

Kateřina Lojdov

Role Comparison of a Student Teacher and Cooperating Teacher in Classroom Management: On the Scene and Behind the Scenes

Abstract: This case study, which focuses on a student teacher and her cooperating teacher, reveals the differences in classroom management that are mainly associated with the distinct roles in teaching practice. An inductive qualitative analysis of video-recordings of classes taught by the student teacher and cooperating teacher was performed and interviews were conducted with both teachers. The results reveal that behaviour management is more difficult for the student teacher because it is influenced by factors connected with the role of the teacher. In instructional management, the student teacher can more easily draw from thorough lesson preparation or subject-matter knowledge. The findings of this study strengthen the need for the improved education of cooperating teachers to reflect on classroom management with student teachers.

Keywords: Behaviour management, classroom management, cooperating teacher, instructional management, student teachers, teaching practice

UDC: 37.091

Professional paper

Kateřina Lojdov, PhD., assistant professor, Masaryk University, Faculty of Education, Department of Education, Pořch 623/7, 60300 Brno, Czech Republic; email: lojdova@ped.muni.cz

Introduction

Classroom management is one of the most difficult tasks for both beginning and experienced teachers. For beginning teachers, classroom management is connected with a so-called reality shock (Ben-Peretz 1986; Kremer-Hayon and Veenman 1984). However, it is not only beginning teachers who experience a reality shock; student teachers who teach in school classrooms during their teaching practice, which forms part of their initial teacher education, also often experience it. The reality shock is typically explained as a gap between the theoretical preparation and subsequent practice, which leaves novice or student teachers across various cultures and educational systems feeling insufficiently prepared for managing classrooms (Beijaard, Dicke et al. 2015, Siebert 2005, Meijer and Verloop 2004). If we focus on classroom management at the beginning of the teacher's professional career – i.e. during their initial teacher education – then we need to consider the distinctive role of the teacher trainee and the teacher. This paper compares the classroom management abilities of student teachers and cooperating teachers in terms of their social roles. The findings contribute to a deeper understanding of classroom management as a challenge for student teachers and to improve initial teacher education.

Theoretical framing

Classroom management can be defined as a “system of strategies employed by a teacher to influence the physical and social space of the classroom in order to foster an environment where learning can occur” (Christofferson, et al. 2015, p. 248). We can distinguish between behaviour and instructional management, which overlap in practice. Behaviour management refers to efforts to prevent misbehaviour by pupils and the teacher's response to a behaviour. Brophy's (2006) conceptualisation of behaviour management includes the arrangement of physical space, creating and maintaining rules, methods of maintaining pupils' attention and disciplinary interventions. Emmer and Sabornie (2013) claimed that behaviour management comprises proactive and reactive elements. Proactive behaviour management aims to

prevent misbehaviour by setting rules, instructional interactions and the teacher's scaffolding of pupils' self-regulation, whereas reactive behaviour management involves reacting to misbehaviour and is mainly represented by the disciplining of pupils (Martin and Sass 2010). Reupert and Woodcock (2010, p. 1261) found that the most frequently employed reactive strategies by student teachers are initial or low level corrective strategies such as »the use of physical proximity«, »moving closer to a student«, and »saying a student's name as a warning«. The ideal situation would be that (student) teachers make more use of proactive strategies than reactive strategies, though both are an important part of classroom management.

Instructional management addresses the field of didactics and consists of such things as »establishing teaching goals, using educational methods, and monitoring pupils' independent work« (Martin and Sass 2010, p. 1126). It is clear from these definitions that behaviour and instructional management overlap. »The teacher's approach to instructional management sets the tone for the overall classroom atmosphere, which can be connected with behaviour management« (Martin et al. 2012, p. 547). However, behaviour management can influence instructional management. For example, as a distinct aim of classroom management in general, minimising classroom disturbances is a prerequisite for high-quality instruction (Evertson and Weinstein 2006).

Effective classroom management consists of a good pupil–teacher relationship (Evertson and Weinstein 2006). In this relationship, teachers are described as »warm demanders«, which means that they perform caring relationship, but also show pupils that the care is holding them to high expectations. Such attitude has a positive impact on cognitive and affective learning outcome (Wubbels and Levy 2005). In terms of student teachers, the problem of »warm demander« does not derive from the student teachers' beliefs, because student teachers want to have a friendly relationship with their pupils and want to be helpful and understanding teachers (Brophy 1988; Stenberg et al. 2014). However, an examination of whether the desired pedagogical image was congruent with actual classroom practices showed that the majority of student teachers were unable to adhere to their preferred approach to teaching (Fung and Chow 2002).

Existing research into the classroom management of student teachers has highlighted the difficulties student teachers experience with performing effective classroom management, particularly when comparing a beginning teacher with an expert teacher (Dicke et al. 2015; Oral 2012; Wolff et al. 2017). The difficulties of student teachers in classroom management have thus been described, especially in terms of how to cope with pupil's discipline. However, some difficulties may be caused not only by the phase of professional development (Ennis 1994; Kim and Klassen 2018), but also by the specific social role of the student teacher in the teaching practice. This study aims to fill a research gap by investigating how a student teacher's role in their teaching practice influences their classroom management ability.

The role of the student teacher and the cooperating teacher in teaching practice

The social role is determined by the social status of an individual in social institutions. The role of the student teacher in the teaching practice, unlike that of the teacher, is for a limited time and to a large extent shaped by the cooperating teacher.

The cooperating teacher is an irreplaceable contributor to the professional preparation of teachers and serves as an integral part of the teaching practice experience in terms of providing support, direction, role-modelling (Clarke 2001) and supervision (Young and MacPhail 2015) for student teachers. Osunde (1996) claimed that the student teacher spends more time with the cooperating teacher than with any other individual instructor throughout the duration of the degree programme. While university-based supervisors are influenced by academic views and focus on the teacher education curriculum, cooperating teachers in practicing schools focus more on school pedagogy and are more familiar with the school curriculum (Uusiautti and Määttä 2012, p. 343). However, Hutchinson (2011) showed the tendency of cooperating teachers to mask or hide the instructions for student teachers, which contributes to their difficulties in constructing an identity as teachers. Additionally, the student teacher may perceive the interfering of the cooperating teacher in the lessons as a sign of mistrust (Taskin 2006). Nevertheless, cooperating teachers are essential agents for socialising student teachers, not only with regard to the classroom but also to the institution of the school. A study by Cohen et al. (2013) confirmed the lack of involvement on the part of principals or other institutional officials involved in the teaching practice.

The cooperating teacher's role is also shaped by aspects that lie behind the teaching in the classroom, particularly the parental involvement, the schools and the community (Severiens et al. 2014). However, as student teachers are unable to fully participate in parental involvement, they should gain more theoretical knowledge in initial teacher education about working with minority families, the legal position of parents in schools and seeing parents as experts on their child (de Bruïne et al. 2014).

Research design

This study compares the classroom management of a student teacher during teaching practice and a cooperating teacher from the perspective of their different social roles. The research question is as follows: How does the behaviour and instructional management of the student teacher differ from that of the cooperating teacher?

Sampling

This study took place at a lower secondary comprehensive class (ISCED 2A) in the Czech Republic. The class is situated in a mainstream school; however, because of the inclusive education in the Czech Republic, there may be some pupils with special educational needs or behaviour disorders in the class.

Student teacher Zdena and her cooperating teacher Iveta were selected based on the following criteria:

- Student teacher: a teaching qualification in Czech language and literature (thus many teaching hours), a declared interest in the teaching profession in the future and an evaluation of the student from her university teachers.
- Cooperating teacher: more than five years in the role of cooperating teacher, teaching qualification in Czech language and literature, cooperates with a student teacher who is willing to participate in the research project, teaching in the same grade (the sixth grade of lower secondary education) and in the same subject (the Czech language and literature) as the student teacher.

Both participants were aware of the methodological design and signed an agreement to cooperate. Their names were pseudonymised and data were anonymised.

Research Methods

This case study comprises a unique and complex sample based on the above-mentioned criteria. The type of the case is intrinsic, guided by the interest of the researcher in the case itself rather than aiming to extend a theory or generalise across cases (Stake 1995). Two data gathering methods were employed: video-recordings of classes and semi-structured interviews.

Video-recordings of classes

Six consecutive lessons in the same class taught by student teacher Zdena and her cooperating teacher Iveta were recorded on video. Transcripts of the video-recordings were made according to a conversation analysis (Jefferson 2004).

Semi-structured interviews

The semi-structured interviews focused on the perceptions of behavioural and instructional management derived from the theory and expanded themes mentioned by both participants.

Data corpus for case study

The data corpus of this case study included transcripts of six video-recordings of the student teacher's lessons and six video-recordings of the cooperating teacher's lessons, interviews with the student teacher (84 minutes) and with the cooperating teacher (69 minutes).

Data analysis

The obtained data were analysed inductively using a combination of thematic coding (Braun and Clarke 2006) and open coding (Strauss and Corbin 1998). The programme Atlas.ti 7 was used for the data analysis. The researcher became familiar with the data through the data gathering and preliminary reading.

First, the interviews were analysed using thematic coding to achieve overall familiarity with the instructional and behaviour management techniques of the student teacher and her cooperating teacher.

Sequences of instructional and behavioural management were identified. Then, thematic coding of the video-recordings of classes taught by the student teacher and by her cooperating teacher was performed to identify the sequences of instructional and behavioural management. Second, the entire dataset was open-coded to analyse the elements of behaviour and instructional management inductively and in more detail. The data were chunked into small units and labelled with codes. Some of these codes are used in the text in *italics.bold*. The codes were grouped into categories (Strauss and Corbin 1998) and may refer to a direct situation within the classroom (*on the scene*) or to factors outside of the classroom (*behind the scenes*). These two main categories emerged this way. Data segments and codes were constantly reviewed during the analysis. A constant comparative method was applied in four stages: (1) comparing incidents applicable to each category, (2) integrating categories and their properties, (3) delimiting the theory and (4) writing the theory (Powell 1997, p. 155). Two main categories capture *on the scene* and *behind the scenes factors of classroom management*. According to the thematic analysis, these factors are described for behaviour and instructional management separately. First, we present a student teacher–cooperating teacher comparison of *on the scene/behind the scenes factors for behaviour management*, which is followed by a comparison of *on the scene/behind the scenes factors for instructional management*.

Results

The results of the research focus on a comparison of the differences in the behaviour and instructional management displayed by student teacher Zdena and her cooperating teacher Ivana. The results of this case study are not intended to provide a generalised description. This study presents a detailed comparison of classroom management based mainly on the role characteristics of a student

teacher and her cooperating teacher; however, the characteristics of professional development are still present. Described differences are divided into behaviour and instructional management and are framed according to the dominant resources: whether shaped directly in the classroom (*on the scene*) or outside of the classroom (*behind the scenes*).

The behaviour management of the student teacher and cooperating teacher

The area of behaviour management should not be perceived as a set of explicit rules, but rather as a complex normative world of the classroom. A part of these rules is inaccessible to the student teacher because they are created outside of the teaching process (*behind the scenes*). Student teacher Zdena considered the rules in the classroom in the passive voice, i.e. »*They were told all this*«. Student teacher Zdena talked about the limitations of her role in relation to the rules in the classroom. She noted that as she is only a visitor in the cooperating teacher's classroom and she cannot influence the rules that the teacher sets for the pupils. She understands the rules as being fixed rather than negotiable on a daily basis.

She side-lined her own role in the behaviour management considerably through rule creation. Nevertheless, behaviour management accounts for the main challenge in the work of both the teacher and the student teacher. Student teachers may have difficulty working with rules compared to experienced teachers.

On the scene: Behaviour management in the classroom management performed by the student teacher

Student teacher Zdena considered behaviour management to be reactive rather than proactive. Student teacher Zdena: »*Well, it happened a couple of times and the pupil who misbehaved at the back, yeah, he beat his classmates, so that was a thing I had to address.*«

Researcher: »*[And how] did you address it?*«

Student teacher Zdena: »*So I just, eh, raised my voice at him so that he would stop doing that. And that's when I set the director on him, but he has Asperger's syndrome so it didn't matter to him much.*«

This situation corresponds to the fact that the student teacher thinks more about the consequences than the causes of misbehaviour of pupils. She named one of the causes of disruptive behaviour, but she did not consider how to work with a pupil with Asperger's syndrome. The student teacher had difficulty gaining insight into what happens outside of the classroom and understanding the factors, other than the situational ones, that cause a lack of discipline. Especially, the issue of how a diagnosis influences a pupils' behaviour and is associated with the student teacher's concerns, uncertainty and lack of preparation.

In the area of reactive classroom management, there are some difficulties for the student teacher. The student teacher claimed that she was missing the thorough *knowledge of the pupils in the class*, which would allow her to perform a differentiated disciplinary action. She could, for example, resear the pupils to resolve the disciplinary problems directly during teaching. Student teacher Zdena performs behaviour management 'here and now' because her knowledge of the tools she could use to deepen the cooperation with the pupils and their parents are limited.

As a result, Zdena also considers the *personal life of pupils and their family situation* to be areas which she should not and cannot influence: »*An individual teacher doesn't influence it all that much. Well, I have the pupil with some problems, who doesn't want to communicate. He is not interested in what he learns, yeah, or so. And it is then really difficult to motivate him. Yeah well, you must wait until the issue is resolved or until it stabilises.*« (Student teacher Zdena)

The student teacher acts rather passively with regard to the personal life of pupils. She perceives it as something that should be resolved on its own. The pupils' family backgrounds are unfamiliar to her, and only in exceptional cases does she communicate with parents. The student teacher perceives that she does not have any tools that would help her deepen the cooperation with parents or pupils, unlike the cooperating teacher who uses meetings with parents and regular homerooms for this purpose. She focuses mainly on current events in the classroom, where she employs reactive behaviour management from the situational point of view. Proactive behaviour management is for her an agenda that reaches outside the current events in the classroom (*behind the scenes*).

The student teacher's lack of relationship with the parents is something that Zdena compensates for by means of the classroom *authority of the director*. The director should function here as somebody with a "higher power" outside the classroom context. In reactive classroom management, Zdena often uses the following pattern to force her pupils to obey: »*an admonition, followed by a repeated admonition, followed by a threat to call the director*«. The director here substitutes for an authority outside the classroom; the teacher uses mostly the parents of the pupils for this purpose.

For student teacher Zdena, one of the few perspectives on the current goings-on in the classroom (*behind the scenes*) are discussions with the *cooperating teacher, who can inform her about the pupils*. If the student teacher is uncertain, she turns to labelling the pupils, which serves her as a quick and simple guidance. That is, she labels badly behaved pupils (a guidance for behaviour management) and smart ones (a guidance for instructional management). Labelling the pupils may be a quick helping mechanism for a student teacher's disciplinary intervention; however, it also presents a risk for mirroring a problematic relationship between the cooperating teacher and a pupil into the relationship between the student teacher and a pupil. A similar situation is described by Zdena, who was informed that a pupil does not make an effort in the lessons: »*And she [the cooperating teacher] told me, for example, that he learns it at home and that he knows it and doesn't have bad grades, and that I should take it as it is and ignore it. So she told me this, so next*

time I knew that I shouldn't get upset because of him, but I should work with the others as usual.» (Student teacher Zdena)

The student teacher accepts the cooperating teacher's definition of what is happening and reaches the conclusion that it is pointless spending time with the pupil. At first sight, this decision solves the current problem in the classroom from her point of view. However, this approach could aggravate the learning problems of the pupil as well as his relationship with the student teacher.

Although Zdena's behaviour management strategies mostly lack the use of parents' authority, her role enables her to search for an *alternative space for management* »behind the scenes«. For example, she uses the time during breaks to try to get to know the pupils better.

»When the kids need it, they come to me during the break... and I talk with them and spend even the whole break with them. Yeah, even if I am hungry and want to eat... or go to the bathroom. So, I just stop and stay with them and even if we don't find any solution or so... I listen to them, and they, just because I listened to them, they start feeling better or it satisfies them that somebody listened to them and that perhaps something will happen regarding what they complained about.» (Student teacher Zdena)

In this regard, Zdena uses the limited break time as a space for proactive behaviour management, but only when the initiative comes from the pupils. In contrast, the homerooms organised by the teacher include topics proposed by both the pupils and the teacher, and they can have a proactive or reactive character.

The limited role of a student teacher is demonstrated directly in the teaching by the fact that the cooperating teacher is always present in the student teacher's lessons. On the one hand, the cooperating teacher always supports the student teacher by projecting her authority into the classroom, but on the other hand, the cooperating teacher's presence demonstrates the limited role of the student teacher. Moreover, the cooperating teacher interferes in the classes taught by the student teacher.

Cooperating teacher Iveta sat on a bench with one of the pupils during Zdena's teaching. During common reading, the pupil was looking somewhere other than at the textbook, which the cooperating teacher noticed immediately (observed in the video-recording of a lesson taught by student teacher Zdena).

The cooperating teacher used a very subtle non-verbal coercive strategy of nudging the pupil to draw her attention back to reading. Therefore, the cooperating teacher projects both proactive and reactive behaviour management more or less explicitly into the student teacher's classroom management.

The behaviour management rules are implicit and invisible for the student teacher. Socialising towards the cultural practice of a classroom is a long-term process that requires reflecting on what is happening in terms of the power relations inside and outside the classroom. Because of the limited setting of the teaching practice and the implicitly limited role of the student teacher, this area is difficult for student teachers. The student teacher is in a situation »here and now«(*on the scene*), and she therefore uses reactive behaviour management rather than the long-term formation of the learning environment. As the student teacher in her

teaching practice finds herself within the limits of a teaching unit, support in behaviour management through cooperation with parents and network of guidance professionals is mostly unavailable to her. The lack of long-term cooperation with the pupils also creates a gap for proactive behaviour management.

Behind the scenes: Behaviour management of the cooperating teacher as an agenda outside the classroom

For the cooperating teacher, behaviour management offers a larger space than for the student teacher. The role of the cooperating teacher includes a *long-term relationship with the pupils*. This relationship is a prerequisite for effective proactive behaviour management and may lead towards a *smaller proportion of the reactive classroom management* found on the video-recordings of classes taught by cooperating teacher Iveta.

Moreover, teacher Iveta organises *counselling circles* where she can establish a relationship with the pupils, understand their needs related to learning and help them to succeed. Likewise, these extracurricular activities are not available to student teacher Zdena.

The cooperating teacher's proactive behaviour management extends beyond the current events in the classroom (*behind the scenes*), particularly in relation to cooperation with parents and other professionals in the school. Cooperating teacher Iveta follows the family background of her pupils closely. The pupils' *parents are a significant partner* (or opponent) in forming the proactive behaviour management for Iveta. The cooperating teacher uses the parents to formally legitimate her instructions. For example, she lets the parents sign her messages: »*They have it on a slip of paper, the parents sign it, so that they are also informed and couldn't make excuses.*« (Cooperating teacher Iveta)

In this way, the teacher secures cooperation from both the pupils and their parents. The teacher builds on the relationship with the parents in proactive (see quotation above) and in the reactive classroom management as well. As reactive classroom management, she uses the pupils' parents as a disciplinary strategy: »*Today I'm gonna call daddy, yeah, you have some debts there (from other teachers as well), so we will just add it to that.*« (Video-recording of cooperating teacher Iveta's lesson)

In this sample from the cooperating teacher's lesson, the authority of the parents is used directly during teaching. Here, the cooperating teacher stops looking for a solution in her relationship with the pupil and transfers it to the parents. Thus, the cooperating teacher has access to a broader social network beyond the teaching compared to the student teacher. She may postpone unproductive teaching situations and tackle them using this network.

Cooperating teacher Iveta describes a structured mechanism for solving disciplinary problems, which highlights that the reactive behaviour management in the case of challenging situations is a *shared responsibility of multiple school employees*, and if necessary involves people outside of the school. »*Well if it is here*

in this class, I'm not a form teacher here, so I consult the form teacher, if it is really significant breaking of those rules, now I mean discipline. So we have such stages of monitoring, first a talk with the pupil, such a friendly one. If, however, the problem appears again, as happened here, as you sit on that seat, so there my colleague sits, a guidance counsellor. So we sit here together, or another teacher of course, and we write a record of the meeting with the pupil. The record then serves to inform the parents, or if [the problem appears] again once more, then meeting with parents, either the form teacher, guidance counsellor, or if the problem concerns more subjects, then more of the teachers meet in whose lessons the student has problems, the school director. Yeah, well and if even that doesn't help, then the problem is referred to the Department of Child and Family Services at the municipal office«. (Cooperating teacher Iveta)

The cooperating teacher's permanent role in the classroom and connected cooperation with parents and professionals creates broader space for behaviour management as an agenda outside the classroom (*behind the scenes*).

The instructional management of the student teacher and the cooperating teacher

Unlike behaviour management, student teacher Zdena showed stronger instructional management abilities due to her social role.

Behind the scenes: A comparison of the instructional management performed by the student teacher and the cooperating teacher

Instructional management provides student teacher Zdena with more resources outside the classroom (*behind the scenes*) than does behaviour management, although even here, many factors remain hidden to the student teacher at the beginning of her practice (e.g. the individual educational needs of pupils, the current knowledge of the given topic and the pupils, learning style). Therefore, I will focus on *behind the scenes* factors of instructional management. In this case, the student teacher utilises her preparation of the lesson and her studies at the university.

»I always prepared conscientiously from one lesson to the next; I prepared lesson plans... even with time periods because I don't like to be unprepared for the lesson, I don't like that.« (Student teacher Zdena)

Student teacher Zdena devotes an extensive amount of time to lesson preparation, which contributes to her comfort regarding instructional management.

On the whole, Zdena's responses indicated that *it is easier for her to prepare for instructional management than behavior management* because instructional management is for her more predictable. In terms of individualisation of teaching, the student reported similar problems as in preparation for behaviour management, namely that she does not know the pupils. In the area of instructional management, the student teacher felt that she contributed *to the cooperating teacher* by enriching the teacher's knowledge with new teaching approaches and methodologies. This

is confirmed by the cooperating teacher: »*For example in one lesson, she did a worksheet which I then also included into my work.*« (Cooperating teacher Iveta)

The student teacher can show the class to the teacher in a new light and *apply teaching methods and procedures* that the cooperating teacher would not try herself: »*Well I would not dare to lead the lesson completely in German, as she did.*« (Cooperating teacher Iveta).

The student teacher may gain a specific position in relation to her cooperating teacher and she can become the innovator by introducing educational trends into the classroom. Student teachers are typically well prepared in the field of their subject-matter knowledge. Compared to behaviour management, the student teacher may have a greater level of expertise in instructional management.

Unlike the area of behaviour management, the area of *instructional management is easier to define and share* for both teacher Iveta and student teacher Zdena. When talking about rules in the classroom in the research interviews, both the teacher and the student teacher began with instructional management rules and they named them with ease. The cooperating teacher talked about the rules in the classroom as instructional management rules: »*I tell them what textbooks and what notebooks they should bring to those lessons. I tell them when the first homework will be given and when to bring it; also what should the notebooks look like regarding graphics, edges; when we'll write dictations, when tests will be written and I tell them about the grading scale... So, they know perfectly, when they write a test or dictation, so it doesn't happen that they would argue, because they have points there and they have it evaluated in percentages. So they know everything about all this, what we talk about, and the reader's diary, which means what the recommended reading is.*« (Cooperating teacher Iveta)

When asked about the rules, the student teacher Zdena responded similarly and she mentioned rules associated with instructional management rather than with behaviour management. For example, she described the evaluation criteria of pupils. This contrasts to the rules of behaviour management which are not fully visible to the student teacher here and they often remain unmentioned even during the reflection with the cooperating teacher.

Therefore, *instructional management can be considered more explicit* than behaviour management for both the teacher and the student teacher, and it can thus be assumed that it will be easier for the teachers to share. On the whole, the cooperating teacher is naturally more experienced in instructional management than a student teacher, and the role of the cooperating teacher is a better prerequisite for successful instructional management than the role of the student teacher. Concerning the social role, student teachers face problems primarily in connecting the individual lessons, mostly because the lessons they lead do not always follow after each other and the student teachers do not work with the class continually. However, instructional management still remains an area where preparation work *behind the scenes* helps student teacher Zdena more than for behaviour management.

Discussion

Classroom management is a complex activity performed by the teacher, which is conditioned by factors originating in the classroom and outside of it. We have placed these factors into the broad categories of *on the scene* and *behind the scenes*. In terms of the research question, some differences in classroom management appeared between the student teacher and her cooperating teacher in these categories. Although the generalisability of the findings from a single dyad is not possible, the findings present a detailed comparison of classroom management by a student teacher and her cooperating teacher from the perspective of the social role, uncovering themes that are relevant to an international context.

Behaviour management is considered a significant challenge for student teachers in many European countries (Atici 2007; Bromfield 2006; Emmer and Stough 2001). The results of this study show that part of behaviour management is connected with the role of a teacher, not with the role of a student teacher, and is formed outside of the actual goings-on in the classroom (*behind the scenes*). Thus, one of the reasons why student teachers have a clear idea of how they want to manage the class, but they do not manage to apply it in practice (Poom-Valickis and Löfström 2019), may be associated with their role as trainees. The student teacher thinks more about the consequences than about the causes of misbehaviour and she also lacks opportunities to build long-term relationships with pupils. Thus, her behaviour management is more reactive than proactive. Additionally, the preparation for behaviour management in initial teacher education is limited to a certain extent, not only because of the gap between theory and practice (Darling-Hammond 2009) but also due to the difference between the role of a student teacher and a teacher. We conclude that the area of behaviour management is more demanding for the student teacher because behaviour management is closely connected with the social role of the teacher. Behaviour management works with the normative world of a classroom, which is, for a student teacher visiting the class for a short time, mostly implicit (Lojđová 2016). The normative world of the classroom is significantly shaped outside of the classroom (*behind the scenes*) in cooperation with parents and other professionals. The role of the student teacher is in this respect (*behind the scenes*) therefore limited when compared to the role of the teacher.

A more significant domain of the student teacher is instructional management; this finding complies with the research of Kaldi and Xafakos (2017, p. 255), who found that student teachers rated their teaching competences concerning instructional strategies rather highly. Instructional management is an area where student teachers feel more comfortable. Unlike behaviour management, the rules of instructional management are more explicit for the student teacher and the cooperating teacher and they may thus be shared more easily. Contrary to behaviour management, student teachers can draw on instructional management from *behind the scenes*, from their preparation of lessons and university studies. These findings are in compliance with the research by Safak et al. (2016), which found that student teachers participated in their study based on their knowledge acquired from their university courses. Moreover, student teachers can demonstrate their

expertise in subject-matter knowledge and up-to-date teaching methodologies (theoretically gained at university), although even here student teachers may lack confidence in believing that they know anything (Hoveid and Hoveid 2004). The cooperating teacher still has the upper hand in instructional management due to a more advanced stage of professional development. This finding supports Chen's (2002) research, which focused on the implementation of constructivist teaching: »The student teachers, unlike the expert teachers, did not use constructivist-based instructional strategies to respond to pupils' learning responses« (Chen 2002, p. 255), which may be connected with constructivist teaching being more difficult for student teachers. However, student teachers' practices offer a certain potential for cooperating teachers because they encounter (at least indirectly) current educational trends. Instructional management is therefore an area in which the student teachers may enrich the cooperating teachers substantially, even though they may be not aware of it.

Despite the limited role of student teachers in behaviour management, classroom management remains an important part of initial teacher education. As Alvarez (2006, p. 1116) proved, »teachers' response to aggressive behavior in the classroom was impacted by their prior training in classroom behavior management.« It seems reasonable to »teach student teachers to make use of proactive strategies whenever and as much as possible, to use punishment only when strictly necessary, and to avoid the use of aggressive strategies« (de Jong et al. 2013, p. 593).

Our findings confirm the need for training programmes where student teachers are involved in a continuum of training situations in the schools (post-lesson interviews and/or arranged class situations) (Escalié and Chaliès 2016). Hutchinson (2011) provided approaches to initial teacher education which rethink of the roles of those engaged in the process including the role of the student teacher and the nature of the partnership between universities and schools. Various training programmes in classroom management have been developed, which aim to avoid a reality shock (Dicke et al. 2015), help teachers with evidence-based classroom management, e.g. using self-monitoring checklist (Oliver et al. 2015) or placing student teachers as members of a collaborative teacher research team (Willegems et al. 2018) or a community of practice (Escalié and Chaliès 2016).

In these programmes, teaching practice has an essential place, particularly due to the unique role of the cooperating teacher (Koc 2012, p. 32). During the practice, the cooperating teacher should reflect on their role affects the classroom management and how to support the student teacher in areas which the student teacher's role does not cover. However, research shows that cooperating teachers work with students rather intuitively. As Clement (2002, p. 60) stated: »Many cooperating teachers exhibit 'best practice' in their classrooms, but they need to focus on published knowledge that will provide more than tricks for managing today's diverse classrooms«.

This study identifies the need for further education for cooperating teachers – this education should focus on a reflection of the practice with student teachers. Further education for cooperating teachers can help to determine their roles with the students in the teaching practice to bring »situated understandings of teaching«

(Rorrison 2010, p. 516) and avoid the cooperating teacher hiding instructions (Hutchinson 2011) or interfering in the lessons inappropriately (cf. Taskin 2006). Such education can also help cooperating teachers provide an informed reflection and offer support to the student teachers regarding the factors *behind the scenes* which limit the role of the student teacher. Last, there is a benefit of teaching practice for the pupils. According to Tygret (2017, p. 123), having both the teacher and the student teacher in the classroom could have a positive impact on pupils' achievements., especially if they are working together.

Acknowledgments: This research was supported by project GA16-02177S (Czech Science Foundation): Classroom Management Strategies of Student Teachers and Experienced Teachers (Their Mentors) in Lower Secondary Education.

References

- Alvarez, H. K. (2007). The impact of teacher preparation on responses to student aggression in the classroom. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 23, issue 7, pp. 1113–1126.
- Atici, M. (2007). A small-scale study on student teachers' perceptions of classroom management and methods for dealing with misbehaviour. *Emotional and Behavioural Difficulties*, 12, issue 1, pp. 15–27.
- Beijaard, D. (1995). Teachers' Prior Experiences and Actual Perceptions of Professional Identity. *Teachers and Teaching*, 1, issue 2, pp. 281–294.
- Beijaard, D., Meijer, P. C. and Verloop, N. (2004). Reconsidering research on teachers' professional identity. *Teaching and teacher education*, 20, issue 2, pp. 107–128.
- Braun, V. and Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3, issue 2, pp. 77–101.
- Bromfield, C. (2006). PGCE secondary trainee teachers and effective behaviour management: an evaluation and commentary. *Support for Learning*, 21, issue 4, pp. 188–193.
- Brophy, J. (1988). Educating teachers about managing classrooms and students. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 4, pp. 1–18.
- Brophy, J. (2006). History of research on classroom management. In: C. M. Evertson, and C. S. Weinstein (eds.). *Handbook of classroom management. Research, practice, and contemporary issues*. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum, pp. 17–43.
- Chen, W. (2002). Six expert and student teachers' views and implementation of constructivist teaching using a movement approach to physical education. *The Elementary School Journal*, 102, issue 3, pp. 255–272.
- Christofferson, M., Sullivan, A. and Bradley, E. (2015). Preservice teachers' classroom management training: A survey of self-reported training experiences, content coverage, and preparedness. *Psychology in the Schools*, 52, issue 3, pp. 248–264.
- Clarke, A. (2001). Characteristics of cooperating teachers. *Canadian Journal of Education*, 26, issue 3, pp. 237–56.
- Clarke, A., Triggs, V. and Nielsen, W. (2014). Cooperating teacher participation in teacher education a review of the literature. *Review of Educational Research*, 84, issue 2, pp. 163–202.

- Clement, M. C. (2002). What cooperating teachers are teaching student teachers about classroom management. *The Teacher Educator*, 38, issue 1, pp. 47–62.
- Cohen, E., Hoz, R. and Kaplan, H. (2013). The practicum in preservice teacher education: a review of empirical studies. *Teaching Education*, 24, issue 4, pp. 345–380.
- Creswell, J. W. and Plano Clark, V. L. (2007). *Designing and conducting mixed methods research*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Darling-Hammond, L. (2009). *The flat world and education: How America's commitment to equity will determine our Nation's Future*. NY: Teachers College.
- De Jong, R., van Tartwijk, J., Wubbels, T., Veldman, I. and Verloop, N. (2013). Student teachers' discipline strategies: relations with self-images, anticipated student responses and control orientation. *Educational Studies*, 39, issue 5, pp. 582–597.
- Dicke, T., Elling, J., Schmeck, A. and Leutner, D. (2015). Reducing reality shock: The effects of classroom management skills training on beginning teachers. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 48, pp. 1–12.
- Emmer, E. and Sabornie, E. (2013). *Handbook of classroom management: Research, practice, and contemporary issues*. Routledge.
- Ennis, C. D. (1994). Knowledge and beliefs underlying curricular expertise. *Quest*, 46, issue 2, pp. 164–175.
- Evertson, C. M. and Weinstein, C. S. (eds.). (2006). *Handbook of classroom management: research, practice, and contemporary issues*. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Fung, L. and Chow, L. P. Y. (2002). Congruence of student teachers' pedagogical images and actual classroom practices. *Educational Research*, 44, issue 3, pp. 313–321.
- Johnson, B. R. and Christensen, L. B. (2013). *Educational research: Quantitative, qualitative, and mixed approaches*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Jones, V. F. and Jones, L. S. (1998). *Comprehensive classroom management: Creating communities of support and solving problems*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Kaldi, S. and Xafakos, E. (2017). Student teachers' school teaching practice: The relation amongst perceived self-competence, motivation and sources of support. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 67, pp. 246–258.
- Kim, L. E. and Klassen, R. M. (2018). Teachers' cognitive processing of complex school-based scenarios: Differences across experience levels. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 73, pp. 215–226.
- Knowles, G. J. and Cole, A. L. (1996). Developing practice through field experiences. In: F. B. Murray (ed.). *The teacher educator's handbook: Building a knowledge base for the preparation of teachers*. San Francisco, Jossey-Bass, pp. 648–688.
- Koc, I. (2012). Preservice science teachers reflect on their practicum experiences. *Educational Studies*, 38, issue 1, pp. 31–38.
- Korthagen, F. A. J. (2010). The Relationship between theory and practice in teacher education. In: E. Baker, B., McGaw and P. Peterson (eds.). *International Encyclopaedia of Education*, n. 7. Oxford: Elsevier, pp. 669–675.
- Kremer-Hayon, L. and Ben-Peretz, M. (1986). Becoming a teacher: The transition from teachers' college to classroom life. *International Review of Education*, 32, issue 4, pp. 413–422.
- Lojdomá, K. (2016) Student nonconformity at school. *Studia paedagogica*, 21, issue 4, pp. 53–76.

- Martin, N. and Sass, D. (2010). Construct validation of the Behavior and Instructional Management Scale. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 26, issue 5, pp. 1124–1135.
- Martin, N. K., Sass, D. A. and Schmitt, T. A. (2012). Teacher efficacy in student engagement, instructional management, student stressors, and burnout: A theoretical model using in-class variables to predict teachers' intent-to-leave. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 28, issue 4, pp. 546–559.
- Maxwell, J. A. (2005). *Qualitative research design. An interactive approach*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Oliver, R. M., Wehby, J. H. and Nelson, J. R. (2015). Helping teachers maintain classroom management practices using a self-monitoring checklist. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 51, pp. 113–120.
- Osunde, E. O. (1996). The effect of student teachers of the teaching behaviors of cooperating teachers. *Education*, 116, issue 4, pp. 612–619.
- Poom-Valickis, K. and Löfström, E. (2019). “Pupils should have respect for you, although I have no idea how to achieve this?”: The ideals and experiences shaping a teacher's professional identity. *Educational Studies*, 45, issue 2, pp. 1–18.
- Reupert, A. and Woodcock, S. (2010). Success and near misses: Pre-service teachers' use, confidence and success in various classroom management strategies. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 26, issue 6, pp. 1261–1268.
- Riedler, M. and Eryaman M. Y. (2016). Complexity, Diversity and Ambiguity in Teaching and Teacher Education: Practical Wisdom, Pedagogical Fitness and Tact of Teaching. *International Journal of Progressive Education*. 12, issue 3, pp. 172–186.
- Rorrison, D. (2010). Assessment of the practicum in teacher education: Advocating for the student teacher and questioning the gatekeepers. *Educational Studies*, 36, issue 5, pp. 505–519.
- Siebert, C. J. (2005). Promoting preservice teachers' success in classroom management by leveraging a local union's resources: A professional development school initiative. *Education*, 125, issue 3, pp. 385–392.
- Stake, R. E. (1995). *The art of case study research*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Stoughton, E. H. (2007). “How will I get them to behave?”: Pre-service teachers reflect on classroom management. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 23, issue 7, pp. 29–51.
- Strauss, A. L. and Corbin, J. M. (1998). *Basics of qualitative research: techniques and procedures for developing grounded theory*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Tashakkori, A. and Teddlie, C. (2003). *Handbook of mixed methods in social & behavioral research*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Taskin, C. S. (2006). Student teachers in the classroom: their perceptions of teaching practice. *Educational Studies*, 32, issue 4, pp. 387–398.
- Tygret, J. A. (2017). The influence of student teachers on student achievement: A case study of teacher perspectives. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 66, pp. 117–126.
- Veenman, S. (1984). Perceived problems of beginning teachers. *Review of Educational Research*, 54, issue 2, pp. 143–178.
- Willeghems, V., Consuegra, E., Struyven, K. and Engels, N. (2018). Pre-service teachers as members of a collaborative teacher research team: A steady track to extended professionalism? *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 76, pp. 126–139.

- Wolff, C. E., Jarodzka, H. and Boshuizen, H. P. (2017). See and tell: Differences between expert and novice teachers' interpretations of problematic classroom management events. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 66, pp. 295–308.
- Wubbels, T. (1993). The model for interpersonal teacher behavior. In: T. Wubbels and J. Levy (eds.). *Do you know what you look like? Interpersonal relationships in education*. London: The Falmer Press, pp. 13–28.
- Yin, R. K. (2011). *Applications of case study research*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Kateřina LOJDOVÁ (Univerza Masaryk, Češka)

PRIMERJAVA MED VLOGAMA UČITELJA IN PRIPRAVNIKA PRI VODENJU ODDELKA

Povzetek: V prispevku predstavljamo študijo primera, s katero smo raziskovali sodelovanje med učiteljem mentorjem in pripravnikom pri izvajanju pouka. Razlike so se pokazale pri samem vodenju oddelka in smo jih pripisali zlasti različnim vlogam v neposredni poučevalni praksi. Opravili smo induktivno kvalitativno analizo video posnetkov pouka, ki sta ga vodila oba učitelja (pripravnik in mentor), z obema smo opravili tudi intervju. Rezultati so pokazali, da je učitelju pripravniku več težav povzročalo uravnavanje vedenja v oddelku, na kar vplivajo številni dejavniki, ki so povezani z vlogo učitelja. Ko gre za samo vodenje pouka, se lahko učitelj pripravnik lažje opre na svojo učno pripravo ter na znanje, ki ga ima kot predmetni strokovnjak. Ugotovitve, ki jih predstavljamo, nakazujejo na potrebo po nadaljnjem usposabljanju učiteljev mentorjev na področju sodelovanja z učitelji pripravniki pri vodenju oddelka.

Ključne besede: uravnavanje vedenja; vodenje oddelka; sodelovanje učiteljev; vodenje pouka; učitelji pripravniki; poučevalna praksa

E-naslov: lojdova@ped.muni.cz