CHAPTER FOUR

DATA ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS

4.0 Introduction

The first part of the analysis is a narrative presentation in the form of case studies of the two college supervisors' perceptions and views, and practice with the inclusion of the student teachers' and the school mentors' perspectives at appropriate points in the analysis. The case studies are categorised into " Background", "The Supervisee", "The Supervisor's Role", "The Three Stage Cyclical Process", "Reflective practice", "Supervisor-Mentor Collaboration" and "Changes in Student Teacher"

The second part is a micro cross-case inductive analysis (Patton, 1990) of the pre-and post observation dialogues, and observations between the two lecturers and the two student teachers focussing on the advice and support given by the college supervisors.

4.1 Case Study One

4.1.1 College Supervisor 1 (CS1)

She is a very pleasant and approachable lady with ten years of experience as a college lecturer and teaching practice supervisor. She has a Bachelor in Arts degree majoring in Linguistics and a Masters of Arts degree in TESL. Prior to joining the college she was a secondary school teacher for seven years.

As for her training as a teaching practice supervisor, she tailed a senior lecturer during her first year in college to observe how the three stages of clinical supervision were conducted. And during the practicum season they were given a series of talks before they went to supervise the students. And in cases where she had to supervise students who were not her major, she was given special training by the particular

department. She claimed that it was the on the job training that gave her the best experience as it was real.

4.1.2 Student Teacher 1 (ST1)

ST1 is a cheerful and pleasant girl with a positive attitude. In class she is quiet and not very proactive, but does her work on time and participates enthusiastically in classroom activities. She has shown much progress in her studies since she entered college and might turn out to become a good teacher in the future. She has SPM qualification with credit 3 in her English. She speaks reasonably well in English but her grammar is not up to the mark. She has never had any teaching experience before she entered college. During the teaching practice she was given a Year Three class with forty pupils, many of whom could not read and write well.

According to CS1, ST1's main concerns were planning the lessons, classroom management and language competence. Her main worry was the assessment. She was not confident enough to try out the teaching of hard to manage language skills like listening and speaking, as she wanted to play safe.

School Mentor 1 (SM1) (Appendix G (i)) felt that she had to provide a lot of help and guidance to ST1 as she had no teaching experience and seemed nervous and lacked confidence. She found her weak in grammar and pronunciation. She had grammatical errors in the worksheets she prepared and the oral questions she used in her teaching. Initially she was not able to follow the steps in her lesson plans, but improved later on. SM1 was however impressed with some of the teaching aids she prepared for her lessons.

ST1 thought that CS1 was there to provide help and guidance, but she was also aware of her role as evaluator of her performance (Turn 35 – 39, Appendix D (i)).

4.1.3 The Supervisor's Role

(a) CS1's Perceptions and Views

CS1 saw her role as a trainer, to train the student teachers to *"... connect what they have learned in college... the theory to the practical part"* (Turn 14, Appendix C (i)). During teaching practice she would make the students see the connection between the stages and activities from the *"... set induction to the closure"* (Turn 14, Appendix C (i)). She disagreed to the notion that supervisors were there to solely evaluate the student teachers' teaching. To her it was more to help and *'train'* them (Turn 20, Appendix C (i))

4.1.4 The Three Stage Cyclical Process

I. The Pre-Observation Dialogue

(a) CS1's Perceptions and Views

The pre-observation stage for her is to see through the student teachers' lesson plans together with them, which includes language errors, teaching aids, worksheets and the activities to teach the content. She takes them through the lesson plan by asking them to tell her what they want to do from the beginning to the end.

By doing so she wants them to see the connection between the stages in the lesson from *"... set induction to closure"* (Turn 14, Appendix C(i)). She usually insists on them writing down the questions and classroom language they plan to use, so that they model error free language in the classroom. This is because, from her experience, the language they produce spontaneously in the classroom always has grammatical errors. As for a focus for the observation, she usually discusses that in the second pre-observation conference. If the students choose *"class management"*, she would look at that in detail. And if they want her to see the whole lesson she would do that. She said it takes her quite some time to go through the lesson plans with the students, so it is

PERPUSTAKAAN UNIVERSITI MALAYA

important for her to be at the school early or plan a meeting a day or two before the lesson. However, the two students that she observed in this study met her a day before the lesson, as they were staying in college.

She does not impose her style of teaching on her student teachers although she expects them to try out the teaching of the different language skills they were exposed to in college.

(b) CS1's Practice

She met ST1 a day before the observation. Basically her approach was collaborative (Gebhard, 1990, Wallace, 1991) with a combination of prescriptive and informative interventions (to provide reinforcement and to help ST1 identify difficulties (Randall and Thornton, 2001). First she asked a guiding question (McIntyre, D., Hagger, H. and Wilkin, M. 1993) to get ST1 to talk about her plans for the lesson:

1. CS1 : Can you briefly tell me what is your plan for your class? (Guiding question) (Appendix A (i))

This is followed by probing and extending ST1's thoughts to get her to explain her activities in a friendly manner (tone of voice) and listening attentively (Wallace, 1991) to ST1. This created an atmosphere of trust (Heron, 1990), which was conducive for ST1 to respond without fear of negative repercussions.

14. CS1 : What do you do before... the reading itself? What do you do? (Probing)
15. ST1 : Hmm... I ask them whether, they have heard about the story or not? (Explaining)
16. CS1 : Ahmm.(Listening)
17. ST1 : Ugh... then I put up... ugh... the, the story on the board.(Explaining)
18. CS1 : Ugh... the story will be on what? (Extending)
19. ST1 : Mahjong paper. (Explaining)
20. CS1 : Mahjong paper.. okay. How long is the story? Is it very long? (Extending)
21. ST1 : No.(Explaining)
22. CS1 : Not long. Then you put up, then what do you do? (Extending)
23. ST1 : Ugh... I put it up... and then...(Explaining)

(Appendix A (i))

When a problem is identified , she probed to raise ST1's awareness of it and then gave directive feedback (Gebhard, 1990) linking theory to practice (Bahagian Pendidikan Guru, 2002) in a warm and pleasant manner with due respect (tone of voice) to ST1 (Wallace, 1991, Heron, 1990):

26. *CS1 : How is that related to your... topic for the day? The body movement that you want to do here?* (Probing)
27. *ST1 :Ugh... it... it not related actually, but I just want them to get ready.* (Explaining)
28. *CS1 : Ahemm...*(Listening)
29. *ST1 : Ah.* (Thinking)
30. *CS1 : Okay, but then you have... y' know, have to make sure that Whatever you do, because this one is considered as set...?* (Raising awareness)
31. *ST1 : Induction!* (Recalling theory)
32. *CS1 : Set Induction! So, even though you want them to get ready, but it has to be related to your... topic.* (Directive information linking theory to practice)

(Appendix A (i))

At times she probed to elicit a teaching strategy from ST1 and then probed and extended her thoughts further to raise her awareness. If ST1 was not able to come out with a suitable strategy due to lack of pedagogical knowledge (Heron, 1990), she gave directive information in a cordial manner (tone of voice) (Wallace, 1991):

219. *CS1 : Okay, so what about closure? How can you close... end your lesson? How can you end your lesson?* (Probing)
Okay, you have to go back to your story again. What is it you want to highlight or that you could use... part of the story to end your lesson. (Directive information)
220. *ST1 : Can I ask them to summarise the story?* (Suggesting)
221. *CS1 : How?* (Probing)
222. *ST1 : By... hmm... story.* (Thinking)
223. *CS1 : You think they can do that? Without any help?* (Extending)
224. *ST1 : Hmm...*(Thinking)
225. *CS1 : Y' see...you have to, if you want them to summarise, you, you... they can, this is primary three, y' know?* (Extending to raise awareness)
226. *ST1 : Hmm...*(Thinking)
227. *CS1 : Well, you have to come out with guideTurns... I mean guide... questions. For example, "How many birds were there in the story?" "What was the title of the story today, class? Hmm?* (Directive suggestion)

(Appendix A(i))

At the end of the discussion she explained to raise ST1's awareness of the importance of giving input if she wanted to test them later in the lesson (Turn 232, Appendix A (i)).

So during the pre-observation stage CS1 largely probed and extended ST1's thinking to get her to explain her activities, raise her awareness of pedagogical matters and weaknesses in her activities, seek alternatives, and eventually gave direct information on how to improve the activities. She did not discuss any specific area of focus for this lesson which is a requirement for clinical supervision.

(c) ST1's Views

ST1 said that her supervisor got her to relate her lesson and then gave comments and suggestions on how to improve her lesson and activities (Turn 49, 53 Appendix D (i)).

II The Observation

(a) CS1's Perceptions and Views

For the observation stage, CS1 stated that the best place to be is at the back of the class unless the student teachers are using the story-telling technique to teach. Then she sits closer to the front, but still behind the pupils. She said sitting in front distracts the pupils or makes it uncomfortable for the student teachers. About moving around, she claimed *"... it's okay"* to do that at the end of the lessons when the pupils are doing written work.

During the observation she always has the students' lesson plan in front of her to see if they follow their lesson plans. Since she gets to observe the students only twice during the first phase teaching practice, she tries to *"... maximize the time"* by observing their overall teaching, that is from the beginning to the end. Concurrently she makes

notes of the lesson, especially the language errors they make, as they are *"language teachers"*. She also times the stages and activities in the lessons.

(b) CS1's Practice

In practice, CS1 observed from the back of the class and moved around at the end of the lesson when the pupils were doing written work. She timed the activities and the stages of the lesson and made notes of the vocabulary, activities and the shortcomings in the lesson. In her brief notes she had questions and statements, which were followed by suggestions and one probing question. The notes were *'descriptive'* and non-judgemental in nature (Wallace, 1991). For example:

> *Poor visibility from the back. Use white paper.*
>
> *No sentence patterns? – drill them on sentences you expect them to produce later. Etc.* (Appendix E (i))

(c) ST1's Views

ST1 thought that CS1 looked for her weaknesses during the observation, to be commented on later, so that she could make improvements on them. She was happy that CS1 sat at the back of the class and moved only when the students were doing written work (Turn 63 – 83, Appendix D (i)).

III. The Post Observation Dialogue

(a) CS1's Perceptions and Views

She considers the post-observation conference to be a feedback session about how the lesson went. She prefers to conduct it immediately after the lesson because what occurred in the classroom is still fresh in their minds. If the student teachers had another class immediately after the lesson, she would wait. She would not have the

session even one day later as the student teachers usually forget some of the details. During this conference she gets them to reflect on what they did in the classroom by posing questions. She normally gets them to talk about the good examples in the lesson first and then she adds the parts that are missing. Following this she focuses on the student teachers' weak areas getting them to suggest ways of improving them. For weak student teachers, she had to explain a lot. Otherwise she would ask questions like:

"What would you do next time, if you were to carry out the same lesson?"

and usually her students were able to give suggestions, which she improves on if this was necessary.

(Turn 40 – 44, Appendix C (i))

(a) CS1's Practice

CS1 conducted the post observation conference immediately after the lesson in the school staff room. Her approach to this counselling session was both collaborative and directive (Gerbhard, 1990, Wallace, 1991). Her strategy was to first put ST1 at ease before drawing her into the discussion. She started by asking ST1 to express her opinion of the lesson followed by getting her to talk about her good experiences in the lesson. This she did by probing, extending and listening attentively.

"Okay, what do you think of your lesson?" (Beginning question)

(Turn 1, Appendix B (i))

20. ST1 : *And then I explained the meaning of the difficult words* (Reflecting)
21. CS1 : *Ahem... You had three right? How many did you have?* (Extending)
22. ST1 : *One, two... four* (Recalling)
23. CS1 : *Yeah, four, okay* (Listening attentively)
24. ST1 : *Then, I...* (Reflecting)
25. CS1 : *How was that done? Was it okay? Do you think?* (Probing)
26. ST1 : *I think it was quite okay... because they...* (Reflecting)
27. CS1 : *Got the meaning?* (Probing)
28. ST1 : *Yeah... they got the meaning.* (Recalling)

(Appendix B (i))

This strategy minimised problems related to the differences between the supervisor and the student (Thompson, 2000 in Pajak, 2002) as CS1 treated ST1 as a professional (Heron, 1990) in her own right.

Then she moved on tactfully into talking about areas which posed problems during the lesson. Again she probed and extended ST1's thoughts to raise her awareness of the cause of her problem in a friendly manner (tone of voice) which prompted ST1 to talk about it:

33. CS1 : ... The writing part. Do you think it was okay? (Probing)
34. ST1 : I don't know why... hmm ... the class, they became noisy ... hmm. (Reflecting)
35. CS1 : Why? Why were they noisy? (Probing)
36. ST1 : Ugh... (Not sure) (Reflecting)
37. CS1 : What did you ask them to do, while waiting, actually? (Extending)
38. ST1 : Ugh... actually I want them to explain first, but (Reflecting)
39. CS1 : Okay... Explain what? (Extending)
40. ST1 : Explain... how to do the exercises. (Recalling)

(Appendix B (i))

At certain points where ST1 indicated lack of pedagogical content knowledge, she gave direct information to raise ST1's awareness of these missing aspects in her teaching. CS1 even cited incidences to raise her awareness of the problem followed by directive suggestions.

100. CS1 : ... so, the thing that I felt was missing here was your pattern, your sentences. (directive information)
101. ST1 : Aha. (listening)
102. CS1 : You don't have that. You have the words here...all right, but you could have gone through, look, look through the story. So many structures there... "Megan has... " (directive suggestion)

108. CS1 : ... I went around, they could not spell properly (citing problem) They say, "have, Megan have" (citing problem)
109. ST1 : Ah.
110. CS1 : Y' see, the structure? Ah, that's the, the thing that we've to make sure that we cover in the classroom (directive information)

(Appendix B (i))

At the end of the discussion she reminded her of the importance of giving adequate in put so that the pupils can produce language, and good class management for carrying out activities successfully (Turn 318 – 330, Appendix B (i)).

Thus in the post observation conference she mainly probed and extended to get the student to reflect on her strengths and weaknesses and listened attentively to her. Then she raised her awareness of missing aspects of teaching and problems by citing pupils' reactions during the lesson and gave direct information and suggestions to reinforce. Although there were no attempts to get the student to seek her own solutions to her problems, by probing and extending her thoughts about her teaching, CS1 raised the student's awareness of the link between practice and theory. This is crucial for her development as a teacher (Ramani, 1987, Johnson, 1996 in Randall and Thornton, 2001:50, 51).

(c) ST1's Views

ST1 found the way CS1 probed, extended, and gave comments and suggestions made her aware of her teaching and the need to improve her activities (Turn 120 – 137, Appendix D (i)). The tips and probing questions made her think, but she was still not confident of her teaching skills (Turn 232 – 246, Appendix D (i)) .

IV. Action Plans

(a) CS1's Perceptions and Views

She usually asks her student teachers to try out the suggestions and ideas that emerged during the post observation discussion in their future lessons. However, she leaves the monitoring to the school mentor as she sees the students only twice, and each observation is well spaced out from one another. The written comments she gives them are meant to help them reflect on their lessons and act as a reference for their future

lesson preparations. After these discussions she feels it is the onus of the student teachers to follow up with appropriate actions. If they do that, and if the mentors monitor *"... whether it's done or not...* [otherwise] *it remains a suggestion... doesn't go beyond that"* (Turn 54, Appendix C (i)).

(b) CS1's Practice

She reiterated some of the suggestions and information given during the discussion at the end of it. Her written comments were actually a carbon copy of her observation notes (Appendix E (i)). There was no *'collaborative negotiation'* of an action plan, which is essential for the discoveries to be brought forward to the next lessons (Randall and Thornton, 2001). However, at the end of the post observation dialogue, she did instruct ST1 to refer to her written comments to write her reflections of the lesson (Turn 332, Appendix B (i)).

(c) ST1's Views

No comments were made in this respect as the researcher did not question ST1 on it.

4.1.5 Reflective Practice.

(a) CS1's Perceptions and Views

To her reflective practice is the looking back at the lessons by the student teachers to recall their strengths and weaknesses (Turn 46, Appendix C (i)). She helps them to do this by asking probing questions to explore their thinking. Once they have identified their weak areas, she probes them to think of ways to improve on them and if they cannot, she would give directive or alternative suggestions. These she does during the pre-observation and post observation dialogues.

She would also get them to write reflections of their lessons using the written comments she gives. Besides that, she stressed that the student teachers are also required to make journal entries of their reflections of the lesson. In addition, they are also supposed to have discussions with their mentors and partners when they do peer teaching, which is another requirement of the teaching practice. Another instance she said that the students get a chance to reflect is when they get back to college where they discuss in the class, on specific areas of focus. (Turn 53, 66 Appendix C (i))

(b) CS1's Practice

She explored ST1's lesson plan together with her during the pre-observation stage getting her to think critically of what she had planned. Critical thinking is the basis of reflective practice (Randal and Thornton, 2001). During the post observation dialogue her probing questions are evidence of her promoting reflective practice. She started from the student's experience in the class, scaffolding ST1 through her *'Zone of Proximal Development'* (Vygotsky, 1978) towards new understandings (Brookfield, 1987 in Randall and Thornton, 2001). Besides those, she expected ST1 to write reflections of the lesson using the written comments she gave. She also encouraged her to complete her weekly reflective journal and checked her work.

(c) ST1's Views

ST1 felt that CS1's probing questions made her think, which she found useful because by reflecting

... we know... where [we] *have done wrong and can... improve. ... if we don't do that, we will never improve. A good teacher must always reflect on what they do...*

(Turn 251 and 273 Appendix D (i))

4.1.6 Supervisor - Mentor Collaboration

(a) CS1's Perceptions and Views

She stressed that it is the requirement of the teaching practice for the school mentors to collaborate with the college lecturers. They have to observe the students teaching, guide them in their preparations, and give suggestions and advice, and monitor them, following up with their suggestions to see if the students carry them out. And when they meet they have to discuss the student's progress, attitude, co-operation and how to offer further help.

(b) CS1's Practice

She worked closely with the school mentor who was a very experienced and committed teacher. Every time they met they discussed ST1's progress and the areas she needed most help. According to CS1, the mentor observed ST1's teaching and suggested many ideas. In fact CS1 picked up some ideas from her too.

Evidence of the collaboration between the college supervisor and the mentor can be seen during the post observation dialogue (Turn 128 – 325, Appendix B (i)) where the mentor sits in with the supervisor and talks about her pupils, offering tips on how to manage a noisy class.

(c) SM1's Views

She maintained that she worked very closely with the supervisor by discussing the student teachers' progress with her. She was there when the supervisor was counselling the student teachers and contributed her views and offered some tips. (Question G. 3, Appendix G(i)) and (Turn 128 – 325, Appendix B (i))

4.1.7 Changes in ST1

CS1 felt that ST1 did put some teaching theories to practice and learned some essential teaching skills like class management, linking stages of the lesson and giving adequate input.

SM1 noticed signs of confidence in ST1's class control and the administering of activities towards the end of the practice. She was more careful of her pronunciation, spelling and grammar while teaching.

ST1 felt that she was better in following steps of her lesson, giving input, and class control.

4.2 Case Study Two

4.2.1 College Supervisor 2 (CS2)

She is a very dynamic, cheerful and resourceful lady with thirteen years of experience as a college lecturer and teaching practice supervisor. She has a Bachelor in Arts degree majoring in English and a Masters of Arts degree in English. After her first degree she taught in a secondary school for twelve years before becoming a teacher trainer. She trains trainers of key personals for the Ministry of Education and conducts short courses at the college for practicing teachers in every aspect of ESL teaching and learning. Her passion is teacher training and she takes delight in her job although sometimes you can sense her discontentment when student teachers take her noble intentions of developing them into responsible and resourceful teachers lightly.

In her first year as a teacher trainer she shadowed a senior lecturer on her rounds during a practicum in a *"...sitting with Nelly"* kind of arrangement. She was just an observer who was not involved in the evaluation or feedback sessions.

4.2.2 Student Teacher 2 (ST2)

ST2 is always in good spirits, pleasant and friendly. However, she can be a little lazy at times and her attitude towards her studies is quite negative. In class she is quiet and not proactive. Neither is she punctual in her work. She does participate in the activities in class, but not with much enthusiasm. She has shown some progress in her studies since she entered college in 2001, and could become a reasonably good teacher in the future if she puts her mind to it. She has SPM (Sijil Pelajaran Malaysia, an equivalent of the Malaysian Certificate of Education) qualification with a low credit in English. Her spoken as well as written English are below average and she has to work hard to improve her grammar. She has never had any teaching experience before she entered college. During the teaching practice she took a Year Four class with 21 pupils many of whom were weak in reading and writing.

CS2 found her to be *'confused', 'not creative', 'not resourceful'* and most of all *'lazy'*. She is weak in her grammar, but does not put in much effort to improve. She was disappointed that ST2 seemed to have forgotten most of the theories and teaching techniques taught at the college and was more incTurnd towards the school mentor's beliefs and concepts of what good teaching is. The problem with that she stressed was some of the beliefs of the school mentor were different from those of the college lecturers, for instance the inclusion of spelling in every language skill taught. ST2 also seemed to always forget her steps in the lessons and ended up either not completing the lesson or going through certain activities too fast and not achieving the objectives of the lesson. Although she knew that she was weak in grammar, she did not heed her advice on using palm notes, and produced error-ridden questions and instructions in the classroom. What annoyed CS2 most was ST2's repeated use of the same activities in most of her lessons and her being too lazy to think of different ways of teaching or using the resources available to her at the college self-access centre and library. She

suspected that ST2 was doing the minimum that was required to pass the teaching practice. She grieved that the only thing that she could do was to raise her awareness, as she felt it was not easy to guide people with such an attitude.

ST2 remembered a few teaching techniques that she learned at the college and claimed to have tried story-telling, using actions, group activities and teaching listening and speaking. It was not easy for her to come out with different activities for each lesson *"...it's very difficult to think...the activity...today we have to teach this and then tomorrow..."*(Turn 69, Appendix D (ii)). As for teaching styles, she claimed to have tried what the supervisor and mentor suggested, but *"...sometimes it's very difficult to apply because this is my first...experience"*, she fretted (Turn 37, Appendix D (ii))

The school mentor found ST2 to be slow and needed much coaxing and she had to help her a lot. ST2's main weaknesses she felt were time management, following the steps in her lessons, grammar, pronunciation and her attitude.

4.2.3 The Supervisor's Role

(a) CS2's Perceptions and Views

CS2 holds her role as a teaching practice supervisor to be *"...formative and developmental"* in that she develops *"the skills, right attitude and aptitudes"* of student teachers, taking them through the *"...stages of development of a teacher"*. She beliefs that a supervisor should give *"feedback"* and not *"...tell them what to do at every stage"*. (Turn 40, Appendix C (ii))

To her, a supervisor is a guide who provides advice and support through discussions when student teachers face problems in their teaching. *"In the days of the old..."* she commented, *"...supervisors will just parachute in...just walk in..."* That is *"...evaluating in nature"*. So, she does not see herself as an evaluator of the student teachers' performance (Turn 46 – 48, Appendix C (ii)).

ST2 felt that CS2 was not there just to guide her, but to check on her mistakes, and to evaluate her teaching (Turn 58 – 63, Appendix D (ii)

4.2.4 The Three Stage Cyclical Process

I. Pre-Observation Conference

(a) CS2's Perceptions and Views

During the pre-observation stage she *"...helps them plan...structure their thoughts...and pull together all the elements in the lesson..."*(Turn 42, Appendix C (ii)) to form a whole congruent lesson. She discusses the activities, the teaching aids, the links between the activities and stages of the lesson and their language accuracy, especially the oral questions they would be using in the teaching. Pre-observation conference to her is to develop the student teachers' confidence.

She feels it is a very *"...traumatic...threatening...intimidating experience"* (Turn 48, Appendix C (ii)) for them to go into the class not sure or feeling insecure about their lesson plan. She thinks that it is very unfair for a supervisor to *"...catch them at their worse and take delight in it"* (Turn 48, Appendix C (ii)). That is why she prefers to meet them days before the actual teaching. This would give them ample time to make changes to their plans. She usually gets them to show drafts of the *"...activities...for each language skill...for all the days they are teaching...three lesson plans"* (Turn 54, Appendix C (ii)) on the Friday before the week of the observation. This is so that when she is not free on a Monday, she can see their teaching on another day of the week. She claimed that they have the time to prepare, as they do not teach everyday. She usually observes the whole lesson, as the students seldom are able to tell her what they want her to focus on. She also encourages them to use palm notes for the questions that they want to ask in the classroom because she does not want them to model questions and statements that have errors in the classroom.

(b) CS2's Practice

For this particular lesson apparently she met ST2 before the lesson. The approach she took seemed prescriptive (Wallace, 1991) probably because the student displayed very limited pedagogical content knowledge in her planning and felt she had to be told about her weaknesses and how to overcome them. Her initial strategy seemed to get ST2 to relate her lesson plan stage by stage, and activity by activity:

> *"Now you can just tell me what you intend to do the first hour?"* (Beginning guiding question)
> *What's the purpose of your lesson? What's your topic?* (Probing)
>
> (Turn 1and 3 Appendix A (ii)

However, when the lesson unfolded and she found very little forethought in the planning of the activities, she probed ST2 to raise her awareness of the shortcomings in her activities:

> *9. CS2 : How much...you intend to use pictures in the listening and speaking? What do you think? How much listening can you generate from those pictures? How much listening? What do you expect them to listen to?* (Probing)
> *10. ST2: Listen to ...for example...when I show the pictures...I...I...ask them to...to listen to how people greet their friends during...their...the festivals. (Justifying)*
> *11. CS2: So, you're only focusing on how...how they greet one another? And that's your listening? This is a year four class?! So, year four only need to know how to greet one another, is it?...* (Probing)
>
> (Appendix A (ii))

Generally, throughout the whole counselling session, her strategy was using probing questions to check ST2's efforts in preparing the lesson, which drew very few responses from ST2, and so she ended up giving directive information to raise her awareness of the problems:

> *39. CS2 : ...Look at all the terms there: "chingay competition", "street procession", "float procession", ugh? What else? "Stage shows", "drama", "cultural dances", "presentations", ugh? "Fireworks display".* (Raising her awareness)

Don't you think those are things that you need to, to, to, to show them in the form of pictures to help them understand your passage? (Probing)...
How do you know they understand all these, hmm? (Probing).
When we give a reading passage, that is one thing you have to ask yourself. How am I going to help my students understand the reading passage? Hmm? Otherwise they're just merely reading the passage without understanding! You got to be able to put in their heads the picture. Visualise in their heads the picture. Then only they'll understand better. (Directive information)

There were also instances where she got ST2 to recall her previous experience relating it to her present activity to raise her awareness of her weaknesses, and her insensitivity to advice and suggestions (Turn 53 – 55, Appendix A(ii)). For these too she kept asking probing questions without any responses from ST2. The questions seemed to be intended to raise ST2's awareness of her lack of commitment in her lesson planning instead of responses from the student.

55. *CS2 : ... The last time I saw you last week... you had problems getting the children to write some of them. And that's because your input... was not adequate. And last week I mentioned that you tend to just ask questions. And it's always the same girl that seems to be answering your questions! ...Does that show that your whole class can follow your lesson?* (Probing)
And don't you think that your strategy should change? (Probing)
Why are you doing the same strategy, then? (Probing)
Last week, I suggested many things to you, but this looks like you're repeating the same thing! (directive feedback)
Where is your input as the teacher here, in writing? (Probing)

At the close of the discussion she reminded ST2 to make the changes she suggested before she went to teach. However, it is doubtful how much of these questions and information ST2 could actually absorb and reflect on for her professional development as there was no real conversation between the two. The interaction between them was not in the manner teachers learn best (Pajak 2002). Picking on the shortcomings of the student and not providing guidance does not develop the student's autonomy (Pajak, 2002). This form of help could lead to resentment and "learned helplessness" (Abramson, Seligman and Teasdale, 1978 in Fanselow, 1990). There was

also no mutually agreed focus for the observation which is a necessity in clinical supervision for the student's professional growth (Ramani, 1987, Johnson, 1996 in Randall and Thornton, 2001:50, 51).

(c) ST2's views

ST2 said that CS2 commented on and discussed the objectives of the lesson, the language skills and activities to teach the topic They went through the contents of the whole lesson, but there was no specific focus. The supervisor suggested changes and gave ideas, but *"...the idea is there, but how to carry out?"* (Turn 77, Appendix D (ii)). At times she was not sure of how to carry out her supervisor's suggestions.

II. The Observation

(a) CS2's Perceptions and Views

The observation stage is when she wants to see whether the student teachers carry out their teaching as planned. To her it is actually the students *"testing their recipe"* to see if it works. She always sits at the back of the class and observes intently at everything that goes on during the teaching. She is against sitting in front because she will not be able to see the teachers, *"...their facial expression, how they interact with their students, their eye contact, body language and ...their voice, audible or not"* (Turn 84, Appendix C (ii)). She feels it would be *"intimidating"* the teacher if she moves around. As for data collection, she prefers to *"...say what I saw...write down what I saw...and on one side comment...on what I saw...mistakes the students made, especially the utterances"* (Turn 94, Appendix C (ii)). She also makes notes of *"...inconsistent behaviours"* of her perceptions of good teaching. During the observation she has the students' lesson plans in front of her and makes comments, *"...open remarks"* of the steps and activities in the lesson.

She does the evaluation part of the practice after the post observation conference commenting on her reasons for putting them at the different levels.

(b) CS2's Practice

CS2 sat at the back of the class the whole lesson and jotted down what the student did, activity by activity. She highlighted the ineffectiveness of the student's teaching strategies and techniques, and grammatical errors, for which she wrote comments, suggestions and sometimes probing questions. Her notes are descriptive but at the same time *'judgmental'*, *'evaluative'*, and *'intimidating'*, which are not helpful for developing the student as a teacher (Wallace, 1991).

For example:

a. Intimidating comments

i. *Do you go around holding a sentence strip when you want to greet a friend? Maybe for you, it's yes! But a normal person only needs to know – They don't read!*

ii. *My bet is: Ten out of ten pupils did not follow your lesson. Your agenda seemed to be more important, not theirs. You did not seem to care whether they follow your lesson or not. All you want to do seems to be to complete your lesson plan... regardless of whether your pps learn anything or not so far.*

b. Non-supportive comments

i. *I see no value in the last activity (group work arranging sentences into paragraphs!)*

ii. *You are a long way to being a teacher!*

iii. *You repeated your questions at the end of the lesson - only to kill time! What a waste!*

(Appendix G (ii)).

(c) ST2's Views

She claimed to be confident after the post observation conference, but the lecturer's presence in the class made her scared and she forgot [the steps of her lesson] (Turn 100 – 102, Appendix D (ii)). She thought that the supervisor was there to check her limitations and she felt that it was important to know her weaknesses in order for her to improve (Turn 106, Appendix D (ii)). She was glad the supervisor sat at the back of the classroom during the observation and her pupils were not distracted, otherwise she said that it would have been more difficult for her to control the class (Turn 120 – 123, Appendix D (ii)).

III. Post Observation

(a) CS2's Perceptions and Views

To her the most important stage of supervision is the post observation conference because this is where the reflection on the lesson both by the student teachers and the supervisor takes place. She spends a lot of time with them and claims to be *"... very, very harsh"* sometimes. She prefers to conduct the conference after the lessons because *"... they can remember exactly what they did... it's still fresh... and know where their blunders are"*.(Turns 102 – 111; 118, Appendix C (ii)).

She usually gets the students to first relate their feelings about the lesson and then probes them to explain why they felt that way.

"Now, that the lesson is over, how do you feel about your lesson?"

"What is it that you're not happy about? (Turn 112, Appendix C (ii))

Then she probes to get them to relate how they conducted the activities they had planned.

"Tell me, what you did in the set induction?"

"How did you do your speaking activity?" (Turn 112, Appendix C (ii))

When she is not happy with something she will keep probing the students until they become aware of their weaknesses.

"Why didn't you teach as you planned?

"When did you do your worksheet? You planned it last night?"

"Look back at how you behaved in the classroom. The way you questioned the students." (Turn 113, Appendix C (ii))

If they are not able to see why an activity did not work, she explains and gets them to recall what they have learned at the college.

"You kept asking questions to test their general knowledge. Was there any language focus? Was there a sentence pattern?" (Turn 116, Appendix C (ii)).

Most of the time she probes them to come out with their own alternatives for the situations, but if they are unable to, she gives suggestions.

When she suspects that the activities are not successful because the students did not follow what they discussed in the pre-observation dialogues, she would be very harsh with them. She claimed that the two students that she supervised this time gave her a hard time because of their complacent attitude.

(b) CS2's Practice

CS2 met ST2 immediately after the lesson in the staff room with other teachers around. Her approach was mainly 'prescriptive' (Wallace, 1991), which comprised mainly probing questions and citing of problems followed by directive feedback to raise ST2's awareness of her weaknesses and unconcerned attitude in preparing the lesson. She started the discussion by getting ST2 to express her feelings about the lesson. Although the beginning question was meant to put the student at ease, the response ST2 gave, showed that she was actually trying to answer the way she thought the supervisor

expected her to answer. Her answers showed that she was aware of some of her weaknesses as they were highlighted in the pre-observation dialogue.

1. CS2: "Okay, now that the lesson is over ST2, tell me how you feel about the lesson." (Beginning question)
2. ST2: The lesson is so terrible.
6. ST2 : I... keep questioning the students.

(Appendix B (ii))

Following this, CS2 used a variety of probing and feedback strategies to get ST1 to reflect on the shortcomings and her lack of prescience in preparing the activities. The researcher has categorised here the strategies she used:

i. Probing and citing pupils' reactions followed by giving directive feedback:

15. CS2 : ...They kept asking, "How to do this, miss? How to do that teacher? How to do this teacher? How to do this teacher?" (Citing pupils' reactions)
16. ST2 : I didn't explain the ... task... quite clear. (Reflection)
17. CS2 : You just ask them to do what? (Probing)
18. ST2 : Finish the...(Reflection)
19. CS2 : You just asked them to open the envelope and rearrange! How about the contents in the envelope? Did you or... ever bother to read it with them? Did you model the task? Did you actually tell them what to do? You just threw the envelopes at the groups. And you expected the groups to be very involved! (Directive feedback)

(Appendix B (ii))

ii. Probing and citing pupils' reactions to raise her awareness and to help her find a solution:

27. CS2 : So it's only the size that's important in group work? (Probing)
28. ST2 : Hmm... the task is easy. It's quite easy (Reflection)
29. CS2 : How do you know the task is quite easy? (Probing)
Why is it that they kept asking you what to do? If it's easy, they wouldn't be asking you what to do? I heard them keep ask... I heard them asking over and over again, what, how to do. (Citing pupils reactions)
So, what's important there? (Probing)
30. ST2 : I must explain to them... ugh... either to this group... I'll explain to them (Solution)

(Appendix B (ii))

iii. Probing and giving directive feedback to raise awareness.

37. CS2 : ...If you give them instructions, which is the best way to give instructions? To them one by one? To go to them group by group? (Probing)

38. ST2 : As a whole class. (Recalling theory)

39. CS2 : Did you do that? (Probing)

40. ST2 : No, I only go to group.(Reflecting)

41. CS2 : You did not do that. You only said, "Get into groups" That's all. Why they need to get into groups, you didn't explain! What they're going to do in groups, you didn't explain. Y' know, doing group work is not as easy as it looks. You have got to explain clearly, what you want the groups to do! You don't simply set up groups and throw them into their corners, and throw the task, and expect them to do it! (Directive feedback)

(Appendix B (ii))

v. Probing, citing problem, probing and giving negative feedback:

49. CS2 : And look at how you flew from one activity to the next, without even asking and checking whether your students are with you. You fly from one activity to the next, activity to the next, ugh? I did not even hear you...ugh...ugh...rounding up the activity. I did not even hear you summarising the activity, and actually making sure that the students u...understand and do the activity before you move on to the next. You were just, "Oh, this activity over, next activity", ugh? It's flying from one activity to another. (Citing problem)
So the agenda is whose, yours or the students? (Probing)

50. ST1 : Me. (responding as she thought was expected of her)

51. CS2 : Your agenda? What's your agenda? You just want to make sure you complete your lesson plan, ugh? (Probing)

52. ST1 : No. (attempting to defend herself)

53. CS2 : I think so! That's the impression I get! Fly from one activity to the next, without caring or not whether your students understand. And then you look at your activities here. You did not, you did not, time your activity properly. That one was done in a rush! That one was done in a rush! And then you had so much time, for the activity three, the group work; you actually had one whole thirty-minute le...lesson. And, and you know what you were doing at the end? Ugh? You were repeating the things you did earlier on! Why? You were playing with time! You were just trying to kill time! Ugh? Don't you think so? (Giving negative feedback)

(Appendix B (ii))

v. Citing a problem and giving directive feedback

68. CS2 : *And I noticed in your lesson plan that you did not have a purpose for the activity.* (Citing a problem)
For example, your group work. There is no purpose. When you do not write the purpose down, then you do not know why you're doing it, that's when you're not sure, what to do? That's why it's very important for you to write the purpose of the activity, under here. I've been training you all my life to tell, to write down the purpose of your activity. (Directive information)
Why is there no purpose there? (Probing)
Why are you doing this group work. What's the reason. That's the meaning of purpose! (Directive information)

(Appendix B (ii))

vi. Probing the student to come out with a solution:

72.CS2 : *Tell me first, why you want them to sequence the sentences?* (Probing)
73.ST1 : *Er...so that they will know the link of the, one sentence with one sentence* (Explaining)
74.CS2 : *If they don't understand the passage that they're supposed to, to, to form paragraph, then how can they form a paragraph? Ugh! If I don't understand that sentence, because my teacher did not help me to understand that sentence, how can I sequence them into a paragraph? Makes sense or not? So what should you, as the teacher, have done?* (Probing)
75.ST1 : *I ask them to read the, the sentence first, and then I explain the sentence, to them* (Solution)

(Appendix B (ii))

vii. And at the end of the discussion, giving directive information

as advice:

96. CS2 : *So, my advice to you, for future lessons is, please make sure, the agenda in the lesson is the student. They need to come out of the lesson, learning something! Not you come out of the lesson, completing your lesson plan! You may have beautiful lesson plan. You may think your lesson plan works. It works just for you, not for the pupils! Who are the people who need to learn? Them! And you provide that opportunity, by, preparing activities that will make them learn! That's your job! Okay! That's the meaning of the students' agenda, and not the teacher's agenda. (directive information)*

(Appendix B (ii))

CS2's techniques of providing advice and support were basically probing the student, citing their weaknesses and pupils' reactions, and providing directive information. She took this approach probably because of ST1's limited knowledge in

pedagogical content and skills. Occasionally she tried to get ST1 to come out with her own solution, but to no avail. Her probing questions and directive information were attempts at improving her pedagogical content knowledge and skills, which in turn links practice to theory (Ramani, 1987, Johnson, 1996 in Randall and Thornton, 2001:50, 51).

(c) ST2's Views

She thought the supervisor conducted the dialogue immediately after the lesson because she did not want to forget what she saw *"...maybe there is so many problems in my lesson...maybe she doesn't want to forget all the things...all the problems"* (Turns 218 – 224, Appendix D (ii)). She did not feel comfortable having the discussion in the staff room because there were other teachers present. During the discussion she felt her *"...mind...scarred...mental... blocked...can't think of anything...worried about the... marks and then the comments* (Turns 256 – 279,Appendix D (ii)).

Many times the supervisor told her what to do, which she was not happy about. She preferred her supervisor to guide her rather then to treat her like a child and tell her what to do. She felt that her supervisor did not have confidence in her doing the things herself. She thought it would be better for her to give suggestions and leave it to her to accept the suggestions or not. (Turns 382 – 392, Appendix D (ii))

She confessed that she hardly understood what CS2 advised her. It was not because of the language used but the volume of [her voice]". The supervisor sounded like she was scolding her and that disturbed her emotionally and was not very supportive towards her comprehension of what was being said. Sometimes she did not feel like listening. However, asking her probing questions she felt was useful and claimed that she has become a thinker. (Turns 403 – 416, Appendix D (ii))

IV. Action Plan

(a) CS2's Perceptions and Views

No mention of any action plan.

(b) CS2's Practice

She reiterated some of the suggestions and ideas discussed at the end of the dialogue. However, there was no *'collaborative negotiation'* of an action plan for ST2 to transfer the findings to her future lessons. This could be because the student had another lesson immediately after that. However, her written comments that were actually her observation notes were meant to do that (Appendix E (ii)).

(c) ST2's Views

She reads her supervisor's comments to help her write her reflections of the lesson and to plan the following lesson. To her the supervisor is a very knowledgeable person and she has gained *"...a lot of ideas...then I know what to do after that...idea how to carry out these activities"* (Turns 577 – 579, Appendix C (ii)).

4.2.5 Reflective Practice.

(a) CS2's Perceptions and Views

To her reflective practice is *"...thinking deeply about what you have done in the lesson, and finding ways to improve on your practice"* (Turn 118, Appendix C (ii)). To get the students to reflect on their teaching, she would ask them a variety of probing questions during the post observation conference like

"How do you feel?

"What do you think of your lesson?" (Turn 118, Appendix C (ii)).

and they would be able to give the answers. And usually she does not need to *"...tell them any more things...they are able to recall what they did...they know where their blunders are"* (Turn 118, Appendix C (ii)). And if they were not able to reflect she would get them to look at the lesson plan and direct them to her comments and say

"Look here. Just now remember what you did? Look here. You planned to do this. Did you do this? (Turn 124, Appendix C (ii))

That she claimed would jolt their memory. When a problem has been identified she would probe them further.

From her experience, very often the student teachers were able to give good alternative suggestions and plan ahead, but the two student teachers she supervised this time were not able to do so (Turn 136. Appendix C (ii)).

She added that besides the probing questions during the post observation dialogue to promote their reflectivity, the students are also required to reflect on their peer teaching with their partners and discuss with their mentors who observe them. They are also asked to write reflections of their lessons and a weekly reflection of the whole practice in their journals. (Turn 140, Appendix C (ii))

(b) CS2's Practice

Through out both the counselling sessions, she used probing questions to make ST2 reflect on her lesson and raise her awareness, but seldom gave ST2 the opportunity to explore the situation and come out with her own alternatives. She just followed these probing with direct information, which did not give ST2 the opportunity to be self-evaluative in a non-directive way, which is important for her professional growth and autonomy (Wallace, 1991)

Some of her written comments on the other hand did allow the student to do some self-evaluation of her teaching strategies.

Examples:

You called up pps. Again to say/talk about festivals... repeating an earlier activity. What does it say about your sequencing of activities? You just had an qn/answer session with one student. What happens to the rest of the class?

This activity is a follow up of your reading just now. What can you do to help pps see the value of this activity? Not all were involved. You didn't scan the class to see how everyone behaved. Half the class was not doing the activity. What does it say of the activity.

(Appendix E (ii).

She expected ST2 to write reflections of her lesson and comments in her reflective journal as it is a requirement of the teaching practice and is checked by the school mentor and the supervisor.

(c) ST2's Views

She wrote her reflections in her journal which was checked by the supervisor, but she never telephoned her or made contacts with her in any other way (Turn 367 – 375, Appendix D (ii)). Besides the supervisor, she had discussions with her partner for peer teaching, other friends and sometimes with her mentor. (Turns 509 – 548, Appendix D (ii))

She felt that although her supervisor was experienced and knowledgeable, her discussions with the school mentor were more helpful because she knew the pupils well - their background, abilities and language competence, and was able to suggest appropriate activities for them. Another reason was that they met more often.

(Turn 532 – 548, Appendix D (ii)).

4.2.6 Supervisor - Mentor Collaboration

(a) CS2's Perceptions and Views

Generally she feels that the school mentor is the one who should be assisting the students to develop *"...bits of their teaching"* like *"using teaching aids... class*

management ... giving instructions ... linking activities" (Turns 74 – 78, Appendix C (ii)) because they have more time with them and they know their pupils. Besides, the student teachers were taking their mentors' lessons during the teaching practice, and so they should be in the class with the students to observe and provide guidance (Turns 74 – 76, Appendix C (ii)). However, she acknowledges that the school mentors are very busy people (Turn 172, Appendix C (ii)).

(b) CS2's Practice

She claimed to have worked very closely with the school mentor and headmaster because the school is very close to the college. She even telephoned them to check on ST2. Even though the school mentor and the headmaster collaborated well with her and tried to help ST2, she did not *"... take advantage of the situation"*. To her, it is essential for all the three, the supervisor, the mentor and the student teacher to play their parts, otherwise the objective of the practice would not be achieved.

In this case, she felt that only two of the players were committed. ST2 who is the *"... most important of the three players"* did not contribute much towards her own growth.

(Turn 184 – 214 , Appendix C (II)).

(c) SM2's Views

She maintained that there was collaboration between the school and the college through discussions with the supervisor. Every time they met she told the supervisor how ST2 was performing, their attitudes and co-operation with her. She even checked ST2's journals and made corrections and comments in them (Question G.3, Appendix G (ii)).

4.2.7 Changes in ST2

CS2 was not explicit about what ST2 learned from this experience, but she asserted that she could have learned much more if she had worked harder.

ST2 said that she has become aware of the usefulness of using real objects in her teaching. She also knows that moving to the following activity when the pupils are not paying attention and having a standby activity are useful strategies for class control .

SM2 just said that ST2 would have realised some of her weaknesses.

4.3 Cross-Case Study

This cross-case analysis is intended to scrutinize the advice and support given by the college supervisors, and the degree of direction provided by them during the three stages of clinical supervision through these categories: 'The Supervisor's Role', 'Focus', Helping Atmosphere', 'Supervisory Styles', Micro Interventions' and 'Critical Thinking'. To facilitate the analysis the following are definitions of terms used in the analysis based on the emerging patterns in the data although there are other terms in the literature on advising and supporting pre-service teachers during teaching practice.

(a). The Supervisor's Role

i. Enthusiast – Passionate in the way she helps and supports.

ii. Informant - Gives directive or non-directive information to raise student's awareness of content knowledge, pedagogical skills or general pedagogical skills to teach content.

ii. Nurturer - Enriches the student with the knowledge of classroom teaching and learning skills.

iii. Listener - Listens attentively and actively to student's communication.

(Smith and West-Burnham (1993

in Randall and Thornton, 2001: 220)

(b) Focus

i. Content Knowledge - In this case the English language

ii. General Pedagogical Knowledge - Skills that are needed for lesson planning, linking activities, classroom management, organising pupils for teaching and learning activities, etc.

iii. Pedagogical Knowledge for teaching content - Skills of using a variety of teaching and learning activities to teach the English language skills, structure and forms.

(Shulman, 1987 in Randall and Thornton, 2001:26 – 28)

(c) Helping Atmosphere

i. Effective attending - Supervisor signalling attention to the student teacher through body posture, gestures, non-verbal parameters, eye contact, smiling, nodding, etc.

ii. Active listening - Strategies used by the supervisor to listen not only to what is said but what is meant.

iii. Probing – The ways the supervisors intervene to move the student teacher to new levels of understanding.

iv. Student as professional - Treat the student teacher as a professional.

(Egan, 1994, Heron. 1990)

(d) Supervisory Styles

i. Directive - Supervisor directs, informs, models and evaluates. Student listens and does.

ii. Non-directive - Supervisor is an understander who allows student to find own solution.

iv. Alternative - Supervisor suggests alternatives and students choose freely.

(Gebhard, 1990)

(e) *Micro interventions*

i. Prescriptive - Refers to interventions in which the supervisor tries to directly tell the teacher what they should do, how to improve or modify the way they teach.

ii. Informative - The supervisor gives the teacher information or knowledge about the situation on which to base a new awareness and to facilitate personal growth.

iii. Confronting - The supervisor tries to raise the student's consciousness about certain aspects of teaching by sharing perceptions of the teacher's behaviour and challenging the teacher on areas that are seen as problematic and through this confrontation to improve their teaching skills.

iv. Catalytic - This type of intervention from the supervisor encourages self-discovery by the student by questioning on critical areas and by bringing knowledge and information to the surface.

v. Supportive - In a supportive intervention, the supervisor affirms the worth of the teacher, primarily by praising and valuing what has been done.

(Heron, 1990)

(f). Critical Thinking

i. Leading - Supervisor cites an occurrence in the lesson and then probes to make them reflect.

ii. Following - Supervisor picks up on a matter raised by the student and probes for further reflection.

iii. Open questions - Probing questions that make the students reflect on incidences in the lesson. Could be *"... intimidating questions asked in a non-threatening way"* (Brookfield 1987, in Randall and Thorn ton 2001)

(Heron, 1990)

The two tables preceding the analysis consist of the lecturers' practice in the three-stages of clinical supervision with regards to the specified categories.

TABLE 1: CS1's Practice

CATEGORIES	PRE-OBSERVATION	OBSERVATION	POST OBSERVATION	ACTION PLAN/ WRITTEN COMMENTS
SUPERVISOR'S ROLE	1. An informant 2. An enthusiast 3. A nurturer	1. An observer 2. An informant 3. A listener	1. A listener 2. An informant 3. A nurturer 4. An enthusiast	1. An informant
FOCUS	1. General Pedagogic knowledge 2. Pedagogical skills to teach content 3. No specific focus for observation discussed	1. Content knowledge 2. General Pedagogic knowledge 3. Pedagogical skills to teach content 4. Identify areas to improve	1. General Pedagogic knowledge 2. Pedagogical skills to teach content	1 General Pedagogic knowledge 2 Pedagogical skills to teach content
HELPING ATMOSPHERE	1. Effective attending 2. Active listening 3. Probing 4. ST as professional	1. Effective attending 2. Active listening 3. Student as professional	1. Effective attending 2. Active listening 3. Probing 4. Student as professional 5. Empathetic	1. Student as professional
SUPERVISORY STYLES	1. Directive 2. Non-directive	1. Directive 2. Non-directive	1. Directive 2. Non-directive	1. Directive 2. Non-directive
INTERVENTIONS	1. Catalytic 2. Informative 3. Prescriptive	1. Informative 2. Prescriptive 3. Catalytic	1. Informative 2. Prescriptive 3. Catalytic	1. Informative 2. Prescriptive 3. Catalytic
CRITICAL THINKING	Strategies 1. Leading 2. Following Catalytic tools 1. Open questions	Catalytic tools 1. Open questions	Strategies 1. Following 2. Leading Catalytic tools 1. Open questions	Catalytic tools 1. Open question.

TABLE 2: CS2's Practice

CATEGORIES	PRE-OBSERVATION	OBSERVATION	POST OBSERVATION	ACTION PLAN/ WRITTEN COMMENTS
SUPERVISOR'S ROLE	1. An informant 2. An enthusiast 3. A nurturer	1. An observer 2. An informant 3. An action planner 4. A listener	1. A listener 2. An informant 3. A nurturer 4. An enthusiast	1. An informant
FOCUS	1. General Pedagogic knowledge 2. Pedagogical skills to teach content 3. No specific focus for observation discussed	1. Content knowledge 2. General Pedagogic knowledge 3. Pedagogical skills to teach content 4. Identify weak areas; cite problems; cite pupils' reactions	1 General Pedagogic knowledge 2 Pedagogical skills to teach content 3. No suggestions or help for grammatical errors 4. Content knowledge	1 General Pedagogic knowledge 2 Pedagogical skills to teach content
HELPING ATMOSPHERE	1. Probing 2. ST not as professional 3. Effective attending	1. Effective attending 2. Active listening 3. Focus on note-taking	1. Probing 2. ST not as professional 3. Effective attending	1. Student as novice
SUPERVISORY STYLES	1. Directive 2. Non-directive	1 Directive 2 Non-directive	1. Directive 2. Non-directive	1. Directive 2. Non-directive
IINTERVENTIONS	1. Catalytic 2. Informative 3. Prescriptive 4. Confronting	1. Informative 2. Prescriptive 3. Confronting 4. Catalytic	1. Informative 2. Prescriptive 3. Catalytic 4. Confronting	1. Informative 2. Prescriptive 3. Confronting 4. Catalytic
CRITICAL THINKING	Strategies 1.Leading 2. Following Catalytic tools 1. Open questions	Strategies 1. Leading Catalytic tools 1. Open questions	Strategies 1. Leading 2. Following Catalytic tools 1. Open questions	Strategies 1. Leading Catalytic tools 1. Open questions

4.3.1 The Supervisors' Role

Both the supervisors were very enthusiastic in the way they conducted the pre-observation dialogues, the observations and the post observation dialogues. This can be seen especially in the counselling dialogues before and after the lesson, how involved they were in terms of the time and effort spent going through every stage, activity and difficulty present in the students' lesson plans and classroom practice to help and support their professional growth. They took at least thirty to forty minutes for the pre-observation dialogues whilst the post observation dialogues were about an hour each.

Besides being very enthusiastic in trying to help the students they were also nurturers and informants in the manner in which they enriched the students with their knowledge of the theory and practice of classroom teaching and learning. From the conversations it can be seen that generally they tried to develop the right ways of teaching and carrying out of teaching and learning activities in the students through their suggestions, information, explanations and the probing questions.

(a) CS1 as Informant and Nurturer

Pre-Observation Conference

22/24 : ...you have to make sure that whatever you do in your set induction it has to be related to your topic.

159 : ...Okay, they're all doing writing...but their levels are different. Those who are weak... instead of writing one sentence...you have parts of the sentences here.

177 : ...we're not just teaching...reading them a story... we're teaching language... we're using story as a tool for teaching...language.

(Appendix A (i))

Post Observation Conference

87 : ...when you did the reading aloud just now, you ask them to read, and read. They were so tired y' know.

322 : ...class management... is not well done, you cannot teach the lesson.

328 : If you want them to write at the end...you must give them some help, the structures and so on, so that they can write.

(Appendix B (i))

(b) CS2 as Informant and Nurturer

Pre-Observation Conference

1. 27 : *...Wouldn't it be a better idea to actually let them talk about the festivals, here, in the speaking practice?*
2. 39. : *...Look at all the terms there, "chingay competition", "stage shows", "drama", "cultural dances", "presentations", "firework display"...Don't you think those are things that you need to ...show them in the form of pictures to help them understand your passage?*
3. 44. : *Teaching reading is not throwing them a passage and asking questions on it. They may be able to answer your questions...they just lift from the passage, but that's not complete understanding of the passage...you got to train your students to be able to visualise things as they read. Now...that's reading with understanding. Not just reading words, pronouncing words.*

(Appendix A (ii))

Post Observation Conference

1 .43 : *...y' know doing group work is not as easy as it looks. You've got to explain clearly, what you want the groups to do! You don't simply set up groups and throw them into their corners, and throw the task, and expect them to do it!*
2. 65 : *...If you had given the students some help, they would know what to say...for instance, before you actually get them to come to the front, to talk about a celebration, you tell them the name of the celebration, the date of the celebration. What do you do during the celebration? How do you feel during the celebration? What you like best about the celebration? Now, if you give them this kind of guidance, don't you think during the practice stage they will be able to say something?*

(Appendix B (ii))

Though both lecturers were informants and nurturers they differed in the way they communicated with the students. CS1 was more direct in giving the information but gentle in conveying her message whilst CS2 was more probing and authoritative in the way she conveyed and explained. She was also more elaborate in highlighting the students' weaknesses and giving comments (Appendix E (ii)).

The supervisors' observation notes showed that both of them were good observers and informants. Good observers in the sense that they took notice of not only the way the student teachers conducted their lessons, but also other aspects of classroom

PERPUSTAKAAN UNIVERSITI MALAYA

teaching. These included classroom management, reactions of pupils, the coherence of activities, the instructions given, the questions asked, the use of teaching aids, and the grammatical errors made by the students. However, CS2 was more meticulous and detail in jotting down what she saw and heard (Appendices E (ii)).

The suggestions, comments and questions they wrote as written comments portrayed them as mere informants as they did not specifically instruct the student teachers to reflect on them and transfer them to their future lessons. This was not done at the closure of the post observation dialogues either. This is a setback in their counselling as the end point of all counselling is the action plan, which is deemed necessary for the advice and support offered to be successful (Randall and Thornton, 2001).

CS1's Written Comments

1. Drill them on sentences you expect them to produce later.
2. Use white paper or dark black ink with brown paper.

(Appendix E (i))

CS2's Written Comments

1. *How about writing out what you want them to talk about?*
2. *You need to time your activities. Certainly in this lesson, you should have given more time to activities 1 and 2 - the Listening and Speaking and Reading.*

(Appendix E (ii))

4.3.2 Focus

In most clinical supervisions of pre-service ESL teachers, the supervisors focus on a few areas of knowledge, some of which are content knowledge, general pedagogic knowledge, pedagogical skills to teach content, and knowledge of pupils (Randall and Thornton, 2001). These supervisors showed some similarities and differences in their focus during the three stages of the practice.

In the pre-observation stage, observation notes, post observation stage and the written comments, both the lecturers focused on general pedagogical knowledge and pedagogical skills to teach content. They identified and discussed areas that the students were weak in and cited pupils' reactions, but CS2 was more meticulous and thorough. As for content knowledge, there was one instant during the pre-observation dialogue where CS1 checked on her student's grammar. In her observation notes she noted the questions ST1 asked and they were all grammatically correct. CS2 on the other hand did that in her post observation dialogue, observation notes and written comments, but did not correct her errors or offer directive suggestions or information. She just circled the errors and asked her student to check them which can be considered as developing autonomy as the student had to seek her own solution.

The lack of focus in content knowledge in the pre-observation stage was because the student teachers did not prepare the oral questions that they wanted to use in the class for the supervisors to check. Neither of them indicated action plans, but the suggestions, comments and questions in the written comments was meant to encourage the students to reflect on them and make changes for their future lessons. There was no evidence of focus on a specific aspect of the lesson to be observed by the lecturers either.

(a) CS1

i. Content Knowledge

(Pre-observation stage)

49. ST1 : ...Megan's brother turned into bird. (missing article)
50. CS1 : Turned into ***a*** *...? (checks)*
51. ST1 : Turned into ***a bird****. (corrects)*

(Appendix A (i))

ii. General Pedagogical Skills

(pre-observation stage)

187. : Firstly, I think that your induction is not related. You have to make sure it is related to your lesson, okay?
189. : Secondly, are your pre-reading activities. What is it that you want them to do before teaching reading? What about your closure?

Appendix A (i)

(Post observation stage)

33. : ... The writing part. Do you think it was okay?
51. : What about your questioning? The oral questions? There was one you did here right?
112 : ... What about your time? In terms of time was it okay? Were you able to cover all that you planned to do?

(Appendix B (i))

(Observation notes/Written comments)

1. *Pupils seated in front of the class.*
2. *Poor visibility from the back!*
3. *Reading aloud: Tr → Students*

(Appendix E (i))

iii. Pedagogical Skills to teach Content

(Pre-observation stage)

171. : ... I don't see any vocabulary work being done... How are you going to... teach that sentence patterns? What sentence patterns are you going to teach?

(Appendix A (i))

(Post observation stage)

104. : Past tense, okay. "Their parents died" "Looked after" " Brothers ate" "became" "was" "dreamed"
106. : ... So many things you could have exploited here (the story). So when you ask them to write they've had that bit of help.

(Appendix B (i))

(b) CS2

i. Content Knowledge

(Post Observation Dialogue)

49. : ...And look at your questions, all of the questions. All your questions were grammatically wrong. Ha! (giggle) Your questions, "When does Pesta Pulau Pinang held?" "How long does it held?" "How did the vehicles decorate?" If you're not sure your questions are write or wrong what do you do?

(Appendix A (ii))

ii. General Pedagogical skills

(Pre-observation dialogue)

3. : What's your purpose? What's your topic?
17. : So, where's your speaking practice?
51. : ...Let's look at your writing activities.

(Appendix A (ii))

(Post Observation dialogue)

37. : ...If you give them instructions, which is the best way to give instructions? To them one by one? To go to them group by group?
49. : ...And look at how you flew from one activity to the next, without even asking or checking whether your students are with you?

(Appendix B (ii))

(Observation notes/Written comments)

1. : I'm wondering what your set induction is. From the plan there is no set induction.

(Appendix E (ii))

iii. Pedagogical Skills to teach Content

(Pre-observation dialogue)

49. : why not give them another passage, which is similar, to give them practice in forming paragraphs?
55. : ...Don't you think it would be very helpful, if you actually do every single pictures...at practice...writing the sentences in the class?

(Appendix A (ii))

(Post Observation Dialogue)

1. : *Why didn't you?[teach vocabulary[... Isn't it one of the most important procedure in teaching reading? That vocabulary work is important in teaching reading?*
63. : *How much guidance did you give them? (Speaking activity) How much input did you give them before you practised?*

(Appendix B (ii))

(Observation notes/Written Comments)

1. : *You read the passage and tried to explain the passage at the same time. I can sense that the pupils were not with you. They do not understand your explanation.*
2. : *You showed word cards/ sentence strips on greetings and put them as a listening and speaking activity. Do you go around holding a sentence strip when you want to greet a friend?*

(Appendix E (ii))

4.3.3 Helping Atmosphere.

An essential feature of counselling dialogues, which is the main determiner for the success, or failure of the dialogues is a 'positive empathetic atmosphere'. The student teachers should feel free to talk and explore their plans and teaching with the supervisors, which involves deep commitment of the supervisors in understanding teaching from the student teachers' perspectives (Randall and Thornton, 2001). This positive empathetic atmosphere is built or created through 'effective attending', 'active listening', 'creative empathy' and 'probing' by the supervisors. A positive empathetic atmosphere entails 'trust', 'concern' and 'non-punitive' interventions (Heron 1990). According to Heron, supervisors can reflect trust by showing respect for the student teachers as professionals, have the wisdom to provide good workable solutions and be sensitive to personal and cultural factors. Usually the student teacher's trust is based on advisor's 'experience', 'position of authority' and whether they are treated as 'friends or equals' (Heron, 1990).

In the case of these two lecturers, CS1 showed clear evidence of providing a positive empathic atmosphere by the way she talked and her tone of voice. CS2 on the other hand, spoke with a raised voice most of the time. At times she sounded as if she was scolding and at other times it was more like grumbling. Very seldom did she talk supportively during the pre- and post observation dialogues.

As for listening attentively, CS1 communicated throughout the two discussions that she was actively and closely interested in what the student said through her verbal signals. Although CS2 also listened attentively to what her student said, she did most of the talking. The manner in which CS1 talked to the student, her tone of voice and the nature of providing help showed that she treated the student as a professional whilst CS2 was like a superior talking sense to a subordinate. Though her intentions were noble, her manner of expressing her thoughts was more confrontational, which put the student under a lot of anxiety. ST2 confessed that she was not able to think and give proper responses to CS2 because she was mentally and emotionally disturbed by the way she intervened and probed during the discussions. Sometimes, she claimed, she did not have the *'mood'* to listen.

(a) CS1's Non-Threatening Interventions

51. CS1 : What about your questioning? The oral questions, there was one, you did here, right? Then you did your story, uh? (Probing)
52. ST1 : Aha...(Relaxed informal response)
53. CS1 : After they have read, you ask them oral questions right? (Probing)
54. ST1 : Yes. (Relaxed response)
55. CS1 : Okay. (Listening)
56. ST1 : Ah, this one...this one (pointing to lesson plan) (Relaxed and informal)
57. CS1 : Okay. (Listening)
58. ST1 : That one they can answer. (Relaxed informal response)
59. CS1 : They were able to answer you? (Probing)
60. ST1 : Hmm. (Relaxed)
61. CS1 : All right. So you feel that the writing was not? (Probing)
62. ST1 : Not okaylah. Not good. (Relaxed informal response)
63. CS1 : Not good at all. That's what you feel. But the reading part

was okay. (Probing)

64. *ST1* : *Yeah.* (Relaxed and informal)
65. *CS1* : *Hmm, can, besides the: besides the class, what other reasons, could there be, y' know, for that?* (Probing)
66. *ST1* : *Maybe because hmm ( ) In fact just now, uh.*(Relaxed)
67. *CS1* : *Hmm.* (Listening)
68. *ST1* : *The students, the pupils said to me that* (Relaxed)
69. *CS1* : *Hmm.* (Listening)
70. *ST1* : *Why could, why could they* (Relaxed)
71. *CS1* : *Ahemm.* (Listening)
72. *ST1* : *Do the simple one? Why could. Why could we write so many, so many?* (Relaxed)
73. *CS1* : *Ehmm.* (Listening)

Appendix B (i)

From the excerpt we can see that she probed the student as if she was an equal, another professional with whom she was discussing. There is no indication of intimidating or evaluating the student's performance. When the student explained, she gave verbal signals to show that she was listening attentively. The informal way the student talks and responds suggests the presence of an atmosphere of trust.

(b) CS2's Confrontational Interventions

49. *CS2* : *...If you're not sure whether your questions are right or wrong, what do you do?* (Probing)
50. *ST1* : *Check with my friends. (answered confidently, initially)*
51. *CS2* : *Yes. You know how to say that, but you don't. Because you think you know how to do it yourself!* (Evaluating)
And look at how you flew from one activity to the next, without even asking and checking whether your students are with you. You fly from one activity to the next, activity to the next, ugh? I did not even hear you...ugh...ugh...rounding up the activity. I did not even hear you summarising the activity, and actually making sure that the students u... understand and do the activity before you move on to the next. You were just, "Oh, this activity over, next activity", ugh? It's flying from one activity to another. (Confronting feedback)
So the agenda is whose, yours or the students? (Confronting)
52. *ST1* : *Me.*(A timid response)
53. *CS2* : *Ugh?*
54. *ST1* : *Me.*(Slightly louder)
55. *CS2* : *Your agenda? What's your agenda? You just want to make sure you complete your lesson plan, ugh?* (Confronting)
56. *ST1* : *No.* (Timid response)

57. CS2 : *I think so! That's the impression I get! Fly from one activity to the next, without caring or not whether your students understand. And then you look at your activities here. You did not, you did not, time your activity properly. That one was done in a rush! That one was done in a rush! And then you had so much time, for the activity three, the group work, you actually had one whole thirty minute le... lesson. And, and you know what you were doing at the end? Ugh? You were repeating the things you did earlier on! Why? You were playing with time. You were just trying to kill time! Ugh? Don't you think so? And when you talk to a student, asking the question to the students one to one, what happens to the rest of the class?* (Confronting feedback)

(Appendix B (ii))

This excerpt from CS2's post observation dialogue with ST2 exhibits a tensed atmosphere. Her raised voice presented a threat to the student and she was defensive and not responding well. She was just listening to CS2 expressing her views without much to say. There was no real discussion between the two. Although CS2 was attempting to raise ST2's awareness of her teaching inefficiency, she did not seem to be reaching ST2 in a helpful and supportive manner. At this point CS2 was not giving the student a chance to explore her own teaching problems, but points them out to her, which is not developmental in nature.

According to Heron (1990), during the observation, the advisor needs to signal to the student teacher that she is effectively attending to the student's teaching, and if she concentrates too much on note taking it could create opposite impression. A comparison of the two lecturers' notes showed that CS2 was very thorough in her observation as she touched on minute details of each activity. CS1 on the contrary, seemed to have observed the whole lesson, but picked out only the most salient weaknesses in the lesson. However it was not possible for the researcher to report how they signalled their effective attending because he was not present.

Randall and Thornton stated that for the relationship to be fully collaborative advisors should signal to the students that she is listening to her concerns. Mainly the students' concerns were classroom management, carrying out their activities

successfully and their grammar. The lecturers' observation notes indicated that they did watch and listened to their concerns of pedagogic skills and content knowledge (Appendix E (i) and E (ii))

4.3.4 Supervisory Styles

In general, the supervisors used directive and non-directive interventions (Freeman, 1982; Gebhard, 1990 and Randall and Thornton, 2001) in their pre - observation dialogues, post observation dialogues and written comments. There were much more directive interventions in all the three discourses than non-directives. Of the directive interventions most of them were questions followed by information and a few directions. The use of directive interventions in the dialogues was to raise the students' awareness of their teaching skills, which they were unsure or unaware of. The non-directive interventions were mostly used to guide the students towards their understandings of the situation, but rarely for seeking their own solutions to their problems. CS2 was more detail in her feedback in the dialogues as well as in the written comments. She had more directive and non-directive interventions in her written comments than CS1 who had hardly any non-directive intervention.

(a) CS1

i. Directive interventions

(Post Observation Dialogue)

75. CS1 : *Okay, okay if you look at this, quite a lot to copy y' know.*(Direct information)
76 ST1 : *Ah* (Giggle)
77. CS1 : *And also, another thing, it was not clear.* (Direct information)
78. ST1 : *The writing.*
79. CS1 : *Ha, not clear. I could not see it from the back! Could not read it! Okay?* . (Direct information) *So, they were trying to: copy this one. Do they have it in their book?* (Direct question)
80. ST1 : *No. No.*

81. CS1 : *They don't have it? So, so they're just copying it, y' see?* (Direct information)
82. ST1 : *Hmm.*
83. CS1 : *The, the, so, that's why they're quite, why the group, group B, uh, they have to write a lot.* (Direct information)
84. ST1 : *Ah.*
85. CS1 : *And the group A, they only have to write ve:ry little.* .(Direct information)
86. ST1 : *May be they're not so good, ( ) right.*
87. CS1 : *Ha, y' see. But even when you did the reading aloud just now, you ask them to read, and read. They were so tired, y' know.* (Direct information)

(Appendix B (i))

This excerpt shows CS1 giving direct information to raise ST1's awareness of why her writing activity was not successful, which the student was not aware of even after probing. She used directive interventions where she felt that the student had to be told because she lacked teaching skills.

ii. Non-directive interventions

(Post observation Dialogue)

33. CS1 : *... The writing part? Do you think it was okay?* (Non-directive)
34. ST1 : *I don't know why...hmm...the class they became noisy...hmm* (Reflecting)
35. CS1 : *Why? Why were they noisy?* (Non-directive)
36. ST1 : *Ugh...*(Reflecting)
37. CS1 : *What did you ask them to do? While waiting, actually?* (Non-directive)
38. ST1 : *Ugh... actually I want them to explain first but,*.(Reflecting)
39. CS1 : *Okay.=Explain what?* (Non-directive)
40. ST1 : *Explain...how to do the exercise* (Reflecting)
41. CS1 : *Aha...*(Listening)
42. ST1 : *But, then, hmm...they... I don't know what happened. (giggle)* (Reflecting)
43. CS1 : *Pupils go out...*(Directive question)
44. ST1 : *No, I mean...they just y' know like: playing with their friends* (Reflecting)
45. CS1 : *Yes.* (Listening)
46. ST1 : *So I cannot control them anymore.*(Reflecting)
47. CS1 : *Aha* (Listening)
48. ST1 : *So I cannot do the explanation: because the* (Reflecting)
49. CS1 : *So, you just ask them to write, yeah?* (Directive question)

(Appendix B (ii))

CS1 was trying to get ST1 to reflect on what she did during the writing activity that made it unsuccessful. Her intention was to raise her awareness of the situation and thus the use of the non-directive interventions. The first directive question was to check if she was aware of the situation. The second directive question was to bring the probing to an end so that she could get the student to relate another incident in her lesson.

(b) CS2

i. Directive and non-directive interventions

(Post-Observation Dialogue)

11. CS2 : ....What's the purpose of the group work? Tell me. (Non-directive)
12. ST1 : Students will discuss the ( ) (Reflecting)
13. CS2 : Did they? (Non-directive)
14. ST1 : No, some of them playing around. (Reflecting)
15. CS2 : Yes! What does that tell you about the way you conducted your group work? (Non-directive)
16. ST1 : I'm not ... hmm ... strict. (Reflecting)
17. CS2 : You're not strict. What else? They kept asking, "How to do this, miss? How to do that teacher? How to do this teacher? How to do this teacher?" (Non-directive)
18. ST1 : I didn't explain the ... task ... quite clear. (Reflecting)
19. CS2 : You just ask them to do what? (Non-directive)
20. ST1 : Finish the ... (Reflecting)
21. CS2 : You just asked them to open the envelope and rearrange! (Directive)
How about the contents in the envelope? (Non-directive)
Did you or ... ever bother to read it with them? (Directive)
Did you model the task? (Directive)
Did you actually tell them what to do? (Directive)
You just threw the envelopes at the groups. And you expected the groups to be very involved! (Directive information)

This excerpt shows CS2 using non-directive questions to get the student to reflect on her group activity to raise her awareness of the problem present in the activity. She used the directive interventions to raise her awareness of the reasons for the problem in the activity.

In both cases, the students' generally lacked the skills and knowledge of general pedagogical skills and pedagogical skills to teach content so it was appropriate for the supervisors to use the directive and non-directive interventions (Heron, 1990).

4.3.5 Micro Interventions

Heron (1990) suggested a few micro interventions for providing advise and support to beginning teachers during teaching practice namely 'prescriptive', 'informative', 'confronting', 'cathartic', 'catalytic' and 'supportive'. In their two dialogues and written comments, both the supervisors were more informative than catalytic or prescriptive with CS2 using confronting questions and statements intermittently. CS1 was supportive in a way when she listened to her student relating her experience. They used the catalytic interventions at the beginning stages of the dialogues and before each activity in the lesson plans or classroom teaching to guide the students towards thinking critically about their planned activities or reflecting on their classroom experience. They then follow this by giving direct information or sometimes prescribe what to do.

(a) CS1

i. Micro Interventions

(Post Observation Conference)

For the purpose of brevity, the researcher had to exclude the conversation between the school mentor and the supervisor from this excerpt

112. CS1 : Were you able to cover all that you planned to do? (Catalytic)
113. ST1 : Except for the: closure. (Reflecting)
114. CS1 : Hmm. You couldn't do closure, right? (Directive question)
115. ST1 : Yeah (giggle)
116. CS1 : Why? (giggle) (Catalytic)
121. ST1 : (Giggle) Actually I want to check the answer (Reflecting)[
122. CS1 : Yeah (giggle) (Supportive listening)
123. ST1 : Then I said "Class! Class! Listen class! But (giggle)
124. CS1 : They won't listen! (Informative)

125. ST1 : *They wanted to continue with their, they don't listen.* (Reflecting)
126. CS1 : *(Giggle) They won't listen. I could hardly hear you. You said "Class! Class!* (Softly) (Informative)
127. ST1 : *(Giggle).*
131. CS1 : *Your voice. You have to: make it a bit* [louder] *(prescriptive)*
133. ST1 : *Ha.*
147. CS1 : *"Class!" Linda. Y' know I was trying to* [say] *"Speak a bit louder!"* (Informative)
150. ST1 : *(Giggle) Just now I already shouted at them, but, aiya cannot* (Reflecting)
151. CS1 : *Cannot, yeah (giggle) I could not really, I mean, it was not like, because they were at the back there y' see.*(Informative)
152. ST1 : *Yeah.*
153. CS1 : *They were doing their work, so when you call them, sti:ll y' know.* (Informative)
154. ST1 : *(Giggle)*

(Appendix B (i))

(The school mentor explained that in times like that she keeps quiet until the pupils realise that something is wrong)

229 CS1 : *That's one way, to get their attention. Rather than trying to call them.* (Informative)
273. ST1 : *(Giggle)*
274. CS1 : *Sometimes, calling, calling, it doesn't work.* (Informative)
275. ST1 : *(Giggle)*
276. CS1 : *You call and call, they wouldn't listen, (Giggle)* (Informative)
318. CS1 : *So...a few things... y' know, management, class management* (Informative).
319. ST1 : *(Giggle)*
320. CS1 : *Otherwise you cannot do your teaching y' know. Sometimes your plan could be very beautiful.* (Informative)
321. ST1 : *Hmm.*
322. CS1 : *But the management there is not // is not well done, you cannot, you cannot teach the lesson.* (Informative)
323. ST1 : *Hmm.*

Appendix B (i)

The catalytic intervention was to get ST1 to reflect on her closure and why she could not complete it. The informative interventions were meant to raise her awareness of classroom management, which was essential for the successful completion of a teaching activity.

(b) CS2

63. CS2 : ... *They didn't know how to say!* (Confronting)
How much guidance did you give them/ // How much input did you give before you practised? (Catalytic/confronting)
You called the students up to practice, all right! (Confronting)
Now, how much input did you give before that, in your presentation to make sure they know what to say! (confronting) Was there any input? // in your presentation? Was there? Yes or No? No? Yes or No? (Confronting)

64. ST1 : *No (reflecting)*

65. CS2 : *And then when you just ask them to practice, how do you expect them to know what to say, if you did not give any input?* (Catalytic)
You did not even give them a, a let's say a, a, a set of a, a guideTurn as to what to say when you want them to come and practice? Ugh! Surely! Surely! If you had given the students some help, they would, they would know what to say! Ugh! (Informative/confronting)
Don't you think so? (Confronting)
For instance, before you, you actually get them to come to the front, you talk about a celebration. You tell them, the name of the celebration, the date of the celebration. What you do during the celebration. How you feel during the celebration. What you like best about the celebration. (informative)
Now, if you give them this kind of guidance, don't you think that during the practice stage they will be able to say things? (confronting)
But, you did not. You did not. (Confronting)

(Appendix B (ii))

CS2's catalytic intervention was to raise the student's awareness of giving input before a speaking activity, but because she had advised her in the previous observation about the importance of giving input before a productive task, she used confronting interventions to make her aware of the mistake she did. This instead raised both their anxiety and the atmosphere was too tensed to help the student reflect and learn from her classroom experience.

Throughout the pre-and post observation conferences, CS1's interventions sounded unthreatening whilst some of CS2's suggestions and comments sounded *'intimidating'* and *'evaluative'*. ST1 sounded more relaxed and responded eagerly. On the contrary, the researcher could sense anxiety and defensiveness in ST2's voice and

responses. According to ST2 in the interview, she was not able to comprehend or respond to CS2 because she was under stress, as CS2 sounded as if she was reprimanding her. This could be the reason why she was not able to transfer the suggestions and discoveries in the pre-and post dialogues to her later lessons. However, the catalytic and confronting interventions used by the supervisors were appropriate for tackling the students' who lacked confidence and were worried about failing (Heron, 1990), except that CS2 did not create a positive empathetic atmosphere for her student to receive her counselling well.

As for the written comments, both were descriptive in nature but CS2, along with her catalytic questions made 'judgmental', 'evaluative' and 'intimidating' remarks that were not helpful to promote the 'development of the teacher's 'personal growth' and 'autonomy' (Wallace, 1991)

4.3.6 Critical Thinking

Reflective practice involves critical thinking and catalytic questions used during counselling dialogues were intended to develop critical thinking among pre-service teachers (Randall and Thornton, 2001). According to them, by analysing and probing students on their experiences in the classroom, advisors act as catalysts to develop their critical thinking. Brookfield (1987 in Randall and Thornton, 2001) stressed that critical questioning by the supervisors should be specific and work from the particular to the general. Four basic strategies for this are 'following', 'consulting', 'proposing' and 'leading' (Randall and Thornton, 2001). Another set of six strategies that supervisors can use to promote critical thinking is what Randall and Thornton call the *'catalytic tool kit'*.

In their probing, CS1 and CS2 reflected two of the strategies: 'leading' and 'following' in both the pre- and post observation conferences. In their observation notes

and written comments, CS2 used 'leading'. As for the use of catalytic tools, of the six strategies the most prominent one used by the two lecturers were open questions.

(a) CS1

i. Leading

i. "Before you go into reading, okay. What do you do first?"
ii. "How are you going to teach sentence patterns? What sentence patterns are you going to teach?"
iii. "What about your questioning? The oral questions. There was one you did here right?

(Turns 10, 171, Appendix A (i), Turn 51, Appendix B (i))

ii. Following

i. ST1 : Then... hmm, when they came to writing
CS1 : ... The writing part, do you think it was okay?
ii. ST1 : And then I explained the meaning of the difficult words.
CS1 : Ahem... You had three right? How many did you have?

(Turns 20 - 21, 32 - 33, Appendix B (i))

(b) CS2

i. Leading

i. "Why do you choose your topic is events. Why do you choose festivals?"
ii. "Look at your group work. Reflect on your group work".

(Turn 7 Appendix A (ii), Turn 11 Appendix B (ii))

ii. Following

i. ST1 : The task is easy.
CS2 : How do you know the task was easy?
ii. ST1 : Hmm... I don't know... my pupils... the words that... because the vocabulary... some of the words they did not understand.
CS2 : Why didn't you? // Isn't it one of the most important procedure in teaching reading?

(Turns 30, 10 and 11, Appendix B (ii)

4.4 Conclusion

The two case studies revealed that both CS1 and CS2 practiced as they perceived of what clinical supervision was to them though in this particular observation CS2 was exasperated by the negative attitude of her supervisee. The cross-case study gave insights into the approach and intervention techniques they used to advise and support the student teachers. On the whole it showed that they were more directive in their approach, giving directive information and suggestions because the two student teachers lacked pedagogical skills and content knowledge. However there were also non-directive interventions, probing the students' to think critically to a certain extent. The micro helping techniques used by CS1 created a more positive empathetic atmosphere for ST1 who received her counselling well. CS2's techniques on the other hand seemed to raise ST2's anxiety, which was actually counterproductive. Although quite a number of discoveries were made during the counselling sessions, they were not efficiently transferred to the following lessons, as there was no proper action plan. The next chapter will delve further into the findings of the analysis, and discuss the implications.