section we learned verbs with irregular yo forms in the present. So they have to know that the yo form of *poner* is *pongo*, the yo form of *dar* is *doy*, and the yo form of *salir* is *salgo*, and then *ver* is *veo*. (Pat)

The explanation of content with the use of comprehension coded statements was also present in the pre-observation written tasks of one nonpeer-coached student teacher. Max, a native speaker and student teacher of Japanese, used the pre-observation written task to explain to his US, an individual unfamiliar with Asian languages, the differences between telling time in English and Japanese: "In Japanese we do not have to distinguish the minutes in time from the minutes in length. However, we have to distinguish the o'clock hour from the hour although we use the same Kanji."

Collaborating on ideas for teaching appeared to be another purpose of this pre-observation conference. Conversations in which peers explained the purposes and content of their lessons and the sequence of their plans seemed to provide the opportunity for peers to work together to finalize lesson plans. At times the interaction between peers resulted in the peer coach making a suggestion for an entire activity to include in her peer's lesson. For example, having explained to her peer that she planned to review the preterite and imperfect tenses with workbook exercises, Sally found herself listening to Maria's suggestion on how she could extend the review by involving her
students in an activity that would not be based solely on their text, “to get out of
the book” and practice more since it was the end of the year and the “students
are tired of the book.” She suggested having students practice both the preterite
and imperfect by practicing the aspectual differences of the past tense,
contrasting what they used to do when on summer vacations with what they did
only once during a vacation:

Maybe a good review for them to review the difference between
the preterite and imperfect will be...okay “When I was a child, cuando
era niño, what did I used to do on my summer vacation?” Okay, so
riding bicycles, corría bicicleta, jugaba con mis amigos, whatever.
And then, “what I did last year?” Compare it. “Well last year I
probably trabajé...viajé con mi familia, pasé en carro, fui a Florida,”
you know? Because that way they can see the time line difference
between the imperfect and the preterite.

Within the pre-observation conference, Sally accepted Maria’s idea and said
that she planned to incorporate it into her review lesson, mentioning that it would
help her “see if they’re getting it, comprehension. Really understanding it or not.”

The discussion continued with María supplying additional ideas on how to
conduct the review:

And you can also review the person. You know, again like
remember like you did with the present verbs? “Okay, we have
how many students that used to ride bicycles or rode bicycles?
We have veinte estudiantes that corrían.” And then you can
review the numbers too. I think it can be used because it’s
really getting the students involved.

This discussion led to the comment coded as a reflection statement made by
Sally who remembered a similar activity she had used in a previous class and
the value she placed on it:
I think it becomes more clear to them because it becomes real. It’s a part of their life so they have to think about it.

Maria seemed to take part ownership of her peer’s teaching by expressing interest in her peer’s use of her idea: “Okay. You can do it. Let’s try it. We’ll see if it works or not.”

In other incidents of joint planning, peers helped each other refine planned ideas. For example, Kelly planned a game to review lesson vocabulary. Pat helped Kelly plan the steps of her game by clarifying its purpose and requiring correct pronunciation in order to award a correct response:

So, it’s working on the pronunciation and the knowledge of the vocabulary. Okay. Sounds good. So, I’ll say the word in German. They’ll have to repeat the word and say the definition then.

Pre-observation discussion also led to opportunities in which the peer reminded the student teacher of the need to include pertinent material into the lesson plan. Joint preactive planning resulted in the following example of Sally’s reminder of reflexive verbs to Maria:

Sally: And will you review the *me, te, se*?

Maria: Uh huh, *sí sí*. I also need to do it in reflexives because when we use the reflexives, we need to have the pronouns there. Yeah, another thing I wanted to review. I am going to need, like you said, to give more examples.

Peer discussion in pre-observation conferences reminded student teachers of their goals and objectives. Kelly was concerned about ensuring students’ mastery of concepts. Her peer helped her clarify that her goal was to
review and not teach the topic as she would in an initial presentation of the material, thus keeping her goals for the lesson realistic:

Pat: Your job tomorrow should not be to teach. It’s to review....You want to help the people that didn’t get it the first time. But, you know, you spent a lot of time on it the first time. So this should be a refresher.

Kelly: Right. So just keep it as short as possible. Five minute review at the most.

In other instances, peer sharing led to the observed peer adapting the coach’s feedback to fit her own goals and the characteristics of her class. While explaining a vocabulary lesson, Sally stated her plan to bring in some personal clothing as props to teach vocabulary. Maria suggested that she pass out the items of clothing to the group of students and give them commands in the target language to trade items as an exercise in listening comprehension. Although Sally did not incorporate this exact idea offered by her peer, she did explain in the pre-observation conference how she could adapt it to her class:

So maybe in some of my earlier classes I could do that but not in this one because it is so big. But maybe I could do something else like walk over to their desks and have three items and say “escoge,” you know?

In addition to uses for the pre-observation tasks, two characteristics contrasted with the pre-observation conferences of the peer-coached student teachers. The first was a concern for classroom management and discipline strategies present through the mid-point of the ten-week practicum. In statements coded as instruction, student teachers in the nonpeer-coached
supervisory group made statements regarding classroom management situations and the strategies they employed in response to students’ behavior:

I have behavior problems with most of the students...To eliminate disruptions I made two rules and threatened to write up whoever doesn’t follow them. The first two days I even wrote the rules on the board as a reminder... I tried to give individualized attention to the last two students at the back row. I worked with one of them and at least he is not disruptive anymore. (Ana, week five)

Some of them were being quite disruptive and disrespectful of me and other students. I have been giving them lunch detentions with me and time outs. I would like you to pay special attention to discipline strategies. (Lori, week five)

Regarding discipline and interaction with students, Lori reported feeling that her use of French caused her students to misbehave because they were not accustomed to consistent use of French for communicative purposes before she began her student teaching practicum. In her pre-observation written task she made her supervisor aware that she found it necessary to give her students “suggestions on how to listen” and that she did not want “to resort to speaking English with them.”

A second characteristic of the pre-observation written tasks was the evidence of concern in week seven for adapting plans and methods to students’ needs, interests, and ability levels. Prior to the seventh week of data analysis, this concern was not mentioned. Adapting their teaching decisions and methods to meet their learners’ needs included the use of both general teaching and foreign language specific methodologies in comments coded as transformation.
A statement made by Ana reflected the concern that she cover the material so that all students were exposed to it in at least summary form:

**Last Thursday many students missed the class. They were excused to participate in a function, so I am reviewing what they missed by summarizing everything on their worksheet.**

The following comment from Sharon’s data related to the challenges of teaching grammar in a manner and at a pace that would encourage both more able and less able students to want to learn the subject matter:

*I’m trying to move through this heavy grammar load in a step by step manner - to move little by little so I don’t lose too many students. I hope the stories and the songs give the students something to link their learning to, more interesting than straight grammar.*

Lori’s written task included the description of a final project her students were creating: a written activity describing a trip to a francophone city. She stated what she needed to teach at this final point in the school year but that she struggled with how to accomplish it:

-Re verbs is the only grammatical point that they have not covered that my other French I has. I’m having trouble deciding how to teach it.

Although the nonpeer-coached student teachers showed evidence of adapting their plans and methods to reach their learners’ needs, statements of transformation were not coded until the written pre-observation conferences of week seven of data analysis. Statements coded in this category relate to the teacher’s preparation of the subject matter in ways that make it most comprehensible to one’s students. In contrast, the concern for adapting
instruction to their learners was present from the first week of data collection in the pre-observation conferences of the peer-coached student teachers.

Statements coded as transformation were the most abundant category used in the pre-observation conferences for week five, the mid-point of the practicum. For example, of the eleven comments made by Maria in her pre-observation conference, eight were coded as transformation statements. A total of 117 transformation statements were coded among the pre-observation conference transcripts of the six peer-coached student teachers. Examples of student teachers’ use of the transformation category during the weeks of data analysis reflected their examination of students’ background knowledge and the content to be covered. Student teachers provided evidence that they chose content and structured their presentations in terms of this background knowledge:

I think what I’ll do is I’ll do a little review of indirect objects before I go over the homework just to make sure they understand because we had to go through it pretty quickly on Friday. (Cindy)

The homework involves two crossword puzzles. One deals with vocabulary and the other deals with -er and -ir verbs. It’s kind of good that we went over the review of the -ar preterite verbs because now they’re just moving on to -er and -ir, but it’s still the same basis that I’m teaching. I’m reviewing without them knowing it, you know? (Pat)

Student teachers considered how the methods they or their peer chose could help them prepare students for future assessments and understand the level of their students’ conceptual attainment:

And then once they get done, you can have them put their answers on the board. Like do one of the suggestions. Each of
the students can write one. And then you will see all kinds of mistakes. And from there you can review it. (Maria, week 5)

So we're going to just start going through the chapter and reviewing and going over the workbook exercises. So today this will give them the opportunity to be able to ask any questions and it will give me the chance to review irregular preterites with them. (Sally, week 7)

One aspect of the transformation category as explained by Shulman is tailoring the instruction or presentation of ideas to students based on an understanding of the students in a particular class, rather than to all students in general. The peer-coached student teachers tailored information and activities as appropriate to meet their learning objectives:

The students are having a lot of trouble answering questions and then answering in the right form, like asking in the 'you' form and they're answering in the 'you' form. So we are still going over that. So they're going to go over the homework, write it out on the board, that way everyone can see. (Cindy, week two)

But this is the first time that they had these expressions and they were complaining about that. So there was also the problem that there were a lot of words. There were like four words on there that meant 'comfortable.' You could use one of those four words for it. So I couldn't think of how I was going to do that 'comfortable' with the 'g,' and then 'comfortable' with the 'a' and how I could get them to do that. So I decided to say the German and have them give me the meaning for it. (Kelly, week two)

Another difference noted between the two groups' treatment of adapting content was that the peer-coached student teachers used past experiences as a means to support their teaching decisions for the lesson to be observed. Such statements were coded as reflection statements, which were explanations or comments grounded in evidence from their own classroom experiences. For
example, Pat explained why she decided not to provide time for students to ask questions about a grammar topic presented:

Instead of just asking if there are questions in general, I asked ten people, “Do you understand?” When I went through it the first time, this guy said he didn’t understand and then one kid raised his hand and said, “Okay, now that I think about it, why is it that way?” (Pat)

Two concerns related to foreign language content and pedagogy appeared in the conferences of the peer-coached group that did not appear in the written tasks of the nonpeer-coached group. First, the peer-coached student teachers expressed a concern that they include language practice in more than one modality. In both self-report data and the pre-observation conferences over the course of the practicum, the peer-coached student teachers expressed the view that language teaching and language learning should include examples in both written and oral modes, not one mode singularly:

Yeah, because my kids, well if I do too much just orally and I try to move them through it and they don’t get enough examples, then I really think they struggle with doing homework. That’s a good idea. (Sally)

At times, the concern to practice more than one language skill extended beyond writing and speaking to reading, listening, and culture. For example, in a German culture class, Pat recognized that her peer integrated all language skills into a lesson on German table habits and etiquette in a lesson that included a video. Her plan to show parts of the video and review pertinent vocabulary, grammatical expressions for ordering, formal and informal
commands, and customs led to Pat’s positive evaluation of her peer’s lesson plan:

I like how you are integrating culture. You know, you’re not just saying cultural things, you’re not tearing them away from what they’re watching. You’re using something they are watching to teach culture.

According to Pat, Kelly’s planning allowed her to provide “what was important about the vocabulary and different grammar points in an interactive way.”

A second difference found in pre-observation conference data was the expression of the intent to include physical activity in language practice:

I have a dress up activity where I have boy and girl figures on a poster and I give the students clues so that they can find out what the people need to wear. And every person has an item of clothing made of poster board and they have to tell me the color too. I’ll ask them the color and they have to put it on the boy or girl. (Cindy)

Discussion

The length and detail of the planning statements made by the nonpeer-coached student teachers suggest that they did not find this exercise to be one of the more helpful aspects of the practicum experience, opting instead to explain their plans and expectations for their lessons retroactively with their US in the post-observation conference. Pre-observation written statements ranged in length from one sentence requests for the US to focus her observation on a particular teaching aspect to one page lesson plans that included descriptions of class sizes and characteristics. Longer statements were those providing the
descriptions of particular classroom management concerns, which tended to include the student teachers' input on strategies taken to improve the discipline situations with which student teachers struggled, or later statements that addressed the concern to adapt methods and materials to students' ability levels and interests.

The finding that there were fewer statements of pedagogical reasoning coded with Shulman's Model (1987) in nonpeer-coached pre-observation written statements than in pre-observation conferences of the peer-coached student teachers suggested that the class descriptions, requests for US observation focus, and lesson plans for which the nonpeer student teachers used their statements did not elicit in-depth pedagogical reasoning as in the conferences of the peer-coached group. There are two possible reasons to explain the lack of detail in the pre-observation written tasks. First, the tasks of preparing materials, planning instruction, teaching, grading and other non-instructional duties that the student teachers acquired may have prevented them from producing more detailed documents. In a preservice teaching study investigating stress, Fogarty and Yarrow (1994) named the newly acquired heavy work load as the primary cause of stress among student teachers. Several student teachers produced these documents in their own handwriting on the day of the observations. Max was the only nonpeer-coached student teacher to prepare word processed pre-observation statements. All others were hand written and appeared to be prepared just prior to the US's visit: 'This morning was slow and disjointed. I am
working on keeping the lesson moving” (Chip, week two). Thus, stress induced from the teachers’ schedules and work loads may have prevented them from producing more detailed pre-observation written tasks.

Student teachers are typically concerned about survival in the classroom related to completing daily teaching, interacting with students, and being successful. This concern may explain why the nonpeer-coached student teachers did not produce in-depth statements. As outlined by Caruso (1977) in the literature on student teaching, prospective teachers pass through six stages during the practicum, the first of which is characterized by anxieties about their own ability to complete their requirements as individuals who are new to the setting.

In addition to survival reasons and heavy work load, the fact that previous early field experiences did not include the assignment of a pre-observation written task may be a reason that these student teachers did not produce tasks that elicited statements of pedagogical reasoning according to the model proposed by Shulman (1987). Those who used the written task as a basic lesson plan may have done so because in previous field experiences they had been required to produce a lesson plan for observed lessons.

The peer-coached student teachers’ use of the pre-observation conference as a time to rehearse their lessons by reciting what they planned to do and how they planned to reach their goals appeared to have created the conditions such that their conferences contrasted with the written tasks of the
nonpeer-coached teachers. The interactive nature of the conferences elicited from the peer-coached student teachers' statements in which they provided the purposes of their lessons and rationales for the choices they made regarding methods. In describing their purposes, rationales, and lessons, peer-coached student teachers informed their peer coach interlocutors about their plans to achieve their goals and complete activities (117 coded statements of transformation). The ongoing nature of the pre- and post-observation meetings and the presence of an interlocutor who responded with questions and comments provided the context for student teachers to use more exact language and to make reflection statements in which they recreated past events to provide support for their teaching decisions.

Nonpeer-coached student teachers, on the other hand, did not make explicit statements of how they planned to achieve goals (ten coded statements of transformation) unless they stated strategies for classroom management purposes. The fact that the pre-observation written task was not interactive and conversational appears to explain why nonpeer-coached student teachers did not state purposes or make explicit statements coded as adaptation until week seven of the practicum.

The non-interactive nature of the pre-observation written task may provide the reason that the nonpeer-coached group of student teachers used the written task as an opportunity to provide the US with a description of their classes and to request the US to focus the observation on certain aspects of
their teaching. The more detailed discussions of the peer-coached student teachers in their pre-observation discussions may have been the reason that these student teachers did not make as many explicit requests for a focus on aspects of their teaching, preferring to explain the lesson sequence and activities in order to inform the post-observation conference.

The statements of pedagogical reasoning coded with Shulman's Model of Pedagogical Reasoning (1987) showed that the nonpeer-coached student teachers made fewer statements coded according to this model and that peer-coached student teachers, in their stated concerns and plans for adaptation of methods and content, made statements coded as transformation to a much greater extent from the beginning of the practicum. Student teachers did not indicate concerns about what to teach. Rather, the use of the pre-observation conference as a time to recite their plans in preparation for their classes demonstrated that the peer-coached student teachers exhibited concerns about methods and how to carry out teaching tasks.

According to Ducharme and Ducharme (1996), "prospective teachers are consumed with how-to-do-it matters." In each of the pre-observation conferences in which at least two categories of Shulman's model were coded, the two categories were those of instruction and transformation. In such statements, the pre-observation conferences were accounts of what the student teachers hoped to achieve and how they planned to do so. Transformation statements are those that describe teachers' decisions to represent the content such that the learners
comprehend it. Instruction statements are those that describe observable acts of teaching and classroom routines (See Appendices E and I).

What is perhaps most noteworthy from the pre-observation conferences is that the peer-coached student teachers reported feeling more encouraged and better prepared to teach their lessons after meeting with their peer. As presented in the findings section for research question three, the peer-coached student teachers supplied their peers with ideas for their lessons, helped refine their peer's implementation of an activity or an explanation, and helped their peer remain focused on lesson goals. The data produced by the student teachers in this group supports the recent call to organize cohorts of prospective teachers to study teaching because teachers who analyze the acts of teaching together are more equipped to find solutions to teaching problems or concerns (McIntyre, Bird, Foxx, 1996). According to Feiman-Nemser and Remillard (1996), much of what teachers need to learn occurs only in situ. The ongoing nature of peer coaching together with the clinical supervision cycle allowed peer coaches to understand each other's concerns in context and extended the teacher education process by providing novices with a "wider repertoire of teaching strategies," helping them cope with the many concerns of teaching (Darling-Hammond & Cobb, 1996). Their conversations provided evidence that, for the peer-coached group, anticipating their lessons was not an individual endeavor.

The collegial aspect of the pre-observation conference demonstrated that, while preparing for their lessons, peer coaches shared their own learnings from
experience during the practicum in statements that were coded as new comprehension. The ability to reflect on teaching actions and students’ responses with the goal of improving one’s teaching is part of having an “adequate knowledge base to teach” (Feiman-Nemser & Remiliard, 1996). Shulman (1987) enumerated the types of knowledge that teachers should have: content knowledge; general pedagogical knowledge; curriculum knowledge; pedagogical content knowledge; knowledge of learners and learners’ characteristics; knowledge of educational contexts; and knowledge of educational purposes, ends, and values.

In their pre-observation conferences, the student teachers in the peer-coached group exhibited a knowledge base that consisted of content knowledge, general pedagogical knowledge, knowledge of learners’ and learners’ characteristics, and pedagogical content knowledge. Nonpeer-coached student teachers displayed the same knowledge base in their pre-observation written tasks. The difference between these two groups appears to be that the interactive nature of peer coaching within the clinical supervision cycle allowed the peer-coached group to exercise their preservice knowledge base from the beginning of the practicum whereas the nonpeer-coached groups’ pre-observation written tasks did not include all parts of the knowledge base in the early part of the practicum. Some parts of the knowledge base, such as the concern to adapt methods and materials to their particular groups of students, did not appear until the later portion of the student teaching practicum.
Regarding the supervisory aspect of the student teaching practicum, it was interesting to note that when comprehension statements were coded in both groups' tasks or conferences, the statements were made in the effort to familiarize the US or peer with the structures of the target language, a language not spoken by the observer. This strategy taken by the observed teacher suggests that a supervisor or observer of a foreign/second language teacher does not have to be a speaker of the target language. In other statements in both the written tasks and the pre-observation conferences, methods used by foreign/second language teachers were mentioned. Such methods or strategies included contextualization of the foreign language grammar, personalization of the relevant vocabulary, flash cards, games, authentic materials, and props to teach vocabulary. When concerns in conversations or tasks focused on these aspects specific to foreign/second language teaching, the student teachers in this study required an observer familiar with foreign/second language pedagogy, someone able to provide ideas and feedback on these topics. That the observer might not be a target language speaker did not appear to be an issue with the student teachers in this study.

Research Question Four

4. What are the similarities and differences of audiotaped post-observation conference discussions of student teachers participating in the peer-coached section and those not participating in the peer-coached section?
a. What is the content of these discussions?

b. How is the nature of peer interaction beneficial to student teachers' acquisition of pedagogical content knowledge as classified according to raters' coding of the categories of Shulman's (1987) Model of Pedagogical Reasoning?

In contrast to the pre-observation written tasks prepared by the student teachers in the nonpeer-coached group, their post-observation conference transcripts with their US showed that, over the course of the ten-week practicum, each of the six categories of Shulman's Model was treated. Present in each of the weeks of data analysis were statements expressing their concerns for classroom management, interaction with students, pacing of lesson content, use of the target language, clarity skills, and adapting the content to learners' abilities and characteristics. A total of 200 comments of pedagogical reasoning were coded in the post-observation conferences of the nonpeer-coached group.

Present in the transcribed post-observation conferences of the peer-coached student teachers were 318 statements pertaining to the six categories of Shulman's Model of Pedagogical Reasoning (1987). The topics addressed by the peer-coached student teachers related to classroom management, interactions with students, completion of lesson plans, use of the target language by their students, clarity skills implementation, and the adaptation of methods and the content that was taught. This section synthesizes the
similarities and differences of the post-observation conferences of both nonpeer-coached and the peer-coached groups.

When the US asked about their feelings and perceptions, the nonpeer-coached group addressed their performance in terms of classroom management, implementation of clarity skills, or their own use of the target language and the use of the target language they required of their students. Nonpeer-coached student teachers mentioned classroom management each week in conferences with their US in statements coded as instruction, evaluation, and reflection. They also discussed discipline by naming it as the reason they either did or did not reach their lesson objectives and by describing techniques and strategies they implemented when students’ behavior became an issue for them:

But when it comes to teaching them count of money, the level of noise did go up rapidly. So I really couldn’t stand it anymore. So I shouted. The first time it was not effective and when I start the quiz, they eventually keep their voice down. But it was a really frustrating lesson. I feel like I completed less than 50% of what I initially intended today. (Max, week nine; reflection)

Now I came up with this idea. Writing the rule on the board. Make a rule and write it on the board. I mean, if I tell them “Please,” they wouldn’t listen. I said this five times...the whole week and they wouldn’t listen. (Ana, week seven; reflection)

The student teachers identified making decisions on classroom management techniques as a challenge in the teaching practicum, and they sought suggestions from their US:

Well I don’t know how to punish the whole class when it’s the whole class out of hand. I had been going through the whole elementary thing, you know? “Our mouths are quiet and your
eyes are up here. I need your eyes up here." And finally just one kid wouldn’t do it. I had to tell him and I said it really seriously I wanted to get everyone’s attention. (Sharon, week five; reflection)

Related to the topic of classroom management was the pacing of activities. Nonpeer-coached student teachers reported that too much time spent on an activity could lead to disruptions:

That’s one problem that I know I have. I tend to go too long with activities and so they just they get bored with it. Then I lose it. (Lori, week two; Reflection)

Sharon spoke of the need to stop activities earlier than she had anticipated in order to maintain students’ on task behavior:

I’m always curious about the timing. I mean it’s so awkward to give the people who need more time enough time. And yet keep the other people on task as they will never be on task anyway. So you don’t want to give them five minutes with nothing to do. So I feel like I cut them off a little sooner than they’re comfortable with. And I always wonder if that was really too soon. (week seven; Reflection)

Classroom management was addressed by peer-coached student teachers in the second and ninth weeks of data analysis. Statements coded as evaluation and reflection during the beginning of the practicum referred to either suggestions or praise offered by the peer coach to the observed teacher. When praise was offered to a peer, it referred to students’ attentiveness and ability to focus:

In the beginning of the period I saw you take control of the class. You told them, kids came running to your desk and you told them Un momento. And then you’d tell them siéntense rápido so you could get the class started. So I thought that was really well done. (Sally, week two; Evaluation)
In the ninth week of the practicum, classroom management was reported as the challenge of keeping students on task at the end of the school year, as, in Sally’s words, it was “hard for the students to work at this point and time of the school year.” Like the nonpeer-coached teachers, peer-coached student teachers discussed techniques they had learned to apply during their practicum:

And one thing that worked for me in my German I class is...I said to them, “Now...I would like to take ten minutes to review with you because the review yesterday did not go well.” As I was doing this people were talking, but I just said in a calm voice, “I need everyone to be quiet and everyone to listen. I will not compete with you.” And then slowly things calmed down. People listened. We got to review a few things. (Kelly; Reflection)

Similarly to the concern for pacing activities, the peer-coached student teachers mentioned lesson completion as a challenge in the earlier conference transcripts. In both transcripts and self-report data, Pat and Kelly documented their struggle to complete all activities planned for their individual lessons:

I hate it when it comes down to right at the end and I don’t get enough time to really explain. It’s again, working on my time management. So I don’t know if they really get what they needed to do. Um, so on Monday, we’re going to have to finish writing up the dialogues from today. I just feel rushed. (Kelly; week two)

As the practicum progressed, these same two student teachers reported on interactive teaching decisions through which they gauged the amount of time to spend on activities and the number of examples to include in their lessons:

I think I enjoyed the part where I asked individual students to give me a color and a clothing word the most. It was kind of sad to end that part. But I had to give back the tests. I didn’t want to stop but I guess you need to stop while they’re still enjoying it. Otherwise it will get old. (Pat; Reflection)
Peer-coached student teachers either evaluated their own lessons positively or praised a peer who completed the lesson as planned. These teachers did not point to classroom management as the reason for not having completed their plans but rather to the desire to ensure their students' comprehension:

So, the first part of my lesson plan was to review homework. I got that. The second part was to review what I wanted for Monday because that is what I wanted them working on after they got done with the test. So I wanted them to know ahead of time. But, as I went through the day, I'm like, I need to give them as much time as possible... The homework for Monday is just a review that they had on their test. So we'll have to go over that on Monday. And then I did get through the flash cards, but that was kind of quick too. (Pat, week two; Reflection/Instruction)

I thought the period went alright. I got done everything that I wanted to do and had a little bit of extra time...They seem to be catching on to -er verbs fine. (Anne, week five; Evaluation)

A third concern present in post-observation conferences in both groups was interaction with students. Nonpeer-coached student teachers discussed the decision making involved in calling on students to participate and strategies to help them assign credit to the students who participated:

What I've noticed about this class is like if you leave someone out, they let you know at the end and then you just feel bad. You know? "Oh, I'm sorry. I didn't call on you at all today." So, today while I was teaching, I'm like, I'm going to have to get a checklist and just check everybody like through the entire lesson. (Tracy, week two; New comprehension)

They get points for participating. There's no way I can call on every single one of them and keep track of that. But when I call on them and if they don't know it and they try, make an effort,
that's fine. But if they attempt an answer, they get that point. (Lori, week two; Instruction)

Like the nonpeer-coached group, the members of the peer-coached group made statements regarding interactions with students when eliciting, waiting for, and encouraging students' responses. At the beginning of the practicum, peers reasoned that with more time in the classroom, decisions regarding these interactions with students would become easier:

I mean once you learn a lot better you'll know to the point where you can push them. Obviously you don't want to spend too much time with one student because everyone else is going to do their own thing. (Cindy; week two)

In later weeks of the practicum, student teachers described characteristics of their classes and reconstructed the events of their lessons to explain to the peer coach the basis of their interactive teaching decisions. For example, Kelly described her method of eliciting students' responses by calling on members of a particular class:

But usually what happens in this particular class is only like two people raise their hands, two or three. So, I need to call on individuals to get through all of them so I know everyone is paying attention. So, sometimes you need to call on them and so that's what I decided to do. (Week seven)

In post-observation discussions, nonpeer-coached student teachers expressed to the US a concern about the use of the target language in statements coded as evaluation and reflection:

I felt a little inconsistent about how like I said, “We're going to do this in Spanish.” You know? And like the kids would ask me questions and I'd answer the question in Spanish. And
then like the third time I’m answering it, I was just, I felt like I wasn’t as consistent as I’d like to have been. (Chip, week two; Evaluation/Reflection)

Sometimes when I’m trying to talk too fast, I mispronounce and I catch myself but I don’t go back. I just keep going even though I know I said I used the wrong article with the word or that kind of thing. (Tracy, week two; Evaluation/Reflection)

While discussing a history and culture lesson with his US, Chip observed that their use of the target language had to be well planned in order to be accurate and understood by students:

It was all spur of the moment. Like if I could have remembered that Atahualpa was the Inca who eventually came to power. If I could have remembered the other guys’ names I felt like that would have been a little more professional... I wanted to use as much Spanish as I could. Especially because we were also going to discuss like, you know, like political things. It’s kind of complicated for me not only for them. (week five; Reflection/Evaluation)

At times, the student teachers made decisions about target language use during interactive teaching sessions. Chip found that he required less spoken Spanish when he wanted to maintain an active discussion with students:

I felt like through the chapter we’ve done, to foster discussion and to keep interest up I had allowed them to use a lot of English while discussing what happened...because otherwise they get frustrated and don’t want to participate. “I don’t know how to say this.” “Okay, you can say it in English.”

He also reported that he could elicit more vocabulary from his students if he accepted one word answers: “You can get a lot of them like a lot of one word answers. I got them to say the vocabulary. Not as much as I was hoping though.”
Regarding the target language, Tracy reported integrating more use of Spanish vocabulary words once they had been introduced even when the words were not the focus of the lesson:

I added something new to vocabulary practice. And they caught on really well. Because I said, “what color is so and so’s shirt?” And they only know how to say ‘my shirt is’ or ‘I am wearing.’ So I put it in there just to see if they’d catch on and they’re like “Oh, okay, pardo.”

As an alternative method of maintaining target language use throughout group work, Sharon suggested labeling the work stations she had prepared in order to give directions, explain the activities, and interact with students exclusively in French:

One thing that would have been nice is if I had the stations labeled before. Like if I had something up saying, “there’s the passé composé, here’s whatever, here’s whatever else.” I guess I could have said “poste numéro 1, poste numéro 2,” and had them labeled like that. (Reflection)

All peer-coached student teachers discussed the adaptation of the target language content in terms of foreign language methodology and eliciting students' use of the target language rather than their own use of the L2. Peer coaches praised the efforts of the observed partners to integrate into target language practice the four language skills of listening, speaking, reading, and writing:

You checked their pronunciation, you checked that they knew the vocabulary words. You practiced the writing with them...to make sure to have adjective and article agreement and feminine and masculine and everything. That’s very important. Also, the reading. They had to read aloud what they wrote on the board. So they had
like different things. They did different things with just one exercise. I think that is good. (Maria)

I really liked how you asked them a lot of questions about those cards because that helps reinforce and just so they’re not just identifying vocabulary all the time. They’re using the language more. (Cindy)

The concern about providing practice in all four skills of language learning was also manifested in the peer-coached student teachers’ discussions of the need to contextualize the target language content. Language instruction that is contextualized “presents real situations that encompass all aspects of a conversational exchange” (Shrum & Glisan, 1994, p.1). Contextualization presented challenges to the student teachers in the planning stages. At times, the student teachers found that they could not use activities that provided students with practice in real life situations using the L2. Reasons given were the need to cover other curricular requirements, the sequence of text materials, or the assumption that contextualization could not be a focus until the skill-using phase:

There are certain verb tenses that we still need to cover or that are good to cover before, just to give them an introduction before they go over to the high school. There are ways that you could make a big scenario and contextualize everything. But, the way the book is set up, those verb tenses are in chapter ten and the other ones are in chapter 13. (Anne, week five; Transformation)

I didn’t have very many student-centered activities except for the modeling because, I mean, I’m basically giving them all new information probably this week and all of next week. I will probably do a partner activity once they get all the verbs down. (Cindy, week five; Reflection/Transformation)
Peers shared and discussed ideas about providing more speaking practice within contextualized situations. Peer coaches positively evaluated the observed teachers' inclusion of target language speaking activities that required sentence level utterances from the students. For example, Anne praised Cindy's use of a participation point activity she used in the beginning moments of class, an idea she began to use because of Anne's success with it:

*I thought the peso activity was good. I do a similar one, as you know with the francs. And I liked the question you asked about who went out to dinner last night because I usually ask them “Who did something interesting last night?” But that may be too open so I think maybe I'll try, you know, “Who went out to dinner?”* (Evaluation)

One method of eliciting students' responses beyond sentence level rather than one word or phrasal responses was the use of recycling old vocabulary during the presentation of new vocabulary. Sally reported success with this method in that students extended their responses to full sentences and also had pronunciation practice:

*We used a magazine today, ¿Qué tal? and it had different examples and it talked about la moda, fashion. It had some new vocabulary. It had ‘comfortable’ and words like that the kids don’t know. It had the verb ‘to take off.’ I also had the verb llevar on the board because I wanted them to tell me what they were wearing. And then I put summer and winter on the board so that we could go through and I could ask them, “What do you wear in the summer?” So they could use the different vocabulary words...you know? (Sally, week five; Transformation)*

Student teachers were also concerned about providing students with the opportunity to interact with each other in the target language; success led to positive evaluations:
But then the questions were good with the little note cards. Especially when you have one kid asking another kid because it kind of makes it more evident, “Oh, he’s asking me. I do need to answer with the ‘I’ type thing.” (Anne, week seven; Evaluation)

Yet another concern was how to elicit students’ active engagement with the content. Sally spoke of Maria’s performance helping students to understand the content of the video episode she showed in class. According to Sally, Maria’s ability to elicit information was the result of her interactive negotiation of meaning with the students:

You kind of prompt them, “Okay, what happened with Raquel? Why was she angry with so and so?” And then some students aren’t really sure. They’re not sure how to say it. Then you keep kind of asking them more questions about it. And you prompt them to give an answer. So I think that is good. You never just answer your own questions. (Week seven; Reflection/Evaluation)

Three nonpeer-coached student teachers evaluated themselves in terms of the use of clarity skills, either by evaluating their own use of skills or by responding to their US’s recitation of observed clarity skills. These student teachers discussed the challenges they faced when implementing specific skills such as summary, rephrasing, or the integration of the skills in general:

Now I’m trying to use the clarity skills we’re supposed to be doing. And sometimes it’s really hard to get every area that would fit with the lesson. (Tracy, week seven, Reflection)

Tracy stated that it was difficult for her to include all the skills in one lesson. In discussion with her supervisor, she concluded that not all clarity skills are used in each lesson and was pleased to hear that she used most skills in some way during her presentation.
Nonpeer-coached student teachers discussed strategies that they implemented in order to integrate clarity skills in their lessons, such as writing objectives on the board when stating them in the target language. One difference between the conferences of the nonpeer-coached and peer-coached groups was the amount of discussion of clarity skills. Clarity was not treated in the conferences of the nonpeer-coached group to the extent that it was treated in the peer-coached conferences. Unlike the peer-coached student teachers, nonpeer-coached student teachers did not mention this topic weekly.

In their post-observation conferences, peer-coached student teachers treated the topic of clarity more often and in more varied ways than the nonpeer-coached group. Two similarities in the two groups' conferences exist: (1) Either the peer-coach or the US recited the clarity skills used by the observed teacher; (2) The use of clarity skills was at times challenging for student teachers. The peer's recitation of clarity skills used by the observed teacher usually coincided with positive evaluation and praise of the observed teacher's competence in this area, specifically in grammar lessons and directions:

I think you did a good job repeating their answers so that everybody understood them and knew what they were doing. And then writing down important information on the board, like the reflexives, the stem-changing ones, and then showing them the reflexive pronouns. It was giving them examples. (Anne)

And I thought you did a lot of writing things on the board, on the overhead and also pointing out important things. Obviously you used examples. I thought it was a good review day. (Pat)
At times, the observed teacher offered a positive evaluation of the lesson in terms of clarity skills:

I did have them summarize. I think that went really well. I wish I had done that in my other classes...sometimes I forget that students want to contribute to the class. (Pat, Week five)

I thought it was a strength that I had all my examples ready. I think that was good that I had my examples prepared in advance and I had them all on the transparencies and they were right there for them to see. (Kelly, Week seven)

Peer-coached student teachers did state that it was a challenge to find the time to integrate the clarity skills into their teaching repertoires:

It’s time to start the quiz and you want to give them as much time as they need. And I think part of my problem with clarity skills is, you know, in reality they don’t take that much time but when you think about them, it’s like, I don’t have time to sit there and tell them everything I want to do. But, yeah, there was a lot of confusion. And I know when I see those vocabulary lists, I’m going to have all kinds of things. (Pat, week five; Reflection)

They also noted that the use of clarity would have helped them reach lesson goals and avoid moments of confusion. They were able to state how they could have achieved their original goals by modifying their use of clarity behaviors:

You notice how they start to say, “What? We are going to the lab today? Are we going to have time?” So what I would do differently maybe the next time is say, “Okay, we’re going to do this grammar point and then we’re going to do something else.” So I should just say, “This is what we’re going to do first. And then I’ll let you know what we’re going to do next.” (Maria)

And so I just wish I had said it before we started the quiz. You always need clarity skills. I should have said, “What you need to do
after the quiz is done is you need to give it to me.” Because I had kids coming up to me asking “Well, where do you want this?” (Pat)

For Anne, clarity skills were adapted in terms of the students' proficiency level and experience in French as a method used to remind them of relevant grammatical concepts:

... with their test too. Like, just have reminders on the board to pay attention to gender, to agreement. Because if they just have a blanket kind of reminder it will help them make it easier. Because this is still French I for them. And so it may even help them next year when they get to French II. That way they're like, “Oh, yeah. I have to remember gender and I have to remember adjective agreement.” I wouldn't do that for French IV. (Week seven; Transformation)

Clarity skills were also used as a means to link new vocabulary to known vocabulary. Pat reported her anticipation of students' spelling difficulty, and her peer noted how her use of the clarity behaviors helped her to enlist students' background knowledge:

Kelly: Then you asked, “Does everybody see this?” And you underlined it. And you helped in explaining an unfamiliar word using background knowledge. So that was good.

Pat: This is the word for ‘orange,’ anaranjado. And in the last chapter they had the word naranja, ‘orange,’ the fruit. And it's just one of those words that I know they're going to misspell. So, maybe if this helps them a little.

In the interaction between peers, coaches gave the observed teacher suggestions to improve future lessons by using clarity skills in relation to their directions, grammatical presentations, and reviews:

Maybe give more examples of how and when to use the past perfect tense. Like more examples in Spanish and English, like when you use it and how you use it. (Sally, Week five)
The adaptation of content was a topic of conversation between nonpeer-coached student teachers and their US in comments coded as instruction, evaluation, reflection, and transformation. Student teachers in this group were able to ground their statements in evidence from their observed classes by recreating the events of the class period as well as by explaining the rationales for choices they made regarding the selection and organization of content. At times, they spoke of their choices in terms of the expectations other teachers would have of their students in the future or of the statewide requirements in mandated proficiency testing. Such statements were coded as transformation statements and included the following:

But for those who are going on to French III, you saw what I had to do with the French III teaching them the passé composé this year. I spent three weeks doing what I've just done with these kids in two days. So with this more in-depth introduction to the passé composé this year, they'll be able to do a little more with it next year. (Suzanne, week nine)

Yeah, they hate listening practice. So they would have complained and they didn't. But um they need practice because I'd say three of them were proficient in listening. So that's why I did that today. (Tracy, week nine)

Another motive for adapting instructional material was to match it to the ability and proficiency levels of students. For example, Max spoke of his combined Japanese II and III class:

I am trying to include as many tasks as possible but in order for me to come back to one situation, it's really hard to give this one student one task and then give this student other task. So, rather than do it, I ask that those advanced students write down
more neat or if they have to do practice once, they can do it twice or three times. (Instruction)

At other times, classroom context and the attitudes of the students played a role in the decision to adapt the process of teaching. Chip mentioned class size and Lori referred to the interest level of her students as reasons to modify the elicitation of answers:

Because it’s a smaller class we can cover a lot more. And they got going a lot faster than when I taught this lesson this morning. I modified my lesson from this morning. I did a lot of this like when we were talking in clarity practice. I did a lot of asking people several questions in a row in this class. (Transformation, week one)

I could tell they were getting a little bored with that so I wanted to move with the activity. I tried to vary it and include a verb game. Like a contest. And so that gets them to, you know, they’re studying it and they’re writing it. But they’re also playing a game. (Reflection, week nine)

Examples of tailoring instruction to specific groups of learners were also found in the post-observation conferences of the nonpeer-coached student teachers. Sharon reported foreseeing her students’ misconception that the passé composé would be used only with the verb être based on the content they had already covered:

I knew that if they didn’t have the passé composé with avoir, how could they do passé composé with être? They’re going to think all passé composé is with être. I tried to keep coming back and reminding them but without a lot of practice and a lot of doing it, it’s not going to sink in...I think they were feeling a little confident, “We already know this. This is easy.” But there is this whole other part to it. (Reflection, week nine)
In the case of teaching a less commonly taught language, Ana described plans to include a lesson dedicated to Arabic culture complete with realia and displays. She reported feeling the need to stimulate interest in the study of Arabic and hoped that her students would continue to study it:

I would give them some information. Here is Syria. Here is what it is like there. Or tell them that they have to read this information about Syria and then they share it with the whole class. This is information about Egypt, about the pyramids, about Cairo. Really I am looking forward to it. And bring in something from Lebanon where I am from. And some art. Not only art but famous cities to see or visit. That would be nice for them. (Transformation, week nine)

Student teachers considered both background knowledge and cultural backgrounds of the students in deciding how to handle lessons and topics:

And so especially on this topic, getting into slavery of the natives of South America, as well as Africans. So that kind of pervaded the studies and with the bulk of the students being African-American, relating to studies that were of particular interest to their personal history...We’ve been doing preterite and imperfect which are past tenses in Spanish. This is history so there would be a lot of past tense in it. It’s something they’re already familiar with and it would help them to understand the text. (Chip, week seven; Transformation)

In addition to describing how they decided to adapt methods and content, they also reported the challenges faced in the process, such as integrating grammatical topics at the end of the school year:

The -re verbs. That’s the one thing that they haven’t had yet. So I was trying to fit that in so that they will know it and try. Because I usually don’t teach on a grammatical syllabus ...But I usually have some other topic and try to fit in things that way. I wasn’t sure how to fit in the -re verbs. (Lori; Week nine, Instruction)
I wish I had had a better way to go over the review sheet. I really couldn't think of one other than, like, you know, "Take some time to look it over and come in with specific questions that you want to go over...Mr. R., I didn't understand how to do the direct objects."

Two of the kids were interested for like any question. The rest of the kids were like, "Oh, we're not interested." That kind of brought it down. But I honestly, couldn't think of a better way to do that. (Chip, Week nine, Reflection)

The conference data showed that nonpeer-coached student teachers interacted with their US to find solutions to problematic situations and brainstormed ideas with their US when they reported feeling a plan was not successful. These situations related to classroom management and more teacher guidance of peer editing activities and group work. In response to either suggestions or questions from the US regarding lesson improvement, nonpeer student teachers also suggested alternative plans for possible use in the future to enhance their lessons. Ana suggested how she could have improved a writing activity:

Well, if I'm teaching this class, I wouldn't pair them together. I would just do it individually. But they do like prediction. One of them was predicting something and the other something else. And they have to write their answers. So which answer, which prediction should they write? (Week seven; Reflection)

Chip stated that he would be able to integrate his US's suggestion to personalize the foreign language content more in future lessons:

The next thing I'm going on to is a unit on food, restaurants, stuff like that. I figured that will lend itself a lot more to stuff like that...into a lot of role play and a lot of like me gusta. We are going to cover me gusta and food. I mean there will be a lot of opportunity for stuff right there. (Week two; Transformation)
In each week of data analysis, examples of adapting content were found in the post-observation conferences of the peer-coached student teachers. During their discussions, student teachers talked about the content, materials, and methods they used in order to reach lesson goals. In retrospect to the observed lesson and in anticipation of future lessons, the peer-coached student teachers analyzed their situations in mutual problem solving discussions.

Initially, the peer-coached student teachers discussed the adaptation of material and methods in order to enhance students’ comprehension of the material presented. References to strategies taken to understand the students’ grasp of the instructional content were found in comments coded as instruction, transformation, reflection, and new comprehension. For example, Sally spoke of using the homework review as an opportunity for a comprehension check so that she “could see it from the students’ point of view.” Anne suggested that Cindy refrain from providing her class with the correct answer if a student answered incorrectly. They discussed the method of eliciting the correct response from other students “to see if it’s the whole class that doesn’t know or if it is just the one kid.”

Although foreign language teachers strive to get the students to practice all four language skills for communicative purposes, during the initial two weeks of the practicum, Maria spoke of using book activities to gauge her students’ comprehension of grammatical elements:
Especially when they are working they like to work on their exercises. They find out where they need more help, if they need more help, or if they don’t understand something. So that’s why I give them the homework and then out of the homework all the questions they have will be brought up from them. There is no way I can explain things I don’t know what their questions are. So maybe if one person brings up one question, someone else had it too, you know? (Instruction)

Peer interaction led two student teachers to use their coaches’ advice regarding grammar lessons in which their students did not achieve mastery. Kelly reported that her students overgeneralized the German rule of capitalization of nouns to adjectives. Pat suggested using dry erase boards to integrate written practice as she had done previously in a college course. Kelly elicited specific information from Pat about this method and reported that she had access to such materials, believed her students would enjoy that type of written activity. and thought it achievable for use in her classes to meet her learning objectives. After Cindy conversed with Anne about the difficulty her students faced in using direct object pronoun replacement with verbs in the preterite tense, Cindy reported her renewed commitment to provide examples of this structure. Anne noted that Cindy’s materials preparation was "exactly what the students needed to get it into their heads..." She also noted an improvement in their use and understanding of direct object pronouns since her last observation and reminded Cindy not to expect mastery of this concept at this point but recommended recycling this content later.
Peer-coached student teachers not only made decisions to adapt their methods and the content based on the nature of the activities, but cited characteristics of their specific groups of students as the reason for having carried out activities differently between classes. For example, Anne tailored her spelling activity based on her perception of the students’ motivation. She explained that she noted differences between the seventh and eighth grade students and carried out similar activities in different manners based on their motivations and interests:

I decided to do the spelling exercises at their desks and then go over them using an overhead. It seemed to work okay. The eighth graders are not so enthusiastic about going up to the board. The seventh graders do it all the time. (Week nine; Reflection/Evaluation)

Grade level was also a topic of discussion between peers Maria and Sally. Regarding content, Maria and Sally realized that they addressed the same material in Spanish III and in Spanish I, respectively. In part of a post-observation conference coded as new comprehension, the peers discussed material fit to be used in their classes and how they could share materials even though Sally’s purpose in her beginning level class was to introduce the material, whereas Maria’s purpose was to review:

And if I bring one idea to my classroom, I can pass it on to you and you can do it in your classroom. Maybe at a lower level. And I can do the same thing at a higher level. (Maria, week seven)

In addition to the above, an appeal to students’ interests was made in order to include content that would engage them in language learning. For
example, in response to her peer’s praise of her culture lesson on German food and etiquette, Kelly explained:

They requested this. I sat down and said “maybe my expectations for a German III/IV class were a bit high...And maybe we need to lower them a bit.” And also, I wanted to know where did they want ...to go? What did they want out of this class after they’ve finished? I didn’t want them coming out saying they didn’t learn anything... That’s why we also did the unit on children’s stories. (Week nine)

Another reason for the adaptation of the material was the year end review in which each was involved during this spring quarter practicum. Reconstructing her lesson, Sally stated that it was hard to know how much information to include in her review and stated some ideas for improvement:

The only part that I think I would have changed was, I kind of rushed through. I think maybe I gave them a little bit too much material because I just wanted to review a bunch of tenses on their review sheet that they had...But I think doing things like that when they are out of context, I don’t know if it helped them or kind of confused them, if it was too much material at one time. But I also wanted to review with them so that they could see ...what they could do. (Week nine; Reflection)

The end of the year presented Pat and Kelly with the challenge of fitting in the necessary review material. They wondered whether the review had a positive impact on students:

And it’s almost that I can’t think. I have my lesson plan in front of me and I have the review sheet and I have my plan of what I want them to get done. And maybe with more experience maybe I’ll be able to come up with simpler examples that will really hit home with them. (Pat, week nine; Reflection)

Their conversation included comments coded as reflection, new comprehension, and instruction. They continued to discuss how they could “simplify the review”
and design their examples to review several grammar concepts in the same sentence. Both agreed that had they not taught this, they would not have realized that reviews could encompass information on more than one topic per section of review.

Praise for the peer coach’s work was also given because of the preparation peers invested in their final examinations and reviews:

You told them exactly what chapters they needed to study. So there wasn’t going to be any surprises for this exam. They knew everything, where it was all going to come from and they had done the review sheets over it. I would have loved to have had something so drawn out for my classes. (Pat, Week nine; Evaluation)

The conversation between these two peers seemed to facilitate Pat’s recall of her testing methods class at the university, and her own self-evaluation of her testing procedures:

They’re getting exactly what they expect. They’re studying what I want them to study. And when they see the test, they’re not going to be surprised or they’re not going to get psyched out because I’ve told them the format. They’re familiar with the format. This test has content validity. (Evaluation)

Peer discussions resulted in adaptation of methods and shared ideas for review lessons. Maria found that she had to change the way she reviewed the video episodes of the television series that she used. She and her peer discussed the results of her new review method in anticipation of the next class meeting:

Sally: I saw them and felt that the students were discussing parts of it, parts of the video. They were only getting the big things that happened, but they understood.
Maria: I was afraid that they were going, remember I asked you, that they were not going to get the idea of what was going on in the episode. But it went okay. They understand, like you said, the main points. Yeah, I need to work on like more details, things that happened. Like, why and who did that? What’s her name? What’s the relationship between Raquel and so and so? (Week nine)

In sum, the analysis of the content in post-observation conferences showed that student teachers in both groups reported similar concerns about their teaching episodes. These included classroom management, interactions with students, pacing of lessons, target language use, clarity skills, and adapting content and methods to learners. Differences in the treatment of these concerns by the two groups of student teachers included less reporting by peer-coached student teachers on the topic of classroom management and a greater content variety in the discussions on the implementation of clarity skills by peer-coached teachers. Both groups of student teachers reconstructed the events of their lessons in order to suggest how to enhance the observed lesson and future lessons.

Discussion

In comparison of the data collected and analyzed between the pre-observation tasks and conferences and the post-observation conferences of both groups of student teachers, the pre-observation conditions showed more differences between these two groups of student teachers. The analysis of the post-observation conferences between the non-peer-coached student teachers and their US demonstrated that the interactive nature of the post-observation
conferences created the context for their conferences to resemble the pre- and post-observation conferences of the peer-coached group of student teachers.

In conversation with their US during the ten-week practicum, nonpeer-coached student teachers addressed all categories of Shulman’s Model (1987). This finding suggests that when reflection remained an individual endeavor, as in the pre-observation written tasks, fewer statements of pedagogical reasoning emerged (27 in pre-observation tasks and 200 in post-observation conferences). With the assistance of their US, nonpeer-coached student teachers were able to address all categories of this model as did the peer-coached student teachers in their pre- and post-observation conferences (See Appendix I).

Pedagogical reasoning emerged in their post-observation conferences with statements in which student teachers were able to provide ideas and strategies to improve future teaching episodes based on the observed lessons, to recall the events of the observed lessons explaining why plans were successful or unsuccessful, and to recall past events in terms of which they explained their goals and teaching decisions. The abilities to state alternative plans and describe how to improve lessons demonstrated that the nonpeer-coached student teachers also accessed the part of the knowledge base on teaching that comes from their own practice. Shulman (1987) refers to this part of the knowledge base as the wisdom of practice.

The post-observation conferences of the nonpeer-coached group showed that strategies the student teachers learned that would help them improve
lessons emerged from their own teaching experience and also in collaboration with their US. Confidence to use a particular activity or method, such as giving students time to practice the writing skill, was stimulated by recommendations and input from the US. In collaboration with their US, nonpeer-coached student teachers were able to evaluate the input offered and to make decisions for future classes. This feature of teacher decision making resembled the suggestions and recommendations the peer coaches made to the observed teacher who then adapted that input into a workable strategy for her own groups of students based on her familiarity with them and her wisdom of practice.

Within the different contexts of post-observation conferences, several concerns were shared by student teachers in both supervisory groups. The first conversational exchange between US and nonpeer-coached supervised teachers in each post-observation conference elicited from the student teachers their feelings and perceptions about their lessons. Nonpeer-coached student teachers tended to answer this first question posed by the US with an evaluation comment in terms of three aspects of their teaching: discipline; target language use; and clarity skills. When nonpeer-coached student teachers evaluated their lessons positively, they reported that there were no discipline problems that interfered with their accomplishment of lesson goals, they used the target language frequently and required it from their students, and they integrated clarity skills into their lessons. Unsuccessful reports included their concerns that they did not provide enough target language input, classroom management
problems did not allow them to reach their goals or finish their lesson plans, or they did not implement clarity skills to the desired extent. The topics of concern were consistent with their pre-observation written tasks in which nonpeer-coached student teachers requested the US to focus on clarity skills and amount of target language used and explained discipline situations.

In peer-coached data the student teachers also treated the topics of discipline, target language use, and use of clarity skills in their post-observation discussions. In the analyzed data referring to classroom management, the concern for discipline was present to a lesser extent among peer-coached teachers. Only two weeks of data analysis showed this topic discussed among peer-coached teachers. When it was discussed, an observing teacher either praised her peer coach’s use of a discipline strategy or made a suggestion to her peer coach for future use, similar to the role of the US among nonpeer-coached teachers.

Peer coaches focused on target language use in both pre- and post-observation conferences. Peers offered each other praise when the target language was used communicatively by students, in interactions with students, and when students were required to make sentence length utterances. When these student teachers were able to integrate practice of more than one language skill, praise was a consistent part of both pre- and post-observation conferences. In fact, when only one mode of language practice was observed in a lesson, the peer coach asked why more varied practice could not be
integrated. This type of interaction between peers demonstrates that peer coaching served the peer-coaching function of the analysis of application.

The use of the target language was addressed not only as the content, but also as the method for instruction. Both groups addressed the topic of contextualization of the language structures used in their teaching and reported difficulties in creating real life contexts for language practice. The topic of target language use referred to both the teachers' and students' use. As noted previously in a section on clarity skills, student teachers were found to use a recitation question and answer based method of second language instruction. Thus, although it was an aspect of foreign/second language pedagogy with which these student teachers struggled, peer-coached student teachers were able to recognize the use of contextualization and praise their peer coach for having succeeded with it.

The third topic in terms of which student teachers evaluated their lessons was clarity skills. When clarity skills were mentioned in the nonpeer-coached group, it was done in response to a student teacher's self-evaluation or the US's recognition of skills. Like the US of the nonpeer-coached group, the peer coach recited the uses of clarity that she observed in her peer's lesson. Additionally, each group reported on challenges they confronted with clarity skills' implementation.

Clarity skills were a more developed topic of discussion each week in the data of the peer-coached student teachers than in the data of the nonpeer-
coached group. In particular, peer-coached student teachers praised their own or their peer's use of clarity skills, particularly when these skills were prepared for in advance, such as using more examples to further explicate the topic of instruction beyond book examples, having students give summaries, and using written objectives on the board. Another difference between the two groups' treatment of clarity in post-observation conferences was that peer-coached student teachers were able to reconstruct their lessons recalling events in terms of clarity skills, stating how they could make improvements in their lessons. Specifically, they discussed how clarity skills could help them link old knowledge to new knowledge, review for future assessments, and make directions and grammatical presentations more comprehensible to students. This degree of discussion about clarity skills did not emerge in the discussions of the nonpeer-coached student teachers, which is evidence of earlier findings claiming that peer coaching facilitates the recall of content from the teacher education courses at the university (Neubert & Bratton, 1988; 1992).

In addition to the areas of discipline, clarity, and target language use, peer-coached student teachers evaluated their own lessons in terms of what they had completed, a concern of several of the nonpeer-coached teachers. Rather than citing discipline issues as the reason for not completing their plans, peer-coached student teachers referred to their own ability to complete all planned aspects of lessons in the given amount of class time. Later post-observation conferences showed that the same peer-coached student teachers
were able to report on interactive teaching decisions, explaining the modifications in their lesson plans that helped them finish the desired material. One modification was to interactively assess students' comprehension of a topic and proceed to the next activity or exercise after having received a sufficient number of correct answers. This reported progress in their teaching, from feelings of failure to feelings of success regarding the material covered, demonstrated that student teachers recognized and reported on their interactive teaching decisions and learnings in their peer-coaching conferences.

In addition to helping a peer by supplying or refining an idea to use in class, peers shared what they learned from their own experience, or in Shulman's (1987) terms, their wisdom of practice. As an alternative form of supervision, an aspect of peer coaching is not only learning together but also learning from each other. Supervision is described as a form of teaching (Arredondo et al., 1995). The post-observation conferences showed that learning was facilitated between student teachers of equal professional and educational status and was not restricted to supervisory situations in which the supervisor was the US or a teacher educator.

Another common concern for teaching was the adaptation of content and methods. As noted in the findings section, both supervisory groups discussed with their US or peer coach the activities they planned in terms of students' background knowledge, interests, and motivations with the goals of preparing students for future assessments, integrating more than one language skill into
their lessons, and tailoring their activities to specific groups of learners based on learners’ age, class size, and proficiency levels. As was seen with the pre-observation tasks and conferences, the concern to adapt materials and methods in discussions of what the student teachers did in their lessons and what they planned to do in future lessons, reveals that all student teachers in this study were most interested in matters of how to carry out instruction. Again, in the post-observation conferences, the student teachers showed a concern for planning activities for purposes of making content interesting and relevant to students, helping them to achieve in the target language, and helping them to use the language interactively. This concern for planning was evident in the amount of statements coded as transformation and instruction. In post-observation conferences, 64 statements of transformation were made by peer-coached student teachers and 37 by nonpeer-coached student teachers. Each group was rated to have made 56 comments pertaining to the instruction category.

Although the motivations for teaching decisions may have emanated from student teachers’ concerns about pupils’ ultimate learning, their discussions focused on their own performance and behaviors rather than the concern for their learners as individuals, their learning, or their social and emotional needs. It is suggested in the body of literature pertaining to stages of student teaching that earlier stages of concerns may remain in later stages of the practicum (Caruso, 1977; Piland & Anglin, 1993). Student teachers in this study revealed
concerns regarding how to carry out the tasks of teaching rather than revealing a concern for professional issues or a critical review of the purposes of the curricular goals they had followed, which is characteristic of student teachers' later concerns and feelings, according to Caruso (1977).

In sum, more similarities were found between the two groups of student teachers in their post-observation conferences than in the pre-observation written tasks and conferences. These similarities included evaluating their lessons in terms of clarity skills and amount of target language used, a more similar treatment of categories of pedagogical reasoning, and the concern to adapt content to levels of students' abilities and interests. The finding of similarity in concerns and pedagogical reasoning of both nonpeer- and peer-coached student teachers demonstrates that, in this study, alternative supervision with a peer coach closely resembled supervision with a supervisor from the university, here a trained foreign language educator. Moreover, it was between peer-coached student teachers that more topics were discussed and more focus on the target clarity skills from the seminar occurred. Additionally, like their pre-observation conferences, peer coaches showed that they supplied their peers with ideas to use in their classes and made suggestions regarding how their peer could improve implementation of methods and teaching strategies.

These findings reveal that peer coaching is less evaluative than traditional US supervision in that peer coaches felt comfortable to raise more
concerns and discuss more issues than nonpeer-coached student teachers. For example, peer-coached student teachers evaluated their own lessons in terms of clarity, discipline, and use of the target language as did nonpeer-coached student teachers. In addition to these self-evaluations, they added completion of their lesson plans and the challenges they found in adapting clarity skills to their classes. This finding resembles previous findings from studies on peer coaching illustrating that the collaborative aspect of peer coaching helped teachers to discuss issues that they would not have suggested for discussion with a supervisor or administrator (Elliot & Chidley, 1985; Leggett & Hoyle, 1987; Hyman, 1990).

Research Question Five

5. In a peer coaching program implemented in a foreign language student teaching practicum, what are the attitudes of the student teachers in the peer coaching program and those who do not participate in the peer coaching program as reported by the student teachers on an open-ended questionnaire and in weekly journals?

In self-report questionnaires, the student teachers described the support they received in supervision regarding their new responsibilities, lesson planning, technical feedback, and clarity training. The fifth research question is made up of six sub-questions related to each of the above topics as well as the student teachers' overall impressions of the practicum experiences and their
perceived needs for professional growth and development as teachers. This section reports on each supervisory group’s questionnaire responses and a discussion concludes this section. Appendix C contains the Peer Coaching Satisfaction Questionnaire.

The twelve student teachers in this study reported receiving assistance with their new teaching responsibilities from their sources of supervision and from other teachers in their school settings. The following report of the data analysis reveals who served as sources of assistance for student teachers in each supervisory group, the attributes of the assistance, the changing nature of the assistance over the course of the practicum, and the strategies taken by the student teachers in response to the forms of assistance they received from the teacher education program.

Student teachers in both groups reported receiving an initial greeting to the new school setting that welcomed their ideas and resources as learned in the teacher education program. For example, Tracy reported feeling welcomed and accepted into the “circle of friendship” of the Global Language Department at her school setting where her CT and department members were ‘willing to share ideas’ and asked her for teaching ideas. According to Tracy, her CT created opportunities for team teaching in classes that were difficult to manage. Sharon reported going to the teachers’ lounge to meet with other teachers: “I feel I did develop professional relationships with everybody on staff. They were all supportive and caring.” Pat compared her student teaching placement and
CT with others from her teacher education experience, reporting an improvement over those of the past:

I was elated when he said, “I know you’re being exposed to new ideas. Feel free to try them out. In my past two field experiences, it took a few weeks to establish this kind of rapport with the CT. Although they said I could try new techniques, I always felt a ball and chain holding me back. I think my teaching suffered because of it.

Cindy stated that her CT not only shared ideas with her but also implemented some of Cindy’s suggestions, such as interactive activities. Both peers Cindy and Anne described school environments in which their CTs were present at all times and called their supervision experiences “professional” and “helpful.” As a result of their supervision experiences with input from their CTs and US, both Cindy and Anne reported feeling “ready to teach” on their own.

During this initial period, several student teachers referred to their CTs as models to emulate. Sharon referred to her CT as an “admirable model of foreign language teaching” in that she taught for proficiency, created thematic units to teach French culture, and personalized the target language material. By observing her CT she said she was able to integrate the use of stories and pictures into her teaching and that this helped her to maintain consistent use of the L2 in her presentations, which was something that she was unable to do previously. In the case where two peer-coached student teachers were placed in the same school setting, there were two CT models present:

I mean we had A, my teacher, and then M next door. And I mean they’re just two totally different teaching styles. So there was a lot
of knowledge that we could get from both of them. And they’re just two Spanish teachers right next door to each other. (Sally)

Both Pat and Kelly reported feeling welcomed to their field setting and initially supported by their CTs. In Kelly’s particular situation, she referred to the cadre of peer coach, US, and two CTs as her “supervision team,” finding a source for help from at least one member of this group for the responsibilities she assumed in her new position as a German and ESL student teacher:

...they were great about listening to concerns and then to offer advice...If one team member lacks advice, then another picks up the slack.

Among the student teachers who reported an early collegial working relationship with their CTs, four said that their CTs assisted them each day of the practicum with their lesson plans. Thus, they felt supported in this teaching endeavor. The CT was identified as a source of help in five ways by student teachers who reported having been placed with both supportive and unsupported CTs. First, the CT had relevant information regarding the students' abilities and interests because she had been with them for three quarters of the academic year prior to the practicum. This knowledge of the students' backgrounds and characteristics helped when student teachers adapted content to particular groups of learners and when student teachers had discipline concerns. Having inherited discipline problems with the German classes, Kelly noted that the only individual in her supervisory team that could offer pertinent help was her CT because of her knowledge of relevant aspects of students'
abilities and personalities. When Kelly wanted help with discipline she reported that she received help from her CT:

But how she suggested to just “forget that and talk to them. When you see them in the hall, talk to them.”...And I know with this one particular kid that I’m talking about, it did help when I went to him on a personal, more personally and asked him if he needed help and just explained it one on one with him. And after that, our relationship was 100% better. And he really truly started working in class, asking me for help, and was more respectful because I talked to him on a one on one basis.

Another positive aspect of the student teacher/CT relationship was that student teachers were able to ask their CT specific questions about what to include in the end of the year review because she knew the requirements for continuing with the next level of the foreign language.

A third area of CT usefulness was as a source of assistance when the student teacher had two classes of the same preparation. CT feedback was helpful in modifying a lesson plan to adapt it for the next class. One instance that Sally reported described a lesson on the comparative and superlative and the help that her CT gave her to include more written practice:

This made a lot of sense. It helped the students to see the examples exactly the way the homework assignment should be done. Maria liked the fact that I had the students in my later classes actually practice writing their own sentences on the board. We both agreed it helped them practice adjective/noun agreement, work through examples orally, and I could examine their work.

The fourth manner in which the CT was noted as assisting student teachers was with materials. Maria and Sally reported sharing materials between their classrooms and CTs. According to Sally, her CT shared songs
and song scripts that she used to reinforce grammatical forms, which helped Sally present the grammar without having to make a “straight presentation” of the concept. She found this technique shared by her CT useful as “the song was repetitive, goes through the whole verb conjugation, and focuses on what the students need to hear.”

A fifth way CTs helped student teachers learn about teaching was by modeling the flexibility to change lessons plans. Student teachers stated that, with the help of the CT, they recognized that their lesson plans would not always evolve as they had planned on paper.

A trend in the data from the nonpeer-coached student teachers who reported receiving a welcome greeting that lasted more than two weeks from their CT and school staff showed that these individuals described the weekly on-campus seminars as a business-like environment. Regarding collegiality and support during the first weeks of the practicum, these student teachers praised the school setting rather than the university setting:

*The one aspect that I wish were different is the weekly university meetings...It seems that we are always too busy taking care of business and thus we lack that relationship building and sharing opportunity and don’t have enough time to share ideas and activities with the other student teachers.* (Sharon)

In contrast, other student teachers reported that the university portion of the practicum and their US were sources of support during the entry phase of the practicum and the ensuing weeks. By his week two journal entry, Chip began to praise his US for her flexibility and her understanding of the need to
reschedule visits based on his having taken full responsibility for all classes. He reported that the time his CT spent with him during the beginning portion of the practicum was used to give him the details of his duties, show and explain the materials, and tell him the characteristics of her classes and the goals to achieve by the end of the practicum. After the initial two weeks of contact he reported that she left him alone to make decisions and to carry out all teaching responsibilities without collaborating with him. Both Chip and Lori reported that their CTs did not offer them samples of lessons to follow or ideas to incorporate: “Her lesson plans are not present. I have nothing to model after” (Chip).

Lori reported that her CT left her alone and therefore unaware of events in the school that affected her teaching duties and required last minute changes in plans. In addition, Lori reported that in the situation she inherited from her CT, students were accustomed to disruptive behavior and not speaking or hearing French in class. According to Lori, this situation inhibited her from requesting the students to use French in interactive activities and from responding to her own use of French.

Ana wrote that the seminar was a “means of support” and that the opportunities to listen to other student teachers’ experiences and watch their video teaching episodes “helped her self-evaluate” and provided her with “realistic expectations” that “students are students everywhere.” Although Ana referred to the seminar as the most helpful part of supervision, she reported that more time and opportunities were needed for sharing of experiences among the
twelve student teachers: “We didn’t have enough time to share much information with our colleagues about our own experiences.”

These student teachers described their experiences with their CTs as the opposite of the collegiality and support received from the university component of the student teaching practicum:

I was satisfied with the collegiality in seminar. It was helpful to share experiences about teaching. It was especially helpful hearing about others’ difficulties so I would not feel I’m a bad teacher because I have so many disruptive students. (Lori)

Every week during seminar, we discussed how things were going in the schools. We offered each other experience on how we each dealt with problems that anyone had brought up for discussion. I did not get the same experience with my cooperating teacher. She was often preoccupied or, as it seemed to me, disinterested. From my supervisors I also received useful sharing and discussion of ongoing events. (Chip)

More than half of the student teachers in this study reported that after the initial one to three weeks of the practicum, the amount of observation by the CT diminished. Along with less observation, student teachers noted a lack of assistance with teaching, testing, and planning duties. Questionnaire data revealed that the early support was brief and without it student teachers felt overwhelmed by the CT’s expectations:

My CT made it so that the only way students would learn Spanish was through me. This was stressful. I was responsible for teaching lessons all week and reviewing for the test. Phew! Now I must compile a test for tomorrow. What is difficult is that I must consider what Mr. C wants on the test as well as what I want. (Pat)

I didn’t feel that I had the most support from my CT. She wanted me to be the teacher basically from the start. (Kelly)
Those student teachers in each supervisory group who reported being observed less by their CT after the initial weeks of the practicum also reported a lack of specificity in the feedback provided by the CT:

My CT was very good about giving feedback on every lesson for the first two and a half weeks. It seemed that I received little or no feedback on my lessons after that. This gave me the assumption that what I was teaching seemed well enough that there were no critical comments, just “very nice today,” or a thumbs up. (Tracy)

Four student teachers found that technical feedback provided in the form of an observation journal kept by the CT was helpful. They reported receiving feedback from their CT daily on each lesson taught during the first two to three weeks of the practicum. Kelly reported that CT feedback became less frequent and less specific as she increased her time in the classroom and CTs no longer observed each class:

I had both my CTs writing in my journal. But the more and more I taught, the more that they were leaving the room and the more they felt that I needed to be by myself. So I got less feedback toward the end from my CTs whereas right at the beginning they were giving me advice on teaching grammar concepts, vocabulary, other ideas on how to do a reading activity or a listening activity. So I felt that at the beginning I had input. (Kelly)

Feedback from her CTs was reported to be less specific than that from her peer coach or her US. Once the journal entries ceased, she received comments such as “good lesson,” “well done,” with no suggestions about how to present new concepts.

Pat reported feeling less confident without the regular feedback from her CT. Her CT also maintained an observation journal in which he kept notes on
pronunciation, grammar, personalization, and pacing. She reported that the journal was a helpful device for her and wished he had continued to use it throughout the practicum. However, this form of feedback ceased once he began to leave her alone to teach. Pat stated that she would have liked to have had more immediate feedback from her CT during all stages of her practicum.

Student teachers' lesson planning was affected by the reported decrease in CT time spent in observation and the transformation of feedback from specific and daily to vague and less frequent. Kelly expressed surprise at the amount of planning that is involved in proactive teaching decisions: "I'm amazed at how much needs to be prethought in teaching." She provided three examples from her lessons about which she did not receive CT feedback until after she had taught what she called unsuccessful lessons because she did not reach her goals: a reading aloud activity, a test she created that was too long for the class period, and several days of plans that were not completed. She reported that when discussing these plans with her CT after her lessons, the latter told her that she knew in advance that her students did not comprehend the reading activity assigned because the focus of her activity was comprehension rather than pronunciation, that the students would not finish the test, and that she should have spent ten minutes on activities she planned to use. Kelly wrote that she would have appreciated this input from her CT on these plans before her lessons, as she had shown her lesson plans to her CT earlier during the
teaching day. She stated: "I just wish she would have made me aware of the error of my way before I made the error."

    Kelly reported feeling that she would have made progress and learned more if she had more CT input on a preactive basis. In contrast to this situation with her German CT, Kelly reported that her ESL CT had given her a plan book to accompany the student text that helped her incorporate the four language skills of reading, writing, speaking, and listening into lesson plans. With this teaching aid, she reported being able to prepare a balance of examples that helped her to achieve her learning objectives.

    Sharon reported that she received ideas for lesson plans from her CT only when she asked her CT a specific question: "Mostly I got ideas from observing her or reading methods books or just by spending long amounts of time staring into space."

    By week four of the practicum Pat had expressed frustration over less time to conference with her CT because of his extra-curricular duty as track coach. In later weeks, Pat reported that CT input and help was minimal, stating that she was responsible for developing materials and creating tests without assistance from her CT:

    I am reinventing the wheel. I start from scratch every night for plans and materials. I wish I had a cabinet full of prepared lessons and materials like my CT.

Both Pat and Kelly reported feeling less confident in their teaching without the assistance of a supportive CT. According to her questionnaire data, the total
responsibility for teaching, testing, and grading that Pat had assumed for their classes caused her to wonder if she reached her intended learning objectives:

I truly want students to learn as much as possible. I don’t want the fact that I’m a new teacher to hamper their learning progress in Spanish.

Some of the student teachers described strategies they chose to use in order to compensate for the challenges they encountered with the reported absence of feedback from their CT. For example, Lori, Pat, Kelly, and Sharon sought out other teachers from their schools or departments to discuss teaching ideas. Of these student teachers, Pat had the opportunity to co-plan a culture lesson on el cinco de mayo with another Spanish teacher. Lori requested that her vice-principal and a language professor from the university observe her classes that presented problems in classroom management. As peer coaches, Pat and Kelly reduced stressful feelings by sharing materials even though they taught different target languages:

There were some times when we were teaching on the same topics so we could share some methods like using flash cards or realia. When we taught clothing at the same time and colors at the same time, then we could talk about basically the same way of teaching things, concepts, grammar concepts which were difficult for me to think of ways to teach them. (Pat)

Pat reported that her peer was as trustworthy a source of help as the other members of her supervisory team: “I respected comments from my peer as much as comments made by my US and CT.”
One strategy taken by Ana and Sharon, two nonpeer-coached student teachers, was to ask students to provide input on their teaching. Sharon reported that the "best feedback" came from her students and "when they learned and got excited, that was the greatest reward."

Along the feedback dimension of early/specific to later/generic, nonpeer-coached student teachers reported that the only time CTs were specific about what student teachers could change in their teaching was during the three 3-way conferences at the beginning, mid-point, and end of the practicum. Four nonpeer-coached student teachers reported that input from their CTs in the 3-way conferences was feedback that they would not have received without the conference opportunity:

My CT said something that I had no idea she was thinking. I mean it was just a little thing, but she never said anything to me about it. Because she told me, when I started, "I covered all the grammar that they're going to have for this year. Do whatever you want to do." So what I tried to do with grammar, I didn't teach it or present anything. But I tried to incorporate it into lessons. But not explicitly. So there was no explicit grammar lessons. But it was there. And so she felt that I should have had some explicit grammar lessons. And she mentioned that in the three-way. And she never would have said a thing to me until then. (Lori)

In the three-way conference your CT would say things that she wouldn't have told you specifically. But during the three-way conference, you're like, "Well, am I doing this bad?" Then all of a sudden, there's all this positive feedback. (Tracy)

When asked to identify the most useful aspect of the practicum, student teachers either named the actual teaching experience they received or their sources of feedback. Patterns emerged in the data of both groups of student teachers.
teachers regarding the characteristics of US feedback. First, they described her feedback as geared toward their concerns and goals for foreign language teaching, relating to the use of clarity, materials, pacing of activities, creation of partner activities, transitions, classroom management, and language teaching methods. Feedback from the US was described as specific, very practical, truthful, and supportive. In situations where the US taught the same language as the student teacher, feedback was described as extending beyond general teaching topics and behaviors in foreign language teaching to include the content area as well:

I think it is neat that my US had a background in Spanish because I feel like I benefited a lot. She could comment on more than just my teaching. Anything that I presented grammar wise or vocabulary or when I presented culture, she could give me feedback on that as well. I felt like I got double feedback on that as well. Like I benefited twice. That was nice. (Pat)

Lori referred to her US as a source of ideas when she found it hard to create “fun and interesting ideas” in classes where it seemed “that they don’t care about French or their grades.” She reported that supervision was helpful and that she “looked forward to it every week.” For some nonpeer-coached student teachers the post-observation conference with their US was the most helpful part of supervision because it provided opportunities for them to see their strengths as well as their weaknesses. The US helped identify what could be changed in a nonthreatening manner:

I usually concentrated on what I did wrong. But I had the opportunity to hear about things I did well, that I usually am not
thinking about. So even when she was discussing the things you need to improve, it’s in a way that is not threatening. (Lori)

The specificity of US feedback was found to help student teachers become more aware of what they were doing in their practice and why what they did was successful: "My supervisor’s comments were helpful. They reminded me of things that I ‘know’ but did not actually put into practice until I was reminded... Supervision from my US has been useful in that it draws my attention to ways I can improve. It keeps me from getting stuck in a rut or from feeling too comfortable with my performance" (Sharon).

Student teachers reported that this US assistance facilitated the use of a method or strategy as a routine in their teaching. The following are examples:

For my seventh graders, I changed the types of activities because I wasn’t having any luck with larger group or whole class activities even for a couple of minutes to introduce something. So my US suggested that I try more individual work because they want a task, they want to do it. And they’ll do it that way. And I practiced that. Not only whole class and small group but some individual work too. I eventually would have figured it out but her comments guided me and got me there quicker. (Lori)

One time I was doing what I thought was a listening exercise, but my US pointed out that it wasn’t purely listening. It was a text recorded on a tape but I had the students looking at the text while they were listening to it. When it came time to answer the questions, only a few of them were. So my US pointed out that it’s better to put the questions up on the overhead first, close the books, and listen... a couple of times through and probably I could have eventually figured that out... After she told me, I knew that was going to work better, which I knew from methodology classes that’s what you’re supposed to do...And I did it several times after that. (Sharon)
One aspect of post-observation conferences reported by four nonpeer-coached student teachers as beneficial was the US’s first question about how they felt about their lessons:

My supervisor is wonderful. She made me feel powerful by focusing on the good things I did and by asking me my opinion about my lesson and giving me support of how I could improve my lesson plan. (Ana)

Student teachers in the nonpeer-coached group expressed the desire for more supervision visits and conference opportunities:

I don’t mind if my US visits me two times a week. It would be a good idea if US1 and US2 switch supervision for a week. I would like to have more and different feedback. (Ana)

The whole quarter I felt starved for feedback because I didn’t get any other than the once a week observation. (Lori)

In addition to characteristics of the feedback, the method of providing feedback further contrasted the CT from the US in their supervisory capacities. Sharon reported that the observation notes taken by her US in script form provided her with detailed information that guided their post-observation conference. In contrast, her CT simply handed her a written report of an observation to read and did not engage in post-observation debriefing. Sharon reported that this left her feeling “intimidated.”

Student teachers found that meetings with the US, which were valuable particularly in cases when the US and student teacher shared the same target language because feedback on pronunciation, grammar, culture, and vocabulary was provided, lacked the immediacy of meetings with the supportive CTs and
peer coaches. The ongoing nature of peer coaching was found to provide student teachers with the awareness of another dimension of US feedback:

You gave good suggestions, but it was after the fact. Meeting with the peer was kind of preventive maintenance in the lesson plan. You had to talk about it ahead of time. (Pat)

Because it occurred only weekly, the post-observation conference with the US was seen by peer-coached student teachers as helpful in a retroactive manner rather than a preactive manner. The peer-coached student teachers reported that input from the US helped them see the improvements they made on a week-to-week basis as well as the areas still in need of improvement, which provided them with the opportunity to note professional growth.

In four placements, the student teachers reported that the CT observed and conferenced with them daily throughout the practicum. These student teachers rated the feedback they received from their CT as abundant, related to students, and helpful; it allowed them to modify their plans to teach the same lesson again in a later class. Anne regarded her CT as the most supportive member of her supervision team because of her familiarity with the students and the setting:

I think probably my CT was the most helpful to me just because she was always there. She knew my situation, the environment, the school, the kids. She was very flexible with me and gave me free use of her materials with the opportunity to make my own. She worked with me all the time. So I think her support and presence was probably the most helpful...The CT is more aware of the backgrounds of the different students. They’ve been with them for a year or two years. So they know what may motivate that student.
Maria's CT was present to observe her teaching every day. She stated that she appreciated her CT's sharing "her rules, strategies, and procedures from her 25 years of experience." She reported that her CT was helpful regarding discipline, was a "good listener," "open-minded," and was available for help on a consistent basis. Like Anne, Maria reported finding this close supervision useful because the CT "knew her students well" and could give input that helped Maria meet her goals. The value of veteran input was noted by each of the student teachers who reported having a CT that was supportive throughout the practicum.

Student teachers who did not report having supportive CTs willing to share such veteran input were members of both supervisory groups. A recurring theme found in the comments made by the nonpeer-coached student teachers included a desire and an expressed need for more university-based opportunities beyond the weekly two hour seminars to confer with other student teachers in order to plan lessons and share ideas:

I'd like to have had more discussion of what the fellow student teachers is doing. And it's not only that they're sharing experience but we can also check the actual theory that we use in the classroom. I would have liked more practical lessons in the seminar. (Max)

I think I would have liked to have seen more information from previous classes like 289 and our methods class. I used this information while creating lesson plans but to see it with the group would have been good. (Chip)
After the researcher read the questionnaire data, a question was posed to the nonpeer-coached group of student teachers in the focus group interview regarding whether or not they believed that more time for interaction with fellow student teachers at the university and school settings would have given them the type of opportunities to share information for which they seemed to have called in other data sources. Responses related to the need to interact with other preservice teachers:

**Different people see the things differently. So you can get the different feedback. And you don’t have to take that opinion, but it will certainly help for some other occasion.** (Max)

In response to the question about whether a peer could offer as much help as the US in lesson planning and teaching decisions, answers demonstrated that nonpeer-coached student teachers would have welcomed collaborative opportunities among the entire cohort:

**I think it’s useful just to increase that support group and increase the range. I felt like I was there by myself...because I usually never had the guts to bring up to the teachers “I wonder what I should do about this.” And then hearing what’s going on and just being with adults. I looked forward to that. It would have felt like more support, more of a support group than it did otherwise.** (Sharon)

No such calls for help were found in the data sources of the peer-coached group of student teachers. Several characteristics of the peer coaching relationship as described by the peer-coached teachers indicate that these student teachers did not perceive the same isolation as the nonpeer-coached teachers. Evidence from peer-coached teachers’ data showed that the ongoing
nature of peer coaching was noted as facilitating conditions for peers to help one another. First, the pre-observation conference was referred to as having a "sounding board" function as peers listened to, thought about, and responded to the observed teacher's plan and concerns. Pat reported that the pre-observation conferences gave her the confidence to "iron out the kinks" of her lesson plans and that her lessons "always improved" after conferring with her peer:

I thought what helped most was putting my lessons in a logical order. How should I present this? In this order? Or will this work better? This type of questions.

According to Pat, during these conferences she and her peer "would take a look at each other's lesson plan to see how they were arranged" and she usually felt "better prepared" to teach her lesson. The value of the pre-observation conference was contrasted with the debriefing sessions with the US as noted above (p. 264) by Pat. The feedback from the US was referred to as "after the fact," thus not having an influence on the observed lesson like the feedback received on one's lesson plan during the pre-observation conference.

Both the pre- and post-observation conferences were reported to have an influence on the planning of the observed student teacher because the peer coach offered alternative ideas and methods in discussions with the observed teacher about how to achieve lesson goals. In one instance Sally spoke of having been able to elicit questions from students regarding the content that would not have surfaced if she had not used her peer coach's idea:
I can come up with an idea, but it’s not always the best idea. Like today I was talking about how I was frustrated about the review. “What else can I do to review?” You know? And then you came up with that good idea about having them walk around and talk during that communicative activity on the subjunctive instead of just having them in their seats. Get them talking and using it a little bit. Make it personal. You had a good idea.

According to Kelly, during these peer coaching discussions, her peer provided a form of assistance that helped with her attempts to personalize the grammar points that she said “tended to be dry” and provided help while creating plans and materials.

Words used to describe the peer coach and the peer coaching relationship were “cheerleader,” “completely honest,” and “friendship.” Both Maria and Pat used the term “cheerleader” which seemed to indicate that peer coaching provided the observed teacher with the confidence to try new ideas. According to Sally, confidence that the peer-coaching relationship provided helped her to take risks in using teaching ideas that she would not have tried on her own:

And just like even with the clothes vocabulary like I threw the clothes out to them and they loved it. Maria said, “Just pin it up on them.” At first I was just like, “I don’t know. I don’t know how they will react.” And I thought about it and they did well with it.

The immediacy of the post-observation conferences was reported to have an influence on planning for the very next lesson taught by the observed teacher. Kelly stated that she considered the input from her peer as seriously as that of her CT and US:
Things that I might not have reviewed again the next day when my US pointed out or when Pat pointed out that, “Maybe that wasn’t clear. I didn’t really understand what you were doing there. I don’t think they got it as well as they should have. Maybe you should review that again on the next day.” Even if I was thinking that it was enough, we’ve spent three days on it. But if they need that fourth day, they need the fourth day. And it helps when there is someone watching who can tell you one way or the other, when they can read the students’ reactions maybe more because they’re sitting there and listening to what you are saying.

A second characteristic of peer coaching was a nonevaluative dimension. Unlike the CT or US, the peer coach had no responsibility or input toward assigning a grade to the observed teacher’s teaching. Having used the term “cheerleader” to describe a peer coach, peers stated that they appreciated the ability to meet with a person who shared the same professional status and teaching experience. Anne reported that she “enjoyed observing” her peer’s lessons because the interaction process of the pre-observation conference, observation, and post-observation conference allowed her to put her peer’s situation “in perspective of her own” and “check her own effectiveness” by having this added source of input. Pat found her peer to exhibit an understanding of her situation unlike other observers or individuals with whom she discussed her student teaching experience:

My friends care about what I’m going through but they can’t empathize like a peer coach can. They can do more than sympathize, empathize with you. “I know exactly what you are talking about.” Or, even if they don’t, they try to understand.

Kelly reported that, on a day when her peer observed, a heating problem prompted her to move her class to the cafeteria where no regular teaching
supplies were available. She stated that if the US had observed that particular
lesson instead of her peer coach, she would have felt unsuccessful and worried:

I didn’t feel threatened at all when Pat was there. If there was
something that messed up, I felt that she understood because she
was in the same situation, like that one day when it was too hot in
the building. She was there for that day. I didn’t feel like, “Oh my
gosh, I can’t believe Pat is here and she’s seeing this and oh this is
a terrible lesson.” I felt that she had compassion for me and that
she felt for me and she was trying to help, “Is there anything I
can carry? Is there anything I can do?” I looked at her as more
of a help and as a resource.

A third characteristic of peer coaching interaction was that the peer
coach, being familiar with the peer's classes and teaching context, could provide
feedback based on students' characteristics:

After the peer has already seen the class, they know what types
of students are in the classroom. Then they can more readily give
advice on “maybe this might be a good idea for this class, but this
particular class it won't work out as well.” (Kelly)

Sally and Maria reported implementing ideas discussed in the pre-observation
conferences. They stated that they provided each other with information about
their classes' abilities and characteristics when discussing activities to be used
and guiding their peer in the analysis of the application of chosen strategies and
ideas: “We could describe our class make-up and then explain why we chose
one method over another” (Sally). Familiarity with the peer coach's classroom
goals also prompted peers to share materials. Although Maria taught levels II, III,
and IV of Spanish and Sally taught beginning levels, in their data is evidence of
their sharing materials such as visual prompts and songs for presentation purposes in Sally's classes and for review in Maria's classes.

Both Pat and Kelly reported that peer coaching was helpful for lesson planning. In pre-observation conferences, their peer helped them to maintain a learner's perspective and adapt their plans for their groups of students:

...when I wasn't totally sure about what I was going to be doing or when I wasn't confident, "How do I explain this?" It made me think, "I have this lesson plan, but is it really going to take hold? If I can't explain it to my peer, then how am I going to be able to teach it?" (Kelly)

Peer coaches who taught the same target language said that planning discussions helped with target language knowledge. For example, in addition to peer interaction having provided her with sources of ideas on incorporating communicative practice of grammatical forms such as the irregular preterite tense, the subjunctive mood, and the differences between the preterite and imperfect aspects of the past tense, Sally reported that through peer interaction with a native speaker of Spanish, her own proficiency in Spanish improved. Sally noted that she learned words that pertained to classroom materials that she would not have used or learned had she not had the opportunity to work with a native speaker:

I had a wonderful opportunity to practice my Spanish with Maria, a native speaker. Often times she would come into my room and just start speaking Spanish...it became second nature to me. So when she spoke to me in Spanish, I answered her in Spanish. Maria was a great person to practice with. I could always
ask her questions about Spanish and learned so much new vocabulary from her such as sun screen, tripod, space suit, wiggle.

Peer-coached student teachers reported that the assistance received from both the peer coach and the US was specific. For example, at the time when her CT began to leave her alone in the classroom and began to plan less and offer less specific feedback, Kelly reported feeling that her peer was helpful in “her search for more concrete ideas in her plans.” The US and peer coach suggested specific methods and both spoke with her on the phone at night. In contrast, the CT did not speak with her by telephone and gave only general feedback such as, “well done,” or “good lesson.” Kelly stated that it was a challenge to get her CT “to look at the specifics like timing and how activities would actually occur. With Pat and my US, I was able to get into more specific problems of my teaching and how this was affecting my students.”

A feature of the post-observation conferences that seemed to lead to the specific nature of the peer’s feedback was that the observed teacher commented first on her own lesson. When the peer coach did speak, she began with the strengths of the lesson. Pat found these conferences to contrast with the conferences she had with her CT, who seemed to maintain an authoritative influence:

What I liked best about the peer coaching between me and Kelly was that I would comment on my own lesson plan before she would say anything. And a lot of times I would point out my own weaknesses and she would say whether it was really a weakness or how I could make it better. I mean, maybe it really wasn’t a weakness. Maybe I was just overreacting. Maybe one student acted
bad, but in my mind 30 of them did! So I mean talking to her in the post-observation conference helped put everything into perspective.

Maria noted that the technical feedback in the form of suggestions for lesson improvements was a mutual practice between her and her peer and because the feedback was specifically geared toward their individual concerns, they were able to make improvements in a short amount of time during their practicum. In addition to specificity, Maria reported that she accepted the feedback received from her peer because of the way it was offered. She noted the collegial character of her work with Sally: "...someone who was available and open to take my ideas as well."

In contrast to the absence of feedback from the CT, the on-going nature of peer coaching was reported as a source of assistance that kept peers "up to date" and "on task" with the clarity material from seminars and also encouraged student teachers to use the ideas discussed at the university setting:

You go to these conferences and people throw all these ideas at you but then don’t tell you how to use them in your classroom. It’s sad to think that someone did not make use of a good idea because they believe it won’t work. (Pat)

Part of the specificity of assistance that peer interaction offered was that it was focused on aspects of teaching with which the student teachers struggled. These included: (1) Making lesson plans achievable in order to complete lesson goals; (2) Maintaining a lesson focus; (3) Classroom discipline; (4) Personalizing the foreign language content. Pat noted that over time the depth of conversation
evolved into including theoretical topics from their university courses in their conferences:

_We actually talked about validity. And I thought that was something that you only talk about in methods class. But we had to because we were helping them write the test. And we were nervous. I know I was nervous because I had never written a final exam before. And I was concerned about whether or not it would be fair._

A fifth characteristic that the peer coaching relationship also offered was the opportunity to reflect. Pat noted that peer coaching sessions gave her time to “calm down and do a better job.” She stated that by nature she is a reflective person and that the pace she kept in order to complete all teaching, testing, planning, and grading duties handed down to her by her CT for three Spanish 1 classes in the early weeks did not allow her to reflect on her teaching as much as desired. Pat valued those peer coaching sessions that let her reflect and discuss her teaching.

Reflection was not only a product of peer discussions, but also prompted by observation of a peer. Kelly referred to one of Pat’s lessons in which she noted the use of several clarity skills. She reported being “impressed by” Pat’s use of several summaries at different points during the lesson, informing students of objectives before beginning new activities, and asking the students to give the summaries, which prompted her to reflect in her journal about strategies for the integration of the summarizing skill:

_One problem with having students give the summary is that if you don’t use directed questions, they tend to jumble everything_
together. Pat did a nice job of clarifying. In her summary she did use an overall question of “What did you learn?” but then she pulled out key ideas such as colors and clothing and had individuals give her words from each category.

The observation of her peer encouraged Kelly to ask her own students to give summaries of material covered, adapting it with more specific questions according to her own concerns. She reported that this method was successful and integrated it during her last two weeks of student teaching.

Maria, Sally, Kelly, and Pat reported that peer coaching was a helpful component to the student teaching experience. In each of these two peer coaching cases, the support reported about CTs contrasted with the other. Maria and Sally reported having CTs who observed daily, shared ideas, and shared materials. Pat and Kelly were among those student teachers who reported lack of observation, feedback, and assistance from their CTs. Although these four student teachers reported that peer coaching was a source of added support in the practicum, negative evidence existed about the dimensions of this helpfulness in the practicum. Anne and Cindy did not report sharing in the same way as Maria and Sally or Pat and Kelly.

Anne contrasted the assistance she received from her peer, CT, and US. Discussions with her peer and CT were referred to as “a more superficial brush over topics of methodology.” Both Anne and her peer coach reported having used their peer-coaching sessions to discuss contextualization, the need to use the target language in their classes, and “made sure they identified when each
of these” topics was used in their classes. They both reported that although they discussed the importance of these topics, they did not use their peer coaching sessions to plan how to implement these ideas. Anne suggested in her data that the reason for not discussing teaching ideas more specifically with her peer was because Cindy did not teach the same target language:

*Sometimes it was neat being of a different language. Like Cindy and I taught different languages. But I also think that it may have been helpful to be with somebody who was teaching the same language to say, “Well, how do you go about teaching the passé composé?” or something that is particular to French.*

She contrasted this to the specificity of terms used by her US noting that the US focused on strengths and areas to improve upon in her teaching in the post-observation conferences, which were the only times she felt she had “an in-depth analysis of application where I was asked to provide a rationale for why I taught a lesson a certain way.”

Data, however, showed instances when sharing was reported to have occurred between these two peers. For example, in one of Anne’s observations of Cindy, she noted that Cindy did not use the five minutes of class time that preceded the daily school announcements for instruction or interaction with students. Anne explained her use of a daily activity she used to award francs to students for participation points in the beginning minutes of class, which Cindy adopted for her Spanish classes by using those minutes of class to award pesos.
Cindy reported that she appreciated all of the observations she received over the course of the student teaching quarter because one teacher "can’t see it all" while teaching and the observer can share strengths and weaknesses about the lesson with the student teacher. She seemed to nest the appreciation that she felt for peer coaching within the function of providing feedback. She noted the helpfulness of the gamut of feedback she received, ranging from the feedback from her peer who was on the same professional level to the veteran input of her CT and US. She commented on the value of feedback as a teaching device:

I'm pretty open minded and want to know what I can improve on. I'm not going to go out there and say, "I'm not going to listen to my US...I have a lot of learning to do."

She reported that conferences with her peer were about the aspects of foreign language pedagogy that they believed to be important based on their university experience. Although their conferences included topics of importance, she stated that the information they discussed was not new to them, but represented aspects of teaching they felt they should consider for their teaching, such as using visuals for those students who need more than oral practice, adaptation and use of clarity skills, presenting material in the target language, and contextualization of lessons. Their pre-observation conferences were conferences conducted directly before the class to be observed. Cindy reported that this scheduling prevented them from being able to modify their lessons.
Anne stated that they did not use their peer interaction to treat methods in a specific way. Although she reported enjoying the observations of her peer’s lessons, Anne made the statement that peer coaching would have been more helpful if they had problems or struggled with aspects of teaching. In contrast to other peer coaches who reported that peer coaching helped them with aspects of teaching with which they struggled, such as the integration of communicative practice or completing their lesson plans, Anne stated the following:

Cindy and I had the same methods classes...and our ideas were mostly the same...I think a teacher would want to talk with somebody else if they have a specific reason to talk with them, “Come look at my class,” or “Could you talk with me about how you go about teaching this?” I think then it could most helpful.

Other than a focus on clarity, as seen in the next section, Anne and Cindy did not report that peer coaching sessions helped them in specific ways.

One part of the self-report questionnaire focused the student teachers’ attention on clarity skills in particular. This section summarizes the student teachers’ perceptions on the assistance they received with the integration of clarity skills from their supervisory sources. The clarity skills training provided during the course of the student teaching practicum was one part of the university-based portion of supervision that both groups of student teachers shared. The comments directly related to clarity grouped thematically from the questionnaires of the nonpeer-coached student teachers showed that these student teachers pointed to their own practice, US supervision, and the teaching of clarity theory as helping them most to apply clarity skills in the classroom.
Those who identified supervision as the element of the practicum that most helped them use clarity skills brought attention to the feedback of weekly supervision visits. Max said that he did not “consciously think of them” (clarity skills) when planning or teaching. He reported that US feedback made him aware of the skills he used. Similarly Sharon said that US supervision helped her become aware of the skills that were used but not planned. Both Max and Sharon also reported that supervision provided them with a feeling of accountability to use the clarity skills during weekly observations. Max said that supervision provided “a bit of pressure that helped” him improve his lessons. In particular, he mentioned that the presence of his US made him “slow his speech, repeat more and state objectives.”

Chip and Ana cited feedback in the post-observation conference as an opportunity to receive assistance with clarity skills:

My US pointed them out. She said “You used this and this clarity skill. It was there and it was effective.” And she would suggest what other clarity skills I might have used.” (Ana)

Ana and Tracy mentioned that using the pre-observation written task was a way to focus their US’s observations and ensuing comments on their integration of clarity skills. Ana lauded the pre-observation written tasks:

Writing the pre-observation note was helpful in a sense I know that my US understood what is going on, what is expected, and she will focus her observation on such things...mostly clarity and how clear I was in the classroom.”
One example of how the pre-observation task assisted Tracy was her learning from her US that she needed to state her lesson objectives with more specificity:

After that, I kind of stated my objectives differently. I would state them before each activity or write them on the board. That gives them a good guide about what's going on.

Presentation of theory and demonstration with videotapes were noted as helpful in acquiring and applying clarity skills in the classroom:

I would say the presentation of theory and the tapes showed me a lot of the things I didn't do naturally already, that I had to think about. And so to recognize them was helpful. (Lori)

The nonpeer-coached group expressed the desire for opportunities to focus on clarity skills by working with other student teachers. Tracy expressed a desire for “mock lessons on clarity” with members of both supervisory groups. Lori said she wanted more university time “to listen and hear what other student teachers do to integrate clarity.”

With the clarity skills it would have helped me more if we did some mock lessons with those skills instead of discussing them. I'm a hands-on person. I have to do it. And I would have liked to have heard what the other group was doing in their classrooms. Try to get ideas from everybody else so that we can write that stuff down. (Tracy)

Peer-coached student teachers also reported that supervision helped them implement clarity skills. Cindy mentioned that she requested assistance with clarity skills teaching because “it is hard to focus on everything that happens during a class.” She stated that she wanted her observers to note whether or not she remembered to include objectives in her lesson because
classroom routines such as the homework check had to be completed before she began the lesson for the day. Consequently, at times she forgot to inform the students of her objectives.

For Sally, the post-observation conference was a "gauge to see if I used clarity in my lessons," a chance to ask her observer to tell her whether or not she used the clarity skills she had mentioned in her pre-observation conference. Kelly’s peer helped her identify the clarity skills she used by labeling them in the post-observation conference. This practice was reported to help her refine her use of the clarity skills.

The pre-observation to post-observation cycle of the clinical supervision model seemed to help Pat with the analysis of application of clarity skills as she wrote in her questionnaire that she and her peer "became experts at identifying clarity skills by the end of student teaching." She reported feeling "better off than most beginning teachers, "because she was aware of the skills used and how to implement them. For example, Pat said that the pre-observation conference was a chance to provide her plan to use the clarity skills to her peer or for her peer to remind her to use the clarity skills. She reported being able to "map out the objectives" and that the pre-observation conference helped her to "know what information to summarize" because, in her own words, “I think the pre-observation conference was the only time you talked about it ahead of time.”

Kelly noted that post-observation conferences immediately after the observed lesson were most helpful for planning objectives, lesson sequence,
and summaries for the next class. The accountability she felt was reported in statements such as, “Your peer was a constant reminder to use clarity skills.” When her peer observed her, Kelly said she focused on the application of clarity skills. But when she was not observed by her peer or US, her focus was related to her own survival concerns:

When my peer coach or US was observing, I tried harder to use the new techniques. Otherwise I was just thinking about how to get through the day and how to keep the students’ attention even though I know being clear will help keep students’ attention.

Cindy reported that the skill summarizes was challenging to implement, not a skill she naturally included in her lessons. As suggested by her US, she watched her teaching videos and identified points where she did summarize or opportunities she had to summarize. She reported that discussions with her US helped her to experiment with ways to use the clarity skills of giving objectives and summaries. Some changes she made were having students give the summaries and listing objectives at several points during a lesson. Cindy also discussed with her peer the need to use the skill of repeating important points, specifically to reinforce correct grammatical forms such as noun and adjective agreement.

Student teachers found it helpful to observe a peer who served as a model of the clarity skills. Maria reported that watching her peer teach the beginning levels of Spanish served as a reminder for her to use similar repetitions and simple words in the target language in Spanish III and IV. By
planning with her non-native speaking peer, Maria reported discovering language that she could use with her students:

**Sometimes when you are teaching lower levels, you learn how to be more specific and clear.**

When observing one of Pat’s lessons, Kelly noted Pat’s use of having her students provide the summaries. Having listened to students’ summaries prompted Kelly to reflect in her journal about strategies for the integration of the summarizing skill. The observation of her peer encouraged Kelly to ask her own students to give summaries of material covered, an implementation of this skill that she had not yet used. She integrated this use of *summarizes* after having reflected on how students could successfully provide summaries and adapted her peer’s idea by using specific questions to elicit the students’ summaries.

Another characteristic of peer coaching that appeared to enhance the use of clarity skills was that the peer helped student teachers to think of their content in terms of students’ understanding:

**Like sometimes I didn’t think there needed to be as much repetition with something or use as many examples or writing different things on the board and... when it was mostly a grammar lesson. But in our discussions, I started thinking about it from the students’ point of view, it just needs so much practice or review. (Sally)**

Peer-coached student teachers also noted in their peer coaching sessions that the integration of clarity skills helped them check for students’ understanding. Kelly provided one example:
Also the summaries were at first, I thought, well they know what they’ve talked about. But I found more and more doing it, that especially in my German I class, that I like it when they do the summary because it’s also a comprehension check at the same time. They enjoy showing that they’ve actually learned something and what they had done and remembering the things.

Cindy also mentioned that the tapes in seminar as well as peer coaching were helpful because, for the skills that did not come naturally: “I have to see it done. I just can’t read about it.” Her peer Anne reported that observing her peer’s teaching and conferences with her US assisted her with the integration of the clarity skills.

Discussion

The student teaching practicum combined direct teaching experience and university-based teacher education so that each student teacher was part of the traditional student teaching triad consisting of student teacher, CT, and US. There were two supervisory models: traditional supervision and traditional supervision with an added peer-coaching component. The findings from the self-report data revealed that, in general, the role of the CT in the supervisory triad, as perceived by each student teacher, was critical in determining how the student teachers regarded other aspects of the practicum.

The student teachers’ perceptions of the university-based portion of the teacher education practicum depended upon the support received from their CT and school setting. Early in the practicum, student teachers reported receiving support from their CTs that resembled the collegiality function of peer coaching.
Student teachers noted the initial welcome, the sharing of ideas and resources, and the invitations to put their ideas to use in their new classroom setting. At this early point, student teachers perceived the university-based portion of the practicum, which offered two hours on campus divided between clarity training and a student teaching discussion-based seminar, as less helpful than this school-based segment. During this time, student teachers reported that the university portion lacked collegiality and was carried out in a business-like manner because of the focus on clarity skills.

After week three of the practicum, the presence of the CT in more than half of the cases was no longer constant nor the feedback a daily occurrence. As the CTs became less supportive, student teachers regarded as more valuable the university-based portion of the practicum: They noted that opportunities for collegial sharing existed in the second hour of the student teaching seminar, an hour dedicated to the concerns that the student teachers wanted to address. The data from the self-report questionnaires showed that each supervisory source represented a unique perspective on teaching as well as particular components of the knowledge base on teaching.

The diagram below functions as a graphic organizer to discuss the findings from the self-report data. Each circle represents one supervision source, in terms of the functions of peer coaching (Ackland, 1991), that each source facilitated. The findings are discussed in terms of the dimensions, attributes, and contexts for these five functions of peer coaching according to the student
teachers' perceptions on the supervisory sources available to them during the practicum. Figure 4.3 represents the situations of the nonpeer-coached teachers and the peer-coached teachers who reported wanting their CTs to engage in more discussion of teaching tasks with them over the course of the ten-week practicum. Regarding the collegiality function of supervision with peer coaching, differences among the supervision team members were found in
the self-report data. First, these data showed that calls for opportunities to
collaborate with other student teachers beyond the weekly seminar were made
from the nonpeer-coached group of student teachers. They wanted more contact
with the other student teachers to discuss their newly acquired teaching tasks
and to know what other student teachers were doing, how they were
progressing, and to know more about other CT relationships. These student
teachers wanted help with planning lessons, integrating content learned in
earlier methods courses, and integrating the clarity model. One drawback
mentioned in literature on inservice workshops is the lack of follow-up sessions
for teachers to integrate the new material or skills into their classrooms. It
appears that the student teachers needed more continued assistance than the
weekly observation by the US or the assistance of their CT.

No such calls for collaboration were mentioned among the teachers in
the peer-coached group, which demonstrates that student teachers involved in
peer-coaching situations were able to assist each other with the integration of
the skills and knowledge into their everyday teaching. Apart from the teaching
task, these student teachers referred to their peer coaches as being able to
empathize with their situations at this early stage of professional life. Having
referred to their peer coach as a model of what they had learned in their teacher
education program, peer coaches provided an extra component to the traditional
teacher education program that compensated for the lack of CT attention given
to student teachers’ concerns. For example, student teachers lamented having
to carry out planning, instruction, and assessment without the aid of CT lesson plans, input on lessons, and materials. They complained when their CTs took time from their lessons to carry out their own “business.” This information suggests that teacher education represented two separate endeavors: that representing the interests of the CT and the other representing interests the student teacher had in implementing what was learned in the teacher education program.

Collegiality was found to exist in peer relationships: Student teachers discussed their interests and identified the possible ways that they could provide the other with assistance. An interest specific to this group of student teachers was having to create materials. Peer coaches assisted the other by sharing materials or by supplying ideas for making materials, even if they taught different levels or different languages.

Fundamental to the relationship, peer coaches noted that peers gave helpful advice or suggestions in a nonevaluative way. According to the self-report data, peer coaches were willing not only to offer an idea to a peer, but to accept the peer’s idea as well. Peer coaching also created collegial relations because peer coaches shared the same status as beginning teachers. At times, a strategy engaged in by a peer-coached student teacher was to seek out the advice and input from a peer instead of the CT or US. The similar perspective, as an individual capable of empathizing with another preservice teacher’s situation, was at times more desired than that of the other individuals on the
supervision team. The comments and characterizations of the peer-coached individuals such as "cheerleader" and "enjoyed observing" a peer intimate that the peer-coached student teachers appreciated the opportunities to observe and analyze teaching episodes with a person who was not responsible for assigning a grade to their teaching.

Several aspects of technical feedback that emanated from this study serve to inform teacher education programs. The feedback dimension that developed over the course of the practicum was one in which CT feedback was specific and consistent during the first three weeks of the practicum. During these earliest weeks, student teachers reported that CTs provided them with support, feedback, and resources needed to teach successfully in the student teaching practicum. Later, CT presence and feedback diminished. Feedback lost its specific nature in favor of generic statements on their progress and lesson ideas. Daily planning ceased and thus student teachers in the nonpeer-group engaged in strategies such as asking students for input on lessons and their learning.

Student teachers in both supervisory groups expressed a desire for more observations and feedback from their CTs. Calls for more help in student teaching among peer-coached student teachers focused upon assistance with lesson planning and more opportunities to receive feedback from their CTs. Calls for help among nonpeer-coached student teachers focused on collaboration with other student teachers, CTs, and in a few instances, more US
visits. These requests for more feedback and discussion on the acts of teaching demonstrate a desire for directive supervision from their CTs. Evidence for this conclusion was found in the data from both non-peer-coached and peer-coached student teachers. For example, Kelly reported that she would have had more successful lessons and completed her goals had her CT given her feedback on her lesson plan before teaching the lesson rather than after lesson execution. Figure 4.4 below summarizes the specificity dimension of CT feedback as reported by the student teachers:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Weeks 1-3</th>
<th>Week 3</th>
<th>Week 10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>specific geared to their needs</td>
<td>generic or not present</td>
<td>“thumbs up” - “good job”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rely on US or Peer coach for specific feedback</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4.4 Summary of CT technical feedback dimension
This specific to generic dimension of feedback offered to the student teachers by their CTs shows that CTs were capable of assisting student teachers with their feedback and suggests that they believed student teachers should teach independently at an early point in the practicum.

Peer-coaching provided the context for student teachers to note the differences between CT feedback and feedback from a peer coach and the US. Peer coaches noted that the feedback from their peer began in the planning discussions during the pre-observation conferences. The clinical supervision cycle was specifically focused on the observed teachers' interests. In response to the lack of CT feedback, peer-coached student teachers relied on their peer coach for the specific feedback that helped them to achieve their goals. The discussions in pre- and post-observation conferences reportedly helped student teachers with problematic areas of teaching. This form of supervision was found to be relevant to student teachers concerns and facilitated improvements that they were able to implement in the short period of the ten week practicum.

Attention given to the pre-observation conferences, which assisted student teachers with their particular concerns and interests, resembles the more recent applications of peer coaching designed by Joyce and Showers (1996) that emphasize the planning aspect of the peer-coaching relationship rather than the feedback received after a lesson. The value of the peer coaching relationship may be found in the planning discussions preceding the lessons rather than post-observation conferences. Pat's perceptions on the pre-
observation conference for planning clarity skills use and helping her organize her lessons are some of the many examples in the data that indicate this value.

Findings regarding the US demonstrated that this source of input and feedback related to the pedagogical content knowledge, content knowledge, and generic pedagogical knowledge domains of the teaching knowledge base. Reliance on the US was a strategy engaged in by both groups of student teachers. As a weekly source of feedback, the US provided student teachers with information regarding their progress toward goals. This feedback helped student teachers realize where progress was made when there was no other form of feedback available. The US was also responsible for arranging for three 3-way conferences among the members of the supervisory triad. It was the feedback received during these mandated meetings that was referred to as specific and helpful feedback. Because CT feedback is so valuable, present teacher education programs requiring these three-way conferences might consider altering their requirement such that CTs provide specific weekly feedback to their student teachers.

When the US shared the same language as the student teacher, feedback related to content as well as to content specific and generic teaching methodologies. Thus, the amount of the shared knowledge base on teaching was greater than when they did not have a common target language. The finding that student teachers appreciated US input on target language grammar, culture, and vocabulary underscores the need for the CT to observe lessons consistently
throughout the ten-week practicum to lend his or her expertise to the student
teacher on the content knowledge portion of the knowledge base. Student
teachers in both groups reported struggling with making grammar presentations
more interesting, and the peer-coached student teachers reported that their peer
coch was a form of assistance with this struggle. These two findings of the
student teachers’ struggles with grammar presentations and the input on content
knowledge that student teachers appreciated suggest that teacher education
programs can provide the CT with a precise list of topics to discuss and practice
with the student teacher.

In addition, student teachers whose CT kept an observation journal during
the initial weeks of student teaching found this form of feedback helpful. This
finding also provides teacher education programs with information on how
specific feedback can be helpful to student teachers. Student teachers can
retain a written report and refer to it at any point in the practicum.

According to several of the student teachers in this study, the opportunity
to acquire actual teaching practice was the most helpful aspect of the practicum.
For others, the feedback they received on their teaching was the most useful
part of the practicum. Student teachers in the peer-coached section expressed a
common appreciation for the three different perspectives on the application of
foreign/second language teaching methodology and clarity skills provided to
them by the members of their supervisory teams. When three sources were
available to student teachers, the perspectives that they gained were reported to
provide a more realistic view of their teaching: Each source was reported to have helped the student teachers see aspects of their teaching that they could not see alone.

Each observer, therefore, had a role in the analysis of application function for the observed teacher. Clinical supervision facilitated the analysis of application by providing teachers with a weekly gauge of their progress and by encouraging the use of targeted skills. When CTs were named as supportive members of the triad, they were noted for their helpfulness in analyzing early classes so that a student teacher could modify the same lesson for a later class. Peer-coached student teachers also received more information on their progress with target clarity skills by meeting with their peers more than once per week. A similarity was noted in the feedback of the US and the peer coach. Student teachers mentioned an accountability to use target skills and methods during their observations. Peer-coached student teachers said that the immediacy of the post-observation conference led them to stay “on task” with the target material from seminar and to discuss their next lesson and plan with the peer. The observation schedule of weekly visits from the US and peer coach was cited as helpful time frame for student teachers to notice their progress with L2 methods and clarity skills implementation.

According to literature on supervision, the student teaching triad typically suffers from a lack of communication among its members and the roles of the CT and US are left undefined (Richardson-Koehler, 1988; Hoover, O’Shea, Carroll,
1988). In this study, student teachers' perspectives on the supervision process and their voiced needs for forms of supervision showed that the roles of the CT and US were clearly defined. When the focus of supervision was to help the student teacher understand how to adapt material and methods to particular groups of students, or how their teaching actions were received by the students, the CT played the primary role. It was found that CTs had the most knowledge of learners, specifically about the pupils' backgrounds, background knowledge, and behaviors. When student teachers of either supervisory group wanted information on classroom management, the CT was the person of the supervisory triad that best knew the students and their characteristics. Even student teachers who had reported a lack of specific feedback and a lack of consistent presence by the CT said that when they had discipline problems they directly approached CTs for ideas and strategies to address these issues.

As new individuals entered classrooms to student teach, the CT acted as a representative of his or her students in order to inform the student teacher's understanding of particular students' characteristics and reactions. The role of the CT in the supervisory triad is, thus, essential. Although these CTs were referred to as not on task with their supervision duties on a regular basis, they did provide their student teachers with knowledge about learners for the adaptation of instruction and classroom management techniques. In the supervision literature, it is the CT who is consistently named as the most critical member of the supervisory triad (Richardson-Koehler, 1988; Metcalf, 1991;
Sudzina, Geibelhaus, & Coolican, 1997). As suggested in this study, the knowledge about the pupils provided by the CT facilitates the student teachers' adaptation of material to pupils and is the reason for the importance of the CT’s presence in the practicum experience.

The peer coach was also noted as a source of help for the peer coaching function of adaptation to students. In some instances, the ongoing nature of peer coaching facilitated the student teacher’s familiarity with the peer coach’s groups of students. For example, Sally and Maria taught in adjacent rooms and saw the same students daily. These two student teachers reported observing each other flexibly, sometimes three or four times per week. This flexible visiting process promoted the student teacher’s understanding of the student groups that her peer taught. Again, the clinical supervision cycle was noted as an important element in this function of peer coaching. The opportunity to meet in post-observation conferences provided the time to discuss the adaptation of methods and content both for the past lesson and for future lessons. Based on the familiarity peers had with each other’s classes, they used the post-observation conference not only to discuss the teaching that had just occurred, but also to plan the next lesson.

When peer-coaching arrangements were organized between peers who did not teach the same target language, the peer was able to offer the observed teacher a learner's perspective on the material of instruction during pre-observation conferences. As the student teacher recited the lesson plan, the
peer coach asked clarification questions. This sort of lesson simulation was reported to aid the observed teacher to feel more prepared for her lesson. Those peer-coached student teachers who used the pre-conference for discussion and problem solving found that this meeting time fulfilled several and at times all of the peer coaching functions.

CTs were valuable not only because of their knowledge of learners, but also because of their knowledge of curriculum. Peer-coached student teachers accessed the CT's knowledge regarding the content to cover based on the expectations for the next level of language learning. In sum, the student teachers named their CTs as the primary source of knowledge on learners and the curriculum. A shared function of the CT and peer coach was knowledge of the learners for the adaptation of content. This function was not reported as being served by the US in either of the two supervisory groups.

The self-report data that provided information on the personal facilitation function of peer coaching showed that the peer coaches or very supportive CTs fulfilled this function for the student teachers. The data showed that these beginning teachers were able to encourage their peer coach in the implementation of new skills (clarity skills) and foreign/second language methods. First, the conferences lent themselves to peers' reciting their plan and together adapting it to their particular class groups. In their adaptations of their plans, peers made suggestions for changes, supplied the observed teacher with an idea to use in class, or helped to refine an idea the other had planned to use.
At times, the peer coaches said that their peer acted as a cheerleader who encouraged them to use an idea that they would not have tried alone.

Student teachers said that peer coaching helped them feel better prepared to teach their lessons. This study showed that peer interaction facilitated student teachers' use of new ideas and new skills in a way that the peer coach can be likened to a co-planner of the observed teachers' lessons. For, in Maria's own words after assisting Sally with creating an activity that would elicit communicative language practice: "Let's try it. We'll see if it works." This evidence demonstrates that peer interaction not only occurred in pre-observation conferences, but that the peer was also willing to analyze the teaching episodes with her observed teacher in the post-observation conference. This finding, together with the finding that nonpeer-coached student teachers requested collaboration with fellow student teachers on lesson plans, demonstrates a need for and reported value for peer interaction in a foreign/second language teacher education program.

A second outgrowth of the personal facilitation function of peer coaching intimates that peer coaching should occur in teacher education programs because of the knowledge growth resulting from peer interactions. One example is the language Sally acquired through her interaction with her native speaking peer coach Maria. This finding suggests that foreign and second language teacher education programs have options to explore for matching peer coaching partners.
Third, the personal facilitation function of peer coaching was found to lead to reflection. According to peer-coached student teachers, reflection was the result of having observed a peer teaching a lesson and then thinking about how the same skills or methods could be used in the observer’s classes among that teacher’s particular groups of students. At other times, reflection occurred during peer conferences while peers recalled content from teacher education courses that informed the teaching episode being discussed. Pat reported that by the end of the practicum, her conferences with Kelly began to include theoretical discussions. An example is their discussion of content validity while planning their final examinations. That peer interaction led to knowledge growth and reflection demonstrates that peer coaching helped student teachers grow in ways that the traditional teacher education did not make salient for them.

Student teachers in this study reported either having a CT who did not engage in collaborative planning and debriefing with them or having a CT who was present to plan, discuss, and assist them each day during the practicum. These supportive CTs were found to provide feedback, share materials and veteran input, conference with student teachers daily about their teaching, plan together with student teachers, and encourage them to implement ideas from their teacher education program. For the student teachers placed with these CTs, feedback was specific and consistent throughout the academic term and CTs were willing to learn new ideas that the student teachers brought to the practicum experience. Four student teachers reported this type of experience.
These four teachers were members of the peer-coached group: Maria, Sally, Anne, and Cindy. Each of these pairs reported a different experience with peer coaching.

One set of peers, Cindy and Anne, reported feeling ready to teach on their own at the end of the practicum. Each of them reported that the teaching experience was the most useful part of the practicum. For them, feedback was specific and consistent. They mentioned consistent input from their CT who observed daily, the opposite situation reported by other student teachers such as Chip, Ana, Lori, Pat, and Kelly. Whereas each member of the nonpeer-coached group mentioned the desire for peer activities such as planning mock lessons with clarity skills or discussing the methods they learned in teacher education courses in light of their own teaching practice, and peer-coached members Sally, Maria, Pat, and Kelly reported that peer coaching was helpful for their own problem solving processes, Cindy and Anne did not report that peer coaching helped them solve problems mutually. They reported their interaction consisted of discussions about what they felt was important for foreign language teaching and identifying target skills or foreign language methods in their peer’s teaching. Regarding peer coaching, they identified the feedback and discussion opportunities as most worthwhile.

The difference between this set of peers and the other two could be explained by the following. First, they each taught a different language. Although they were able to share generic ideas, such as using open-ended questions in
the beginning of each class period to provide communicative practice and to award participation points, they did not address content other than to explain what they planned to cover and what the peer would need to know in order to understand the observed teacher's goals. However, the fact that peer coaches Kelly and Pat, who were not teachers of the same target language, had a more fulfilling peer-coaching relationship than Anne and Cindy seems to negate the possible explanation of different target languages.

In search of another possible explanation, the review of data found one aspect that set Anne and Cindy apart from the other four peer-coached teachers was the lack of a report on challenges or struggles that they engaged in together. Unlike the others, they reported no problems in working with their CTs, as did Pat and Kelly. They reported no discipline problems or CTs' failure to address their needs. They reported being satisfied with their student teaching placements. For Anne and Cindy, it appears that a satisfactory school placement and CT made them place less value on peer coaching because their CTs addressed their needs and areas for problem solving. Had they faced teaching issues with which they thought the other could assist, perhaps their view of peer coaching would be as positive as that of Pat, Kelly, Maria, and Sally. In the peer-coaching relationship between Anne and Cindy, where no challenges were presented for problem solving among peers, neither of these two student teachers reported acquiring new knowledge from their peer. Instead, as Anne stated, they discussed only what the two of them already perceived as important:
But I think Cindy and I had gone through the same methods classes, the same or similar program as far as the education goes. So I don't think that she knew anything exciting that I didn't know or a different school of thought. We were both going along the same path and the ideas we had were mostly the same.

In the cases of Anne and Cindy, the CT served the functions of peer coaching by providing feedback, encouragement, support, knowledge about students and the school context, and by engaging in the study of teaching with their student teachers. The evidence found in the self-reports of Anne and Cindy would alter Figure 4.3 (p. 266) to the diagram depicted in Figure 4.5 below.

The following diagram depicts the functions that a CT can serve when the CT creates a supportive environment in which the student teacher’s learning is a primary concern. Compared to Figure 4.3 depicting the overall findings of this study regarding the functions of peer coaching, the role of the peer coach and the CT are similar. Thus, this study demonstrates that peer coaching enhanced traditional student teacher supervision such that the peer coach performed the five supervisory functions of collegiality, technical feedback, analysis of application, adaptation to students, and personal facilitation when the CT did not perform these functions and did not engage in reflection and problem solving with his or her student teacher.

In situations where the CTs were collaborative and performed any or all of these five functions, data showed that peer coaching also served these functions and was an added source of support: Peers discussed challenging teaching situations, reported that the extra feedback was beneficial, supplied
Figure 4.5  Summary of functions of supportive cooperating teachers within the supervision triad

ideas for a peer to use, identified appropriate use of target skills, and encouraged a peer to use a new idea.

In light of Bowman's (1995) finding that elementary education majors involved in an early field experience that included a peer-coaching component exhibited more clarity skills and a greater pedagogical content variety in their
post-observation conferences than nonpeer-coached practicum students, this study raises considerations for teacher educators who intend to use peer coaching during the teacher education process. Bowman (1995) found that peer coaching helped foster a positive attitude toward the early field experience and that peer coaching needed to be established in the early field experience to provide preservice teachers with a focus for observation and feedback.

The present study found that peer-coached student teachers involved in the final practicum did not exhibit issues or pedagogical reasoning that were meaningfully different from the nonpeer-coached after lessons were taught. More similarities than differences were found in their post-observation discussions. This finding appears to indicate that when student teachers are involved in field experiences early in the teacher education process, more differences than similarities may exist among them. These differences in pedagogical reasoning and teaching issues may diminish or appear less salient after preservice teachers complete the necessary requirements and coursework that make them eligible to student teach. One possible reason for the coached and non-coached preservice teachers in this study to have exhibited such commonalities in their post-observation discussions is their having completed a similar amount of course work within the same teacher education curriculum. Such prior knowledge may provide them with the common criteria for assessing their lessons.
One set of peer coaches did not engage in peer coaching for problem solving purposes and did not refer to the opportunity to plan together. Rather, these student teachers preferred to plan in collaboration with their CTs, who were individuals reported as supportive and dedicated to their student teachers’ learning. The two other pairs of coaches did use the peer-coaching process for problem solving in the student teaching practicum. Each shared interests and challenges with the other and used the clinical supervision cycle to address their needs, either in a supportive or unsupportive environment as provided by the CT. The value of peer coaching in this study appeared to be in the planning stages of lesson development. When pre-observation conditions were compared, more statements of pedagogical reasoning were coded in the peer-coached transcripts. As noted in the findings for research question three, peer coaches received feedback and assistance with lesson ideas and they were able to incorporate the peer’s ideas. Thus, there may be times when peer coaching is more pertinent to the goals of a teacher education program and when more learning can occur.

The overall portrait of peer coaching in this study suggests that peer coaching in the student teaching practicum may be most valuable on occasions when peer-coached student teachers perceive a need for any or all of the five functions of peer coaching. The data in this study highlight the planning stage as the occasion for which these needs surfaced, for peer-coached teachers referred
to the value of the pre-observation conference and the nonpeer-coached
teachers expressed the desire to plan lessons with other cohort members.

Other research endeavors have shown that preservice teachers who
struggled to achieve the goals of the teacher education program were able to
improve their teaching with the aid of another preservice peer (Morgan et al.,
1992; Morgan, Menlove, Salzberg, & Hudson, 1994; Pierce & Peterson-Miller,
1994). In light of those findings, Bowman (1995), and the present study, it
appears that if peer coaching is introduced to preservice teachers in early field
experiences and methodology courses such that these teacher education
students learn to serve the functions of peer coaching, then one possibility for
the use of peer coaching in the student teaching practicum would be to
implement it on an as-needed basis to be determined by the student teachers
themselves. For some student teachers, peer coaching may serve needs on a
weekly basis. Others may need or call for fewer peer coaching cycles.

As this study shows, student teachers can explain teaching concerns and
seek assistance from a peer. Perhaps some student teachers, like Cindy and
Anne, may have used peer coaching for problem solving purposes if they were
provided a flexible schedule to use peer coaching on occasions they deemed
most pertinent for their situations.

The findings from this study also offer considerations as to the pairing of
individuals for peer coaching. For example, if language proficiency is a concern
for a student teacher, then a more proficient peer could serve as coach for a student teacher who is less proficient in the target language.

Research Question Six

6. In what ways are the findings of this study applicable to foreign language methods instructors and student teacher program developers in Foreign Language Education?

The findings for research questions one through five as presented in this chapter offer foreign language teacher educators information relating to both the content and process of foreign language teacher education. Regarding content, it was found that clarity skills that have been validated by general teacher education research were useful for foreign/second language teaching. In particular, these skills were named as pertinent to the stage of teaching that focuses on grammatical presentations. The data analyzed and presented in this study urge teacher educators to include a focus on those skills within the foreign and second language methodology courses prior to the student teaching practicum in order to provide practice opportunities to prospective teachers regarding the pertinence of clarity skills to foreign/second language teaching. For example, clarity skills were reported helpful in achieving foreign/second language teaching goals of personalization of the content and for preparing learners to engage in communicative activities.

Regarding foreign and second language teaching in particular, the concern for eliciting an integrative and productive use of the target language
from students was present in both supervisory groups. The twelve student teachers in this study evaluated themselves in terms of the amount of the target language they used in class and in terms of their ability to elicit the target language from their students for communicative purposes. In response to a question asking which area of their teaching repertoire they needed to improve in the future, the twelve student teachers included the following: creating thematic units, oral language skills, integration of more communicative activities, songs, games, and use of student portfolios.

Findings pertaining to the process of teacher education in this study inform teacher educators of the organization of learning experiences for preservice teachers. Peer coaching was found to serve as the vehicle for student teachers to analyze direct teaching episodes with the goal of lesson improvement. The findings here call teacher educators to consider not only the use of peer coaching within the foreign/second language teaching program, but also the possibilities for combinations of peer-coaching relationships in order to meet individual needs of student teachers. For example, it was found that peer coaches teaching different languages could supervise for generic teaching skills and for use of foreign language methods. Also, a native and non-native peer-coaching relationship was found by the non-native speaker to be beneficial for her own target language growth. The non-native speaking peer was reported to have assisted the native speaking peer to understand her students’ language learning perspective. Such findings encourage teacher educators to explore the
supervisory possibilities of purposes and forms of peer-coaching relationships based on the individual experiences and learning needs of the prospective teachers. As found in the data, student teachers may vary in the amount of and focus for peer coaching.

The purpose of this study was to advance knowledge about foreign language teaching in terms of student teachers’ use of clarity skills, pedagogical content knowledge, and their satisfaction with the form(s) of supervision they received. Summaries of the first stage of data analysis in quantitative form are provided in Appendices F and I. These display the greater extent of clarity skills use and statements of pedagogical reasoning made by peer-coached student teachers. The qualitative stage of data analysis provides portraits of the value of clarity skills for foreign language teaching, the teaching concerns and interests of the twelve student teachers, and the peer- and nonpeer-coached teachers’ perceptions of their respective forms of supervision. Figure 4.6 below provides a summary of the qualitative phase of data analysis.

Both the content and process of teacher education as it relates to the findings of this study will be further developed in the next chapter. The following chapter provides the conclusions and implications of this study as well as the future considerations for research in teacher education as proposed by the findings from the present research endeavor.
Clarity Skills

1. Clarity skills were useful for foreign language teaching when the focus of instruction was on grammatical topics.

2. The use of the clarity skill repeats important points was valuable for foreign language teaching in combination with other clarity skills (use of examples, asks questions, informs students of lesson objectives).

3. The skill use of examples helped the student teachers personalize the foreign language content during their teaching episodes.

4. Clarity skills were considered during the lesson planning stage in order to supplement text examples, prepare directions and grammatical explanations, and help the student teachers access the most important points of the content that was taught.

5. The skill of repetition was noted as a frequently used skill and an aid for distinct pronunciation by student teachers who were native speakers of the languages they taught.

6. Supervision by the university supervisor (US) and the peer coach provided student teachers with a sense of accountability to use clarity skills.

7. The challenges of maintaining discipline, completing all activities planned for a lesson, and the increased responsibilities in teaching duties were noted as hindering the student teachers' uses of clarity skills.

8. Beneficial outcomes of using clarity skills, as noted by the research participants, included better classroom management, better communication of content, and increased student responsibility toward their own learning.

9. Beneficial outcomes of informing students of lesson objectives, as noted by the research participants, included on task behavior by students, providing a focus on lesson goals for both students and teachers, and providing teachers with a means for on-line checking for goal achievement.

10. Clarity skills were helpful when organizing communicative activities during instructional time.

Pedagogical Content Knowledge: pre-observation conditions

1. More instances of pedagogical reasoning were present in the peer-coached student teachers' pre-observation conferences than in the nonpeer-coached teachers' pre-observation written tasks.

Figure 4.6 Summary of qualitative phase of data analysis
2. Peer-coached and nonpeer-coached student teachers used their respective pre-observation conditions for different purposes:

   a. Nonpeer-coached student teachers used the pre-observation written tasks to provide descriptive and narrative information about their classes, provide a lesson plan, and request feedback from the US regarding a particular aspect of their teaching.

   b. Peer-coached student teachers used the pre-observation written task as an opportunity to rehearse/recite their planned lessons.

3. Different characteristics were found between the pre-observation conferences of the peer-coached group and the pre-observation written tasks of the nonpeer-coached group:

   a. Peer-coached student teachers used detailed language and exact terms/phrases to describe their lessons to their peer coach.

   b. Peer-coached student teachers engaged in co-planning of a peer’s lesson by providing a peer with a teaching idea, refining a teaching idea for a peer, or by adapting a peer’s teaching idea to fit their own classes.

   c. Peer-coached student teachers supported their teaching decisions by using examples from previous lessons of their own practice.

   d. Peer-coached student teachers expressed interest in or praise of a peer’s use of target language practice in both written and oral modes.

   e. Peer-coached student teachers provided the rationales and purposes of their lessons in each week of the practicum. Nonpeer-coached student teachers did not provide purposes or rationales until week seven of the practicum.

   f. Peer-coached student teachers discussed the adaptation of their lessons to relevant characteristics of students in each week of the practicum. Nonpeer-coached student teachers did not exhibit an interest in adaptation of content to students in their pre-observation written tasks until week seven of the practicum.

   g. Nonpeer-coached student teachers exhibited concerns about classroom management in each week of data analysis. This concern was not present in the peer-coached student teachers’ pre-observation conferences.

   h. Both peer- and nonpeer-coached student teachers made comments coded as comprehension to explain their lesson content/plan to a non-native speaking observer.

Pedagogical reasoning: post-observation conferences

1. More instances of pedagogical reasoning were present in the peer-coached student teachers’ post-observation conferences than in the nonpeer-coached observation conferences with the US.

Continued
2. More instances of pedagogical reasoning emerged in the post-observation conferences of the nonpeer-coached group than in their pre-observation written tasks.

3. In conferences with their US, nonpeer-coached student teachers evaluated their lessons in terms of their use of clarity skills, use of the target language, and classroom management.

4. Peer-coached student teachers exhibited more varied discussions about the uses and relevance of clarity skills to foreign language teaching.

5. Both groups of student teachers exhibited an interest in the adaptation and representation of content to students each week during the practicum. This concern for adaptation of content emerged earlier in the practicum for the nonpeer-coached students in post-observation conferences with the US than in their pre-observation written tasks (see 4f above).


**Supervision**

1. Student teachers in each group reported feeling encouraged during the first week of the practicum because of the welcome they received from their cooperating teachers (CT).

2. Nonpeer-coached student teachers who reported an initial welcome to the school placement by their CT reported that the weekly on-campus student teaching seminar provided a business-like atmosphere rather than a supportive one because of the focus on clarity skills.

3. Those student teachers who initially reported that the student teaching seminar was businesslike began to refer to it as a collegial and supportive meeting opportunity when their CTs began to leave them alone to teach and stopped providing feedback on a daily basis.

4. Most of the CTs began to leave the student teachers alone to teach and carry out instructional duties during the second and third weeks of the practicum.

5. CT feedback became less specific when they decreased their time spent in observation of a student teacher.

6. Each supervisory source was found to offer the student teacher with a different type of assistance than the others. For example, the CT was found to fulfill the adaptation to students function by offering helpful information for the representation of content to students in terms of students’ behavior and specific individual and group learning needs.

7. The nonpeer-coached group expressed a need for more interaction with fellow student teachers for the purposes of planning, collegiality, support, and feedback.
CHAPTER 5

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

If we expect teachers in training to use the knowledge available in the preparation programs, we must supervise them carefully, point out helpful pedagogical methods, and show them how to incorporate new knowledge and ideas into their own teaching practices. Offering feedback and advice is essential; however, all this is irrelevant unless the system allows teachers to use their pedagogical methods, content, personal knowledge, and educated judgement (Schwartz, 1996, p. 11).

Introduction

Presently, discussions on teaching and teacher education focus on the professionalization of teaching. Teaching and learning are currently viewed as highly specific and situated (Sparks, 1992). Reform groups have responded to this view of teaching by emphasizing that teacher education programs should focus on teachers’ capacities to reflect on their teaching, the consequences it has on learners, and their abilities to revise their teaching techniques as needed to help learners reach instructional goals (Darling-Hammond & Cobb, 1996). Two core recommendations of the National Board of Professional Teaching Standards (1990) called for teachers to be organized into learning communities such that they think systematically about and learn from their own teaching. Peer
coaching provides a vehicle for both preservice and inservice teachers to use their acquired knowledge to address concerns about teaching practice and to find solutions to challenging teaching dilemmas.

Summary

A review of the peer coaching literature revealed that peer coaching is an outgrowth of research on teacher training designed for staff development purposes (Joyce & Showers, 1980; 1996) that has been applied to both preservice and inservice teacher education as an innovative form of clinical supervision. Peer coaching is defined as a process in which two or more teachers meet regularly for problem solving using planning, observation, and feedback for the development of a specific skill or set of skills (Joyce & Showers, 1980). In teacher education, peer coaching has served as an alternative form of supervision that places the responsibility for supervision in the hands of the teachers themselves.

The goal of peer coaching is the transfer of skills to everyday teaching, while the purposes of peer coaching vary according to the teachers’ needs. Technical coaching is intended to help teachers transfer training in the new skills to their classroom teaching. Collegial coaching is engaged in when a teacher wishes to refine an existing skill present in his or her teaching repertoire. Challenge coaching is implemented when a teacher identifies a problem in goal achievement and works toward its resolution.
Peer coaching can be carried out by individuals who differ in their knowledge of the specified skills. Expert coaching occurs when a specially trained teacher with expertise in the skills observes and provides the teacher with feedback. In reciprocal coaching, the teachers who work together have the same amount of knowledge about the specified skills and carry out the process of observation, analysis, and feedback for each other (Ackland, 1991).

Whether the purpose for coaching is technical, collegial, or challenge, the characteristics are the same: Peer coaching is a non-evaluative form of supervision, it is based on the observation of classroom teaching followed by provision of feedback, and has the improvement of instructional routines as its goal. In any of these forms or purposes for coaching, the role of the coach is to provide feedback and to support the observed teacher in the implementation of new teaching techniques and strategies.

Inservice applications of peer coaching aim to encourage collegiality among teachers, reduce teacher isolation and improve the five to ten per cent rate of transfer of training that is the result of inservice programs that do not provide follow-up training (Joyce & Showers, 1980; 1996; Batesky, 1991). Past research has indicated several outcomes of peer coaching programs that improve teaching and inservice education. For example, peer coaching increases the time teachers spend together in discussions of planning, instruction, and assessment (Showers, 1985), thus providing teachers with
companionship and collegiality. Peer coaching allows teachers to learn in context by focusing on the adaptation of skills to particular groups of learners (Smylie & Conyers, 1991).

Reflection is fostered by engaging in peer coaching: As teachers prepare for post-observation conferences, they reflect on the feedback they will provide for their peer (Garmston, Linder, & Whitaker, 1993). Peer coaches acquire a common language and a detailed vocabulary (Little, 1982) with which to describe, analyze, and interpret their teaching episodes. The traditional role of the teacher is broadened by acting as a peer coach and observer (Gilman, 1989; Bartunek, 1990): Teachers assume the role of teacher educator as they share ideas about teaching and discuss the application of theory. Peer coaching provides a supportive environment in which to experiment with new techniques or change existing teaching techniques (Sparks & Bruder, 1987). The non-evaluative nature of peer coaching encourages and gives teachers more confidence to try new teaching strategies.

Applications of peer coaching for prospective teachers are more recent and were motivated by successes on the inservice level. Peer coaching on the preservice level addresses several problems inherent in the traditional supervision of student teachers: The demanding schedules of university professors or graduate students occupied with teaching and scholarly duties leaves minimal time for them to devote to student teaching supervision; The ratio of student teachers per university supervisor, which can reach twelve to fifteen,
does not typically allow the university supervisor (US) the opportunity to engage in frequent clinical supervision cycles with prospective teachers (Giebelhaus, 1993); The roles and responsibilities of the supervisor and cooperating teacher (CT) are often left undefined (Hoover, O'Shea, & Carroll, 1988); CTs are unwilling to reflect on the acts of teaching with student teachers (Richardson-Koehler, 1988); The majority of CTs are untrained for their supervisory roles (Meade, 1991; Metcalf, 1991); Student teachers tend to infer what good practice is on the basis of their own observations of their CT as well as their own experiences as K-12 students, leaving behind the training they received at the university (Richardson-Koehler, 1988).

A review of the related literature shows that peer coaching on the preservice level counteracts these barriers to supervision by creating a match between the goals of the university teacher education program and the CT in the school setting (Barnett & Bayne, 1992). Preservice teachers have been able to improve their observation skills from the guidance and focus that peer coaching provides within the clinical supervision cycle (Majhanovich & Gray, 1992), increase their rate of transfer of the new teaching skills because of the ongoing nature of observation, practice, and conferencing (Neubert & Stover, 1994; Peterson & Hudson, 1989; Wynn, 1988), and increase their repertoire of teaching skills because of the opportunity to share teaching ideas and materials when planning for observations (Neubert & Stover, 1994).
Peer coaching organizes preservice teachers into communities of learners such that their problem solving skills are enhanced (Arends & Winitzky, 1996) and their ability to reflect on their and their peer’s teaching is improved because the pre- to post-observation conference cycle focuses their attention on the implementation of teaching strategies and methods (Barnett & Bayne, 1992). The focus on individual needs was found to help preservice teachers progress from a developmental stage in which commentaries on their teaching were superficial to an advanced stage in which they exhibited concern and a deeper level of reflection about teaching (Neubert & Stover, 1994).

The reflection that evolves through peer-coaching relationships allows teachers to explore their own learning and researchers to investigate the knowledge employed by teachers to cope with teaching situations. Within peer-coaching discussions, teachers’ pedagogical reasoning can be discovered. That is, their plans for and reflections on representing content to their pupils are uncovered.

Following recommendations from previous research on peer coaching (Bowman, 1995) and the calls for integration of knowledge generated from the general teaching research base into the foreign/second language teaching field (Jarvis & Taylor, 1990; Hammadou, 1991), the present study provided training in clarity skills to a cohort of twelve foreign/second language student teachers. This endeavor was stimulated by the literature on foreign/second language teaching asserting that this particular content area has not made use of the
research from general teacher education. Instead, it has comprised its research agenda on topics specific to second language acquisition; linguistics, pedagogical grammar, discourse analysis, interlanguage, syntax, phonology, and language testing.

The use of clarity as the focus for the training program for peer and nonpeer-coached student teachers was chosen on the basis of its status as the leading teacher effects variable (Rosenshine & Furst, 1971). Investigations of teacher clarity have found that the use of clarity skills is not contingent upon subject matter, that preservice teachers can be trained to use clarity behaviors within the time constraints of an academic term, and that teachers' use of clarity is positively correlated to student achievement (Hines, 1981; Hamilton, 1988; Metcalf, 1989; Bowman, 1995).

The purpose of the present study was to advance knowledge about the nature of foreign/second language teaching by investigating: (a) the value of and need for clarity skills in foreign/second language teaching as perceived by student teachers who have participated in peer and nonpeer-coached preservice training as part of their student teaching practicum; (b) the nature of pre- and post-observation conferences of both groups of student teachers; (c) the degree of satisfaction expressed by the members of the two groups with respect to the student teaching practicum. The investigations of these questions provided information on the usefulness of peer coaching and clarity skills, teacher
behaviors substantiated in general teacher education research, for the specific
field of foreign/second language teaching.

Qualitative methodologies were used to gather and analyze the data for
this study. Each of the twelve student teachers served as an individual case
study for clarity skills, supervision method, and foreign language teaching
concerns as reflected in their statements of pedagogical reasoning in pre- and
post-observation sessions. Data were collected by videotaped observations of
teaching episodes, audiotaped pre- and post-observation conferences, pre-
observation written tasks, weekly journals, final satisfaction questionnaires,
focus group interviews, and follow-up interviews. An analysis of these data
sources, as parts of a developing understanding of student teacher perceptions,
resulted in answers to the research questions of this study.

The nonpeer-coached group’s pre-observation written tasks and post-
observation conferences with the US and the peer-coached group’s pre- and
post-observation conferences were coded by the researcher and a graduate
student teaching assistant according to the six categories of pedagogical
were tallied and compared by groups (See Appendix I). Statements of
pedagogical reasoning in post-observation conferences and pre-observation
written tasks and conferences were again reviewed by the researcher to identify
the concerns and perspectives of foreign and second language preservice
teachers regarding the representation of content to their pupils.
The conference data and all self-report data from written and transcribed documents were coded using inductive analysis (Erickson, 1986) procedures and grounded theory coding (Strauss & Corbin, 1990; 1996). Linkages (Erickson, 1986) among similar instances of data were compared within and among cases and grouped to account for the patterns in the data sources as well as negative evidence. The procedures of open, axial, and selective coding of the transcripts and self-report data allowed themes, categories, and subcategories to be induced from these data sources and the story line (Strauss & Corbin, 1996) regarding peer coaching, foreign/second language teaching, and clarity skills to emerge. The findings resulted in answers to the research questions of the study.

The observational data, in the form of four videotaped teaching lessons from each member of the nonpeer-coached and peer-coached groups, were observed for the implementation of clarity skills. The researcher along with two experienced foreign language teachers, who received training with the Clarity Training Manual (Metcalf, 1989), rated the videotaped teaching lessons. Use of clarity skills were tallied (See Appendix F). These data were utilized in conjunction with the self-report data on clarity provided by the student teachers in order to investigate the uses of and challenges for clarity skills in the foreign and second language classrooms of prospective teachers.

In sum, the data regarding student teachers' pedagogical reasoning and clarity skills were first analyzed quantitatively. In this first stage of analysis, the
number of instances of clarity skills used were counted and averaged and the number of statements of pedagogical reasoning were counted and organized by categories of pedagogical reasoning (Shulman, 1987). The second stage of analysis was qualitative and revealed how peer interaction was beneficial to student teachers' pedagogical content knowledge, the student teachers' perceptions of the value of clarity skills for foreign language teaching, and their satisfaction with the supervision they received during the practicum. For example, this qualitative analysis revealed that both peer- and non-peer-coached student teachers found value in the use of clarity skills for foreign language teaching. Findings that emerged from the patterns and linkages within and across cases included the following: Clarity skills were useful for foreign language teaching when the focus of instruction was on grammar; The skill uses examples helped student teachers achieve the foreign language teaching goal of personalization of the content; The use of clarity skills was enhanced when student teachers considered them during the lesson planning stage (See Figure 4.6 for a more complete summary of this qualitative stage of data analysis).

Summary of Findings

Clarity Skills

Although the student teachers mentioned that their newly acquired teaching responsibilities at times challenged the implementation of clarity skills, clarity skills were reported to be useful in foreign/second language teaching at the secondary school level. The skills most implemented were asks questions,
examples are used, and repeats important points. Asks questions was the most implemented skill by five of the six participants in both the peer-coached and nonpeer-coached groups.

More clarity skills were observed in the teaching of members of the peer-coached group. Rephrases and summarizes were not used by two peer-coached student teachers. Various members of the nonpeer-coached group were not observed using rephrases, summarizes, provides opportunities for students to ask questions, demonstrates, and repeats important points. In both groups of participants, the least implemented clarity skills from raters’ observations were rephrases, summarizes, provides opportunities for students to ask questions.

Although not perceived as an initial part of their teaching repertoires, the student teachers identified clarity skills as conscious strategies for teaching in general and for teaching particular aspects of foreign/second language content. Beneficial outcomes of the use of informing students of lesson objectives included keeping students engaged in tasks, achieving lesson goals more efficiently than when objectives were not stated, and helping the student teacher remain focused on the daily teaching goals. According to several student teachers, their students became more responsible toward the completion of their work when objectives were stated by the instructor. In some cases, stating objectives became a regular part of the teaching routine and were stated more than once during particular lessons. When clarity skills were utilized, student
teachers felt that they communicated the subject matter well, felt more confident, and noted that their lesson plans were fully implemented.

Clarity skills played an important role for foreign language teaching when the focus of instruction was on the goal of grammatical competence. This tendency was noted for both initial grammar presentations as well as for the purpose of review. The clarity skills informs students of lesson objectives, use of examples, asks questions, summarizes, and repeats important points used together in a lesson seemed to provide student teachers with a general methodology to convey grammatical topics. Use of examples was a helpful skill in order to achieve the foreign language teaching goal of personalizing the content and making the foreign language more relevant to students' lives. Repeating important points was reported frequently to be helpful for pronunciation of the target language in addition to its use for grammar. When the focus of instruction was not on grammar, clarity skills were reported to be useful for the directions student teachers gave for communicative activities.

Although clarity skills facilitated their teaching, conditions present in their teaching environment challenged the student teachers' implementation of clarity skills: The need to carry out teaching routines such as the homework verification in the first moments of class reportedly prevented students from beginning instruction by stating objectives; Having enough time to complete lessons as planned seemed to hinder their uses of summaries; The need to focus attention on classroom discipline matters was said to have taken student teachers'
attention away from clarity skills implementation. Additionally, when student teachers assumed total responsibility for teaching duties during the practicum, clarity skills were reportedly difficult to integrate.

Both peer-coached and nonpeer-coached student teachers reported that supervision enhanced their use of clarity skills because it provided them with a feeling of accountability to use the skills. The pre-observation conferences that the peer-coached student teachers conducted were helpful in discussing planned uses of clarity skills and in receiving feedback and assistance in stating objectives and summaries in observed lessons. Supervision was also reported as helpful because, while observing, the peer coach served as a model to the peer observer for clarity skills implementation.

**Pedagogical Reasoning**

Pedagogical reasoning was examined by coding the pre-observation written tasks and the pre- and post-observation conferences of both supervisory groups according to the six categories of Shulman's Model of Pedagogical Reasoning (1987): comprehension, transformation, instruction, evaluation, reflection, new comprehension. These six categories comprise the components of pedagogical content knowledge; the kind of knowledge that is specific to the educator in that it entails the knowledge of ways to represent content in order to make it comprehensible to students. Comments coded according to these categories were then thematically grouped by the inductive analysis coding
procedures as part of grounded theory methodology to discover the teaching concerns of prospective foreign/second language teachers.

The pre-observation written tasks of the nonpeer-coached student teachers and the peer-coached student teachers' audiotaped pre-observation conferences showed that in each week of data analysis, the peer-coached student teachers addressed more of Shulman's categories. Distinct uses of the written tasks and pre-observation conferences were made by student teachers in each supervisory group. Nonpeer-coached student teachers used the written tasks to provide the US with a focus for the observation, to provide concrete descriptive and narrative information about their classes, and to provide a lesson plan. These uses elicited the coded categories of instruction, transformation, comprehension, evaluation, and reflection in a total of 27 coded comments over the weeks of data collection (See Appendix I for a display of data for each supervisory group).

A prevalent concern during all four weeks of data analysis in the nonpeer-coached student teachers' written tasks focused on classroom management and interaction with students. These topics elicited coded statements of instruction, evaluation, and reflection. When nonpeer-coached student teachers made statements of reflection or evaluation, they referred to discipline issues and strategies they had adopted to improve classroom management. Therefore, the non-interactive condition of the required pre-observation written task of the nonpeer-coached group did not elicit as varied a treatment of topics for reflection.
as was present in the pre-observation conferences of the peer-coached student teachers. Rather, the written tasks showed a focus on survival in coded statements regarding classroom management.

Peer-coached student teachers made use of their pre-observation conferences as a sort of rehearsal for their lesson plans by reciting their plans and eliciting feedback from their coach. This use of the pre-observation conference elicited coded statements pertaining to each of the categories of pedagogical reasoning as outlined by Shulman (1987). The length and detail of the conferences differed from the pre-observation written tasks. First, a total of 247 comments were coded in these pre-observation conferences. Second, the use of the pre-observation conferences to recite lesson plans elicited detailed summaries of their lesson sequences in which student teachers shared information about how they planned to meet lesson goals. This rehearsal activity elicited a higher number of transformation statements in relation to other categories, reflecting a concern for methodology (Ducharme & Ducharme, 1996) and pertaining to questions about how to carry out instruction to achieve lesson goals. The transformation category refers to the acts of preparing and representing one’s own understanding of content for specific groups of learners.

The pre-observation conferences also served a collegial purpose. After listening to the observed teachers’ plans, the peer coaches provided their partner with feedback on their plans, ideas to use in class, or helped refine an idea that the observed teacher planned to use. Observed teachers either
decided to use their coaches' ideas or adapted these ideas to characteristics of their specific groups of learners. Peer-coaching conferences, therefore, served as a vehicle for reflection and integration of ideas when planning for instruction.

Peer-coached student teachers included the purposes and rationales for their plans and teaching decisions beginning in the first week of data analysis. Nonpeer-coached student teachers did not state lesson purposes until week seven. Similarly, peer-coached teachers explained methods of adapting the content to their students' learning needs, ability levels, and interests. Nonpeer-coached student teachers did not state plans to adapt material to students until week seven of the practicum in their pre-observation written tasks. Student teachers in the peer-coached group explained their teaching decisions in terms of previous teaching experiences, supporting their lesson purposes. When nonpeer-coached student teachers reconstructed past lessons in pre-observation written tasks, their focus was limited to classroom management and descriptions of discipline strategies they adopted.

The concerns to include language practice in more than one mode and to include physical activities were present in the peer-coached group's conferences. When peer-coached student teachers recited plans that included listening and speaking practice in addition to reading and writing, the peer coaching partner praised the lesson plan.

In post-observation conferences, nonpeer-coached student teachers evaluated their own lessons in terms of use of the target language, clarity skills,
and classroom management. When nonpeer-coached student teachers interacted with the US in post-observation conferences, there were fewer differences between the conferences in each supervisory group. The post-observation conferences of the two supervisory groups elicited comments coded from each of the six categories of Shulman’s Model of Pedagogical Reasoning (See Appendix I). Nonpeer-coached student teachers provided strategies and evidence in support of their teaching decisions, used past evidence to explain why a plan was either successful or unsuccessful, and suggested alternative plans regarding how they could have improved their lessons and reached their goals.

Unlike the pre-observation conditions that showed differences between the pedagogical reasoning of student teachers in each group, post-observation conferences showed that student teachers in both supervisory groups had similar concerns, challenges, and goals. For example, the number of nonpeer-coached comments coded according to Shulman’s Model was greater in the post-observation conferences with the US than in their pre-observation written tasks. The number of evaluation, reflection, and comprehension comments between each group of student teachers was more similar in post-observation conferences than in pre-observation conditions: 17, 80, and seven for the peer-coached students teachers and twelve, 73, and four for nonpeer-coached student teachers, respectively. The opportunity to engage in discussion of their teaching revealed fewer differences in the post-observation conferences of peer
and nonpeer-coached student teachers than were found in the pre-observation conditions.

In statements of evaluation and reflection, both groups of student teachers addressed the use of the target language in terms of maintaining their own use of it during instruction and the amount of the target language they required from their students. In conversations with the US, nonpeer-coached student teachers learned that the amount of the target language used must be planned prior to the class period according to the focus of activities and topics. Among peer-coached student teachers, successful lessons were discussed as having provided students with opportunities for target language use in which more than one skill was practiced and utterances were more than one word responses or phrases.

Clarity skills implementation was addressed by the US and peer coach by reciting the uses of skills observed. The challenges for clarity skills implementation were discussed by each supervisory group of student teachers. Student teachers positively evaluated their own lessons or the peers’ lessons when skills were used. The topic of clarity was addressed each week by the peer-coached group in discussions that treated more topics related to clarity skills than were discussed in the nonpeer-coached group, evidence of the value of peer coaching for skills acquisition and reflection. Among peer-coached teachers, the value of clarity skills pertained to helping student teachers accomplish lesson goals and linking students’ background knowledge to new
knowledge. Peer-coached student teachers made suggestions for future use of clarity skills in their own and a peer's classes and reported using clarity skills according to students' proficiency levels.

The adaptation of foreign/second language content was discussed by both groups of student teachers for similar reasons. In each group, student teachers considered specific characteristics of their groups of students as they prepared for meetings with them. Content was adapted in terms of students' abilities, proficiency levels, interests, background knowledge, and learning needs. Future assessments and learning expectations for the next level of language study were also discussed.

Two findings contrasted the post-observation conferences of the two groups of student teachers. First, classroom management was mentioned in each week of nonpeer-coached post-observation conferences in statements of evaluation and reflection. Student behavior was cited as a cause for either completing or not completing lesson goals. In contrast, classroom management was present in only two weeks of peer-coached conferences. It was mentioned in comments coded as evaluation or instruction when peers either praised their partner's strategies for discipline or made suggestions to help the peer maintain classroom management.

The second difference between the two supervisory groups in post-observation conferences was found in comments coded as reflection. Whereas nonpeer-coached student teachers recreated classroom events reflecting on
goal achievement only in terms of classroom management in the pre-observation written tasks, post-observation conferences with the US showed that they looked back at their teaching in terms of topics that included organizing group/pair work, the use of the target language, clarity, and the end of the year review, as the peer-coached group had done in both sets of conferences. Although there were more instances of reflection from pre- to post-observation conditions, nonpeer student teachers made 18 comments coded as reflection, whereas peer-coached student teachers had 94 post-observation comments coded for this category. Though interaction with the US seemed to encourage more discussion and reflection among non-peer teachers, it also seems that interaction with a peer encouraged more engagement in the task of critically analyzing the student teachers’ lessons.

**Supervision Conditions**

The role of the CT was decisive in determining the student teachers’ satisfaction with the practicum experience. CTs either provided support for the student teacher with newly acquired teaching duties or left student teachers alone to make planning and instructional decisions. Student teachers who were left alone with their new responsibilities perceived the university portion of the practicum as collegial and the part of the experience that provided them with assistance necessary to accomplish teaching tasks. The weekly seminar meetings were found to be opportunities to share teaching experiences and
concerns and pose questions to fellow student teachers and supervisors regarding their teaching situations. A positive perception of the university portion of the practicum was given by at least half of the student teachers, representing both nonpeer-coached and peer-coached student teachers. The difference between these two groups of student teachers was that the peer-coached members were able to rely on the peer as an added source of input and assistance. Reliance on the peer coach was reported as a strategy undertaken to cope with the lack of CT assistance.

The positive viewpoint that some student teachers had of the university seminar and US supervision was not the norm during the beginning two to three weeks of the practicum. At this initial time, their perceptions were very positive in the direction of the school-based portion of the seminar in that the CT welcomed them, shared materials, met with them to outline plans for the rest of the year, and invited them to use teaching ideas learned at the university. During this initial collegiality between student teachers and CTs, nonpeer-coached student teachers stated that the university portion of the practicum was not collegial, but business-like because of the hour spent on clarity skills training. When student teachers were left alone with all new teaching responsibilities, they expressed a desire for more time in the seminar hour after clarity training to discuss their teaching concerns and the university portion was no longer regarded as businesslike.
For student teachers who experienced the diminished CT presence beginning in the first weeks of the practicum, the nature and quantity of feedback from the CT changed from very specific and occurring daily to nonspecific and occurring infrequently. Student teachers reported approaching their CT with specific questions in order to receive feedback. Collegiality in the form of planning lessons together, sharing materials, and creating tests was no longer available as it had been in the earliest weeks of the practicum. Therefore, after these initial weeks of the practicum experience, the perceptions of CT support changed and student teachers' behaviors changed in response to this newly perceived lack of support.

When the amount of CT supervision began to wane, student teachers in both supervisory groups called for assistance with their teaching duties. Members of the nonpeer-coached group voiced the need to meet with other student teachers to plan lessons by discussing information from earlier methods classes, to plan integration of clarity skills into lesson plans, and to hear about others' teaching placements, CTs, high school students, and other topics. Student teachers in both groups who experienced unsupportive CT situations voiced their opinions about how their CTs could help them: meet with them daily; provide feedback on lesson plans prior to lesson execution rather than retroactively; share materials; provide model lesson plans; team teach with them; and provide more specific suggestions for lesson ideas. Teacher isolation was reported to have been experienced in the practicum and student teachers
expressed a need, in their data and in the seminar, for more directive CT supervision.

The consequences of being left alone by CTs to make all teaching decisions included stress and less confidence while teaching, and wondering if they were meeting their lesson goals. When CTs were perceived as uninterested in student teachers' progress, the student teachers reported being challenged to create materials and to complete simple tasks because of the lack of a CT model and assistance with planning.

Faced with conditions of isolation in their early teaching, student teachers engaged in strategies to procure forms of assistance that the CT did not provide. Student teachers relied on other members of their supervisory triad or team as sources of feedback, lesson ideas, and collegiality. The weekly US visit and/or visit from the peer coach was relied on by student teachers as a source of the feedback lacking from fewer CT observations. Student teachers used the seminar at the university setting to seek input from other student teachers. Student teachers who sought feedback on their lessons from pupils found this source useful because it allowed them to include ideas suggested by students. The challenge of creating instructional materials was addressed by peer-coached teachers through a sharing process. When they noted that they had materials that a peer could use to teach a topic they had already taught, peers exchanged materials and borrowed from each other.
Each member of the supervisory triad and the peer coach offered a distinctive form of assistance in practicum supervision. The role of the CT was unique and essential in the supervisory triad because of the CT's familiarity with the school setting, school district, its requirements and goals, and the students' backgrounds, their knowledge, and proficiency levels. When student teachers had classroom management concerns or wanted to tailor plans according to students' ability levels, they named their CT as the most appropriate source of assistance. Although some CTs did not engage in joint planning or problem solving with student teachers on a regular basis, student teachers approached their CT in matters related to discipline and level of students' conceptual understanding.

The supportive CTs provided assistance in the form of the veteran perspective they offered students with their feedback. Those who shared information regularly with their student teachers were identified as helpful regarding the nature of students, ideas to teach particular topics, and materials sharing. One form of CT feedback that was found useful for the supervision of prospective foreign language teachers was a notebook in which CTs provided observation notes on grammar, pronunciation, and interactions with individuals and groups of students. For situations in which CTs were not supportive, student teachers found that the 3-way conferences provided unique occasions during which feedback from the CT was shared regarding topics that CTs did not address with the student teachers on a regular basis.
The US served a role that helped student teachers set and modify goals for improvement. The post-observation conference was noted as the most helpful aspect of the practicum by student teachers who had supportive and unsupportive CTs. When student teachers described the helpfulness of the US, they referred to the specific nature of US feedback. The feedback that the US offered provided a weekly portrait of progress, helping student teachers to become aware of teaching strengths, progress on their goals, and to identify areas to improve. Post-observation conferences were specifically geared toward student teachers’ concerns and student teachers perceived the feedback and assistance from the US to be directed toward their foreign/second language (L2) teaching interests. When the US and student teacher shared the same language of instruction, the feedback included a focus on content such as L2 grammar, vocabulary, pronunciation, and culture. Therefore, regardless of whether or not the US shared the same target language as the student teacher, her feedback was reported as useful by both peer-coached and nonpeer-coached student teachers because it helped the student teacher focus on how to improve teaching skills.

The US provided the student teachers with confidence to implement teaching ideas and strategies that became regular aspects of their teaching repertoires. Examples included providing time for individual writing practice during class and providing guided questions for listening activities. Whereas the CT served the supervisory role of adaptation to students, the US functioned in
the supervisory role of analysis of application. One purpose of US supervision was the analysis of the application of the clarity model. Student teachers felt accountable to implement clarity skills and made conscious efforts to use them in their lessons because of US supervision.

The clinical supervision schedule that placed peers together twice per week was a beneficial aspect of the practicum in that student teachers reported being assisted with teaching responsibilities. By observing each other weekly, the peer served as another teaching model from whom the observing student teachers garnered teaching ideas. This modeling occurred with the clarity skills as well as L2 teaching concerns such as providing students with practice in more than one language modality.

The clinical supervision cycle beginning with pre-observation conferences provided assistance to student teachers prior to lessons rather than retroactively, unlike the feedback from their US and some of the CTs. Peer-coached student teachers felt more confident and encouraged to teach their lessons after meeting with their peer coach in the weekly scheduled pre-observation conferences. Student teachers used this conference time to recite their plans in a rehearsal fashion to their peer coach, which helped them refine their plans. Coaches supplied ideas to use in the class they were to observe or helped the observed student teacher to refine an idea for that class. This practice opportunity provided student teachers with a learners’ perspective on their lessons because the peer coach generally asked clarification questions
about the plan and made suggestions regarding students’ reception of the material planned.

The peer coach played a role similar to the US in her observations and conferences by focusing on the specific needs of the student teacher. These conferences were a time for knowledge sharing related to content, methods, and students. When a native-speaking peer was matched with a non-native speaker of the target language, learning occurred between them. The non-native speaker gained content knowledge of target vocabulary and grammar. The native speaker was assisted in understanding the students’ grasp of the content by discussing her teaching with an American peer. Peers assisted each other with specific concerns related to L2 teaching. Two of the topics included providing grammatical practice within a communicative context and making grammar lessons more interesting. Peer coaches relied on each other for feedback and assistance with aspects of teaching that challenged them. Clarity was among the challenging aspects of teaching. Peer-coached teachers felt that their coach helped them to stay on task with the training model and other teaching concerns with which they reported struggling. Thus, peer coaches engaged in mutual problem solving.

The concern for making the subject matter comprehensible to students occupied the discussions in both conferences. The post-observation conferences provided opportunities to plan future lessons together and were occasions devoted to the student teachers’ questions of how to present the
content. When the post-observation immediately followed the observed lesson, it was reported to have helped student teachers plan the next class meeting with that particular group of students. Student teachers in the peer-coached group gave attention to the clarity model in their conferences, by planning objectives for their next classes as well as discussing what to include in summaries and statements of objectives. The conferences between peers facilitated the recall of topics and teaching methods learned at the university. The peer-coached group discussed clarity in more detail than the nonpeer-coached group. Like the US, the peer coach provided a source of accountability to use clarity skills in lessons and this carried over to a greater extent in their conferences.

The peer-coaching activities provided a source of collegiality that the other supervisory sources did not provide. The peer coach and observed teacher shared the same professional status as novices. Empathy with the peer’s teaching setting and challenges seemed to be a beneficial aspect of supervision mentioned only by peer-coached individuals. They did not report such collegiality from their US or CT during the practicum experience and some felt that at times neither the US or CT was the person to approach with a particular question. The peer coach provided a source of collegiality not only by a willingness to share ideas and help her peer with teaching tasks, but also by exhibiting the willingness to consider the feedback and accept ideas for implementation from the coach. This finding serves to contrast with the calls for more meetings with fellow student teachers from the nonpeer-coached group.
There were no calls for additional collaboration among student teachers in the peer-coached group.

The peer-coaching conferences and observational schedule provided the opportunity to reflect on one's own teaching and that of the peer. In an otherwise busy schedule when student teachers may not have taken the time to reflect on their teaching, peer coaching acted as a means to facilitate reflection. At times, student teachers reflected on how to implement clarity skills or an L2 teaching method because the observation of their peer stimulated thought about an aspect of teaching that related to their own concerns.

In sum, the peer coach was found to serve each supervisory function outlined in the peer coaching literature: collegiality, technical feedback, adaptation to students, analysis of application, and personal facilitation. The US was noted as serving the analysis of application function. The CT was noted as a source of input on the adaptation to students function of peer coaching. On the whole, the findings of the present study indicate that peer coaching enhanced the student teaching practicum experience by serving as a vehicle for teacher reflection, skills acquisition, and support with newly assumed teaching duties.

In contrast to the positive findings on peer coaching regarding problem solving from four individuals in this study, one pair of peer coaches found the peer coaching relationship worthwhile only for the observational and feedback opportunities it offered. As a form of collegiality, these two student teachers appreciated peer coaching for the chance to consider their own classroom.
practices in perspective of another individual at the same professional level who had progressed through the same teacher education program. These two individuals did not use the peer coaching meetings to solve problems or resolve teaching issues, but rather, used the time to discuss what they considered to be important issues in L2 teaching, the clarity model, and to identify when they observed these in their peer’s teaching.

One aspect of the practicum experience of these two student teachers was that their CTs were a regular source of assistance to them throughout the ten weeks. They reported daily conferences and observations rather than the diminished CT presence that one half of the student teachers in this study reported. While their CTs encouraged them to use ideas from their teacher education experience, they also offered their own ideas, input, and feedback on lessons and lesson planning. For these two student teachers, the CT also provided them with each of the five functions of peer coaching throughout the practicum experience.

Conclusions

The analysis of the data led to several conclusions regarding the topics of peer coaching, supervision, pedagogical reasoning, clarity skills training and implementation, and L2 teaching. First, foreign language preservice teachers were able to serve as a source of assistance to a fellow student teacher during the student teaching practicum. Peer coaching was most helpful to student teachers when they identified an aspect of their teaching with which they needed
assistance. Peer coaches focused on these specific student teaching issues and offered ideas for lessons, helped a peer refine an idea to use in their teaching, and addressed the peer's concerns both in advance of lessons and after lessons had been taught and data regarding lessons had been collected.

Second, in addition to providing assistance to student teachers with specific teaching difficulties such as the challenges that clarity skills implementation provided or the desire to make grammatical lessons more communicatively based, peer coaching reduced teacher isolation. Peer coaches were a source of assistance when the CT was not present to plan, discuss, and offer assistance to the student teachers with their newly acquired teaching responsibilities. Thus, peer-coached student teachers were able to engage in the five supervisory functions of peer coaching: collegiality, technical feedback, adaptation to students, analysis of application, and personal facilitation. Peer coaching enhanced the traditional triad of student teaching supervision. Unlike peer coaches, nonpeer-coached student teachers requested more time to collaborate with fellow student teachers regarding planning, clarity skills implementation, and discussion of teaching experiences.

The third conclusion is that each member of the supervision triad or team had a specific role for the supervision of foreign and second language student teachers. The US served the supervisory function of the analysis of application of clarity skills and L2 teaching methods. The US assisted preservice teachers by providing weekly input on progress toward goals. The consequences of such
input were the ability of preservice teachers to know their teaching strengths and weaknesses and the use of that information to set new goals for improvement. The character of US feedback was specific and geared toward the concerns of the L2 teacher. The nature of this feedback met the needs of the student teachers who lacked CT assistance in this regard. Student teachers relied on the weekly visit by the US because it filled the gap that they perceived in the quality of US feedback on their teaching and plans.

The portrait of most of the CTs in this study mirrored that of the literature previously cited, such as the lack of willingness of CTs to spend time reflecting on lessons with novices (Richardson-Koehler, 1988). When CT assistance was minimal, in the cases of two peer-coached and five nonpeer-coached individuals, CTs were able to provide help regarding the adaptation of methods and plans to the students. The role of the CT in the supervisory triad is essential because no other member of the student teaching supervision team possesses the same knowledge of students’ characteristics, interests, backgrounds or the school setting. In situations where CTs were reported to have been helpful, they acted similarly to expert coaches in that they provided assistance to student teachers regarding all functions of peer coaching.

In peer-coaching situations, the peer coach was found able to compensate for the lack of CT assistance. The peer coach was named as an extra source of assistance adding a collegial perspective to supervision in that peer coaches shared similar concerns and challenges while assuming new
teaching responsibilities. Peer coaches facilitated teaching improvement in a short amount of time because of the specific focus on challenges and aspects of teaching with which student teachers struggled. Peer coaching offered a means of support and assistance in anticipation of the lessons taught, addressing student teachers’ questions regarding how to achieve lesson goals.

Peer coaching broadened the teacher education experience for novice teachers. Observation provided another source of teaching ideas for foreign and second language teachers to garner ideas to use in their own classrooms: The peer coach acted as a model of L2 teaching. The nonpeer-coached individuals did not have this added teaching model in a peer, but expressed a need for collaboration and more meetings among student teachers in the cohort. Thus, peer coaching appeared to fill a gap noted by nonpeer-coached teachers in the process of foreign/second language teacher education.

The fourth area about which conclusions can be drawn from this study is pedagogical reasoning. Pedagogical reasoning emerged to a greater degree and regarded more aspects of teaching with a peer or the US than when student teachers considered their lessons alone. The interactive nature of conferences elicited statements pertaining to each category of Shulman’s Model of Pedagogical Reasoning (1987). Peer interaction was beneficial to the student teachers’ pedagogical reasoning both prior to lessons as well as after lessons were taught. Peer coaches consistently made more comments coded according to the six categories of pedagogical reasoning than the nonpeer-coached
teachers and discussed more teaching topics in these discussions (See Appendix I).

Although both groups of student teachers discussed similar concerns in the post-observation conferences, the consistent use of transformation and instruction comments in both the pre- and post-observation conferences reflected an orientation toward planning. Post-observation conferences were devoted to the renewed planning aspect of clinical supervision. The value of peer coaching in this study resembles the latest designs of peer coaching by its originators in that the planning aspect of teacher collaboration is emphasized as most valuable for goal achievement (Joyce & Showers, 1996).

The fifth set of conclusions from this study can be made regarding clarity skills training and implementation. Within a ten-week foreign and second language student teaching practicum, clarity skills were presented to student teachers and used by them as conscious strategies to reach both content specific and generic teaching goals. Generic teaching research validated that certain teacher behaviors, in the form of clarity skills, can be used in the specific content area of foreign/second language teaching in grammatical presentations and the organization of communicative activities. When the focus of instruction was not on grammatical topics, clarity skills aided student teachers in organizing, arranging, and explaining communicative and interactive activities that provided spoken language practice. Therefore, besides the focus on grammar, clarity skills were found to assist student teachers in achieving teaching goals related
to the interpersonal mode of language teaching (U.S. Department of Education, 1996).

In addition to applications specific to foreign/second language teaching, clarity skills were also valuable regarding general teaching concerns. Clarity skills training and implementation helped preservice teachers to address discipline issues, a prevalent source of stress in the student teaching practicum (Fogarty & Yarrow, 1994).

Challenges existed in the student teaching experience that prevented student teachers from the use of clarity skills in their classes, such as coping with the amount of teaching tasks to accomplish during the time available in a class period. Peer coaching seemed to facilitate clarity skills implementation. Peer-coached student teachers were observed to implement more instances of clarity behaviors than nonpeer-coached teachers (See Appendix F). Also, peer-coached student teachers’ data showed more varied discussions of the perceived value of clarity skills for goal achievement.

Finally, conclusions can be drawn about the L2 teaching concerns of the student teachers involved in this study. First, student teachers in both groups viewed language teaching as having two distinct facets: a focus on grammar and a focus on language for communicative purposes. Consistently in self-report data and conferences were comments and evidence that the student teachers were not challenged by teaching grammar and noted that clarity skills facilitated this goal of L2 teaching.
Data showed that teaching grammar within a communicative framework was challenging. Student teachers' goals included contextualizing L2 content, maintaining target language use in their presentations, personalizing the content, and providing language practice that included students' active use of the productive skills: speaking and writing. However, regarding clarity skills, asks questions was the most or second most used skill by the twelve student teachers. This recitation-based method of teaching coincides with their expressed challenge to meet these L2 teaching goals.

The end of the practicum found student teachers expressing the desire to learn more about how to implement student portfolios, thematic units, and whole language approaches to L2 teaching. That student teachers included the above as teaching goals suggests that the ten-week practicum did not help them to acquire practical knowledge about these methods.

Implications

The findings and conclusions of this study suggest implications for the content and process of teacher education for prospective foreign/second language teachers. Based on this study, colleges of education need to regard and utilize peer coaching as a vehicle for skills acquisition and reflection on teaching in both field experiences and the student teaching practicum.

Peer coaching was found to enhance the supervision process in the student teaching practicum. First, the nature of peer coaching was found to be related to the specific concerns and needs that foreign/second language student
teachers described during their practicum experience. The ongoing nature of the clinical supervision cycle helped the peer-coached student teachers identify their teaching concerns and address these in peer coaching conferences. This aspect of peer coaching holds implications for the possible combinations and the schedules for peer coaching programs within a teacher education program, for one's learning proceeds best when one perceives that his or her learning needs are being met (Fuller & Bown, 1977).

Foreign language education programs should create opportunities for student teachers to identify their particular needs and concerns for L2 teaching. When these needs are known, teacher educators, in conjunction with the prospective teachers, can brainstorm possible coaching combinations to create peer coaching relationships that directly meet the needs of the student teachers. One example of this for foreign/second language education is the combination of a native target language speaking peer with a non-native speaker of the same target language. As was noted in this study, the native speaker better understood her learners' perspectives about the target language content and the non-native speaker learned more of the language.

That peer coaching was beneficial in situations in which student teachers reported challenges, struggles, or needs for their peer coach to address implies that peer coaching cycles in the student teaching practicum could be arranged according to occasions when student teachers perceive their needs and challenges to be the greatest. For example, this study showed that the point at
which student teachers assumed total responsibility for teaching was a time when assistance was needed regarding clarity skills. Thus, a task for teacher education programs that utilize peer coaching would be to assist preservice teachers to identify the challenges they confront in reaching learning goals of the teacher education program.

Furthermore, if peer coaching is used earlier in the teacher education process in early field experiences as Bowman (1995) recommended, then by the time the student teaching practicum occurs, prospective teachers will be familiar with the processes of identifying their needs, conducting observations and conferences, and addressing their concerns with a peer. The finding that nonpeer-coached student teachers expressed the desire for more meetings with fellow student teachers, and no such requests were made from the peer-coached group, implies that the traditional student teaching supervision triad is in need of enhancement. Such an implication, coupled with the finding that student teachers who did not report specific challenges described situations in which they were able to rely on supportive CTs as the source of assistance for their concerns, suggests that the use of peer coaching in the student teaching triad be arranged according to the varied situations of peer-coaching relationships.

Peer coaching cycles can thus be initiated based on the expressed needs of the individual student teachers. Such an arrangement for peer coaching cycles in which the student teachers meet for the clinical supervision
components of pre-observation conference, observation, and post-observation conference within the student teaching practicum, can be visualized graphically with the figure below.

Figure 5.1 depicts how peer coaching could reinforce the traditional student teaching supervision triad. Each vertex of the triangle represents the triad members: student teacher, cooperating teacher, and university supervisor. The outlying circle represents the support of peer coaching cycles arranged in response to teaching needs as requested by the student teacher. The arrows indicate that this process is ongoing. The number of peer coaching cycles should not be predetermined (hence peer coaching cycle n) and would vary according to the student teachers’ perceived teaching needs and interests.

The second set of implications of the present study refers to what the twelve student teachers identified as L2 teaching concerns. Student teachers expressed the desire to meet with fellow student teachers to address the content of previous methods courses. The challenges the student teachers in this study reported did not pertain to what to teach or why they should teach the content they focused on, but pertained to how they could teach the L2 content. The challenges they reported that related to L2 teaching included creating materials, maintaining target language use, eliciting sentence length target language utterances from students, personalizing the L2 content, providing practice of all four language skills in the same lesson, and providing grammatical practice in communicative exercises.
Figure 5.1 Enhancing the student teaching triad with peer coaching

Also, at the end of the practicum, student teachers stated their learning needs in L2 teaching that they perceived were not addressed or met in the student teaching practicum: creating thematic units, use of content-based methods to teach the L2, creating student portfolio projects. These findings provided information regarding the possible content of peer coaching partnerships that foreign/second language teacher education programs can organize and arrange in order to meet the learning needs of novice L2 teachers.
Third, following from the two previous sets of implications, the participating foreign/second language teacher education program and ones similar to it should examine their field experiences. Careful examination of the requirements, settings, and the participating individuals may determine that field experiences can be arranged according to prospective teachers' needs. Local school districts can be explored to identify the expertise of foreign/second language educators who may serve as models and mentors for novice teachers. Although beyond the scope of this discussion, one avenue of exploration would be to identify native speaking teachers of the target language to provide prospective teachers with opportunities for target language development and access to authentic materials. From such an examination of practitioners and resources, purposeful combinations of experienced educators and novices could be arranged in order to meet the expressed L2 teaching needs of the student teachers and the theoretical underpinnings and the goals of the education department.

Another implication of this study is to examine the clinical experiences within foreign/second language teacher education programs for type and amount of direct and vicarious practical experiences offered to prospective teachers. In this study, when the student teachers' task was to solve problems in situ, they requested help when they were not engaged in a peer-coaching relationship. At times, peer-coached student teachers expressed discomfort when they had to experiment with ideas, seeming to prefer a more directive type of supervision.
from the CT and peer coach with their lesson plans. This reaction of field experience students calls into question whether the amount of practice regarding planning, lesson execution, and reflection on lessons is sufficient prior to the student teaching experience. For example, findings from this study showed that some of the target clarity skills were not used at all by some members of the peer- and nonpeer-coached groups and that pedagogical reasoning emerged to a greater extent among peer-coached student teachers than nonpeer-coached student teachers.

Organized clinical and laboratory experiences would serve to assist teacher education students with skills that they perceive more difficult to implement as well as with the dispositions toward analysis and reflection of their teaching. Programs of foreign/second language teacher education should investagete how to arrange laboratory experiences on campus that provide safety of setting and controlled situations for which planning for and reflecting on teaching episodes occurs among prospective teaching peers.

Field experiences have recently been the subject of controversy. At the same time that proponents of the field settings call for extended field experiences (Holmes, 1986), opponents disagree and seek more on-campus clinical practice (Cruickshank & Armaline, 1986; Metcalf & Kahlich, 1996). One current view of the laboratory experience is that it is superior to initial field experiences for the development of teacher behavior, cognitive abilities, and positive affect of the participating teacher education students (Metcalf & Kahlich,
Laboratory experiences focused on the needs of novice L2 teachers, such as those listed above, would provide novices with experimentation opportunities to focus their attention on answers to questions related to how to teach L2 content.

Whereas the above Figure 5.1 represents the use of peer coaching during the student teaching practicum, Figure 5.2 below depicts how peer coaching can be used prior to student teaching in teacher education classes to strengthen the preservice program. Teacher education classes such as methodology courses and introductory professional courses that include field and classroom components should also incorporate a laboratory experience requiring preservice teachers to work together in the practice of skills and analysis of teaching events. Such an arrangement for peer interaction in preservice courses would prepare teacher education students for student teaching by familiarizing them with teaching methods as well as the processes of identifying their teaching interests and struggles and analyzing and reflecting on lessons early in the teacher education process.

The fifth set of implications also refers to the student teachers' concern for how to carry out instruction. The field of foreign/second language education has not documented a case literature of teaching experiences (Hammadou, 1991). Such a case literature specific to this field would include the experiences of veteran and novice teachers' teaching episodes and challenges. A body of documented practical knowledge could assist preservice teachers' problem
solving skills within the safety of the teacher education environment as they learn how to represent content to students' abilities and interests. Such a case literature of the "wisdom of practice" (Shulman, 1987, p. 11) would serve as a set of guidelines for preservice and beginning teachers as they undertake the arduous task of learning how to transform content knowledge for pupils' use.

Sixth, the findings that peer-coached student teachers implemented clarity skills to a greater extent than non-peer coached student teachers, exhibited more instances of pedagogical reasoning, and served the five
functions of peer coaching for a peer coaching partner encourage foreign
language teacher educators to investigate the uses of student teaching seminars
as the means to provide student teachers with more strategies for problem
solving and a greater understanding of the complexities of classroom practice.
When student teachers who represent different classrooms have the
opportunities to address topics of teaching together, traditional isolation that
characterizes teaching is reduced and preservice teachers have a more
extensive appreciation for classroom processes.

The seventh set of implications also regards the content of teacher
education. This study found that teacher behaviors validated by general teacher
education research in the form of clarity skills were useful for foreign/second
language teaching. In particular, these skills were applied to the teaching of
grammatical topics and the organization of communicative activities. It follows,
then, that foreign/second language methodology instructors should fully
integrate these skills substantiated by general teacher education research in
their courses for the particular uses cited by the student teachers: grammar
teaching, organizing communicative activities, and personalizing foreign
language content. Furthermore, foreign language teacher education programs
should investigate the uses of other teacher effectiveness behaviors and how
they can be useful to L2 teacher education.

Next, this study holds implications for the roles of the cooperating
teachers of preservice L2 teachers. In most of the cases, the reaction of the CT
to his or her supervisory duties was pivotal in shaping the attitude of the student teachers toward the components of the practicum experience. When the CT was very supportive and consistently a source of assistance and input, the student teachers regarded the university portion of the on-campus seminar as a requirement they had to endure rather than offering a supportive learning environment. Conversely, when the CT reduced his or her amount of observation, feedback, and assistance, the university portion of the practicum that was once viewed as business-like, was seen positively as a source of collegiality and support. Thus, teacher education in the student teaching seminar was represented by two separate endeavors: (1) the activities on campus with the US and fellow student teachers; (2) the actions and conduct of the CT.

According to literature on supervision, the student teaching triad typically suffers from a lack of communication among its members and the roles of the CT and US are left undefined (Richardson-Koehler, 1988; Hoover, O'Shea, Carroll, 1989). In this study, student teachers' perspectives on the supervision process and their voiced needs for forms of supervision showed that the roles of the CT and US were clearly defined. The US provided specific feedback to student teachers that they used to gauge their progress and set new goals for improvement. In many cases this specific feedback was relied on by student teachers in place of the lack of input by the CT.

The CT possessed knowledge that neither a US or a peer coach could possess: knowledge of the school setting, the students, the goals of the district
and the school’s foreign/second language department. Student teachers reported that the knowledge the CT had was essential for success in his or her classroom teaching. An example is the personalization and contextualization of material. Student teachers stated that one could not achieve either of these L2 teaching goals without being familiar with their students, their background knowledge, interests, and interaction patterns. Another reason for CT presence is classroom management. As new individuals enter classrooms to student teach, the CT acts as a representative of his or her students in order to inform the preservice teacher’s understanding of particular students’ characteristics and reactions. The role of the CT in the supervisory triad is, thus, essential.

When viewed in light of the five functions of peer coaching, the minimal roles of the US and CT appear to be the analysis of application and adaptation to students functions, respectively. The CTs’ reluctance in some cases to plan and reflect with their student teachers suggests that the CTs either did not want to do so or did not know how to carry out their supervisory functions. It becomes, then, the task of the teacher education program to inform the CTs of their particular role in the education of prospective foreign and second language teachers. It is not the norm that CTs receive any training or assistance with their supervisory functions beyond the written orientation materials provided by the teacher education program at the beginning of the practicum (Sudzina, Giebelhaus & Coolican, 1997). Other researchers have concluded that CTs have expressed willingness to be trained in specific aspects of student teaching.
supervision, such as how to offer constructive criticism (Ramanathan & Wilkins-Canter, 1998).

Thus, one task of foreign/second language teacher education programs becomes that of unifying the separate endeavors of teacher education in the university and field settings. One possible manner of providing CTs with the necessary information they need is to use the five functions of peer coaching to explain the purposes of supervision, making the CTs aware of the parts of their knowledge base that they need to share with their student teachers and stressing the need for them to observe and offer feedback continually throughout the practicum experience. If such training is available, then perhaps potential CTs will be more carefully selected by teacher education programs and the availability of placements and willing teachers or administrators will not be the deciding factors for CT assignment.

Finally, this study holds implications for the content and process for CT training. Currently teaching and teacher education finds itself in an era of teacher testing and accountability. Experienced teachers are finding themselves required to accumulate recertification credits to maintain teaching eligibility. The training of potential CTs for supervision can be addressed in the realm of teacher inservice toward recertification. Regarding supervision, training in providing feedback, collaborative problem solving, and the role of the CT as representative of the students and school follow from the findings of this study. Regarding the characteristics of student teachers, the student teachers’
concerns about L2 methods and how to carry out teaching tasks that emerged in
this study serve to inform CTs' work with foreign/second language student
teachers. Such training would assist CTs in understanding when to employ
directive forms of supervision and when to engage in more creative and personal
(Gebhard, 1990) forms of teacher education with preservice teachers.

Recommendations for Future Studies

The present study has offered findings on the concerns expressed by
foreign language student teachers in two different supervisory conditions during
the student teaching practicum. The qualitative exploratory nature of this study
has generated questions that should be researched in future investigations in
the field of foreign/second language teacher education. The following eleven
recommendations originate from the findings and conclusions of this study:

> More inquiry investigating this study's research questions pertaining to
  peer coaching should be conducted among similar cohorts of
  foreign/second language preservice teachers in order to further discover
  L2 language teaching concerns and add to the knowledge base of this
  specific field.

> Future studies should investigate the use of peer coaching arranged
  according to a particular number of peer coaching cycles based on the
identified needs of cohorts of foreign/second language preservice teachers in the student teaching practicum. Such a study could address the suggestion from this investigation that peer coaching is more useful to student teachers when they are confronted by particular concerns or problems, rather than when peer coaching is a general requirement for student teachers on a weekly basis.

A similar study might be conducted in foreign/second language practicum experiences in the elementary school setting to determine if the same or similar L2 teaching concerns of preservice teachers emerge in such practicum experiences. Such a study could also address the perceived need for and value of clarity skills development particular to elementary foreign/second language teaching.

Based on the finding that one set of peer coaches reported that their peer coaching was not used for problem solving but for feedback and skills identification purposes, while two other pairs engaged in mutual problem solving and resolution of teaching difficulties, future studies should investigate reasons for peer coaching's serving different purposes for prospective teachers. For example, personality or prior experience could be analyzed in such studies.
Based on the findings in this study pertaining to clarity skills, use of the research on teacher behaviors generated from the research base of general teacher education should be fully integrated into the specific field of foreign/second language teacher education. Examples would include teachers' use of praise or the use of questioning skills. Such studies would add to the knowledge base in foreign/second language education by investigating the particular values of such skills for the content specific area of L2 teaching and would assist foreign language teacher educators to more thoroughly apply the general teacher education knowledge base into their curricula.

Additional qualitative studies investigating the wisdom of practice portion of the knowledge base of experienced and novice foreign/second language teachers should be conducted to elicit from them information regarding how they approach teaching tasks in order to represent the content to their pupils. Information generated from such studies could add to the current knowledge base of foreign/second language teaching by documenting the development of teaching knowledge in novice teachers.

If a case literature for foreign/second language teaching is developed, as the above recommendation advised, then this field should follow the counsel of Jarvis and Taylor (1990) and investigate the common parts of
the knowledge base that other content areas share with foreign/second language teaching. Such an investigation may help foreign/second language methods instructors to develop ways that address preservice teachers’ requests for more knowledge regarding content-based methods of L2 instruction as evidenced at the end of the student teaching practicum by the participants in this study.

Cooperating teachers should be included as research participants in future studies investigating the peer coaching triad: student teachers and cooperating teacher. Such investigations would inform supervision training programs for cooperating teachers regarding the elements of feedback and support.

A follow-up study of student teachers employed in initial year teaching placements should be conducted to ascertain their tendencies toward forms of (expert and reciprocal) and purposes for (technical, collegial, and challenge) peer coaching.

Future studies should investigate how peer coaching aids teacher career development during the initial years of teaching. Comments made by peer-coached student teachers regarding the helpfulness of clarity skills and their more varied pedagogical reasoning suggest that peer coaching
is beneficial to teacher development and teacher efficacy in the student teaching practicum.

Future investigations of peer coaching should include experimental studies that could serve to corroborate the self-report data from the present study regarding clarity skills, foreign language teaching, and supervision.

Peer coaching was a means to meet preservice teachers’ needs for help with teaching responsibilities. Placing student teachers in peer-coaching relationships also provided a method of data collection leading to the findings of this study related to clarity skills for use in foreign/second language classrooms, supervision, and foreign and second language teaching. The present study used peer coaching as a vehicle to introduce general teacher education research into the specific field of foreign/second language teaching for preservice teachers and to investigate their pedagogical reasoning in order to understand the nature of foreign/second language teaching.

In an era of teacher testing, in which teachers’ knowledge, skills, and dispositions are evaluated, peer coaching can provide the means to organize learning communities during teacher education programs for prospective teachers to explore their own learning potential. It can also provide teacher education in specific content areas, such as foreign language teaching, with
increased avenues for accessing the knowledge base of teachers, both novice and experienced. Finally, the present study has shown that peer coaching is a source for preservice teachers to develop both interdependence and autonomy.
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APPENDIX A

DEFINITIONS OF TEACHER CLARITY BEHAVIORS

I. The teacher logically organizes instruction and instructional content.
   
   1. Informs students of lesson objectives in advance.
      The teacher begins the lesson by informing students of the content material or concepts to be covered.

II. The teacher emphasizes important aspects of instruction and instructional content.

   1. Repeats points that are important.
      The teacher, during the lesson, repeats (for emphasis) specific aspects of the content of instruction (e.g., point, rule, idea, etc.)

   2. Summarizes the material presented in class.
      The teacher, upon completion of the lesson or of clearly segmented portions of the lesson, provides a summary of instructional content or concepts that were presented.

III. Explains/Demonstrates how to do the work by using examples.

   1. Examples are used.
      The teacher makes use of verbal, written, or practical examples when explaining some aspects of instructional content.

---

1 The above and following material has been taken from The Clarity Training Program: Instructor’s Manual, part of the unpublished doctoral dissertation at The Ohio State University by Kim Metcalf (1989), An investigation of the efficacy of a research-based regimen of skill development on the instructional clarity of preservice teachers.
2. Works examples and explains them/Demonstrates.
The teacher works through examples of problems on the board, chart, etc. and explains the procedures involved. The emphasis is on demonstration and explanation of the application of instructional content to solve particular problems.

IV. Provides for student understanding and assimilation of instructional content.

1. Repeats points that students do not understand.
The teacher repeats aspects of the content (previously addressed) which students directly or indirectly communicate to the teacher that they do not understand.

2. Asks questions to find out if students understand.
The teacher, after explaining, repeating, or reviewing some aspect(s) of the instructional content, asks a direct question (“Is that clear?”; “Do you understand?”) or asks questions about the content presented to determine whether students understand what has been presented.

3. Allows time (pauses) for students to ask questions and answers students’ questions.
After explaining, repeating or reviewing some aspect(s) of the instructional content, the teacher deliberately pauses to provide time for students to ask questions. When questions are asked, the teacher answers content-related questions.

4. Provides opportunities for students to practice (or work examples).
The teacher, during the class period, provides specific time for students to do written or practical examples related to the content of instruction. This may take the form of individual seat work or group work. The teacher may play an active role in the case of group work.

5. Rephrases
The teacher paraphrases aspects of the content previously addressed.
## APPENDIX B

### SUMMARY OF STUDENTS' BIOGRAPHICAL INFORMATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher:</th>
<th>Anne</th>
<th>Cindy</th>
<th>Kelly</th>
<th>Maria</th>
<th>Pat</th>
<th>Sally</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L1</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPA</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>3.307</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>2.557</td>
<td>3.785</td>
<td>2.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program of studies</td>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>Bachelors</td>
<td>Bachelors</td>
<td>Bachelors</td>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>Bachelors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language Taught</td>
<td>French</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>German &amp; ESL</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study Abroad</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years of language study</td>
<td>since grammar school</td>
<td>since middle school</td>
<td>since high school</td>
<td>since grammar school</td>
<td>since middle school</td>
<td>since high school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paid teaching</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes: summer programs</td>
<td>yes: summer programs</td>
<td>yes: public library</td>
<td>substitute teaching</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tutoring</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA majors</td>
<td>French</td>
<td>Changed to FLED from Music Education</td>
<td>Changed to FLED from Internatl Studies</td>
<td>FLED</td>
<td>Journalism</td>
<td>Changed to FLED from Exercise Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>self-rating proficiency</td>
<td>Superior</td>
<td>Advanced</td>
<td>Intermediate</td>
<td>Superior</td>
<td>Advanced</td>
<td>Advanced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate after practicum</td>
<td>more required courses</td>
<td>more required courses</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>more required courses</td>
<td>more required courses</td>
<td>more required courses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher:</td>
<td>Ana</td>
<td>Chip</td>
<td>Lori</td>
<td>Max</td>
<td>Sharon</td>
<td>Tracy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L1</td>
<td>Arabic</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPA</td>
<td>3.822</td>
<td>2.662</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>3.509</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>2.544</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program of studies</td>
<td>Bachelors</td>
<td>Bachelors</td>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>Bachelors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language Taught</td>
<td>Arabic &amp; ESL</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>French</td>
<td>Japanese &amp; ESL</td>
<td>French</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study Abroad</td>
<td>BA in US</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>BA and MA in US</td>
<td>yes: Sorbonne</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years of language study</td>
<td>since grammar school</td>
<td>since middle school</td>
<td>since middle school</td>
<td>since middle school</td>
<td>since middle school</td>
<td>since middle school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paid teaching</td>
<td>yes: English Teacher, Lebanon</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes: substitute &amp; university lecturer</td>
<td>yes: public &amp; private US schools</td>
<td>Yes 3rd grade</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tutoring</td>
<td>yes, US</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA majors</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Changed to FLED from pre-med</td>
<td>French &amp; Arabic</td>
<td>FLED</td>
<td>French Literature</td>
<td>Changed to FLED from elem.ed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>self rating proficiency</td>
<td>Advanced</td>
<td>Advanced</td>
<td>Advanced</td>
<td>Advanced</td>
<td>Advanced</td>
<td>Advanced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate after practicum</td>
<td>more required courses</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>more required courses</td>
<td>more required courses</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX C

PEER COACHING SATISFACTION QUESTIONNAIRE

Satisfaction Survey

I participated in a Peer Group______ or individually______

Please respond to the following items to indicate your satisfaction with the student teaching practicum. Give answers to the following items and cite examples where appropriate. Thank you in advance for helping with this research project.

The practicum provided:

a. Collegiality

b. Technical Feedback

c. Analysis of application

d. Adaptation to students
e. Personal Facilitation

f. Your overall degree of satisfaction with the practicum:

Part II:

g. The most useful parts of the student teaching practicum were:

h. Overall, how would you rate your field experience with regard to your professional growth? Tell one area in which you rate your teaching skills as needing improvement.
APPENDIX D

CLARITY OBSERVATION INSTRUMENT

Teacher_________________________ video # ______

1. Informs Ss of Lesson Objectives L1 L2
   W________ W________
   V________ V________

2. Repeats Important Points for Ss to learn L1 L2

3. Examples are Used L1 L2
   W____________________+____________________________________
   V____________________+____________________________________

4. Demonstrates L1 L2
   W____________________+____________________________________
   V____________________+____________________________________

5. Repeats Things Ss don’t Understand L1 L2

6. Rephrases L1 L2
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7. Summarizes

W______________________________

V______________________________

8. Asks questions

L1/Ind. L1/Group

L2/Ind. L2/Group

9. Opportunities for Ss to ask Questions

L1

L2

10. Opportunities for Ss to practice

W: Written
V: Verbal
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APPENDIX E

SHULMAN'S MODEL OF PEDAGOGICAL REASONING

Student Teacher _____ Week_____ Page Number

Comprehension
Of purposes, subject matter structures, ideas within and outside the discipline

Transformation
a. Preparation: critical interpretation and analysis of texts, structuring and segmenting of a
development curricular repertoire, and clarification of purposes

b. Representation: use of a representational repertoire which includes analogies,
metaphors, examples, demonstrations, and explanations

c. Selection: choice from among an instructional repertoire which includes modes
of teaching, organizing, managing, and arranging

d. Adaptation and Tailoring to Students' Characteristics: consideration of conceptions,
misconceptions, and difficulties, language, culture, and motivations, social class,
gender, age, ability, aptitude, interests, self-concepts, and attention.

Instruction
Management, presentations, interactions, group work, discipline, humor,
questioning, and other aspects of active teaching, discovery or inquiry instruction,
and the observable forms of classroom teaching.

Evaluation
Checking for student understanding during interactive teaching. Testing student
understanding at the end of lessons or units. Evaluating one's own performance and
adjusting for experiences.

Reflection
Reviewing, reconstructing, reenacting and critically analyzing one’s own and the
class’s performance, and grounding explanations in evidence.

New Comprehension
Of purposes, subject matter, students, teaching, and self
Consolidation of new understandings and learnings from experience
APPENDIX F

FREQUENCIES\(^2\) OF CLARITY SKILLS BY SUPERVISORY GROUP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Peer-coached group</th>
<th>Non-peer coached group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Most Used Skill</td>
<td>Asks Questions - 719</td>
<td>Asks Questions - 437</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Most Used Skill</td>
<td>Examples are used - 427</td>
<td>Examples are used - 201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third Most Used Skill</td>
<td>Repeats Important Points - 184</td>
<td>Demonstrates - 86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fourth Most Used Skill</td>
<td>Demonstrates - 105</td>
<td>Provides Practice - 79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fifth Most Used Skill</td>
<td>Provides Practice - 93</td>
<td>Repeats Important Points - 70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sixth Most Used Skill</td>
<td>Repeats Points Students do not Understand - 41</td>
<td>States Objectives - 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seventh Most Used Skill</td>
<td>States Objectives - 37</td>
<td>Repeats Points Students do not Understand - 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eighth Most Used Skill</td>
<td>Provides Opportunities for Students’ Questions - 31</td>
<td>Provides Opportunities for Students’ Questions - 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ninth Most Used Skill</td>
<td>Rephrases - 30</td>
<td>Summarizes - 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Least Used Skill</td>
<td>Summarizes - 17</td>
<td>Rephrases - 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^2\) Frequencies are averages of observed instances of each clarity skill by the three raters.
APPENDIX G

INTER-RATER RELIABILITY TABLES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skill</th>
<th>Mean Correlation</th>
<th>Inter-rater Reliability Coefficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Skill 1</td>
<td>.982</td>
<td>.994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skill 2</td>
<td>.985</td>
<td>.995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skill 3</td>
<td>.970</td>
<td>.989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skill 4</td>
<td>.946</td>
<td>.981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skill 5</td>
<td>.942</td>
<td>.980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skill 6</td>
<td>.890</td>
<td>.960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skill 7</td>
<td>.922</td>
<td>.972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skill 8</td>
<td>.975</td>
<td>.991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skill 9</td>
<td>.963</td>
<td>.986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skill 10</td>
<td>.970</td>
<td>.990</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Mean correlations and inter-rater reliability coefficients for the ten clarity skills of interest
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rater</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>Rater</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skill 1 (NAME)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Skill 6 (NAME)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.987</td>
<td>.977</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.836</td>
<td>.836</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td>.980</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skill 2 (NAME)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Skill 7 (NAME)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.974</td>
<td>.984</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.942</td>
<td>.874</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td>.980</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skill 3 (NAME)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Skill 8 (NAME)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.960</td>
<td>.975</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.965</td>
<td>.975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td>.974</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skill 4 (NAME)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Skill 9 (NAME)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.952</td>
<td>.942</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.958</td>
<td>.942</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td>.945</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skill 5 (NAME)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Skill 10 (NAME)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.970</td>
<td>.963</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.979</td>
<td>.956</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td>.894</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Intercorrelations between raters for each clarity skill of interest used in calculating inter-rater reliability
## APPENDIX H

### SUMMARY OF CLARITY SKILLS IMPLEMENTATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Informs Students of Lesson Objectives: Peer Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher: Anne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L1 - W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L1 - O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L2 - W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L2 - O</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Informs Students of Lesson Objectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher: Ana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L1 - W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L1 - O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L2 - W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L2 - O</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

L1-W: Skill completed in the first language in written form
L1-O: Skill completed in the first language orally
L2-W: Skill completed in the target language in written form
L2-O: Skill completed in the target language orally
### 2. Repeats Important Points: Peer Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Anne</th>
<th>Cindy</th>
<th>Kelly</th>
<th>Maria</th>
<th>Pat</th>
<th>Sally</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L1</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L2</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2. Repeats Important Points

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Ana</th>
<th>Chip</th>
<th>Lori</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>Sharon</th>
<th>Tracy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L1</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L2</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3. Examples Are Used: Peer Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Anne</th>
<th>Cindy</th>
<th>Kelly</th>
<th>Maria</th>
<th>Pat</th>
<th>Sally</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L1-W</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L1-O</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L2-W</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L2-O</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3. Examples Are Used

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Ana</th>
<th>Chip</th>
<th>Lori</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>Sharon</th>
<th>Tracy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L1-W</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L1-O</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L2-W</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L2-O</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 4. Demonstrates: Peer Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher:</th>
<th>Anne</th>
<th>Cindy</th>
<th>Kelly</th>
<th>Maria</th>
<th>Pat</th>
<th>Sally</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L1-W</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L1-O</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L2-W</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L2-O</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4. Demonstrates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher:</th>
<th>Ana</th>
<th>Chip</th>
<th>Lori</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>Sharon</th>
<th>Tracy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L1-W</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L1-O</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L2-W</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L2-O</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 5. Repeats Important Points that Students Do Not Understand: Peer

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher:</th>
<th>Anne</th>
<th>Cindy</th>
<th>Kelly</th>
<th>Maria</th>
<th>Pat</th>
<th>Sally</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L1</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L2</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 5. Repeats Important Points that Students Do Not Understand

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher:</th>
<th>Ana</th>
<th>Chip</th>
<th>Lori</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>Sharon</th>
<th>Tracy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L1</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L2</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### 6. Rephrases: Peer Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher:</th>
<th>Anne</th>
<th>Cindy</th>
<th>Kelly</th>
<th>Maria</th>
<th>Pat</th>
<th>Sally</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L1</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L2</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 6. Rephrases

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher:</th>
<th>Ana</th>
<th>Chip</th>
<th>Lori</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>Sharon</th>
<th>Tracy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L2</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 7. Summarizes: Peer Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher:</th>
<th>Anne</th>
<th>Cindy</th>
<th>Kelly</th>
<th>Maria</th>
<th>Pat</th>
<th>Sally</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L1-W</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L1-O</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L2-W</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L2-O</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 7. Summarizes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher:</th>
<th>Ana</th>
<th>Chip</th>
<th>Lori</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>Sharon</th>
<th>Tracy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L1-W</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L1-O</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L2-W</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L2-O</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 8. Asks Questions: Peer Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher:</th>
<th>Anne</th>
<th>Cindy</th>
<th>Kelly</th>
<th>Maria</th>
<th>Pat</th>
<th>Sally</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L1 Indiv.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L1 Group</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L2 Indiv.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L2 Group</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 8. Asks Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher:</th>
<th>Ana</th>
<th>Chip</th>
<th>Lori</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>Sharon</th>
<th>Tracy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L1 Indiv.</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L1 Group</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L2 Indiv.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L2 Group</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

L1 Indiv: Questions asked to individual students in first language  
L2 Indiv: Questions asked to individual students in target language  
L1 Group: Questions asked to whole class in first language  
L2 Group: Questions asked to whole class in target language

### 9. Provides Opportunities for Students to Ask Questions: Peer Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher:</th>
<th>Anne</th>
<th>Cindy</th>
<th>Kelly</th>
<th>Maria</th>
<th>Pat</th>
<th>Sally</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L1</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L2</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 9. Provides Opportunities for Students to Ask Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher:</th>
<th>Ana</th>
<th>Chip</th>
<th>Lori</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>Sharon</th>
<th>Tracy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L1</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L2</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 10. Provides Opportunities for Students to Practice: Peer Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Anne</th>
<th>Cindy</th>
<th>Kelly</th>
<th>Maria</th>
<th>Pat</th>
<th>Sally</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 10. Provides Opportunities for Students to Practice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ana</th>
<th>Chip</th>
<th>Lori</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>Sharon</th>
<th>Tracy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX I

SUMMARY OF CODES OF PEDAGOGICAL REASONING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anne</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cindy</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelly</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maria</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pat</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sally</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ana</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chip</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lori</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharon</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tracy</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Peer-Coached Post-Observation Conferences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anne</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cindy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelly</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maria</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pat</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sally</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>17</strong></td>
<td><strong>64</strong></td>
<td><strong>56</strong></td>
<td><strong>80</strong></td>
<td><strong>94</strong></td>
<td><strong>7</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Non-Peer Coached Post-Observation Conferences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ana</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chip</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lori</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharon</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tracy</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>12</strong></td>
<td><strong>37</strong></td>
<td><strong>56</strong></td>
<td><strong>73</strong></td>
<td><strong>18</strong></td>
<td><strong>4</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comp: Comprehension  
Transf: Transformation  
Instruc: Instruction  
Eval: Evaluation  
Reflect: Reflection  
New Comp: New Comprehension